



1980 Bombay



1980 Brockwood
Public Talks and
Conversations With
David Bohm



1980 Madras



1980 Ojai



1980 Saanen



1981 Bombay



1981 Brockwood



1981 Madras



1981 New Delhi



1981 Ojai



1981 Rajghat



1981 Rishi Valley



1981 Saanen



1982 Bombay



1982 Brockwood 1
Conversations With
Pupul Jayakar



1982 Brockwood 2



1982 Madras



1982 Ojai
Public Talks &
Conversations
Bohm, Hidley And
Sheldrake
(title: The Nature of
the Mind)



1982 Rishi Valley



1982 Saanen



1983 Bombay



1983 Brockwood
Conversation With
Pupul Jayakar



1983 New Delhi



1983 New York



1983 Ojai
Public Talks &
A Conversation
With Jonas Salk



1983 Rishi Valley



1983 Saanen



1983 San Francisco
Public Talks &
Radio Interview



1984 Bombay



1984 Brockwood 1
A Dialogue With
Staff And Students,
3 Brain Seminars &
A Conversation
With Ronald Eyre



1984 Brockwood 2
Public Talks &
Conversations with
Zimbalist, McCoy
and Murdoch



1984 Madras



1984 New York
Public Talks &
United Nations Talk



1984 Ojai



1984 Rajghat



1984 Rishi Valley



1984 Saanen



[1984 San Francisco
Public Talks &
Radio Interview](#)



[1985 Bombay](#)



[1985 Brockwood 1
Conversations With
Four Students](#)



[1985 Brockwood 2
Public Talks &
TV Interview](#)



[1985 Madras
Public Talks &
A Conversation
With J. Upadiah](#)



[1985 Ojai](#)



[1985 Rishi Valley](#)



[1985 Saanen](#)



[1986 Madras](#)



[Lost And Found](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[2nd Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Conversation With David Bohm](#)

[2nd Conversation With David Bohm](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

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

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

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[4th Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[1st Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[2nd Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[3rd Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[4th Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[5th Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[4th Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Talk With Students](#)

[2nd Talk With Students](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

1st Talk With Students

2nd Talk With Students

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

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

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Conversation](#)

[2nd Conversation](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

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

[4th Public Talk](#)

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

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

1st Conversation With David Bohm, John Hidley and
Rupert Sheldrake
Roots of Psychological Disorder

2nd Conversation With David Bohm, John Hidley and
Rupert Sheldrake
Psychological Suffering

3rd Conversation With David Bohm, John Hidley and
Rupert Sheldrake
The Need for Security

4th Conversation With David Bohm, John Hidley and
Rupert Sheldrake
What Is a Healthy Mind?

*The video tapes of these conversations were named:
"The Nature of the Mind"*

2nd Public Talk
Crisis in Ourselves

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting
Violence, Fear, and Religious Division

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting
Awareness, Concentration, and Attention

3rd Public Talk
Thought and the Source of Disorder

4th Public Talk
The Content of One's Consciousness

3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting
Responsibility, Respectability, and Self-Knowing

4th Public Question And Answer Meeting
Negation of the 'I'

5th Public Talk
On the Nature of Love

6th Public Talk
The Thinking Machine and Meditation

[1st Talk With Students](#)

[2nd Talk With Students](#)

[3rd Talk With Students](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

1st Conversation

Is there an Eastern Mind and a Western Mind?

2nd Conversation

Is There a Space Without End?

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

Conversation With Jonas Salk
Can We Uncondition Ourselves?

1st Public Talk
Responsibility for the World

2nd Public Talk
What Is

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting
Understanding Wholly, Not Intellectually

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting
How Do We Waste Our Energy?

3rd Public Talk
The Recording Machine

4th Public Talk
Freedom and the Sacred

[1st Talk With Students](#)

[2nd Talk With Students](#)

[3rd Talk With Students](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[New Dimension Radio Interview With Michael Toms](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[Talk At The Indian Institute Of Technology](#)

[Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[Dialogue With Staff And Students](#)

[1st Brain Seminar](#)

[2nd Brain Seminar](#)

[3rd Brain Seminar](#)

[Conversation With Ronald Eyre](#)

[The Elements of Playfulness](#)

1st Public Talk
The Cause of Conflict in Relationship

2nd Public Talk
Looking at Fear, That Extraordinary Jewel

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting
Good and Evil

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting
Why Do We Pray?

3rd Public Talk
Is It Possible to End All Sorrow?

4th Public Talk
The Nature, Depth, and Beauty of Death

1st Conversation With Mary Zimbalist
Conditioning

2nd Conversation With Mary Zimbalist
Fear

Conversation With Mary Zimbalist
And Ray McCoy
Conditioning

1st Conversation With Iris Murdoch
Where There Is Self-Interest, Love Is Not

2nd Conversation With Iris Murdoch

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[United Nations Talk](#)

[Peace In Our Time](#)

[Alternative Title: The Causes of War](#)

1st Public Talk

Why Human Beings Hurt Each Other

2nd Public Talk

The Invention of Gods

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting

Are You an Individual?

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting

Facts, Opinion, Justice, and Sexuality

3rd Public Talk

Invention and Motive

4th Public Talk

The Absence of the 'Me'

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Talk With Students](#)

[2nd Talk With Students](#)

[3rd Talk With Students](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[New Dimensions Radio Interview With Michael Toms](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

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

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

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Conversation With Four Students](#)

[2nd Conversation With Four Students](#)

[3rd Conversation With Four Students](#)

1st Public Talk

Why Do We Have So Many Problems?

2nd Public Talk

The Relationship of Time and Thought to Fear

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting

To Be Psychologically Simple

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting

Living Vulnerably

3rd Public Talk

The Relationship of Freedom to Self-Interest

4th Public Talk

The Nature of the Brain That Lives Religiously

TV Interview

The Role Of A Flower

1st Public Talk

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting
Illusion Can Be Fact

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting
Observing Without a Thought

2nd Public Talk
Can Thought Give Human Beings Security?

3rd Public Talk
Shallowness of a Life Without Passion

4th Public Talk
Death Is Not at the Far End of Life

Conversation With J. Upadiah

1st Public Talk

Responsibility in a Chaotic World

2nd Public Talk

Is There Something Beyond Thought?

1st Public Question And Answer Meeting

Guilt is Part of the Ego

2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting

Tomorrow is Now

3rd Public Talk

Beauty, Pleasure, Sorrow, and Love

4th Public Talk

What Is a Religious Mind?

1st Talk With Teachers

1st Dialogue With Students
Why Do We Have Opinions?

2nd Talk With Teachers

3rd Talk With Teachers

2nd Dialogue With Students
Who is Krishnamurti?

1st Public Talk

Why Does Man Live in Conflict?

2nd Public Talk

To Be Utterly Free of Disorder

3rd Public Talk

Seeing Self-Interest as the Root of Fear

4th Public Talk

Beauty Is the Quiet of the Self Forgotten

5th Public Talk

Silence as the Ground of the Eternal

1st Public Talk

The Fact and the Idea of the Fact

2nd Public Talk

The Origin of Primal Energy

3rd Public Talk

The Inquiring Brain

[1982 Brockwood - Discussion With M. Wilkens and
David Bohm](#)

[1982 London - 2nd Public Talk](#)

[1985 New York - United Nations Talk To An Invited
Audience](#)
[Understanding Yourself](#)

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 16TH JANUARY 1980

It would be rather interesting to find out why you are sitting here and what you are going to listen to. You either come out of curiosity or you have been urged by friends to come and listen; or one is very serious to find out what the speaker has to say. To find out what the speaker has to say, one has to listen, listen with a sense of care, attention and perhaps affection, as though listening to a friend talking about the vast expanse of life with all the complexities, with all the pain and sorrow, anxieties, death, love, meditation, the whole process of living, all this is included. And if we could right at the beginning be clear that you are not listening to a series of lectures, a series of ideas or a philosophy, that is, a lot of words with a great many ideas involved in those words, but rather we are thinking together, if that is possible. We rarely think together. If you have ever observed your friend or yourself or an intimate person, we never think together and if we could during these talks and discussions, or rather, dialogues between yourselves and the speaker, then perhaps we could go together into a vast enquiry, into a deep perception of our life, our daily monotonous life of boredom, tears, sorrow and grief and all the rest of it.

Thinking together implies that both of us, the speaker and you, meet not only at the verbal level, but also at a much deeper level, because words are merely a means of communication. When one speaks English, the other perhaps understands also English and so there is a verbal communication, but words can be dangerous, can be misleading. So one must be very careful in the usage of words,

their meaning and their content. Because we are not disseminating any ideas, doing any propaganda or urge you to join some kind of ridiculous so-called religious organizations, we are not telling you what to think, but rather how to think over many problems that we have. The art of thinking together. I do not know if you have observed that you can think together about something, about the corruption in this country, the degeneration of human mind, the political situation and so on? Thinking together about something is comparatively easy. But thinking together is quite a different matter. I hope we understand this point.

When there is a crisis of any kind in which we are all involved, we put aside our own personal point of views, prejudices, conclusions, concepts and come together to think over a certain problem, like war, then we all come together out of our fear, hatred of our neighbours and so on. It is strange how human beings come together when they hate, when they want to kill, which is war. But what we are suggesting is not thinking about something, but thinking itself, together if that is possible. Because we are not trying to persuade or pressurize you to think this or that. But the art of thinking together demands a great deal of freedom. Freedom implies etymologically, the root meaning of that word is friendship, love, care, responsibility, all that is involved in that word `freedom'. But as one observes, freedom is being denied to man. Religions throughout the world have denied freedom to man because they have through a great many centuries insisted on dogmas, beliefs, rituals, concepts, words put together and that has controlled, shaped the mind and therefore there is never any freedom. If you believe in something, that prevents you from

having freedom, if you are caught in a concept, as most people are, the concept which is to conceive an idea from observation; you see something or understand intellectually something, from that understanding make an abstraction which becomes an idea. And so man, if you observe throughout history and actually what is going on, freedom which is so utterly, absolutely necessary for man, for his growth, for his flowering, for his goodness is being denied by the Marxist, by the Maoists, by the totalitarian states, forcing man to conform to a certain pattern. I do not know if you have observed all these things. And apparently human beings are too willing to conform to a pattern - religious, economic, social or political. The extreme left with their concepts, ideas, Marxism, Maoism and so on and the extreme right with their concepts, with their conclusions, so gradually, if you observe for yourself closely, freedom is being denied.

Freedom means not doing what you like, being permissive, freedom implies a great sense of love, and with that responsibility, clarity to observe, and freedom also implies action. So we are using that word very carefully. And without freedom man cannot flower in goodness. Please, this is very important to understand. If I may point out we are thinking together. We are sharing together the meaning of words, not only intellectually, which is, the function of the intellect is to understand and if possible translate it into action.

And without freedom in the sense we are using that word - it does not mean doing what each one likes which has led man to this present state of chaos, to his present state of degeneration, to this collapse of civilization of a culture - where there is freedom there

must go with it love, responsibility and action. And during these talks it is our function, it is our responsibility to free our mind, which is such an extraordinary instrument, to free our minds from all the burden of a million years, so our minds can flower, increase, expand.

I wonder how much we are in communication with each other. One wonders whether each one of us really want freedom - freedom from our tradition, dead, destructive traditions, from our authorities, both religious, ideological authority from our own narrow experiences, demands, urges and desires, because without freedom there can be no goodness and without goodness you can't possibly create a new society. A society is not made by some extraordinary events, society is brought about as it is now by human beings with their corruption, with their ambition, competition, brutality, violence and all the greed and envy that is involved in each human being, we have created this society and we are the only people who can change it, that is bringing about in our own life, in our daily life, a sense of goodness. The word `good' means whole, not fragmented, good means a life in which there is no contradiction in ourselves. Goodness also means a life that is made whole.

We can't go into this during these talks, but we must understand right from the beginning, from this day till the end of these talks that we are not only thinking together, but acting. Because life is action, not just a lot of theories, a lot of speculative nonsense. You may read the Gita, the Upanishads and all the rest of it, but they are a vast structure of words, and you cannot live on words, which you are trying to do. So it is important from the beginning of our talks

that we understand each other, that we are not trying to persuade you to think one way or the other or disseminating any kind of ideas. What we are concerned about, is with the activities of our daily life, which includes education, sex, sorrow, love, death, meditation, all that is included in our daily life and if we don't understand our daily life we cannot possibly be good.

So can we together, take a journey into the vast structure of the mind. Our minds, yours and the speaker's, our minds have evolved with its brain through millennia, through a million years and more. This is a fact, not a supposition, not a theory, your brain is the result of millions of years of experiences, knowledge, memories with a continuous expansion and contraction. So your brain and your mind is not yours, it is the mind and the brain of humanity which has grown through vast evolution in time. I hope this is clear. Unless you understand this right from the beginning we will not be able to meet each other. You understand sirs? Your mind, the mind being your senses, your emotions, your capacity to think, your sexual desires, your ambitions, your greed, all this is a million years old. So your brain, your mind is the result of vast human endeavour, of vast human struggle. And that mind is not yours, it is the mind of human beings, but our mind has made thought which has made of the idea of `me' and `you', `we' and `they', which is totally erroneous, an illusion. I don't know if you are following all this. Probably you will totally disagree with all this and I hope you do because that is your tradition, that you are an extraordinary individual, with a separate ego, soul, with a separate character and so on, but if you examine at a deeper level all human beings throughout the world, whether they are brown, black, purple,

yellow or whatever colour they are, they go through sorrow, they have tears, laughter, pain, anxiety, it is a common factor of man.

But you may have certain technological, educational conditioning, you may be in India a scientist, a biologist, an archaeologist, but basically, inwardly, deeply, you are like the rest of humanity. So you are not an individual. Right? No, you won't understand this, because we cling to our individuality; when we suffer we don't see that mankind suffers, when we are violent which includes anger, cruelty, unkindness and so on, all human beings have this seed of violence. Right sirs? You see the point, don't you? That we are the whole summation of humanity, and when one realizes that, not verbally, but actually as fact, not as a theory, that our minds, that our brains are the result of millions of years of time and growth, experience, knowledge, we then have a total responsibility, not as an individual having a little responsibility to his little family, but of course he has, but a responsibility to all mankind, that gives an extraordinary vitality which the individual has not. I wonder if you follow all this. Are we communicating with each other? Would you kindly tell me, some of you whether you are really, logically, rationally, sanely following what is being said or do you say, this is a fanciful utopian idea, sounds very nice, but in fact it is nonsense? Or do you see the full implication of what is being said? How our minds have grown into narrow grooves, as the individual, as the Hindu, as the Christian, as the Communists, Marxists, Maoists, you understand, narrow grooves and to realize those narrow grooves bring about separation: when you call yourself a Hindu you separate yourself from the Muslims and the Muslims separate from

the Islamic and the Islamic from the Jewish community, and the Jewish community separate themselves from the Christian and so on and so on. You realize all this. This is logic, rational, but reason, logic is never convenient. We are more driven by our desires, by our pleasures, by our continuous assertion that we are individual. The very word 'individual' means a human being is not broken up, who is indivisible. Do you understand all this?

If we do really understand the depth of the meaning, then the endeavour to be a separate human being, as an individual, as belonging to a certain community completely ends, then you are totally a human being with all the problems involved in that.

So during these talks, there will be six of them I believe, if you are serious, it is our sharing together the content of our mind. The mind includes not only as we pointed out the senses, emotions and the reactions, but also the brain, the brain which has evolved through millennia, thousands and thousands of years and accumulated a great deal of knowledge through experience and this knowledge as memory is stored up in the brain. This is a fact, not the speaker's invention, it is a fact that our whole brain, the whole of it, is the residue of vast experience and therefore vast memory and the cells in the brain hold this memory. You can ask a brain specialist, if he is a friend of yours and he is willing to discuss with you. Find out if what we are saying is not so, the most advanced brain specialists are saying what we are saying, have been saying for sixty years that the brain has evolved through time and therefore that brain has accumulated vast experience from which arises our knowledge and this knowledge, which is memory, is in the brain, all the senses of the brain contain memory. You

understand the implications of it? You see, when a brain is so crowded it is incapable of being free. You understand the point?

Just go as two friends talking over together their problems, their anxiety to solve their immediate accidents, incidents, problems and reactions, we are two friends, right? Please, I mean it, we are two friends talking over together. Friends also means, the word 'friend' comes from the word freedom, freedom means affections, care, love, so we are two friends talking over together, I am not lecturing, I am not telling you what to think, or what to do, drop this or do that. We are two friends concerned with all the problems of life, not just your problem; your problem is the problem of every human being. So two friends talking over together, so there is no barrier, can we be like that, there are no barriers and so we are enquiring together, we are asking, having a dialogue, if the brain is the residue of millions of years and the whole of the brain is memory, what are the implications of that? Which means the past is guiding our life, right? The past is shaping our life, the past being the tradition, the rituals, the authority of some so-called priests, gurus and all the rest of it, the memories of your hurts, of your demands sexually, memories of all that. So what happens? You are always living in a narrow groove of the past. You understand all this? So what takes place? Your brain then becomes specialized, like a doctor, is specialized, like an engineer, like a house wife, like a carpenter, like a scientist, they become specialized, therefore they become narrow. They can't think or go beyond their limitations. Have you ever discussed with any specialist, whether he be a doctor, a scientist, or so-called specialists who are the gurus, have you ever discussed with them?

Go beyond their conditioning, they are lost. You understand what I am saying?

So gradually human beings have become specialists. Aren't you all specialists in your job? If you are a lawyer, for the rest of your life you think as a lawyer. You may go outside that occasionally, but your whole brain is functioning along a particular narrow groove. With the result - please follow all this, it is your life, not my life - with the result that more and more separation, more and more conflict, more and more struggle, violence. Right? You are following all this? Not what I am saying, that has no importance. I am only acting as a mirror to your life in which you see yourself as you are, and when you see in that mirror what you are then you can throw away the mirror, the mirror is not important.

So we are enquiring into ourselves, looking at our activities, at our memories, how all our memories are either of yesterday or of a million years, and from those memories thought comes. You are following all this sir? Thought is the response of memory. If you are educated as an engineer, you have stored up an enormous amount of knowledge, stored up in the brain and that knowledge is memory and you think along that memory. So thinking is the response of knowledge, experience, memory. If you have no memory you can't think. Right? Obviously. But as most people have cultivated this memory their thinking is always limited. Right? Please understand this carefully.

Knowledge is never complete, can never be complete. That is a fact, the scientists can explore not only the atom but also the universe, the stars, what is beyond the stars, but their knowledge is limited, they can never, never have complete knowledge of the

universe, any more than a mathematician, or a biologist, or any kind of specialist's knowledge must invariably be limited, which means, listen carefully, that knowledge always goes with ignorance. You follow my point? I wonder if you do. As knowledge can never be complete, it must always have the shadow of ignorance with it. And out of this knowledge springs thought. So thought is always limited. Right? Please come with me, move.

So thought has created our society. Thought has created all the gods, whether the Christian saviour or Hindus business, all are the product of thought. When you go to your church or to your temple, do your puja and ring the bell, all that circus, it is essentially the product of thought. There is nothing sacred about it. You are following all this? I know you will follow it intellectually, but go home and ring the bell, do the puja and carry on. I know, that is your way of living. That is you hear something logical, sane, true and do exactly the opposite in your daily life, and so your life is broken up, you become hypocrites and therefore constantly in battle. So when one realizes that thought upon which we depend so much, thought from which all our actions take place, is limited, whatever it has created, however beautiful, however technological, it is still limited. So as our whole brain contains memory and from that memory thinking takes place, then what relationship has memory, thought in our human relationship? You understand my question? Right?

Please, tell me somebody understands or not. Look, relationship, that is, human relationship, is our daily life. Right? Our human relationship can be superficial, sexual, business and so it can be on the surface, or our relationship can be much deeper.

Right? The word `relationship' comes from the word 'relate', that is, to relate something which has already happened. You understand this? Oh, lordy, come on sir. You relate a story, that is, you have already heard that story and you re-say it. If you observe, our relationship is based on memory. Right? Which is on thought. Right sir? Look at it, don't agree with me. Look at your own life. When you are related to your wife, husband or whatever it is, that relationship contains the great movement of thought. Right? The remembrance, the sexual remembrance, the remembrance of hurts, the remembrance of irritation, jealousy, that remembrance is our relationship. Right? Which means what? Enquire into it much more. Which is, if our relationship is based on memory which is thought limited, then what place has love in thought? You understand? Do you understand my question? I wonder. Now let me repeat it again in a different way.

As we pointed out the meaning of the word `relate' means to look back, to refer to. And our relationship is based on referring to the past events, past incidents, past experiences, which has built an image and that image has relationship with another image. You are following all this? Sirs, exercise you minds, your brains, work at it. Don't just go to sleep because I am talking. It is very important to understand because unfortunately most of us are educated. We have cultivated the brain and the knowledge, the knowledge that we have acquired through school, college, university if you are lucky enough, or unlucky enough, and if you are not educated you have just become a - you know.

So our minds, our brains which are so conditioned by our education, by our tradition, by our books, so that we cannot find

out or break through the limitation of thought. As our life is a movement in relationship we must understand the full significance of relationship and whether it is possible to transform the present relationship into something totally different. Otherwise we live as we are living, absolutely meaningless, quarrelling, jealous, antagonism, hurts. You are following all this? So as relationship is life, the life that we know, the daily life, that relationship is based on memory: the referring back to past events, past memories and so on and so on. So what happens to a relationship when everything is based on thought? Right? You understand my question? You understand sir? Come on! Surely in your life when you look at it very closely, memory, which is thought, is dominant. Right? What is the relationship between thought and love? You understand my question? That is, is love remembrance? Is love, compassion, merely an instrument of thought? When you say you love somebody, I wonder if you Indians ever say to anybody that you love, do you? Do you? Don't, don't. You know what it means to love somebody? When you love somebody you forget yourself, you are not, and love is. Where you are, love is not. You understand what I am saying?

So we are asking: our relationship now is based on thought and therefore in that relationship there is always division, naturally because thought is fragmented, limited, and when your relationship is based on thought it must be divisive, separate, and therefore where there is separation there must be battle: the Muslims and the Hindus, the Jews and the Arabs. Right? The Communists, the Maoists, Marxists, you understand all this? Where there is division, there must be conflict and apparently you are content to live in

conflict. Right? You accept it. You say, yes, we know that, but that is inevitable. It is our lot, it is our karma, words, words, but you love to live in conflict. Right? So what does that indicate? Sir, go into it. For god's sake look into it. That you accept everything. Right? You accept corruption because you yourself are corrupt, you accept authority - authority in the sense, not the authority of law, the authority of tradition, the authority of the guru, the authority of the book. You understand? So your brain accepts anything that is comfortable, not disturbing, stay put. Right? Haven't you noticed this in your own life?

So what has happened to a mind that has accepted things as they are? It is a dead mind. Right? You shake your head and say, yes, that means that you are dead, a living corpse. See what you have reduced yourselves to. Please go into it for your own sake.

Sir, human beings cannot perpetually live in conflict because that is the very essence of degeneration. You understand? When you are constantly in struggle, constantly in conflict, constantly competitive, you must inevitably wear yourself out, both psychologically and physically. You know in North Canada, the eskimos, you know the people who live in the North Atlantic, the Arctic, they never knew competition: they hunted together, they never said, I am a better hunter than you are. They hunted together, though separately they lived in their igloos, they came together and they hunted, shared what food they had and so on. There was never any sense of superior and inferior, never this terrible competitive spirit. Then the so-called white man came there and introduced racing. You understand all this? The slave, which meant, who wins first, then began the competition. Now, all that we are pointing out,

is that a mind, brain in constant struggle, constant pain, constant anxiety becomes a dead mind, you understand, it is not alive. And so civilization goes down the drain. You follow what I am saying? What has happened to you all? Sir, you had a culture in this country for three to four thousand years. Right? The so-called Brahmanic culture. Just a minute, I am using the word `Brahmanic', the Brahmana, without any attachment to that word. You are following all this? I am not anti-Brahman, or pro-Brahman, I don't belong to that kind of nonsense. But you have had a culture of three to four thousand years, so-called Brahmanic culture which has left a tremendous imprint. And during the last fifty to a hundred years it has totally been wiped out. Right? The Brahmins are afraid to call themselves Brahmins, naturally they are not Brahmins, but their birth, all the rest of it, they are afraid to call themselves Brahmins, because they won't get a job. They are frightened and so on and so on.

Now if you examine why this culture has completely gone, why - you will say, it is perhaps the Western culture, the technology, the telephone, the radio, the communication, the science, the medicine, all from the West, nothing of your own, all from the West, swamping you. Right? Your business, your travels, the aeroplane, everything is from the West, is that the reason why you have this civilization, however good or bad - I am not talking about the value of it - has gone? Is that the reason the Western culture swamping the Eastern culture? That is rather superficial? Is there a deeper cause? Obviously, there is. Which we will go into now.

The speaker has discussed this matter with lots of people, professors, pundits, scholars, politicians, and so on. They are not

interested. They say, our culture is going on, we have our traditions, our traditions are this and that, you know all that nonsense. What is the root cause of man - please find out sir, it is your life - what is the root cause of man's degeneration? A thing that has grown into such an enormous capacity. You understand? The brain has extraordinary capacity? The development of technology, the extraordinary things that they are doing. On one side, and degeneration on the other side. You can be a marvellous technician, marvellous computer expert, a great surgeon, but look at their lives and all the rest of it. So what is the cause of this degeneration of human beings? It is not so much more in this country than elsewhere, but the tendency is to degenerate. Why? You are all silent, are you? Look sir, people who live by the book, you understand 'by the book', which means by words, by theories, by speculations, by concepts, which are all a movement of thought put down in words, in books, and when you live by those words, in books, you are following what is happening to you? You are following all this? That is, when you live on words, the Gita is a word, right? I know, I know your reactions. So the word, the book, becomes all important, not your life. Not your daily life, but words, look what is happening, sir, this is so simple. You have used the words, books like the Gita, Upanishads and whatever all your other sacred nonsensical books, and when you live on that word, your mind is incapable of moving away from the lateral - you understand lateral, linear movement - to something totally different. And that is the major factor of the degeneration of man, depending on knowledge in the book which is not their knowledge, which is not their experience, which is not their word, but

somebody else's. You follow? That means that you are all secondhand people.

Yes sir, it is frightfully serious and tragic. If you want to create a new world, a new civilization, new culture, you have to change the whole way of living, thinking, feeling. But you are not prepared for that. You don't want that. So the see the difficulty, when you are listening to all this which you know to be true, which you know to be factual, but you will do nothing about it, because you are afraid, you might lose your position, what will your wife say, and so on and so on. You will find a lot of excuses, and say, I am weak, but it is all right, carry on. So your life becomes an ugly affair. And no god, no outside agency, no social reform, no politician, no scientist, nothing will change you, except you look at yourself, look at yourself as you are, not what you think you should be, that is just non-fact. The fact is what you are, your daily anxiety, fear and all the rest of it, that is what you are. To say, I must be non-violent, is non-fact. You understand? That is just an idea, the fact is, you are violent, and merely escaping to non-violence is just ridiculous, it has no meaning.

So we began the talk by asking if we can think together. Right? Are we thinking together? Or you are merely listening to a lot of words and those words have their meaning and you know the content of that meaning, which means your life, your daily, monotonous, boring, lonely, anxious life, full of tears and you will create the society which you want, which it is now. You understand, sirs, how serious your responsibility is, as human beings, not as an individual, as human beings living on this earth, which is our earth, not the Indian earth and the Muslim earth, it is

our earth. And we have created a monstrous immoral society. To bring a change in that society, no outside agency, no system, no new Marxism, no new ideas are going to change the society. You have to change. Right? And that change can only begin, that revolution, psychological revolution can only begin very near, which is you. To go very far, you must begin very near. Right, sirs? Very near is you.

So as we are going to talk together next Saturday and Sunday and so on, please bear in mind that we are taking an immense journey into ourselves. Right? Ourselves being the rest of humanity, when you enquire into yourself it is not selfish endeavour, it is an endeavour into the vast human struggle, human pain, human anxiety with their sorrows, love and pleasure and all that. So we can only take that journey if you are serious, not merely intellectual, that is nothing. If you put your heart, your mind, your whole being into this then we can do something together.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 19TH JANUARY 1980

I hope we may continue with what we were talking about on Wednesday evening. We were concerned with the nature of the mind, the mind being all the responses of the senses, emotions and the constant movement of thought. We were concerned whether that whole nature of the mind, which is the mind of every human being which has evolved through many, many millennia, with all of its vast experiences, knowledge and the many incidents, accidents and griefs and sorrows and the continual pursuit of pleasure, fears, anxieties and many varieties of conflict, man has lived in that state - man being woman and man, not just the man alone. And as long as we are merely functioning within the field of knowledge, which is the brain, which is the mind with all the accumulated knowledge, then in that field action becomes fragmented. We will go into it very carefully.

But before we go into it, we must be clear that we are thinking together. This is really, if you don't mind my repeating it over and over again, very important. We never think together. Each one thinks according to his own particular desires, conclusions, concepts and ideas hopes and so on. So there is never coming together in our thinking, in our feelings, in our observing. And as our brains and minds are the result of thousands and thousands of years that brain and that mind, which is not yours or mine, it is not an individual mind, it is the mind of humanity. I think this must be made totally perfectly clear, right from the beginning. What we consider our special brain or special mind has evolved through

millenia. That is a fact. Your brain is the result of thousands of years of experiences, so-called evolution; evolution being a series of accumulation of knowledge through time. That is a fact, it is not the speaker's invention or the speaker's desire, hope, but that is a fact, the fact being that your mind is the result of thousands of years and that mind is not your mind, it is the mind of all humanity. You are the humanity. Please understand this very carefully together because all humanity throughout the world suffers, all human beings go through various forms of struggle, conflict, despair, desperate loneliness, grief, anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, this is the lot of man. As you are the rest of mankind, you are mankind. If one could understand that, not intellectually, not verbally, but the truth of it, inwardly, when one feels this, the reality of it, the truth of it, then this separate isolated activity, self-centredness ends. You are then concerned with the whole of mankind. That gives you tremendous vitality. Because when we narrow this brain and this mind to an individual self-centred activity, as we are doing now throughout the world, that is, 'me' is the most important idea, the 'me' and the 'you', on that we live. But when one realizes the fact, and the brain specialists are also saying now, that the whole of the brain - please understand all this - the whole of your brain retains memory, it is memory: memory being accumulated knowledge through experience. That is a fact. And as long as we function within that area which is limited, because all knowledge is limited, there is no complete knowledge, both in science, biology, archaeology, in any direction where knowledge is operating it is always limited. Right? This is so. And therefore that knowledge is always within the shadow of ignorance. Right?

Please understand this because we are going to go into the various questions which involve our daily life. Until you understand this very carefully, see the truth of it, that our minds are the rest of mankind, if you see the truth of it there is great beauty in it, there is a sense of total responsibility. Not responsibility to your family, to your jobs to this or that. You are totally responsible for all mankind.

So we are going to think together to find out whether our energy is limited always or is there an energy which is limitless. Because now our energy is limited by our action, by our education, by our narrow nationalism, by our beliefs, by our gods, by our religions, it is all canalized. Right? Are you following all this? And when energy is limited its activity must also be limited. Right? So we are going to find out if it is possible for human beings to act so that their action is not fragmented, broken down, and therefore in that there is a great deal of conflict which is a wastage of energy.

Right? You are following all this? Please don't be mesmerized by the speaker. Don't go to sleep. We are not giving out ideas, we are not disseminating some concepts. We are together, you and the speaker together finding out for ourselves, in which there is no authority whatsoever - though the speaker sits on a platform, it doesn't give him any authority, sitting on a platform is merely for convenience. And so we must forget or put that aside when we are listening to the speaker so that we are together moving, walking as two friends, so that we can discover for ourselves the truth of things which is beyond all belief, all tradition, all gods, all concepts.

So if you have established a relationship between you and the

speaker, not only verbally, but intellectually and also actually - you understand the difference between actuality and the verbal capacity of the intellect to grasp the meaning of the word, translates those words into concepts and live according to those concepts? We are not doing that. We are dealing with actuality, that is, what is actually taking place now. One can only deal with that, not with concepts. You understand all this? Because concepts, ideas, ideals are non-fact. What is actually happening is fact. So we are dealing with what actually is happening, to each one of us; and most of us want to avoid that because it is much easier to talk about concepts, ideas and all the rest of the nonsense and never come to face what is actually going on in our daily miserable, limited life. Right? So please, if I may request you most seriously, we are dealing with actuality, not with ideas. Right? The word `idea' comes from the Greek and Latin and so on, which means to observe, to observe, not observe and make an abstraction of it into an idea, into a concept. You are following all this?

So we are concerned with our daily life, what is actually going on inwardly, inside the skin, as it were, and also what is happening outwardly. The outward and the inner are like the tides of the sea coming in and going out. Right? Our brains have extraordinary capacity, untold capacity, as you can observe in the technological field what human beings have done - the atom bomb, the surgery, the medicine, transportation, the division between people and so on. The brain has extraordinary capacity and that capacity is narrowed down by our tradition, by our books, by our beliefs, by our constant battle with each other. I hope you understand all this. So this vast energy is brought down into a small narrow groove. It

took energy for you to come here, it took energy for you to put aside some time to have leisure to come here. When we talk, when we see, when we think, when we feel, all that demands energy. Everything that we do demands energy. But this energy instead of flowering, increasing to a vast degree, we have brought it down to a small area which is our daily miserable conflicting contradictory life. Right? Do we see that as an actuality or when you listen to this are you translating what is being said into an abstraction which becomes an idea? You are following what I am saying?

So the speaker is asking you, how do you listen? How do you receive a statement of that kind? Do you listen or do you resist, or in the very act of listening, you are translating it to your own convenience, to your own comforts, resisting, so that you continue in your tradition, in your work and so on and so on? So it is very important to find out how you listen. You are following all this? Do you listen at all? That is, naturally you hear with the ear, but the hearing with the ear is very limited. Right? You hear the words, the meaning of the words, and there you generally stop. You don't pursue the full meaning of the words, the full content of the words because the word is the expression of thought. Thought, as we pointed out the other day, is limited because knowledge is limited and knowledge which is experience, and therefore it becomes memory and that memory is limited. And when we listen we are listening with thought. I wonder if you understand this. May I go on? Are we listening with thought or are we merely listening? You see the difference in the two? I can listen to what you are saying, arguing, non-verbally, a dialogue and never listen to what you are saying because my thought is interfering with listening to what you

are saying. Right? So can you listen without the movement of thought interfering, which is quite an arduous thing for you to have gone into. Because we are always listening, not only with the ear, hearing with the ear, but also listening not only to what you are saying but also listening to the thought which is interfering with what you are saying. Right? So can you listen without the movement of thought interfering with the act of listening? Because we are going to go into the question, as we are doing now, as long as we live narrowing all our energy to a self-centred activity, life must become tortuous, full of anxiety, grief, sorrow, because we are reducing this vast energy to a small narrow little groove. Right?

So we are going to find out through all these talks whether it is possible to release this total energy. Do you understand my question? And so first we must find out what is order? Is there absolute order, or is order always relative? You are following all this? The housewife wants order in her kitchen and she doesn't want to stand in a queue to get a piece of bread, she wants order; and the business man wants order, so that his investment, his earnings and so on and his avoidance of taxes, he says, please give me order, security. So we turn, we translate order into security. As long as we are secure in our job, having money, we think that we bring about order. We want order. Now the brain can only function excellently when there is order, when there is no self contradiction. You are following all this? When there is no sense of competition, when there is no striving, struggling, the brain demands security, to have security in order to function efficiently. This is what you do in business or if you are a professor or whatever you are, you need security to function skilfully or not skilfully. Right? So the brain is

seeking security.

I do not know if you have noticed in your daily life there is disorder. Right? Please face it. Look at it, don't dodge it. There is disorder and when you sleep the brain tries to bring about order in this disorder. Have you noticed this? When you wake up next morning you find some kind of order is being established. Haven't you noticed all these things? You are a strange set of people.

So we are going to find out whether there is absolute order, irrevocable, immovable order, or order which is relative, convenient, comfortable, safe and all that. You are following all this? Order means, the root meaning of that word comes from the Latin word is to originate, to grow, to increase. Now order according to knowledge is limited order. Right? I wonder if you follow what I am saying. May I ask you, if you don't mind, most respectfully, are you also working as the speaker is working? You understand, working, your mind, your brain are acting, thinking, investigating, observing or are you just sitting there, just listening, and so gradually going to sleep? Which is the fact? Are you working, thinking, observing, actively now?

So we are now asking, what is order, because without order the brain cannot be secure. When there is disorder the brain is all the time trying to create out of this disorder some kind of order because it can only function in complete order at its highest excellence. Right? This is so. Now we are asking, what is order. We accept order as following certain diction, certain ideals and so on. Order according to the totalitarian people is accepting authority. Right? Whether the Maoist authority, Marxist authority or the authority of the Pope or the authority of your guru or the

authority of the books. You follow? In following, in accepting authority you think there will be order - not only outwardly, but also inwardly. Right? And our brains are trained to accept authority: You know, I don't know, please tell me what to do. And so what happens? When we accept authority so that there can be order your mind is not actively alive to find out. You are not investigating. Gradually your mind and your brain become dull which is what is happening in this country. Right? So order based on knowledge, please follow this, order based on knowledge and knowledge being limited, order will also be limited. See the fact of it. Please go into it with me. If I base my desire to have order according to what I already know, or according to certain sanctions, which is based on knowledge, that order will inevitably bring about disorder. Have you got it? So any order based on knowledge must inevitably bring disorder. I wonder if you see the beauty of it.

And is there order which is not based on knowledge? You understand my question? You are following this? Please come with me, let us move together. Because it is very important to find out. As we said, energy which is expended on the accumulation of knowledge and the energy expended on that knowledge in action which we think will bring order will invariably bring disorder. This is a fact. So we are asking is there order beyond the limitation of knowledge? Look, mathematics is order based on knowledge. Order according to science is based on knowledge. All the political economic investigation, acceptance and so on is again based on knowledge and all your politics are based on knowledge, whether it is personal ambition and so on. So our question is, is there an order

which is so absolute, which is not based on human accumulation of knowledge, memory, thought? You get it? Please find out.

We are walking together. We are two friends walking along the same road, friendly - the word `friendly' means affection, love, care - we are two friends walking together and this is a very important question which affects both of them in their daily life. So they are not resisting, they are walking, looking at the trees, the hills, water, the birds, and also saying is there absolute order. Then if there is, the brain is so completely secure, it can act at its highest excellence. You follow this?

We are going to find out if there is an order beyond thought. Right? Now what do you mean by that word `order'? We must be clear, both of us when we use the word `order', what do we mean by it? As we said, the origin of that word is the beginning, the beginning, not the end, not the cause, but the very beginning of energy. I wonder if you get all this. You understand my question? Order implies a state of mind which can also act where thought is necessary, but also be free of thought so that it has an order of the universe. Sir, the universe, which is the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, the new moon and the full moon, the bright stars, they are in complete order. Right? If the sun didn't rise tomorrow or for the next few days we would all be dead. There is order in the universe. And that order is not based on our thought. Do you follow? Please follow this, see the beauty of it, come. Nature is not put together by thought. Thought out of nature has created various things, table, chair, and so on, out of the earth, but the earth, nature, the stars, the beauty of the heavens, the waters, is not put together by thought. And they function, if man doesn't interfere, in complete

order. Right? There is total complete order, absolute order.

Now we are going to find out if in our daily life such absolute order can come into being. You understand my question? We accept disorder. Right? Not only outwardly, but inwardly. Corruption is disorder. The lack of efficiency in the highest places is disorder. When there is a quarrel between two people that is disorder. When man treats woman as though she was mere chattel, as it happens in this country where you don't respect a woman, that is disorder. And without creating order between man and woman you want to find out absolute order. Which is, without understanding disorder and acting so as to live in disorder in our daily life you can't possibly understand the other. You can speculate, write a thesis, take a PhD, become a philosopher. These are just nonsensical, irrational, irrelevant activities when we are concerned with disorder in our daily life. You are following all this? Now you have heard that? Will you realize how you treat women? Right? And change it, say, yes, I agree, it is so, we do ill-treat our women, we have no respect for them, we use them for sexual purposes, to breed our children, and if we have a girl she has a very bad time. You know all this. And all that is disorder and unless you change that radically, you can't possibly find out an order that is so absolute. You are following all this? Will you do it? No, you won't. And that is why our society is degenerating and corrupt, because we think one thing and do a totally different thing.

So as we are saying, the release of energy can only come totally, fully, completely, when there is absolute, irrevocable order, the order of cosmos. And when there is order there is a totally different kind of action. You are following all this?

Now, look, what is action, in which you are all involved? To come here is action, to listen is action, to think is action, not just moving from here to there physically or just going to the office and sweating in the office for the next fifty years, that is also action. To talk to your wife, sleep with her, do anything is action. And the word 'action' means not having done or will do, but to act now. You understand? That is action. You are sitting there listening, that is action. But if you are listening and thinking it over and saying, I will think about it tomorrow, that is not action. So we are saying action is what is taking place now. Whether that action now is based on the past, past memories, past knowledge, past incident, past suffering or acting according to a future concept, future ideas. Right? So which is it that you are doing? Are you acting according to what you have already known? Right? Or acting according to some concept, ideals, premeditative resolves, or observing what is going on and acting immediately? You see the difference? I wonder if you see that. Am I struggling for myself with all this? Or are you also working? Because it is your life, not my life.

So action means order not based on memory. Go into it, sir, you will see. There is such an action which is absolute, which is correct, precise, unchangeable. That can only take place when you realize the past - please follow this - the past meets the present, modifies itself and becomes the future. Right? That is what you are doing. Your past has told you that you are this or that, a Hindu with all the tradition, and so on and so on, and meets the present, the economic, the over population, the lack of jobs, the corruption, all that modifies itself and becomes, goes on to the future. So we are living all the time within this area, within this movement: the past

meeting the present, modifying itself, proceeding, that is what we call time. I wonder if you follow all this. Now is there an action which is not based on this? This is not useless speculation, the speaker is not given to speculation. He won't speculate, he won't theorize, he deals only with facts, which is what is actually happening. So what is actually happening is this movement from the past to the present, modified, the future, that is what we are doing all the time and in that process is our action and therefore that action is always limited. And hence it must invariably bring about conflict, conflict with men, women with each other, with the universe, with nature, it is a conflict. So we are asking is there an action which brings absolute order? Right? Action means order. And to find out that, sir, which is part of meditation, is to find out how you live in your daily life, whether there is an action of postponement, or action based on remembrance, and when you realize that postponement and remembrance, it will invariably bring about contradiction and therefore conflict.

Then when one realizes that, the question from that arises: what do you mean by realizing? You understand? You understand my question? When you say I realize it, I understand it, what do you mean by that? Do you understand the meaning of the words, therefore you intellectually grasp the meaning and there it ends? With most of you that is the fact. Say, yes, I follow everything you are talking about very clearly, it is so logical and so on and so on, and there you remain, which means what? Your intellect has been trained to accept the words and theories, totally unrelated to the rest of the whole movement of human beings. You are following all this? That's how you are trained, your education is that, this

tremendous cultivation of memory, as a businessman or a professor or a scientist and so on and so on, totally unrelated and irrelevant to our life. Right?

So we are asking can one live in this world, this world being our jobs, family, children, pleasure, pain, all the nonsense that goes on around us in every department, especially the religious world which is monstrous, can we live a life of action? Life is action, life is relationship. Can we live and act without this whole momentum of the past changing itself in the present and moving? You follow? Can there be an end to it? You understand what I am saying? I will show you, go into it with me, you will find out if you are serious, not playing games with yourself or with the speaker. Now as I said, as the speaker said, the past memory modifying itself with the present moment, then changing, this is our life which means always moving in time. Right? Now is there an action which is so immediate that it doesn't allow time? You follow what I am saying? It is all new to you, so please listen. To us action is based on knowledge, time, ignorance, memory, thought. Right? Our actions are based on thought and so thought is always limited, which we went into, I won't repeat it over and over again. Therefore that action being fragmented, must invariably bring about many various problems. Right? Is there an action which is not within the field of time? You have got it, time being memory, knowledge, movement. I will show you if you are interested, go into it. Which means action is always non-action. You understand? We are never acting, which is only now. We are always acting according to the past or according to the future. Therefore there is never complete action now. I wonder if you see this. Right? Do

you see that, at least intellectually grasp it? Now we are saying or we are asking, is there an action which will bring complete order, and act so that there is no residue, as pain or regret, sorrow and all the rest of that. You understand my question?

That is, we have to investigate or look into the question of what is observation. Will you follow it with me? What is it to observe? Have you observed anything? That is, given your full attention to observe a tree. Right? To observe, not to observe, translate and say, it is good, bad or I like or I don't like, just to observe. Right? Have you ever done that? If you are honest, you haven't. Have you ever observed without all the memory, without all the associations of the person with whom you are intimate, have you ever observed that person? Have you ever observed your wife, your children, your neighbour, your politicians, or your blessed gurus, have you ever observed them? Or are you so differential and nonsensical that you have never looked.

I am going to show you something. Come with me, together. That is to observe, observe without the word. Right? Can you do it? Please look at it. See what happens. That is, to observe a tree, a woman, a man, a child, anything, a bird on the wing, the waters, to observe without the word, without the association that word creates, without all the responses of that word, which is memory, just to observe. Now when you so observe, in which there is no observer - you understand? Oh god! I will explain it. Aren't you all tired?

Q: No.

K: Don't say no, sir, because at the end of the day you have been working, the office and all the boredom of the office, and we

have talked over an hour and five minutes you must be tired. You understand? Your mind must have been tremendously active, probably you are stimulated by the speaker for the time being, and so you are using the speaker as a drug and then when the drug wears off you are back home. So we are saying, observe without the movement of thought coming into your observation. That is, the movement of thought is the observer - right? - who is the residue of all the past experiences, and he observes through the observer. You are following all this? Now can you observe without the observer? You understand what I am saying? I observe you. If I am prejudiced, I say, I don't like that, I don't like the colour, too red, he belongs to this group or that group, he is wearing this and he is wearing that. You follow? All this is movement of thought interfering with actual observation. Right? When you so observe without the observer, in that perception, in that seeing, there is immediate action which is unrelated to memory. Right? You are following all this? Do it, do it.

So we are saying there is an action which is totally unrelated to knowledge, knowledge being limited and therefore your action then becomes limited. You are following all this? Whereas if you observe - now wait a minute. Observing is not only with your eyes, observing, listening, learning, all that is a movement of complete perception. You understand what I am saying? You understand sir? No, no, you don't. Sir you look. Sir you are so used to explanations, commentaries, somebody has to tell you all this. You don't find out for yourself. You don't say, look, I am going to find out, I'll spend an hour at this, have your leisure and spend that leisure. You know, sir, the word 'leisure' means a place where you can learn. You

understand? School comes from the word `leisure'. You are sitting down here, you have leisure, so you can learn now. But your learning is limited because you are not observing, you are not listening, you don't put your whole mind, your body, your senses, your heart to find out.

So we are saying that there is this vast capacity of the brain, mind, astonishing capacity, unlimited capacity and that capacity, that tremendous energy is now limited and so brings about disorder. Right? Disorder between people, between groups of people, between communities, between this guru and that guru, between their beliefs, all that is disorder. And we are expending our energy in disorder. And I was pointing out that there is order, total complete order which is the order of the universe, when you understand the whole movement of knowledge and enquire if there is action, if there is order beyond all knowledge, beyond all experience. For that you have to find out how you observe yourself, how you observe nature, how you observe your boss, your wife, your friends, your children, observe. In that observation there is great care, great affection and from that care, affection, attention, there is immediate action. This is not a theory of the speaker. This is his life. This is the way he lives. And I am pointing out most respectfully and humbly, you can do it if you give your mind, your heart, your whole being, to find out how to live correctly.

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 20TH JANUARY 1980

May we go on with what we were taking about yesterday? It is rather important to understand the full meaning of the word `together'. We have created this society together. The society in which we live, the politics, the religions, the books, the gurus, the whole so-called civilization has been created by each one of us; not only by us, by our forefathers, by all the past generations. And together we can bring about a change in society, no one person can do it. People have tried it, various so-called political leaders and conquerors, and they have always failed because they are leaders, authorities, the supreme rulers and people had to accept, submit, acquiesce to their domination. And if you are at all serious and concerned with the whole growth of man, that is, the human mind, his brain, his emotions, and the freedom from sorrow, pain, anxiety and all the innumerable struggles and violence and all that, each one has to change. I think it is important to understand when we are talking over together that `together' means coming together, being concerned, being deeply committed, not to some ideology, not to some concept, or to some scriptures and so on, but be concerned very deeply to the understanding of not only the world outside us which we have brought about, but also the whole movement of our own existence, because that is the beginning.

And we were talking the other day about freedom, which we have so misused, we have so destroyed the full beauty of the word by permissiveness, by each one of us doing what he likes, not being responsible and that freedom in which is implied love,

consideration, care, attention all that is implied in that word `freedom', not to do what each one of us what he wants to do, because each one of us is the result of a million years, and if we don't understand this enormous complex structure of our mind, and brain with all its senses, emotions, cravings, without that deep perception, understanding, we cannot possibly bring about a different world, a different structure of human existence.

And please bear in mind, if I remind you again that we are together in this, that the speaker is not delivering a talk, a lecture, but we are together moving, enquiring, learning. And we are using the word `learn', which is to accumulate knowledge as it is understood, college, school and all the rest of it, acquiring various forms of skill which will help one to have a livelihood and acquiring knowledge which can be used skilfully and so on. That is, we have developed the brain to acquire knowledge to survive, through instructions, through experience, through various forms of knowledge, just to survive and that is generally called learning. That is to acquire information on various subjects, and one chooses a career and for the rest of one's life follows that career, whether it be a scientist, philosopher, engineer or even a sannyasi. Sorry, there are so many of you in front of me! And there is a different kind of learning, a learning which is not merely accumulation of memory, knowledge, but learning through observation, observing which we have neglected altogether. We have cultivated a certain part of the brain to acquire knowledge, act skilfully or unskilfully according to that knowledge, survive, and therefore that cultivation of memory is a very narrow limiting process. It is so obvious.

And we are asking, or trying to find out if there is not a different

kind of learning which is the employment of the total mind, the activity of the whole process and the nature of the mind. You are following all this, I hope. Please let us be clear that we are not trying to entertain you. This is not a gathering where you can be intellectually stimulated, or stimulated in any form. This is a gathering of, I hope, of serious people who are concerned with the outer and the inner. And is there a way of learning apart from the usual acquisition of knowledge through books, through teachers, learning special subjects and so on, which is perhaps necessary; but is there a learning which is not a mere repetition, mere mechanical process of a brain that is being trained along a particular line, but a learning that is beyond experience? I am going to go into it, because I think it is important to understand this. Because as we were talking yesterday about order, the origin of that word is to begin, begin the enquiry into the very source, into the beginning of life, not the biological life, which scientists will explain fully, but beyond all that. Right? We are following? We are meeting each other? I hope so.

There is a learning through observation, which is much more fundamental, much more active, it is not mechanical, it is not repetitive. If you observe, most of our minds and brains have become mechanical: repeat it, if it be a mantra, if it be a scientist, if it be whatever. It has become mechanical because we have trained it to be mechanical. Right? And we are asking, is there a learning which does not reduce the mind, the brain to a machine ticking over like a dynamo, producing the same results day after day, month after month till you die. Is there a learning which is not conducive to the process of routine which ultimately leads to

boredom? You are following all this, right sir? We have used the eyes, the optic nerves, the eyes, to only read books, we have never used our eyes to see what is actually happening around us. Right? That is, we have never learned to observe: to observe nature, to observe your friend, your wife, your girl, whatever it is, to observe. In that observation, the nature of observation is directed by the observer. Right? Please follow this a little bit, it is not complicated, I have made it as simple, as clear as possible. But we have to come together, that is, we are walking together as two friends, perhaps who like each other, we have certain care, affection for each other, so please listen, pay attention to what is being said, if you care to. If not, it's all right too.

Our observation is directed by the observer. The observer is the accumulation of knowledge as experience, and memory, the past. Right? If you observe your wife, the colour of the dress and so on and so on, it is already being experienced, stored, remembered, and that observer is the accumulation of this remembrance and when you observe this whole momentum of the past rushes into action. You must have noticed it. Right? May I go on? And thus you never observe; the past impinges on the mind and perception then is directed by what has been. Now to observe without the observer is to learn action without the momentum of time. Now I will go into it. You see, I am not used to explaining, I want to run. We will go together, patience.

You see sir, man has tried to find an action which is not always crowded with the past. When the past interferes with the action it becomes routine. Right? Whether it is sexual, whether it is any kind of action when the past, which is the very essence of the

observer, shadows action, then in that action there is division as the observer and the thing observed. Right? It is obvious. So when there is this division between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. Right? Which brings about the question, I don't know if it is the right moment to ask, the whole question of duality. You are following all this? That is, I have to explain it.

There is the observer and the observed, which we all know. The observer is the past, the accumulated knowledge, the accumulated experience, memories, remembrance, associations and so on; the verbal structure in which the past lives. Right? And so there is this division. This division brings invariably conflict, either conflict, suppression, evasion, trying to go beyond it and so on. Right? Now is there an observation without the observer? Can you look, perceive, observe the trees, the hills, the bus, your neighbour, your wife or girl friend, or whatever it is, to observe without all the recollections, the remembrance, the association rushing into your observation? You understand my question? Then in that observation without the observer there is instant perception and action which is learning, which is not routine. I don't know if you are following. Please, as we are talking, do it. That is, you see the speaker sitting on a platform, unfortunately, can you observe not only the physical appearance, but observe the whole story which is yourself? Right? Are you following all this? Observe without his reputation, whatever you have imagined about him, putting all that aside completely, observe so that your mind and your senses are highly active in that observation. I wonder if you can do it. You pass the sea every day, the waters, the movement of the waters, light on the waters, the horizon, if it is not a foggy day, the beauty

of water, the immense horizon, the meeting of the earth and the sea, can you look at it without the observer saying, this is the sea, how I like it, I don't like it - just to observe with all your senses fully active? Then there is a learning in which the repetitive process of memory does not operate. Please, this is very serious because it implies whether the mind, the brain can observe without registering.

Our brains have been programmed, like a computer: you see something, it has registered, remembered and held and so there is always a process of registration going on. Right? You must know this. Now we are asking, can this registration, when it is necessary, yes, but is there a possibility of not registering anything that is observed which might bring about a psychological centre from which to act? I wonder if you get it. No, you don't understand. I have to go into it.

Our brains are registering all the time. That is a fact. Your experience, all the rest of it, it is registering and so the brain is never quiet, never still. I will go into part of meditation, which we will go into presently, not perhaps today, but some other day. And we are asking when there is this constant registration then the brain becomes mechanical. Then it is repetitive. Then it is never free. Obviously so. So we are asking, is there a way of living in daily life in which what is necessary is registered and what is not psychologically necessary not registered? You are following all this? See it sir, move, use your brains. Let us go. Say for example, please listen, I don't like taking examples, but we will take an example: psychologically, inwardly you are wounded. You understand? You are hurt, hurt from childhood by your brothers, by

your father, by your school, by your teachers, by your educator, gradually as you grow older and older, you are getting more and more hurt. Hurt, wounded and you build a wall around yourself not to be hurt any more. So there is a resistance towards life. You are following all this? Now is it possible not to register any hurt at all? You understand my question? You call me a fool, idiot, any name you like and immediately the response is dictated by the image I have about myself. Right? That image gets hurt which is the 'me'. Now a way of living in which there is no image and therefore no hurt, which means never to register anything that is psychological. Do it sir, as you are talking, find out, see the tremendous implications that are involved, to have no image about oneself. And therefore there is no possibility of ever somebody treading on it. Now to hear that, hear it fully, understand it verbally, see the actual fact, see the fact immediately and dissolve it. You understand my question? That is a learning. Am I making this clear or shall I go over it again?

Most human beings throughout the world are violent in some form or another: sexually, in their life, hating somebody, disliking somebody, angry, competitive, and so on and so on, all this is violence, irritation is violence, conformity is violence. That's a fact, human beings are. And man has invented the non-fact, which is non-violence. Now let us forget the non-fact, perhaps you cannot because you have been trained in this idea of non-violence, which is nonsense, the actual fact is violence and to deal with that is more important than to become non-violent which is a non-fact. You are following all this? Now to observe the whole movement of violence, to observe it in oneself, which is, to see the whole nature

of violence, including the cause of it and see it immediately and dissolve it. That is action without time. You have got it. The moment you allow time, you are postponing it and during that interval between now and the ending of it, you do all kinds of mischievous things. So to prevent the continuity of a hurt or a violence is to act immediately, which is, not to allow the brain to register violence in time. You have got it? Will you do it? If you don't it becomes just a lot of words.

So we are saying there is a way of learning which is not mechanical, which does not make the brain routine and therefore it gets sluggish, bored, and being bored it tries to escape through many forms of entertainment, including religion. May I take a breather?

We were saying order means the enquiry into the beginning, I am going to go slowly. The beginning which is the source of all energy. Now please listen carefully, I am not talking about god. God is merely an invention of man. Sorry if you are all godly people. It is just an invention of thought to explain all the confusion, misery, the inequality, the injustice, the stupidity of man. God is a process of thought which has not been able to solve its own problems. I am not talking about that at all. We are asking a totally different kind of question outside the experience of man, beyond knowledge. As we explained yesterday, knowledge brings order, but it is always because knowledge is surrounded by ignorance, it is always bringing about disorder. We explained it very carefully yesterday. Now we are asking something entirely different: the source of all order, not the order created by thought, not the order created by knowledge, experience, memory, and all

that, that is all trivial, whether the order created by thought of Marx, or any politician, that is all very, very limited and perhaps destructive order. But we are talking of a beginning which one has to go into to find out the source of all energy. Please forget about kundalini, forget all the mantras and all the tricks that man has invented to find an energy which is limitless, endless, indestructive. We have tried every form of enquiry. But you see we are enquiring with the instrument of the mind which is thought and therefore we can never find out. You understand?

To go into this very carefully and deeply, one must begin to understand or rather begin to enquire into the very nature of the senses, you understand, the senses: the taste, the smell, the seeing, hearing, the touching and so on, because we are enquiring not that which is beyond all knowledge and thought which is the source of energy, but we are enquiring into the nature of desire. Because if you don't understand that very clearly, the nature and the movement of desire, if that is not absolutely clear, which doesn't mean the domination of desire, the control of desire, please listen to all these words, not the domination, control or exercise will over desire, but the nature of desire, the origin of desire. When one understands that, perhaps intellectually, but much more deeply, actually, then you will find out for yourself wherever there is a movement of desire, the origin of that tremendous energy can never be discovered. You are following? I am going to explain sir. I am so tired of explanation. Your minds aren't quick enough to grasp this.

First see, sirs and ladies, how mankind has lived upon desire: sexual, desire which propels man to the highest position in society,

desire to find god, if there is, of course that is nonsense, desire to find illumination, what you call self-realization, whatever that may mean, desire to conform, desire to accept, desire to be competitive, desire to have a better house, better car, nicer looking wife or husband, desire which is burning in all people, even in the sanyassi. So unless you understand it, see the nature of it and go into it very deeply, if there is any movement of desire, the source of energy can never come into being. You have understood.

So we are enquiring first into what is desire, not the object of desire, which varies according to every person, but the very movement of desire. We have cultivated one or two senses to dominate other senses. Right? You must have noticed that. Either your taste or your perception with your eyes. One or two senses dominate and usurp or give or neglect other senses. Now we are saying that when the whole, all the senses are highly awakened, not one or two, then there is no centre from which desire arises. No, please don't agree with me. You don't understand this. Don't nod your head and say, yes, I understand this. Go into it with me. First of all perhaps you have never done this. If you can observe the waters, the restless sea, the wine coloured sea, the Greeks called it - if you can observe it with all your senses - can you do it? No. Because you have never done it. But if you look at the sea, the tree, the sky, the moon, the young slip of a moon, the beauty of it, with your eyes, with your heart, with your nerves, with your senses fully. In that you will see there is no centre from which you are observing. Therefore there is no centre from which desire arises.

We are going to examine what is the movement of desire. I am just pointing out something very radical. If you will go into it for

yourself, which is when the whole activity of the whole senses are in full operation, then there is no centre from which you are observing. Haven't you noticed any of this? Sir, look, when you see a mountain with the snow, the Himalayas or any other mountain, the Alps, the grandeur, the majesty, the absolute serenity, the solidity, the sense of immense depth of it, the outline of the line against the blue sky - when you observe that, what takes place? The majesty of the mountain drives out all your senses? Haven't you noticed it? You are struck by the enormity of it. When you are struck by the enormity of it you are absent. Right? You are following all this? The enormity of something drives away your self-centred state because the enormity has absorbed you. Right? It is like a boy, a child that has been given a good toy, he starts being mischievous, restless, the toy has taken him over. Remove the toy and he is back to himself. You are following all this? Which is, any great event, any great accident, any great mountain, sea, drives away the centre which is your base, and in that state there is no centre from which you are moving; you are that. You don't know about it. You will go into it, do it and you will find out; that is part of meditation if you want to know, if you go into it very deeply that's part of it.

Now we are asking, what is desire. What is the nature of it? Why man has always yielded to it and why most religions, organized religions with their priests, with their sannyasis, with their monks have said, suppress desire: don't look at a woman, don't look at anything that might stir up desire. You sannyasis must know this. Now we are enquiring into the nature of desire? Have you ever gone into it? Have you ever said, what is desire? That is,

you must be committed to find out, not just say, well, tell me, I will accept it or not accept it, which is just a verbal communication which means nothing. But if you say, I must find out totally, completely, so that the mind is not a slave to desire. You understand? When you observe anything, that very observation brings about a sensation. Right? When you see a tree, a beautiful car, a woman, a man, a child, the seeing is the beginning of sensation. Right? Then there is contact: seeing, contact, sensation. Then what takes place? Examine it closely, please, watch yourself. You see something pleasant, a nice house, a nice garden, a nice man, or a woman, who is nice looking, has a sense of beauty - beauty can only go with integrity, not just the face. Seeing, contact, sensation, then where does desire come into being? You understand my question? Where is the origin, the beginning of desire? Not in this, the seeing, contact, sensation, it is not desire. But when does desire begin to assert itself? It begins when thought - go slowly, I am going very slowly - when thought creates the image of you sitting in the car and driving it. Right? That is, perception, contact, sensation. That is healthy. That is normal, that is, all your senses are active. But thought says, how nice it would be if I had that car, or that woman or that man or that house or whatever, then thought creates the image and then the pursuit of that image is desire. You get it? You have understood it? Do it sir, find out, put your blood into it to find out, not accept what I am saying.

So that controlling desire is to increase desire. The controller is desire too. Right? Because he says, I will control my desire in order to have greater desire. So if one understands this very deeply

that the moment, the second that thought creates the image of possessing a house, having a lovely garden, then that is the beginning of this calamitous multiple desire. So is there attention so that the interference of thought doesn't come in? You have got it? So that seeing, contact, sensation, then there is no problem, there is no question of controlling, not controlling, all the tortures that human beings go through. If that is clearly understood, not intellectually, but actually, so the mind is free of desire - of necessary things of course, clothes, shelter, food, I am not talking of those. But desire, psychological desire, that complicates life. This complication of life with all its problems, prevents freedom. So desire begins the moment thought creates the image of possession or non-possession, then you have all the problems involved with desire. That is, to be so attentive at the moment of seeing, contact, sensation. So your mind then becomes extraordinarily active. Will you do it sir? Which is, now the mind is crippled of problems. Right? Sexual problems, religious problems, economic problems, and so on and so on, we are inundated with problems. A mind that has no problem, you understand sir, that is freedom and there is such a mind. Which is, to learn, to observe and immediate action so that there is no time interval at all.

Now just listen. Most of you are greedy, perhaps most of you, not all of you, some of you worship money. Right? You all worship money, would it be right if I said that? Some of you. So money is your god and you do anything for money, cheat, avoid taxes, you know, all the tricks you play, and can you see the value of money because it has a value, otherwise you couldn't be sitting

here, to see the value of money and not give it psychological importance. You are following? And if you give it psychological importance, to end it immediately. So the mind never has a problem. Oh, you don't see it. When you understand desire completely, that is, desire is will. Right? We exercise will, will is the essence of desire, obviously. Now desire, will and the continuity of time. You understand this? When you say, I will do it, that is allowing time. Between now and when you do it there are other incidents taking place in that interval and thus bringing more problems. But when you see your greed, your anger, your envy, your anxiety, observe it and end it instantly, immediately so that your action is complete. And action is complete only when you don't allow time. You see that way, sirs, you bring about a different mind, a different brain, a brain that is so perceptive, active, which has no problems and therefore you can then enquire what is the origin of all things, if there is an energy that is limitless, but you must act without leaving a mark on the sands of time. So that is it. The beginning, if you discover the beginning, that is the ending. You understand?

So you have heard all these talks, many times perhaps, and some of you perhaps have heard them for the first time, you may say at the end of them, you haven't told us what to do, you haven't given us a system which we can follow. Now if you observe yourself you will see that your training, your education has been what other people have told you to do. In all the realms, when you are learning engineering, other experts in mathematics, pressure, strain, have told you what to do, what to think and you are used to that. That is your habit. That is why the gurus flourish, because

they tell you what to do and you like that; it is mechanical, easy, comfortable, but you never discover anything for yourself. You understand the importance of it. Which means we are always depending on others to tell us what to do. Please don't. That way you become secondhand or third-hand human beings; whereas if you say, I am going to find out, I am going to enquire, I will give my life to find out how to live rightly, what it means to love, what it means to be totally, completely intelligent, all that does not depend on another. Please realize this. Because we are so dependent, dependent on governments, we are dependent on postmen, that's quite right, dependent on the telephone, quite right, but to depend on another human being, depend on books, depend to be told how to live, what to do, you are destroying yourself because in that there is no freedom. Truth can come and flourish only when there is total complete freedom.

So please, we are not instructing you what to do. We are not disseminating systems. That is all too childish. But we are together, and I mean together, we are walking together a very complex road and one must be free to walk. And in that walking one discovers the enormity of existence, not the problems of existence, the immensity of life, the immensity of the beauty of living.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 27TH JANUARY 1980

I am afraid we have to apologize, all of us who are responsible for the microphone and the loudspeakers, yesterday, they didn't work. It is said there was some kind of sabotage in it, but it doesn't matter. I am sorry if it made all of you uncomfortable, coming from a long distance for nothing.

As we were saying yesterday when we had this misfortune, that we have cultivated fear, pleasure, sorrow, grief, anxiety and the various travails of life. We said it has been the lot of man to struggle, to bear pain, to be wounded and feel very lonely, and this has been going on for many, many centuries. Our brains have become accustomed to this. Our thought is wrapped around all this. And also we have not cultivated, or given a great deal of enquiry into the first man who must have thought or enquired if there is something beyond all this misery, misfortune, sorrow, this endless time movement; is there something beyond all this? And that we have never cultivated; we have never allowed that enquiry to flourish, to flower and bear fruit; we have been caught in various forms of rituals - becoming monks and sannyasis and various forms of sacrifice, following, obeying, conforming. We have never gone into this question of why man throughout the ages has not found a state of mind that is beyond time. And why human beings throughout the world, whatever part of the world they live in, why human beings have tolerated, supported, adjusted themselves to this fear, sorrow, grief; to the various wounds that one receives from childhood, wounds that apparently are never healed, the deep

psychological wounds that pervert our life. Apparently we have not gone into this.

So we are asking a very serious question: whether the mind which includes brain, the senses, the feelings, thoughts and that quality of intelligence which is not the product of thought, that is not the result of knowledge - so we are asking, if we may this evening, whether the mind can ever be free, whether the mind can ever put an end to its immense continuous struggle, strife and violence and all the rest of it. I think this is a very serious question which each one of us who are at all serious, should ask. Is there freedom from the thousand yesterdays with all the remembrance of grief, violence, brutality, accepting and obeying others, following others and never resolving the human problems? After millions of years look at ourselves. Look at the confusion we live in, the mind corrupted, distorted, never free, never clear, pure. We are using the word 'purity' in its original sense, which is a mind that is not polluted, that is not distorted, that has no problem whatsoever. That is the nature of purity which has in it deep integrity. And throughout the ages man has born this burden, trying to run away from it through various forms of entertainment, both religious and the cinema, the football, and all the rest of it.

So if you will this evening, walk together, perhaps hand in hand, not with so many, it is impossible, but walk together with a certain quality of dignity as human beings, a certain sense of care, affection, between two friends who are enquiring into this very complicated question whether the mind, of a million years of its vast experience and knowledge, can ever be free and be as originally pure so that it can live without a single problem. And if

one may point out, there is no authority here. This is very serious to understand. Authority, especially in the spirit of the mind, has no place whatsoever. Authority, laying down certain sanctions, rules, systems, polices, doctrines, in the world of spirit, that is, in the so-called spirituality, in the so-called inner flowering of man, authority has no place whatsoever. The authority of a book, the authority of those who say, they know, and those who say they know, don't know. So please from the very beginning of this talk and also the talk of next Wednesday, let us put aside all authority, conclusions, opinions, like two friends who are open to each other, enquiring, demanding, questioning each other. And in questioning there must be a great deal of scepticism and doubt. But all scepticism must always be held on a leash, like a dog that is held on a leash, if you keep it all the time on a leash you will destroy the very nature of the dog. But you must occasionally let it go and run, on a beach, in the meadows, along the river. So likewise, we must have this scepticism on a leash, and also know when to let it go. That is an art.

And in our enquiry, in our questioning, in our wandering along the path, not some mysterious path, to glory, to nirvana, but a path of enquiry, the first thing to enquire, if you will allow, is the nature of time. Because time plays a great part in our life, not only the chronological time but the psychological time; the inward sense of movement from here to there not only psychically but psychologically. It takes time for you to come from where you were to come here. That took time, and psychologically, inwardly time is the remembrance of the past, modified by the present and continued. You are following all this? Just listen. If you don't

understand, it doesn't matter. Because you know a talk like this is not only at the conscious level, at the verbal level, but also if you listen, the unconscious, the deeper layers of the mind absorbs what is being said. It is like sowing seeds. It will take, if the earth is good, well watered, manured and so on, so likewise, if you will, listen not only to understand the words, but also grasp if one can, the deeper meaning of the word. So one has to listen not only with the hearing of the ear, but also listen at a different level, with a deeper demand, with a deeper sense of giving oneself over to find out. So we are talking about time.

And time has played an immense part in our life, our whole brain structure and the cells are the result of millions of years and more, so-called evolution which is the movement from the very beginning to the very end. And the brain is accustomed to time. That is, I will be, I am not, but I will be. That means you are allowing time from 'what is' to 'what should be'. You are following all this? Sir, follow, not mere words but see the fact of it. So the brain, the mind is accustomed to this movement of time. And man has always sought whether there is a possibility of going beyond time - not the science fiction time, but time as we know it: time as remembrance, time as the past, present and the future, this constant movement in which we are caught. And time is also postponement. Time is also action depending on the past - knowledge, experience, memory, action modifying that memory and the future. Right? Right sir? So there is this quality of time in which we function not only physically, but also psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were. And is it possible - just listen to it - is it possible not to allow time in action? Do you follow it? Perhaps this is something

new that you have not heard before and so you might get puzzled, or reject or resist. But one must ask this question: that is, time which is an interval between now and then, between `what is' and `what should be'. Time is what has been, what will be and what is now. So all that is time. And when you allow time to change `what is' to `what should be', that is, in that interval between `what is' and `what should be', which is time to reach that, in that interval there are other factors entering into that. Naturally. You follow all this? Right?

We are walking together? Or are you lagging behind. I will wait. The speaker will wait till you come back. We can walk together. Which is, it is very important to understand. Please give a little attention to it.

You understand? Violence and freedom from violence. Right? That is, human beings are violent, they allow time to become free of violence. Right. In that interval what is happening is, you are expressing, acting violently. So there is never an ending to violence. Do you get this? Human beings are violent. You are violent. And you have an idea, a concept, an ideal, of not being violent. In that interval between now and then you are being violent. And so there is never an ending to violence, because you allow time to come into the factor of ending violence. You get it? So can time be abolished? You understand my question? So that there is no `between now and then`, which means acting immediately. You have understood this? Sir, just capture the meaning of this. Don't be too analytical. The speaker is pretty good at analysis. But don't be too analytical, for the time being, we'll go together. As we pointed out, when there is violence act instantly,

not become violent, act to the ending of violence immediately. Which means not allowing the idea of non-violence to come into being at all. Got it? I don't think you see it.

Please, once you capture this, not intellectually, but actually, it transforms your whole way of living, your whole way of acting. That is, violence or any other human factor, like greed, envy, anger, grief and so on, never to allow time to create the opposite. You have got it? It is time that creates the opposite, time being thought. Am I complicating it? Say, you are hurt, wounded psychologically; you know the cause of that wound, because you have an image about yourself and somebody treads on that image, puts a pin in that image and you get hurt. And that hurt, the consequences of that hurt are great in life, because you build a wall around yourself not to get hurt any more. Which is allowing time. So to see the fact that you are hurt because of the image and finish with that image immediately. Right? Are we doing it? If you don't do it, it's no fun. It just becomes a lot of words with no meaning. But if you see that time is a dangerous factor in human life, and that time distorts action, and so we are going into something, if you understand the nature of time fully because all our thinking is based on time. Time is movement. Right? From here to there, or psychologically from being `what is' to the ideal or `what should be'. All that involves time, movement. So thought is movement. Right? When you think about your business, about anything, it is a movement from the past to meet the present and carry on to the future. Right? So time is thought. And time is the distorting factor in life, which is, if you can act immediately there is no time. You understand?

So bearing that in mind we are going to enter into the field where time has played an immense part in our life, which is, the factor which man has lived with from the beginning of time, fear. He is not only afraid of physical security, but also he is afraid inwardly, psychologically of what is going to happen. He is afraid of the past, he is afraid of the future, he is actually afraid of the present. Right? Don't look so bewildered please. And we have borne this cloud of fear which darkens our life and accepted it. We never said to ourselves, is it possible ever to be completely free of fear. Fear: physical fear can be dealt with fairly easily. The physical pain can be modified, be put up with or altered. But the psychological fear is very, very complex. It has many, many branches, and its fruits are many. One may be afraid of the dark, afraid of one's husband, wife, or girl, afraid of losing a job, afraid of not achieving nirvana or heaven or illumination this life, afraid of the bosses, the gurus, the authorities, and so on. This tree of fear has many, many branches and its fruits are multiple. So we are asking, is it possible to end fear completely - not I am free of fear one day and back again. So we are asking, is there an end to fear at all. Do you follow sirs? Have you ever asked that question? Or you put up with it, saying, it is our lot, our karma. You have some kind of verbal structure which will cover up the fear.

If you have asked, is there a possibility of ending psychological fear so completely it never comes back. The speaker is asking the question for you, though you have not asked it, the speaker is asking that question for each one of us. What is fear? Think with me, think about it together. What is fear? You have fears. You don't have to tell me what your fears are. This is not a confession.

You know what your fears are very well. If you are a Brahmin, you are afraid to be a Brahmin in an economic world where Brahmins are looked down upon. So you hide your Brahminism, cut out the name Iyer, because you adjust yourself. Basically you are afraid. You conform to the pattern which exists round you. And if you say, I am not a Hindu, that creates a problem around you, so you keep on repeating that you are a Hindu, or a Muslim or a Christian. So there is this constant, hidden, secret pressure of which we will be conscious or not aware, it is there. And how can love exist when there is fear? This is not a rhetorical question. I am asking as a human being, how can love, compassion, great sense of affection and care exist with fear? It cannot. Obviously. So is fear which man has carried for millions of years, can that burden be put aside completely. The speaker will point out the nature, the movement, of how it can end. Not by a system, not a method, not a practice, not a suppression of fear, nothing of that kind. You are following all this? Because if you suppress fear it is always there. Even if you analyse, and I believe Indians are quite good at analysis, but they never end it. They are very clever spinning it out and finding the cause and there it ends. So we are not saying suppression, escape from it, transcending it, conquer it, nothing of that kind. We are asking, are you ever aware at the moment of fear? Listen to it carefully. At the moment, at the second when fear arises. You are not. You are aware of it a second afterwards. Right? Are we meeting each other?

Please, sir, communication, not only verbally, but actually in your heart, feeling, then we are really in communion with each other. Fear is time. Right? Fear of the past, of the things that one

has done, not done, commissions and omissions, regrets and all that. The remembrance of all that and be afraid of something that you have done, which is time and the future, of what might happen, which is also time. So fear is the essence of time. You get it? Oh come on sir! That's why you have to understand time and abolish time. Which is, when the moment fear arises, be completely watchful of it. Don't run away, don't escape, don't find causes, be completely attentive to that fear. Where there is attention there is no time. You understand?

So there is instant action: immediate response of that fear and ending that fear which means you are not only aware of all the branches of fear but you are going to the very root of fear. Which is, thought has movement which is time and to act instantly immediately so that time is not a factor in fear. You have got it? Do please give your mind, your heart to find this out. Because life without love is meaningless: you may be rich people, you may be comparatively happy, having pleasure untold, unlimited, but without love, which means the ending of fear, life has no meaning whatsoever. Love is not pleasure. Love is not desire. So please follow this carefully. Pleasure is the movement of the remembrance of things past and the picture created by thought and the pursuit of that picture image is pleasure. Right? Which is time. You have got it sir? You have understood it?

And again pleasure plays an important part, perhaps the greatest part in our life: sexual pleasure, pleasure of achieving, pleasure of controlling yourself, pleasure of possession, pleasure of attachment, pleasure in being free if you have money, if you have position, if you are a politician - and pleasure is not at the actual

moment but the remembrance of things past entering into the present and continuing as pleasure. Have you got it? Now if you can totally be completely aware of the moment it is taking place, then there is complete action. I will show it to you now.

Desire is the movement of pleasure. Right? And desire, as we explained the other day, is seeing, seeing with your visual, optical eyes, contact, touching, smelling, and sensation. Right? Seeing, touching, contact, then the sensory responses, which is sensation, then thought makes an image of that object which you have seen and desire then begins. Right? You see - I don't know what you see - you see a woman or a man, nice looking, clean, healthy, beautiful. You look at the mountain, the hills, the water, the glory of the earth and heavens, you look and you touch, you have a sensation. Then thought comes and says, how lovely that shirt is or that dress is, and imagines, creates the image of being dressed in that shirt or robe, at that moment is the beginning of desire. Right? You have understood this. Don't hear my words, know it in your blood.

So desire, that is, desire to achieve, desire to have, desire to possess, desire to dominate, desire to do so many things, is the movement, not only in time, but the movement that creates duality. Come on! Which is, one desire opposed to another desire. Right? So there is conflict. This conflict can never be ended. What we end is the comprehension, the deep profound truth that desire comes the moment thought creates the image. To be aware of this total movement is immediate action.

Are your brains working? Or are you merely hearing words, because our brain is full of words, and the word has tremendous

importance in our life: the wife, the husband, the nation, India, communist, socialist, Catholic, you know all the rest of it. Words have an immense significance for us. And if you only listen to words, then you will not grasp the beauty of a life in which there is no fear and the understanding of pleasure. And where there is pleasure there must also be fear. Don't you know that? And where there is fear there can be no love. So desire, fear, pleasure, berefts life of love. And love is not to be cultivated. You cannot say, I will practise love. No sir, that's what you are all doing: practise kindness, tenderness, this sense of oneness.

So we are asking, a mind that has lived a million years carrying all these burdens, can that mind ever be free of all its content. You understand my question sir now? Its content. The content makes up our consciousness. Our consciousness is made up of our beliefs, conclusions, your fears, your pleasures, your dogmas, opinions, your superstitions, your gods, your nationality, the whole consciousness of the human mind is its content. Right? And as long as you are living within the field of consciousness there is no freedom. So we are saying, this content is the immense memory of man, including woman, of course. This tremendous burden of the past which is guiding, distorting, creating a thousand problems in our life. We are asking whether the mind with that complicated, subtle, extraordinary beautiful brain, can that brain, mind, which are one, can that put aside all its burdens? that is, the burden exists as long as there is time. Right sir? Say for example, you have problems: sexual problems, career problems, problems of loneliness, despair and so on, have you ever asked, can the mind ever be free of every problem?

So what is a problem? Something that you have not resolved, something that you have not finished. A problem exists only when you carry it over to the next day. You are following all this? Right sir? Somebody agree with me. You have many, many problems. And a mind that is burdened with problems, can never be free. So is it possible to live a life, here on earth, without a single problem. You understand the implications of that question? And do you understand the beauty of that question, the depth, the vitality of that question? As we said, the problem exists only if you allow it to have duration. Right, right? Why do you allow problems to endure even for two days or three days, why? Come on sirs, why? Is it that you are used to this method, used to carrying problems till you die? Is it that we are habituated to it, we have accepted it, we say, yes, that is the normal fate of man, to have problems and so struggle, struggle. They have never said or asked, not verbally, with passion, with care, with attention to find out if you can end problems. I will show you. The speaker will point out. No authority. Just pointing out. If you are serious, if you want to live a life without a single problem, you don't know the beauty of that: the quality of a mind that has no problems and therefore no experience.

Your minds are full of experiences, the present and the future experiences and the past. The word 'experience' means to go through and finish, not carry the memory of it. You understand? Finish the physical pain that you have today and end it, not carry it to the next day. How will you approach a problem? I am not talking of physical, or technological, or electronic computer problems. There are experts for that. Our friends say many things about that. I am not talking about that. I have a friend who talks a

great deal about it, we are not talking of those problems. But we are talking of human problems: the loneliness, the sense of isolation, the sense of deep abiding despair. How do you approach a problem, an intimate, perhaps even secret problem that you have, how do you approach it? Please find out. Find out now as you are sitting there. Find out how you approach a problem. Is your approach to finish with the problem, to go beyond the problem, to resolve, finish, anxiously end it. How do you approach it? Do you approach it with a motive, with a conclusion that you have already come to, how that problem should be resolved? You are following all this? So the approach to a problem is more important than the problem itself. You understand this? Are you all asleep? Sir, the speaker is saying something which he actually lives; this is not to encourage you, not to stimulate you, but one can live a life which has no problems whatsoever. It is not for you to believe, or disbelieve, I don't care. But it is important to find out for yourself because a mind that is full of problems, a crippled mind, whether it has religious problems, sexual problems, problems of attachment.

Now take that. You know you are attached to your beliefs, to your wife, to your gods, to your puja, to your rituals, to your gurus, whatever it is. You are attached. Why? Because in attachment you feel secure. Right? Right? You feel secure, you feel comfortable, you feel protected, safe. I am attached to you, to the audience - if I am attached to you then I depend on you for my stimulation, for my elation, for my endeavour. But I am not attached to you. I am not your guru, you are not my followers. So take that one thing: you are attached, not to a baby, not to a person, but to an idea, to a conclusion, to a hope, to something that you cling to, craving, and

therefore holding. Now if you know how you approach that attachment, but you don't want even to enquire how you approach because if you are detached you will feel tremendously lonely. Right? No? So the more you are attached, the deeper the loneliness is. And so you say, don't talk to me about attachment, I like what I have, for god's sake, status quo, don't talk about it. So you go back home and being attached you become jealous, angry, quarrels and all the things attachment brings, shedding tears, laughter and the ache of losing.

So if you can approach that question of attachment freely, that is, not have a motive, not 'what might happen if I gave up'. But if you could see the full meaning and the consequences of attachment at one glance, not keep on at it, at one glance see immediately the implications and the consequences of attachment and act immediately - not allowing time to come into being. Then you are free from that attachment to face the fact that you are a lonely, desperate human being. Face that fact, look at it, not run away from it. It is like a surgeon who discovers the patient has cancer and the patient gets so frightened by the very word and he postpones it, and says, wait doctor, allow me to enjoy my smoking, or whatever you are doing, I'd better come back next week. This thing will grow much deeper, destructive, it may become terminal. So when we allow time - you understand what I am saying? - in any form, then you are perpetuating the agony of man, because your mind is the mind of humanity. It is not your mind, both genetically, this remembrance of millions of years is the common mind of humanity. You are humanity, you are the whole essence of human endeavour. You may be a different colour, shorter, darker,

but your mind your brain is the world. And if that mind has never known freedom, then you live always in despair, anxiety, pain; and that freedom is an ending of time, which means acting immediately. Which doesn't mean irrationally, unintelligently, on the contrary, it is the act of supreme intelligence and therefore that action is of excellence. Right sirs.

BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH JANUARY 1980

This will be the last talk. I wonder why you are all sitting here. What is behind your mind? What are your desires, your aspirations, your depressions, your sorrows, the innumerable travail of life? We expect, don't we, unfortunately, that someone will solve our problems - some enlightened human being, some philosopher, some erudite scholar or a guru, or someone upon whom we invest our devotion, our courage, our hope and we have lived that way for a million years, looking for someone else to do all the work and we just follow. Someone to lay down a pattern and we merely copy; someone to lead us to heaven, or to other places and we have lived that way. Priest after priest, religions after religions, leaders, political, social, economical, the marxist, the maoists, all these people have offered their wares, logical, illogical, historical and non-historical, illusory, without much meaning, and we have meekly, humbly without much thinking followed them. This has been the lot of all human beings. And one wonders why we have become like this, why we have become secondhand human beings without any depth to our life, without solving all our problems by ourselves, but always looking for someone else.

And as this is the last talk, I would like to point out to you, if I may, that we are not selling any goods, we are not doing any idealistic propaganda, we are not offering any scheme, any method, but pointing out, if you are serious and if you are willing, that there is a different kind of life to be lived daily, without conflict, without this confusion and misery which man has accepted as a way of life.

Life is a vast complex field, area. It is tremendously complex in the sense that verbally the words have made it complex, because we live by words, our brains are crowded with words, and words have become extraordinarily important in our life and so we live a very superficial life, wanting, hoping to live a deeper, more serene, a life in which there is not this ugly content, but words must be used but they are only the means of communication between two people, and words if they are not properly understood, must inevitably lead to misunderstanding. So I think this is important that we learn the art of listening; not to what the speaker is saying only, but also to nature, to everything about us, to listen so that our hearing, not merely by the ear, but hearing deeply to our own complex misery, strife, and struggle, to listen to it, not to reject it, not try to overcome it, not run away from it, but to listen to it so completely, so deeply so that the very thing that it is telling you becomes reasonable, rational truth.

And as this is the last talk, we have covered a great deal of our life in all the four talks. I think we ought to talk over together this evening the nature of love. What love means and if there is an end to sorrow, not only the sorrow which each one of us goes through, but the sorrow of mankind the sorrow which wars have brought about, the tears of all the people, not who have killed but have others who have been killed, the poverty, the degradation of penury. And we also should talk over together the nature of death and meditation. So we are going to cover a large field this evening and I hope you will not mind if we do not rush through but go carefully, step by step, hesitantly with care, with attention, then perhaps some of us will capture the meaning and live by it.

Because what we are concerned with is to bring about a different society, a different culture, a different way of living, and that can only be brought about by each one of us together, not by one single human being, or some divine law but by each one of us, the way we live everyday. And if there is a transformation of one or two of us, and that transformation does bring about a new culture. Culture can only be a new one, can only come out of religion, not out of superstition, not out of ideas, however good or bad. Religion, not these things we call religion, the puja, the rituals, the fancy robes and so on and so on. That is not religion. Religion is the assembling of all our energy to live a life that is harmonious, actual, and in which there is great affection, great love, a sense of compassion for all things, that is religion, not all the things you are playing with.

So we will begin by talking over together, I mean together, not the speaker thinks it out for you and you agree or disagree, but you and the speaker are walking together happily, easily without too much tension, without too much occupation, a sense of amicable, friendly, happy relationship. If we could establish that, at least an hour, this evening, we could go a great distance together. You know man has always lived in sorrow, we all go through this great thing called sorrow. We may be conscious of it, or unconscious of it, we become conscious of it when you have pain, when somebody dies, when somebody runs away from you, leaves, when you are left utterly lonely, at that moment or previously you have felt this agonizing sense of isolation. And this loneliness, this sense of complete state of mind when you have lost all sense of relationship with anything. I am sure most of you must have felt this on rare

occasions, or perhaps know of it when you meet a great many people, in an office, in a factory, or when you are talking to somebody, you have this deep abiding sense of isolation. And that is one of the causes of this suffering, and apparently we never seem to dispel that depressing, wasting energy of loneliness. And, as we said, that is one of the causes of this suffering.

Now when one is aware of this, we generally get frightened, we generally run away from it, or seek some escape, which is satisfactory, pleasant and gratifying. But that loneliness remains like some disease from which you are trying to escape. You may escape, but the disease is there. And so can this loneliness which has a great many consequences-you may become a social worker, a politician fighting for a place of power, or a priest or a businessman, or whatever it is, there is this sense of loneliness, isolation. And the consequences are, any form of escape, religious, any form of entertainment, but it is always there. So can we in talking over together, and I mean together, can we look at it? Because without the ending of sorrow, there is no love. Please realize this. This is not a rhetorical statement, but truth, that where there is sorrow, where there is fear, love cannot be. And life bereft of love has no meaning. And without the ending of sorrow, that flower cannot blossom. So it is important to find out for ourselves, without being guided to it, without being persuaded, to see for ourselves the nature of this loneliness.

Please don't go to sleep. It is too early. You may be tired after a days work, and sitting comfortably, listening to somebody might put you to sleep. Or go off into some kind of fanciful meditation, closing your eyes and having lovely dreams. If you want that kind

of thing, go to bed, or go to a cinema but here we are a group of serious people, I hope who are wanting to find out for themselves how to live a life which is totally different, a life that will create a new society.

This loneliness comes about through our daily action. I don't know if you have noticed how self-centred we are, how extraordinarily selfish we are. Sir, please don't nod your head. It has no meaning. Just listen to it. Nodding the head in agreement, has no meaning. What has meaning is to observe your own selfishness, your own self-centred activity, your constant endless occupation with yourself, either as a meditator, or a businessman, as a man or a woman you are occupied daily with yourself. And where there is self-centred activity, it must inevitably lead to isolation. You may talk of co-operation, working together, being together, but as long as this self-centred movement is going on in the form of nationalities, groups, sex and all the rest of it, that self activity must inevitably lead to loneliness. You understand this obviously.

So one asks, can there be an activity which is not centred round oneself, because as long as man is lonely through his daily activity, sorrow must inevitably continue. Sorrow, the etymological meaning of that word is passion. Sorrow and passion go together verbally. And as we are not passionate people - we may be lustful people, we may be struggling to express our own little self and fight for a place, but we have no passion. We are all nicely tamed people. Passion means to have total energy in which there is no motive, no desire, but the sense of complete, total comprehension which is the essence of intelligence. And that passion can only

come about with the ending of sorrow; and it is only passion that creates a new society, not ideas, not systems, not a new bureaucracy, or a new tyranny. Please understand all this. Not verbally, but from your heart, one must have a sense of passion and that passion cannot come if that passion is embedded in a belief, in a dogma, in a person or devotion. All that is sentiment, passion has nothing whatever to do with sentiment, romanticism. That passion can only come about with the ending of sorrow. That is what we are concerned to discover if at all possible for a human being who has lived for a million years carrying this heavy burden of sorrow, to end it. Because we said without it you can never have loved. And apparently in this country, and perhaps elsewhere, we don't know what that word even means. It implies great sensitivity, care for another, generosity, a sense of total unity with all mankind, and without love life has no meaning whatsoever, you may be rich, you may have power, position and all the rest of it, but without that flame, which can never be extinguished, one has to live with sorrow.

So our concern this evening is to find out for ourselves if it is possible to live a life without sorrow. And sorrow will exist as long as there is self-centred occupation. Right? You understand? Please. If you listen to it, not 'how am I to get at it', 'how am I to stop being self-centred' - that is a wrong question. Because then when you say 'how am I not to be self-centred', you want a pattern, you want a system, you want to be told what to do, then you are back again in another pattern which is also self-centred. Right? So if you would kindly listen, just listen. Either you listen consciously or unconsciously, deeply. Consciously has very little effect, but if you

listen from the depth of your own being, from the depth of yourself, which probably you never have even felt, ever known. So if you could listen with such grace, with such ease, the very listening is a miracle of action. You understand what I am saying? You understand? Some of you say, yes. Let us move together. You see if you try to do something about not being self-centred you are being self-centred. You understand? If you say, I must not be selfish, the very statement of that contains selfishness. Because you want to be different from being selfish, and that very 'want' creates another form of selfishness. You have understood?

So to merely observe the fact that one is selfish and not make a single movement not to be selfish, because any movement of the mind which has been living with deep unexamined self-centredness, any act of the mind with regard to selfishness will not only strengthen selfishness, but will change the pattern of selfishness and you will think that pattern is unselfishness. You are following all this? So to observe without any movement of thought or action, that is, to observe your self-centred occupation in the name of god, in the name of all the rest of it, to observe it without the past interfering, just to see your face, as it were, in the mirror, you can't change your face, probably you wish you could but there it is. It is what it is, and to observe it purely without any distortion, without any pressure, just to observe, that very observation exposes the whole consequence of selfishness and that observation cleanses the mind of selfishness. Don't accept it. Do it. So if we could listen so entirely to the fact that all self-centred activity in any form must inevitably lead to isolation and therefore division and therefore strife. Listen to it. Don't agree or disagree. It is a fact. It is like

gravity is a fact. You can't do anything about it. But if you observe it very closely, minutely, precisely, without any distortion, then that very perception is immediate action. Are you doing it as we are talking?

So where there is isolation in our relationship, and we are isolated in our relationship, you may be married, you may sleep with another, you may hold his hand, say, my wife, my husband, my girl friend, we are isolated in our relationships, because each one has an image of the other put together by thought, through days and years and time. Those two images have relationship, images put there by memory, by association, by remembrance, and that is not relationship. That's why if you observe it, the image that you have about another, to see it actually what is happening, that your relationship is based on memory, a remembrance of another, which has built an image in yourself of the other and the other has also an image about yourself, these two images are the factor of division. Please understand this. It is your life. And as long as there is that division there will be isolation, loneliness, pain, jealousy, anxiety, anger, hate, strife. I wonder if you are listening. And loneliness is the consequence of our self-centred occupation. If you hear that and see the truth of it, instantly, immediately, then you will find that self-centred activity comes to an end. It is like ending something which you have been carrying for a thousand years.

So there is an ending to sorrow. And there is the sorrow of mankind, man has borne, has made, has brought about sorrow. Killing each other, dividing into castes, nations, groups, sects, ashramas and so on. Dividing, dividing, dividing, fragmenting and as long as there is division between nations there must be war, as

between people. We know all this, perhaps logically, intellectually, verbally, but we never apply, we never say, test it out. And so sorrow never ends.

We will have to go into this question of what is death. You know, it is one of the most extraordinary things in life that we haven't solved this question. We have never enquired, not verbally, but deeply, why this enormous fear of something unknown exists in each one. Why we have never enquired if the mind can ever be free from the known. You understand? So do we realize factually that we are always moving in the field of the known? Your gods are known, because they have been created by man through thought and fear, that is the known. You live in the past, past experiences, past memories, past associations, past hurts, past nostalgia, past values, that is the known, and your daily activities are also in the field of the known, the accumulated knowledge that you have, it is still known. So we live always in the field of the known and we may expand that field, we may endlessly enquire and accumulate but that which is accumulated becomes instantly the known. So we have never asked, and it is important to ask, whether there is any freedom from the known - the known hurt, the known memory, the known longing, the known future, the ideal, can the mind which is the instrument of the known, which is the accumulated knowledge of experience, all that is the known, can the mind, the brain ever be free from the known? Otherwise the known becomes a routine, you can expand it but the future also becomes the known. Do you follow all this?

That is, sir, the exploiter becomes the exploited. Right? And the exploited becomes the exploiter. This has been the cycle of man,

historically, politically, economically, the exploiter exploits and the one who is exploited becomes the exploiter. And this is called evolution, this is called the movement of perpetual revolution, if you have followed all this, if you have listened to some communists and so on, this constant revolution, from the known to the known and the known modified and further known. So we are asking, can the mind which is the result of millions of years with all its knowledge, with all its experience always within that field, ever be free to discover, to come upon something unknown? You understand my question? And why man, you, are frightened to death? Whether you are young, or old, whether you are going to be operated on for some serious illness, why man has put between the living and death, a long period of time. You understand? It may be a very short time, or a very long period of fifty years or eighty years. And he has always pushed it as far away as possible, and we have never asked why, why each one of us is so scared to die. Are you asking that question now? And if you did ask that question why are you frightened of it? Is it that you are afraid to leave, let go the known, the family, the known, the family, the friends, your accumulated money, black market and all the rest of it. That is the known and you are frightened to let that go. (Madam, don't take notes, please, I said listen. You make me want to cry, you have so little feeling.)

And when one begins to enquire, not into what is death, that is inevitable, you may live if you are sixteen now you may live to be a hundred and twenty, because you have got all the medical care and all that. And if you begin to enquire into death, not the actual fact of dying, when the body through disease, old age, accident,

dies, that is inevitable, but what is dying? You understand my question. What does it mean to die? Please ask yourself this question. If you ask this seriously, it means ending. Right? Ending. Now will you end that which you hold most dear, end it? You understand my question? The ending of attachment with all its consequences, pain, jealousy, anxiety, fear, hatred, to be attached to something, to a belief, to a person, to an idea and when you actually die, physically, you end all that. Now can you - listen now - end your attachment immediately? That is death. Right? I wonder if you are following all this. It's up to you. That is death.

And death also means separating from that which you are living daily, your business, your money, your wife, your children. All that. So to find out what death is clearly, not just verbally and all the comfort of reincarnation, karma and all that kind of stuff, but to find out what it means in our daily life, you have to go into the question of what is your life, what is your daily life. If you believe in reincarnation, that your soul or whatever you call it is born next life, that is, if you are good this life, you will have a palace next life, if you are noble this life you will have wings next life. But your belief is only a nonsense because if you actually believe that you will be born next life, according to what you are doing now then you will change your life now. But you won't. So our daily life is a terrible, complex, miserable existence, going to the office day after day, ten years or fifty years. Face it. But you won't change because you hope somebody will create a new society in which you haven't to work from morning until night. So please just listen to it. You may not do anything about it, but just listen to it.

To live with death every day, which means to live without time

because death is time, which means every form of attachment, every form of fear, possession, domination all the rest of it, when death comes all that ends. And can we live with death, that is, ending every day everything that you have accumulated, psychologically, inwardly, end everything that you have psychologically gathered, your hurts, your ambitions, all the rest of that business, end it. And with the ending there is a new beginning. There are much more complex problems involved in death, but we haven't time.

And also we must go into the question of what is meditation. Are you meditating now? May I ask? You are sitting there, very quietly, listening, I hope. Are you in a state of attention - not tension, attention. Again this is a very complex problem which must be approached very simply. All premeditated meditation is no meditation. The word, the meaning of the word etymologically, the meaning of the word is to ponder over, to think over, to enquire, to delve into, to delve very deeply, profoundly - that is the meaning in a good dictionary. Now start from there, that is, to think over, to ponder over, to delve very, very deeply into one's consciousness and to pay complete attention to what you are enquiring into, with diligence in which there is no deviation and no negligence. All that is implied in the word 'meditation'. Our meditations now are of different kinds. There is Zen Japan, the Tibetan meditation, the Buddhist meditation and the various gurus with their meditations and so on and so on. Which is what? They are all premeditated meditations. You have understood? You have got it? That is, some person or people, have experienced something or other. For a mind that demands experience and seeks experience is still living within

the known. A mind that is free of experience, actually free of experience, can only know what is truth - truth is not in experience. That's a side issue.

So meditation has been the acceptance of a system, method, practice laid down carefully by other people who say, they know, and when they say, they know, they don't know, follow it sir, don't laugh, don't laugh, you are in it, for god's sake realize it. So they say if you do this, this, this, you will reach god, or enlightenment, nirvana, moksha or anything you like to call it. And we poor gullible people come along and say, yes, marvellous idea, they have such a great reputation and we must also do this, and you practise day after day, day after day, sitting quietly, breathing rightly, and all that stuff, and repeating some kind of mantra, which is as good as saying a lot of words, and you hope thereby to achieve some extraordinary state. Right? Agree? You know one of the factors is, rather an most amusing factor, in this country anybody who is slightly unbalanced becomes a saint, a guru, whereas in Europe or America they would go to a mental hospital. Right?

So that is what is called meditation. The Tibetan, the Zen, which is to pay a great deal of attention and so on, I won't go into all the details. In all that there is this idea of controlling your thought so that your thought is silent, your thought doesn't wander about. Right? But the controller is also thought. Right? I wonder if you are listening to all this. The controller controls the thing which he has called thought, but the controller himself is thought. So there is a duality. The controller saying all the time, I must control my thoughts, I must control my body, I must control my breathing,

I must practise, I must do this, I must do that, I must exercise, I must sacrifice, you know, will - the controller is the very essence of desire, of thought, of the past. So there is always in these meditations this fact. In these meditations, they never realize the controller is the controlled. If you see that fact for once in your life, completely, that the controller, the observer is the observed, if you see that, all conflict to achieve something comes to an end.

And then we come to a certain point which is, when there is no concentration, which is brought about by thought, directed towards a particular subject, towards a particular idea, concentration which is resistance of other thoughts coming in, but only one thought directed in one direction, that is what we call concentration. Right? In that is involved constant struggle to keep other thoughts from coming in. Right? Have you ever done all this? The speaker did it one morning and dropped it from that day. He saw the futility of that kind of game and saw the uselessness of it, and he dropped it. When you drop something like that, then what takes place? That is, please see this, you have realized, the mind has realized that something is not true, false, and seeing the truth in the false frees you from the false. Have you understood this? Right, sir? If you see something false and drop it, the very dropping is the action of the intelligence which has discovered that it is false. If you drop your illusions about your innumerable gods, and see gods are the factor brought about by thought and fear and all the rest of it, if you see the illusion, the very perception of that illusion is the truth. You understand? Will you do it? You won't. That is up to you.

So where there is attention, that is, to see something as an illusion, created by thought, like your gods, your rituals, and all

that stuff, see the falseness of it, the very seeing of the falseness is intelligence. That intelligence is necessary completely to perceive the action that is born out of that intelligence. Think about it - no, don't think about it, listen to it. So when you see the false, that is, in that perception there is complete attention, there is no concentration, there is just attention. Attention implies there is no centre from which you are attending. There is a centre which demands concentration, but in attention, there is no centre. Right? Do it.

Now I will show you. Would you please kindly, the speaker is asking most respectfully, pay attention completely now to what he is saying, completely, and when you so pay attention there is no centre from which you are attending. You understand? There is only the state of attention, not that 'I am attending'. Right? This is something new to you all. You haven't thought about it. Now when there is attention, the implications of that attention are care. Care can only exist where there is love, care for your wife, for your husband, for your children. Where there is attention, if you watch very carefully, there is absolute silence. Right? If you are listening to what is being said with complete attention, in that attention, though you are listening to the words, there is silence, and that silence is necessary to enquire - that silence is necessary, in that movement silence is not static, it is a living thing - in that silence, that movement moves towards the source of all energy. And this origin, the beginning of all energy - don't translate it as god and all the rest of it - the origin, the beginning of things, if you come to that, if the mind ever comes to that extraordinary state then from there action takes place. For that one must have a mind that is free

from all problems, all problems so that it is totally, completely free from the known. This is meditation. Right sir.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 30TH AUGUST 1980

May I point out, if I may, that we are not doing any kind of propaganda, nor advocating any belief or ideals, nor are we asking any of you to join something, which is non sectarian, non reforming, not institutional, nor something that we can look to to help us. But we are rather serious about all this. And I would like also to point out, if I may, that we are thinking over together the whole problem, the problem of existence in our daily life, together. We are not merely listening to the speaker but sharing not only the words, the meaning of the words, the significance of the content but the pursuit of enquiry. So it is your responsibility, as well as the speaker's, to think together. And it becomes rather difficult to think together if you are committed to some kind of institution, to some kind of belief, if you are a follower of somebody, if you are attached to a particular belief or experience; and from that point of view to think together is impossible. So I hope you will not mind that during this morning and the subsequent gathering here that we are free, mature people who are willing to go and discover for themselves how to come out of this terrible chaos that one lives in.

The world is so fragmented, more and more every year, breaking up not only religiously but also politically, economically, ideologically and so on. Everyone throughout the world is concerned about their own little selves, their own little problems - not that they are not important, they are, but we must consider the whole of humanity, not just our little shrine or our little guru, or our little belief or our particular idiosyncrasy and particular

activity. Because we are concerned, aren't we, if one may point out, that all humanity, whether they live in India, or in Europe or in America, Russia, China, all humanity goes through this terrible struggle of existence, not only physically, outwardly but also inwardly, psychologically. This is the common factor of all human beings throughout the world. I do not know if we realize this sufficiently to have a global point of view that is whole, not fragmented. And as human beings living in this particular country, or in another, we are like the rest of mankind. We suffer, we have problems, we have untold misery, confusion, sorrow, the fear, the attachments, the dogmatic beliefs and ideals and so on. This is common to all human beings throughout the world.

So psychologically we are the world. And the world is us, each one of us. This is a fact. As a toothache is a fact this is a fact, it is not an idea, it is not a concept, it is not something one strives after, an ideal, but an actual daily factual happening in all our lives. Either you can make this into an ideal or an idea and then try to conform or adjust yourselves to that idea, or treat it as an actual fact that we are basically, the core of our being, like the rest of humanity. You may be tall, you may be short, you may be brown, white, pink, black and purple outwardly, you may have techniques that are different from another, a different kind of education, different jobs and so on, but inwardly, deep down in all of us there is this tremendous sense of uncertainty, insecurity, sorrow and the unimaginable pain and grief, loneliness. This is the common ground on which all human beings stand. That is, we as human beings are the rest of the world and the world is us. And so our responsibility is something global, not just for my family, for one's

children, those are important, but we are responsible for the whole of mankind because we are mankind. But our beliefs, our ideals, our cultures, experience divide each one of us - Catholic, Protestant, Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims or following the latest guru. This is what is breaking us up - our nationalities, our insular particular attitudes. And this attitude brings about fragmentation in our lives. And where there is fragmentation there must be conflict between various fragments of which you are made up.

Please, if I may point out again, we are thinking together, you are not merely listening to the speaker or trying to find out what he wants to say. We are together examining the whole issue of our life. It is our life, your life, not somebody else's life. And that life, which is so fragmented by our education, by our nationalism, by our religious concepts, ideals, dogmas, images. These are the factors that bring about fragmentation in our life. And we listen to all this, perhaps casually or seriously, with passing interest or if you are serious not merely intellectual, emotional or romantic but profoundly serious then the question arises: what is our relationship, what is our responsibility to the whole, not only to the particular, to the whole of mankind? The responsibility that as a human being who is essentially, basically the rest of mankind - you may not like to believe that, you may not like to feel that you are merely an individual and what has one to do with the rest of mankind, which really is quite absurd if you really go into it. We are the mankind. And so when we realize that, not intellectually, not verbally but deeply, profoundly as something terribly real, not as something romantic, emotional but something that is actual in our daily life, then what is our responsibility to the wholeness of

mankind? Please if I may ask, put yourself this question.

One feels responsible for one's children, wife, husband, girl, boy or whatever it is because you are intimately connected with them. You have to bring them up, educate them and so on, earn a livelihood, feel a certain amount security, so gradually restrict the wholeness of life into a small narrow little groove. And having such mentality one is disinclined or is repulsed, puts aside the responsibility to the whole of mankind, not only mankind but to the earth on which we all live. We are responsible for all that, ecologically, economically, spiritually. But if we cling to our little images, however reassuring, comforting, satisfying, then we bring about a great fragmentation in our life and that prevents all of us from seeing the totality of mankind.

Please, do pay attention to what I am saying. I am not - the speaker is not trying to convince you of anything, nor trying to persuade you, influence you, or direct you. I am not your guru, thank god! Gurus are absurd anyhow.

So realizing that, that we are together investigating this problem, and when the speaker says together, he means it. Because the speaker can talk to himself in his room but since we have all gathered here together under difficult circumstances, with rather foul weather, it behoves us to apply our minds and our hearts to find out a way of living that is whole, complete, not fragmented, because the world is becoming more and more distorted, destructive, disintegrated and degenerated, morally, ethically, spiritually. I can use that word 'spiritually'. And we are part of that world, we are part of that society in which we live. We have created that society, whether the Christian society, or the

Communist society or the Hindu, Muslim and all the rest of it. We have created it, our fathers, our grandfathers, the past generations upon generations and we, who have followed them, we have made the society what it is - corrupt, there is injustice, war, man against man, infinite violence. And when one is confronted with all this, not as a picture, not as a descriptive analysis in a newspaper but when one is actually faced with it, which we are facing it now, in our daily life, what is our responsibility? What shall we do?

You see our minds, our brains are so conditioned, that we can't find an answer for this. We look to somebody, trot off to India to some guru and find out if he has a system, a method to solve this problem. They haven't got it. They have got their own systems, their own absurdities, their own megalomaniac ideals and so on, but when you are confronted with this as each one of us is, whether we are young or old what is our reaction, what shall we do?

To find out what is right action in all this, not right according to somebody or some value, or according to one's experience, or according to some ideological concept, such concepts, conclusions, do not bring about right action. When we use the word 'right' we mean that it is precise, accurate, irrespective of circumstances, what is the right action in all this, in this mad, rather insane world in which we live? To find out what is right action, not right according to the speaker, or to some philosopher, or psychologist, but to find out for ourselves an irrevocable, right action which would be right under all circumstances. First to discover that for ourselves one must be totally free from all attachment, for attachment breeds corruption. If one is attached to a person, you can see the consequences of that attachment, jealousy, antagonism,

fear, the loss, the loneliness. So where there is this particular form of attachment to a person, corruption is inevitable. But to cultivate detachment is another form of corruption - right? I wonder if we understand all this? If one is attached to an ideal, you can see very well the consequences of that ideal, one becomes violent and is always trying to conform to a pattern that thought has established, and are never facing the fact of what is actually going on but rather comparing what is going on with 'what should be'. It is another form of corruption. If you are attached to an image, and that is one of the most difficult things because each one of us has some kind of image about ourselves or an image created by thought in a church, in a temple, in a mosque and so on and so on. Those images are very comforting, reassuring, giving us a tremendous sense of security, which is no security at all.

And again to be attached to an experience, to hold on to an experience, some experience that you have had, talking or walking by yourself in a wood, you suddenly come or feel this oneness with nature, that there is no division between you and the world about you, this sense of wholeness, which happens and that is an experience which is registered in the mind, in the brain, and then one clings to that. And one is then lost in past memory, something that is dead and gone, and when a mind clings to something that is finished, withered away, corruption begins.

If the speaker may point out, he hopes you are not merely listening to the words of the speaker but you are investigating into yourself, seeing actually what is going on within yourself. The speaker merely acts as a mirror and the mirror has no value, you can break it, and one must break the mirror. That mirror is merely

to see oneself actually what is going on inside, how we are attached to all these forms of persons, ideals, concepts, conclusions, prejudices, experience, which is the beginning of corruption and fragmentation. If you have one image and I have another, being born in India or you born in America or in Russia, or here, we have created that image in ourselves and that image separates us, and so destroys this feeling of wholeness, this sense of global reality of our life.

So can one actually be free of all attachment? Not just keep one or two secretly to oneself but be totally completely free of all that. If one cannot then you are maintaining fragmentation and therefore conflict, division, struggle, wars and all the ensuing miseries. And it is one's responsibility. This is real responsibility for each of us, not to have a single image. And therefore when there is no image there is a totally different kind of relationship which comes into being, not only with the person with whom you are intimate but also with the rest of mankind. Then your mind and your brain is free. It is only in that total sense of freedom there is love, not in ideals, not in dogmas, in churches, in the things that thought has created and put them in the churches and temples and so on.

So one asks how serious one is. Is it all, one's whole life, an illusion, constant battle, struggle and unending misery, confusion and sorrow? Or can one live differently? Is our brain capable of totally changing its whole structure, its nature? The brain has - if I may go into it and if you are willing to listen, and if you don't listen it doesn't matter either, but if you care to listen and since you have taken the trouble to come here, uncomfortable and all the rest of it, it seems necessary, adequate and right that one should listen to

something that is actually true - our brains have been conditioned along a certain pattern. You can observe it for yourself, the speaker is not a brain specialist, though he has talked to many of them about the brain, but one can observe oneself the activity of the brain. It is conditioned to follow a certain pattern. That brain has evolved through time, through millenia and therefore that brain is not my brain or your brain, it is the brain of mankind. And that brain has followed a certain way, a certain route, a certain pattern, and that pattern has brought about this division between man and man - which is obvious when you look at it, when you go into it. That brain, which has evolved through time, which is the result of millenia, is constantly seeking security in images, in persons, in conclusions, in some ideals, that is the pattern human beings have followed. Please look at it yourselves, you will see the truth of it. And it becomes extraordinarily difficult to break that pattern, even an ordinary physical habit like smoking, drinking and all the rest of it. When it becomes deep rooted habit, it is extraordinarily difficult to break it. And the brain has followed this particular path, this particular way of living, being concerned with itself, with its own egotistic activities, its own sorrow, its own particular anxiety, its own pleasures, its own demands - that has been the pattern of this brain for generation after generation.

And we are asking: can that pattern be broken? Not by will, not by some kind of pressure, idealistic carrot, but seeing the actual pattern of our life and seeing the cruelty of it, the inanity of it, the stupidity of it, that to live in images is the very essence of a destructive way of life. When one sees the truth of it you have already broken away from it. So one asks: does one actually see the

pattern, the norm, the continuity of this movement from generation to generation? And this movement is in the brain, in our brain, in our hearts, in our minds. So can one be free of all that? Otherwise we pursue the way of our daily life which is corrupt, fragmentary, destructive, violent.

So what will make a human being put away all these things? Religions have threatened saying. "If you don't do this you will go to hell." - especially in the Christian world. If you don't follow a certain religious image you are - you know, all the rest of it. So what will make a human being, like us, see the reality of it and break, go through with it, finish with it? You understand my question? We have tried every kind of persuasion, propaganda, we have followed so many ideals, gurus, concepts, we have exercised every kind of will, rewards and punishments. But apparently human beings don't change, change radically, they change a little bit here and there, depending on circumstances, convenience, satisfaction. So what will make us change? What will make us, for example, a very simple fact that we have multiple images not only about ourselves, about our country, about our neighbour, about our politicians, our religion, god, and all the rest of it - images created by thought. What will make us drop one of them so completely that you never go back to that? Please this is a serious question we are asking, not just a casual question on a morning that we are gathered together. It is a very serious question. What will persuade you, what will make you, what will drive you, what will influence you to change? We have tried all those, every form of persuasion, every form of reward and punishment, but apparently after thousands and thousands of years we are still more or less the same

- self-centred, lonely, being attached to some ideal, following some pattern political or religious or other. All that indicates the fragmentary state of our brain and mind.

Since you are good enough to listen to all this, what will make you change? What will make you naturally, easily, without effort, without any anxiety, or thinking about the future, just give up, let the images that one has fall away? If one sees logically, reasonably, the fact that images of various kinds do separate man from man, that images between people prevent relationship and that relationship assumes a responsibility which is not responsibility at all but a form of particular individual pleasure, all that. Now what will make my mind deeply reject all that? Is it the fault of our education? Always geared to passing examinations, jobs, careers, money, power, position, is that one of the major factors of this fragmentation? Is it the political system, whether left, right, extreme left, extreme right and so on? Or is it also the fault of our religions, organized religions with their dogmas, rituals which have no meaning whatsoever, it is all so stupid, childish. And we go on with them, and are always frightened about the future, this sense of deep inward insecurity. So seeing all that, what is our answer to it?

Either you reject all that, or oppose it by clever arguments, the impracticality of a life without ideals, without images, that is what you think, you think that is the most practical way of living. It is not. On the contrary, you can see what is happening in the world, the Communists, the Socialists, the Catholics and so on and so on, with their images, with their ideals, with their concepts, dividing, dividing, dividing. And if they do not divide they try to convert

you to their way, through pressure, through torture, through various forms of excommunication and so on.

I think it is rather important to find out for oneself whether this fragmentation brought about, as we explained, through attachment, through various forms of ideas and images, can these be totally set aside so that one has quite a different way of living, a different way of thinking, looking, feeling, with love and a great sense of compassion?

Why do you listen to me, to the speaker? You are all very silent. Is the speaker trying to stimulate you or influence you, or persuade you to think in this way or that way? He is not. All that he is saying is look, observe, for god's sake look at things as they are, see what is actually going on within your skin, within your mind, within your heart, not try to translate it, distort it, but actually observe what is.

So one of the problems is, perhaps that is the major problem, that our thought has created this society, our thoughts have brought about this religious structure without any meaning, our thoughts have built this world about us, apart from nature, apart from the animals, apart from the earth, otherwise thought has built all this - our churches, our gods, our religions, our political system, right, left, centre, extreme this or that, it is thought. And thought must be always limited because thought is the outcome of knowledge. And knowledge can never be complete about anything. Knowledge is the process of time, the accumulation of experience, not only yours, but all the past generations and generations, it is knowledge that we have stored in the brain, and that knowledge is always incomplete, it always goes with ignorance. Ignorance and

knowledge go together. And out of that knowledge, memory, thought. And so thought under all circumstances is limited, narrow, must be fragmentary. It may create the most beautiful bridges, these marvellous cameras, the battleships, the submarines, the latest guns and so on. And also thought has created all the things of this world like beautiful architecture, but not the streams, the rivers, the birds, the wonderful earth on which we live. And thought has created the images which we have put in the churches and the temples and so on. So thought by its very nature is fragmentary, and we, the whole of our being, our struggle, is the movement of thought.

Please, are you getting tired? You can be, I don't care. It is a very serious thing we are talking about. And we rely on thought to alter the course of our life. And when thought alters the way of our life, that way of life will be fragmentary, it will not be whole, complete.

One comes to the point, one realizes all this, if one has gone into it at all, and one comes to a certain wall against which you can't go further because we are still operating with the only instrument we think we have: that instrument is thought. Thought, desire and pleasure and fear, which is all the movement of thought. We will go into that a little later. So through thought we think we can break through this pattern of the brain which has been evolved through millenia. I wonder if we see that. Thought cannot possibly break through. It can only create further fragments because in its very nature it is limited - right? Can we move from there?

Knowledge is necessary. Technological, surgical, engineering, scientific knowledge and so on is necessary. But the knowledge

that one has psychologically accumulated through millenia as human beings, is that necessary at all? You understand my question? I must have knowledge to go to the room in which I happen to live. I must have knowledge how to drive a car, how to write in English, or in French, or in Spanish or Sanskrit and so on. I must have knowledge to earn a livelihood, skilfully or otherwise. That is absolutely necessary. But why should I have this accumulation of psychological knowledge? You understand my question? Which is the centre of me - right? My egotistic pursuits, my egotistic demands, activities, the whole of that, is based on knowledge. That knowledge may be transmitted into the future, modified by the present, but it is still knowledge. And psychologically why should I have any knowledge at all? Knowledge being when one has a relationship with another, intimate or otherwise, one creates through time, through various forms of conflict, pleasure and so on and so on, the image that one has about you and she has about you. That image is our knowledge - I don't know if you are following all this. Right? May we proceed?

That knowledge is fragmented, obviously. I can't know all about you. I may know all about you at a totally different level - we are not talking of that. We are talking of physical daily existence in which there is so much conflict between two human beings. And that conflict comes about through this constant building of images between you and the other. No? And can that image-making come to an end in our relationship with each other, as a man and a woman, or mother and child and so on and so on, can that image making come to an end? I say it is possible, it can be done. We

have potential to create the image, we have also the potentiality to break down that image. That is, why does the mind, thought, and also the brain, create the image? Please this is very important to understand because the wholeness of life, if one comes to that, that sense of total integrated whole, then all conflict ends. And as long as there is this movement of thought creating images between oneself and another, that sense of destructive individual narrowness will also destroy the wholeness. You understand what I am saying?

Why are you all so silent? I hope you are thinking together and that is why you are silent.

So after pointing out all this, what is one to do? Is it ever possible to end this movement of not only creating images about the whole as well as the particular, can this movement of thought end? You know meditation is essentially the ending of thought. Not the meditation that people practise twenty minutes every day, or twenty minutes in the morning and the evening, or meditation according to a system and so on, that is not meditation at all. Meditation is the ending of image-making by thought and the ending of psychological knowledge totally so that the mind is free from the past. That is real meditation.

We have talked for an hour and what good has it done? Not that one is seeking a result - the speaker is not. I don't care if you do, or don't. It is up to you. So after listening for an hour perhaps to this harangue, or to this sermon - you know that story of a preacher talking to his disciples every morning, that was his habit. He would get up on the rostrum, talk to his disciples for about ten minutes, or quarter of an hour or an hour, and begin the day that way. So one

morning he was preaching, talking about the goodness of life, how to behave. A bird comes and sits on the window sill and the preacher stops talking. And they all listen to that bird. And the bird flies away and the preacher says. "The sermon is over for this morning." Right? Got it?

May I get up now? We will continue tomorrow morning.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 31ST AUGUST 1980

May we go over a little bit what we said yesterday and we will continue from then on?

To put it briefly what we were saying yesterday morning was that the world is in such a chaotic condition, fragmented, violence, every kind of degradation going on. And it is one of the basic irrefutable facts that all human psychology, all human states throughout the world, whatever country one may live in, that all human beings suffer, that all human beings go through various forms of despair, depression, anxiety and innumerable ways of fear and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure. This is a common ground upon which all human beings stand. This one must see very clearly, that there is no actual division psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were, that we human beings are extraordinarily similar. Although we may physically have different shapes and colour and stature but intrinsically we are mankind. You are the world and the world is you. And there is no such thing as really the individual. I know perhaps you will not like this. Because we are all conditioned, educated to think we are separate individual minds, souls, entities, but it is not a fact. We are the result of centuries of conditioning to this idea and the actual fact is that we are like the rest of mankind. Our brains though conditioned to a particular activity of a so-called individual, but actually we are not, we are the whole of mankind. And we said yesterday when we actually realize this fact, which is irrefutable, you may logically tear it to pieces, but it is so, and then one asks: what is our responsibility? -

not only to our own particular family, friends and so on, but to the whole world, to the whole humanity of which we are. What is our responsibility? Do we act as a whole human being? Or as a fragment of that totality, a fragment that is dividing itself all the time, into nationalities, cultures, religions, various sects and gurus and all that business.

And our brains, our mind, our heart are actually the expression of the world in which we live, the society which we have created, with our violence, greed, anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, longing for some security both physically and psychologically, and we have created such a society which is obviously corrupt. And this corruption, as we said yesterday, comes into being when there is attachment to any particular country, idea, belief, dogma and so on. Where there is attachment there must be corruption. I think this also is an obvious fact. If you are attached to a particular symbol, a particular image, that must inevitably bring about division and therefore conflict and corruption, which is seen all over the world. And so that is what we said yesterday, more or less.

And also we said, realizing all this, which most of us do if you are at all watching, observing what is going on in the world and also within ourselves, what shall we do? We observe this, we see it, we know it, we feel it, and yet we seem to be incapable of breaking through this, breaking through this heavy curtain of tradition, of our conditioning of the brain following a certain pattern, pattern of fear, pleasure, anxiety, nervous responses, hate, jealousy, the old pattern of thousands and thousands of years. And perhaps we are aware of this, and yet we seem to be incapable to finish with it, because we are the result of many, many thousands

of generations who have lived in the same way as we are living now, perhaps a little modified, a little more comfortable, a little more sanity, a little more comfort and so on, but inwardly we are almost like the thousand past generations.

So the question arises from that: why is it that we don't change? Change, not only superficially, but deeply, profoundly, so our way of looking at the world, looking at ourselves is entirely different, a way of living which is not a series of continuous conflict, misery, struggle. Why is it we human beings who have cultivated such an extraordinary technological world, with all its destructive and perhaps some of it is sanity, why is it that as human beings who are supposed to be somewhat intelligent, educated, sophisticated, why is it that we do not radically bring about psychological revolution? If one asks that question, if you have ever asked it of yourself, and find that you are caught in your own experiences, and the images that one has created, not only of the world but of the so-called religious mind, which is essentially based on images and symbols and superstitions and hopeless illusions. And yet we go on, day after day continuing with our fears, with our anxieties, uncertainties, confusions, sorrow and so on.

As we also said yesterday, we are thinking together. We are investigating together. It is not that the speaker is laying down any principles, any ideas, any conclusions or doing any propaganda of any kind. Unfortunately we have been accustomed, or trained, or accepted, that we cannot solve these problems ourselves, we must go to somebody, either the priest or the psychologist or the latest guru, with all their fanciful dress and absurdities and we are so trained and conditioned that we cannot dissolve our own inward

struggles, problems and anxieties. That is why you are all sitting here probably, hoping that I will help to solve your problems, hoping that you will have a new kind of enlightenment. You know that is one of the strange things, enlightenment cannot be given by another. It is not a matter of time. It is not a matter of evolution, of gradual growth, moving from one step to another step, higher and higher and higher, until ultimately you come to something called enlightenment. That is a good old tradition, a trap for the human mind. That which is eternal, which is nameless is beyond time and you cannot approach it through time, through graduations, gradual process.

So we must ask: why is it that our minds and our hearts and our own brain which is the brain of humanity, because your brain is not your brain, it is the brain that has evolved through millenia, and that brain has followed a certain path, a certain route, a certain attitude and so on. And as the brain is the most important factor in our life, can that brain change itself completely? That is a central question. You understand? We are thinking together, you are not listening to me. We are like two friends talking together. There is nobody else but two friends and I hope we are like that in this gathering. You and I are sitting quietly in a comfortable chair, or uncomfortable, or walking along in the wood and talking over this seriously. That is, can the brain, which is evolved through time, has set a pattern for itself, a movement in which it has grown gradually from the most primitive, most backward, to an extraordinary brain that we have now. And that brain has lived always in this pattern. You understand my question? Of fear, greed, violence, brutality, never being satisfied, pursuit of sex, pleasure, you know all the rest

of it. That is our brain. Can that brain transform itself? You understand my question? Because the brain is the most important thing in our life. The brain, then the heart, physical heart and all the nervous responses which the brain controls, holds and so on. Can that thing transform itself? That is what we are going to enquire together during all these four talks, if you have the energy and the patience and the desire to discover for yourself.

One of the factors of this brain and mind is that it is controlled by desire - right? Desire with its will, will is the essence of desire. And we are always trying to become something; like the clerk trying to become the manager, the bishop becoming archbishop and the cardinal and ultimately the pope and the disciple trying to become like the master. So this constant movement to become something. And if we don't become something then we vegetate. So that is one of the factors that we have to go into: whether there is any becoming at all. And this becoming is the urge of desire, the battle of discontent. It is good to be discontented with everything around one, including with the speaker: to doubt. And in the Christian world doubt is an anathema, you are tortured for it, if you doubt. But in the Eastern world, like in Buddhism, doubt is one of the major factors of life. You must doubt because doubt purges the mind. Doubt your own experiences, your own gurus, your own activities, why you put on these strange clothes. So doubt not only experience, doubt the nature of desire, why one is caught in this. Because we are trying to find out whether it is possible to transform the mind, not through more knowledge, not through more experience. Knowledge is always incomplete, and experiences are always incomplete naturally.

So we are trying to find out, investigate together - I am not investigating and you just merely listening. It is our responsibility together to go into this as deeply as possible. And when you leave the tent this morning, if you are at all serious, to discover for oneself that it is not only possible, it actually can take place. This is not a hope, an idea, a concept, an illusion, an illusion that is satisfying, but to discover for oneself without any persuasion, without any reward, without punishment, without any direction, which means without any motive - you are following all this? - without any motive, to discover whether it is possible to totally transform the brain and its activities. Its activity is the movement of thought, and its physical neurological responses and sensations and so on.

When this question is understood, that we are together investigating, and one of the factors of this investigation is that the movement of desire is constantly not only changing but trying to move, trying to become something more and more and more and more - right? It is not what I am saying. It is so. If you go into it you will see it for yourself. So one has to ask why and what is the nature of desire. Why man always from the very beginning of time is caught in this thing? And so the pattern has been set to become something, which we are all trying to do all the time. "I am not so good as I was but I will be." Or "I will get over my anger" - jealousy, or envy, or whatever it is. which is the constant movement in time to be something - right? We are together in this, up to now?

And it has been one of the factors in life that those so-called religious people, the saints who are peculiar people anyhow, the so-

called monks, and the real sannyasis in India, not the phoney ones who walk around in strange clothes, the real ones, have always said desire is one of the most destructive factors in life, therefore suppress it, avoid it, go beyond it. And therefore to go beyond it exercise will, control, suppression, but the thing is boiling inside. You may sit quietly in a monastery, or on a hill, or in a wood, or on a bench in this garden, and the thing is burning. So one has to understand its nature, not pervert it, not suppress it, not destroy it, but understand it. One can understand it either verbally, or actually. Verbal understanding has very little meaning. We can go into it step by step, analyse it, look at it, without analysing, just look at it as it moves. Then one begins to have an insight into the whole problem of desire. I am going to go into the question of insight presently. Because as desire is such a violent process - controlled, shaped, but tremendous vitality it has. And is one of the driving factors in our life, and merely to suppress it becomes too childish.

So one has to patiently go into it, observe it, and see where discipline comes into this. You understand? You are following this? We will go into it. Desire has significance and vitality only when thought creates the image - right? The seeing of the blue shirt, or the blue dress in the window, and creating the image of oneself in that shirt or in that dress, that is the beginning of desire. You understand what I am saying? Right? Do we meet each other? That is, seeing, contact, sensation, if it stopped there, it is natural, otherwise if one is not sensitive you can't perceive the thing clearly, if your touch is not sensitive, then seeing, contact, sensation. Then begins thought creating the image of you in that shirt, or in that dress, or in that hat, or in that car. Then desire

arises. So the image created by thought is the movement of desire, not seeing, contact, sensation, that's natural, healthy. You are following all this?

So discipline as we generally practise is control, accepting the authority of a pattern, obedience, and so on - conformity essentially. Whereas discipline has a totally different meaning, which is to learn. It comes - naturally we all know English - it comes from the word disciple, to learn. Disciple is one who is learning, not from a master, from a superstitious guru, but to learn means to observe - to observe the movement of seeing, contact, sensation, then thought creating the image and the flowering of desire. To see how desire arises requires very close observation - right? That observation has its own discipline. The observation is the learning. I wonder if you catch what I am saying? Right? Can we go on?

Thank god! Somebody says yes.

So as we said, discipline means to learn, not to conform, not to imitate. And one can learn through observation in which there is no compulsion, no comparison, because learning is taking place all the time as it is moving. Therefore there is no sense of "I am learning more". I wonder if you see that? So we can see now learning is the movement of desire and from that you see that the moment thought arises with its image desire flowers. And to give an interval, a long interval between seeing, contact, sensation and thought bringing with its image, to postpone the image. You understand? To postpone the image is the learning. Right? Good!

And will is part of that desire. So desire is the movement of time - right? Not the physical time but the time that "I will have

that shirt". Right? So in enquiring into desire one begins to understand the movement of becoming - right? That is, is there duality at all? You understand my question? Please it is related to what we are talking about, it is not something irrelevant, it is related directly to desire. That is, we live in opposites. I am angry. I should not be angry. The fact is I am angry - right? The non-fact is "I should be". And this is part of our becoming. I wonder if you follow all this? You are following? It is rather fun if you can go into this, not as an intellectual game but it is a human game, it is much more serious than an intellectual game. We are dealing with humanity, with ourselves, who are humanity. And we are asking whether this mind, this brain can totally transform itself so that it is something entirely different. We say it can be done, it is possible. And we are doing it now if you observe it slowly. Carefully. We have followed the pattern of desire and the conflict between the opposites - "I am", "I should be". The fact is only what I am, not what I should be. What I should be is the invention of thought in order to avoid 'what is'. I wonder if you follow all this? And the understanding of 'what is' is the learning of it, not how to transform it - you are getting all this? Not to transform it, but to learn about it. In the very learning about it is the dissolution of it, is its radical change - right?

So we say it is possible and if one has this insight into the whole nature of desire, insight, then that very insight - I have discussed this with certain scientists, they agree to this, so you may perhaps agree also to it, but don't agree because scientists agree, but see for oneself the fact. That is, when one has an insight into this movement of desire and becoming, and the conflict of the

opposites, which is part of desire, when one has this insight the very brain cells themselves are changed. Don't accept this because the speaker is saying it but you can see it for yourself. So we have to enquire into what is insight. Shall we go on?

You see we are always functioning with knowledge - right? Knowledge that one has accumulated through education, mathematics, geography, history, that knowledge in order to survive in this world, to get a job and so on, but also we are functioning with our psychological knowledge, the accumulation that one has gathered through thirty years, forty years, or past generations, inherited genetically. So there it is. We are always functioning with knowledge, skilfully or not skillfully - right? And knowledge, as we said yesterday, is always limited, is always within the shadow of ignorance. There can never be complete knowledge but there can be an ending to knowledge. I wonder if you see the difference? I am going to show it presently.

So knowledge is the movement of time, of experience and that movement is thought. So that is the instrument with which we act. That is the instrument with which we analyse and come to a conclusion and then say that conclusion is right because we have logically explained it, which has been proved and so on, it is acceptable, reasonable, sane, based on thought, which is always limited naturally. You follow this? Please follow this a little bit with attention if you don't mind. That is the field in which we operate all the time, waking and sleeping. And with that knowledge we try to resolve the psychological problems, like desire, for example. And when you examine it, analyse it, which is the movement of thought, that analysis can never dissolve that desire.

It can modify it, it can be controlled, it can be given a different direction instead of clothes and cars it can go towards god. But it is the same movement - god, you know god!

So we are asking: what is insight then? We are saying insight can only take place when knowledge has come to an end and there is pure observation, without any direction - you understand? Then you comprehend the whole movement of desire. When you say, "I have an insight into the technological problem" - an engineer, or an electrician, or a computer expert, he has sudden insight. That insight is not the result of constant examination, constant analysis, investigating day after day, it is sudden cessation of all knowledge and seeing something directly. I wonder if you follow this? I hope you are doing this as we are talking together. That insight brings about a fundamental change in the very brain cells themselves which carry memory - right? I won't ask you if this is right because it is. If you go into it and do it for yourself you will find out. As we said, doubt, not accept. Doubt what we are saying but if you keep on doubting, doubting, doubting, it leads nowhere. But you must doubt and yet at moments that must be let go, like a dog on a leash.

So in the same manner, one of our factors in life is relationship. Life is relationship, whether one lives in a monastery or an ordinary life, life is a movement in relationship. In that relationship there is constant struggle - man, woman, you know the whole business. And apparently we have never been able to solve it, which is again a factor - right? So many thousands of divorces, moving from one man to another man, another woman - you follow? Trying to find some kind of satisfaction, fulfilment, all that business. And that is what we call relationship. And the older we

grow the more dependent are we on relationship. And in that relationship there is always you and me - the two separate entities trying to be related. You understand the absurdity of this? Which means why is there this division? Are we following each other? I am sure this will interest you! The other you think is all nonsense, or too idealistic and illusory but this I hope will interest you. A strange world isn't it? (Laughter) We are only interested in something that is very near to us, something that is biting us. But we are not interested in the global thing, in the whole human existence, so we reduce all this enormous life, with all its complexities into a little thing - me and my struggle, me and my fulfilment, me and my becoming something. This is what we are concerned about. And the tragedy is you never solve this unless you have understood the wholeness of life and the great beauty, the greatness, the sublimity of the wholeness, which is that you are the entire humanity. You understand? You will leave the tent and go back to your little backyard. Fortunately at Brockwood the backyard is very large!

As we said one of the factors is relationship. We are always trying to find a way to be related to somebody so completely, in which there is no division, you and me. We try to find it through sex - right? And unfortunately one of the philosophies in India is that through sex you can find that ultimate whatever it is. It is another of those nonsenses. It is very popular in India! (Laughter) And that is why all these followers go off to their gurus in India. (Laughter)

So we are trying to find out whether it is possible to live in this world, actually in this world, of relationship of man, woman,

between each other without any division - you understand? Is that possible? When all our education, all our culture, all our religions, everything is to divide, to divide, divide. Now together we are going to investigate this. And in this investigation you are taking part. You are sharing in this. It is not that the speaker is investigating and you kind of agree or disagree and then go off, but together investigate it. What makes this division? - apart from the superficial physical division, we are talking about psychological division, the inward sense of me and you, we and they. Why does this division exist? Is it actual? Is it something that we have been conditioned to, like the Arab and the Jew, and the Muslim and the Hindu, this division which has been created through culture and religion, which obviously is the result of thought and propaganda and all that business, actually there is no division. If I live in India I am not an Indian or a Muslim, there is no division. Does the division exist because of the word? Follow it carefully please. I am going slowly into this. Of the word - Englishman, Frenchman. Or is it the cultural division? Different, much more intellectual in France, the sense of highly cultivated mind, and here there is a different culture, more buying and selling, which is part of America? Or is it that each one has his own particular image of himself and the image about the other? Right? You are following all this? Right? That is, two people living together intimately, are bound to create these images - right? I live with you and I inevitably, day after day, the monotony of it, the familiarity, the remembrances, the hurts, the flatteries, the encouragements - you know, all that is going on, that inevitably must create the image about me. So I create an image about you and you create an image

about me. So this relationship is between the two images. Sorry to be so... And this is what we call relationship. Actual relationship doesn't exist. I wonder if you are following all this.

So is it possible to live together without a single image? You understand my question? We say it is, or course it is. Otherwise there is no love, there is no - you follow? Then there is conflict. Division invariably brings conflict - British and French, and German, you follow? So can this image-making machinery stop? We are investigating together.

Now, why does the mind, thought, create the image? You understand? You have an image about your husband, or your wife, girl friend or whatever it is, why do you create an image? Is it because in the image there is security? Not in the person - right? I wonder if you see this? I am not being cynical, I am just pointing to facts. How stupid all this is, isn't it?

Now can that image-making stop? Then there can be love. Two images having relationship and calling that love, you can see what it is - jealousy, anxiety, quarrels, irritations, bullying each other, possessing each other, dominating and so on and so on and so on, and that is called love. And we are asking: is it possible to end the building of these images? That is, why does the brain register? You understand? When it is not possible to register there is no image-making. You follow this? Is it becoming too intellectual? No, no. The speaker doesn't like to play around with the intellect alone, it is stupid.

So why does the brain register any irritation? You understand? Any sense of anxiety within this relationship, jealousy and so on? Is it possible for the brain not to register? You have understood the

question? How are you going to find out? You flatter me, or insult me, which has happened, both. And why should the brain register the insult, or the flattery? I mean if one is called an idiot immediately it is registered. The registration takes place only when you have an image about yourself. I wonder if you capture all this? This is insight, you understand? So that insight into the whole question of relationship, which is based on images, those images are dissolved. Insight dissolves them, not argument, analysis and emotional reactions.

Now have you in talking over together, going into this, have you dissolved it? Otherwise there is no point in attending these talks. This is very serious. And as we said this is one of our factors in life, relationship, which is based on fear, you know, all the rest of it, jealousy. Now when one sees the whole of that and the insight that transforms the whole movement of all that, the energy of all that, then there is a possibility of having an actual relationship with another. There is no you going off to your office, working yourself step by step in ambition and coming home and being docile and loving and all that business, which has no meaning. You understand all this?

We have spoken for an hour, shall we go on?

The meaning of all these gatherings - and we have had it for sixty years, I have had it - either we play with all this and come back next year and say, "Let's play the same game again". Or talking over together seriously as we are doing now, you see for yourself the depth of your own perception, into yourself, unaided by another. You see it in yourself, the whole movement of desire and relationship. And when you have an insight into that your life

is transformed vastly. But that requires attention - not in this tent when you are listening to the speaker. Attention, not concentration but attention in your life, when you are sitting in front of your husband at the breakfast table, he with a newspaper and you cooking the egg, or whatever you are doing, watch it. (Laughter) You understand? Actually the terrible reality of no relationship, except sex and all that. Actually there is none so by your own action you are living a solitary, an isolated life. Do you understand what I am saying? How can an isolated entity love? And love is relationship, not the thing that we call love now, which is a torture. But that sense of having no division, which means you with your ambitions, with your greeds, with your envies, with your anxieties, and he with his, how can these two ambitions meet? They can never. So when you see the whole pattern of this, and the seeing is the discipline - you understand? Pure learning. And when once that learning has taken place, which is insight, the thing, the image-making machinery comes totally to an end. Totally. So that life is then something entirely different.

I don't know if we have time to go further into this question of becoming. You understand? This is it: desire, relationship. In both is to become. That is what our whole way of life is, to become something. You have heard relationship, and the division exists as long as there is that image. Now the natural response would be, : How am I to get rid of the image? - which is to become something else. You understand? Not the understanding of the nature of images, who builds it; learn about it.

And the other factor in our life is pleasure. Pleasure is the most isolating factor - sorry. I don't know if you want to go into it? Have

we time for that? You see our life is a constant movement in isolation. That is a fact. Each one of us is so occupied with himself, with his ambitions, with his lack of fulfilment, with his progress - you know? The self-centred activity is isolating. Building a wall around yourself and then stretching your hand over the wall to another. And is it possible to live in this world without this movement? Please this is a very serious question. We are always seeking fulfilment, or being, wanting, dissatisfied. You know discontent is good. We are too satisfied with most things, as we are. We accept our politicians, our preachers, our authorities - and I hope you haven't got any gurus, if you have you accept them and their foolishness and so on and so on. You are so easily satisfied and smother this flame of discontent. Right? Discontent is a factor. The more it burns the clearer the mind becomes. But we are so easily satisfied, gratified. Then one asks: can there be an end to all discontent? Part of this discontent is fear. And why is one discontented? This longing for something which we haven't got - right? Longing for some happy relationship where you can have some peace of mind. That is, where there is discontent there is always the search for content. You understand all this? Move, please let's move together.

Can there be discontent by itself? Or is it always associated with something? I am dissatisfied with my house, with my wife, with my job, with my looks, with my hair, with all kinds of things. Is discontent born out of comparison? You are following? Why do we compare? It is said that through comparison there is progress and all the rest of it. But the idea of comparison. We only compare with something that you haven't got - right? I wonder if you follow. And

this comparison is always a battle, a struggle and part of this discontent is comparison. When there is no comparison whatsoever psychologically, or even physically, is there discontent? What is discontent in itself, per se? Is there such a thing as being discontent in itself? Or always with regard to something? You are following my question? Unless we understand this we will only discover the nature of fear and the ending of fear, but we have to understand this too. All this commercialism is comparison, more, more, more, more, which is different from need - we won't go into all that.

So can the mind be free of all comparison, not only physically, how you look compared to another, you know all that business, it is really commercialism; also to end comparison with the image you have built so that you are comparing yourself with the image that you had. Can you end all that so that there is never a sense of discontent? Which doesn't mean you are satisfied, which is the opposite. But the understanding, the learning about discontent. It is a flame, it is something that you must have but if it is not understood it destroys everything. And in that also there is the question of fear.

Now it is a quarter to one, we had better stop today. We will deal with it next Saturday and Sunday.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 2ND SEPTEMBER 1980

We have been looking over all the questions that have been handed in. There are perhaps a hundred or more, or less, and I am afraid we cannot answer all those questions. We could if we all stayed here for a couple of months but I don't think what would be possible.

When one asks a question, in that is implied that someone is going to answer the question. The meaning of that word 'question' means to seek. So together we are going to seek the answer; not that the speaker is going to answer the question but together we are going to seek, find, discover the right answer. So please this is not a Delphic Oracle. Together we are going to find out the meaning and the significance, not only of the question but also together seek the answer.

A lot of questions have been asked which could be answered if one thought it over carefully for oneself, and other questions with regard to yoga - should one do it, should one not do it, why are you vegetarian, why don't you grow your hair longer, and all that kind of thing! So out of all those questions that have been handed in, the speaker has carefully chosen what seems to be representative of all the questions. So I hope you will not mind if your particular question is not answered. Perhaps it will be answered when we go through all the questions that we have typed out. Is that all right?

1st QUESTION: You have spoken so much against organizations, so why do you have schools and Foundations? And why do you speak?

Need I answer this question? Yes? I think a group of us saw the necessity of having a school. The meaning of that word 'school' means leisure, leisure in which to learn; and a place where students and the teachers can flower, and a place where a future generation can be prepared, because schools are meant for that, not just merely to turn out human beings as mechanical, technological instruments, merely jobs and careers and so on - which is necessary - but also flower as human beings, without fear, without confusion, with great integrity. And to bring about such a good human being - I am using the word good in its proper sense, not in the respectable sense, good in the sense of a whole human being, not fragmented, not broken up, not confused. And it is very difficult to find teachers who are also inclined that way. And as one is aware the teachers are the lowest paid, without the least respect from society and so on. So we are trying both in India where there are nearly six schools, in California and in Canada and one here, to see that they are really centres of understanding, of comprehension of life, not books only, and we thought such a place is necessary and that is why we have these schools. They may not always succeed but perhaps one or two, after ten years, might come out of it as total human beings.

And the Foundations in America, in India, here and other places, Canada, exist not as centres of enlightenment and all that business, but merely to publish books, to organize these Gatherings, to help the schools and so on. And nobody is making a profit out of it - right?

And why do I speak? This has been often asked. "Why do you waste your energy after sixty years and nobody seems to change.

Why do you bother about it?" Is it a form of self-fulfilment? You understand my question? Is it a form of whether you get energy talking about things, so you depend on the audience? We have been through all that several times.

First of all I don't depend on you as a group who come to listen to the speaker. I have been silent, so you can rest assured the speaker is not exploiting you, he is not attached to a particular group or is it necessary for him to have a Gathering. But then why do you speak, what is your motive? Right? There is no motive. I think when one sees something beautiful, true one wants to tell people about it, out of affection, out of compassion, out of love. And if those who are not interested in it, that is all right, those who are interested perhaps can gather together. And also can you ask the flower why it grows? Why it has perfume? And it is for the same reason the speaker talks.

2nd QUESTION: Is it always wrong or misguided to work with an enlightened man and be a sannyasi?

Sannyasi is a Sanskrit word. It is a very old tradition in India where the monks who take this vow, they really renounce the world outwardly. They only stay one night in each place, they beg, they are celibate, they have nothing except they have one or two cloths - you understand? The modern sannyasi is none of those - you understand what I am saying? He has been called a sannyasi by somebody in India and they think it is marvellous. Put on a robe, yellow robe or pink robe or whatever the robe you put on and beads and they think they are sannyasis. They are not. It is misguided, and not ethical to call them sannyasis.

Is it always wrong and misguided to work with an enlightened

man? How do you know he is enlightened? How do you know?
Would you kindly answer. How do you know? By his looks?
Because people call him enlightened? Or he himself calls himself
that he is enlightened? If he calls himself enlightened then you may
be assured that he is not enlightened! There are a great many gurus
who are doing this, playing this game, calling themselves lords,
giving themselves titles, a new lot of mischief. And before you find
out who is enlightened why don't you find out what is
enlightenment? You understand my question?

I may consider you as enlightened. What is my criterion which
makes me judge that you are enlightened? Is it because of some
tricks, a great many people come round me, put garlands round
me? Or enlightenment is something that cannot possibly be talked
about? The man who says, "I know", does not know - right? Please
be serious about this because lots of people are doing this in India,
mostly Americans and Europeans, who gather there and - you
know - do all the circus. So shouldn't we doubt, question these
people? And if you question them will they answer you? Or they
have put themselves up on a platform, you know, on a level, which
forbids you to question them.

So to work with an enlightened human being is totally
unimportant. What is important is to work upon oneself, not with
somebody - right? We are seeking this together. Please, I am not
advising, counselling, etc. etc., but together to find out what is the
truth about all these matters. Because truth is something that has no
path - right? There is no way to it, nobody can point it out to you, it
is not something fixed and you can go towards it by a system, by a
meditation, by a method and so on. A living thing has no path to it,

and if one is seriously inclined to find out what is truth one has to lay the foundation first, to have a great sensitivity, to be without fear completely, to have great integrity.

And to be free from all knowledge, psychological knowledge, and therefore the ending of suffering. From that arises love and compassion. If that is not there as the well laid deep foundation, one is merely caught in illusions - illusions that man has fabricated, thought has invented, visions that are the projection of one's own conditioning. So all that has to be put aside to find that which is beyond time.

3rd QUESTION: You say that fundamentally my mind works in exactly the same way as everyone else. Why does this make me responsible for the whole world?

I am afraid I did not say that. I said, the speaker said, that wherever you go throughout the world human beings suffer, they are in conflict, they are in anxiety, uncertainty. Both psychologically and physically there is very little security. There is fear, there is loneliness, despair, depression. This is the common lot of all human beings whether they live in China, or Japan, India or here, in America or Russia, everybody goes through this. It is their life. And as a human being you are the whole world psychologically. You are not separate from the man who is suffering, anxious, lonely in India, or in America. So you are the world, and the world is you. This is a fact which very few people realize, not an intellectual fact, a philosophical concept, an ideal, something to be longed for, but it is a fact as you have a headache. And when one realizes that profoundly, inside not intellectually, verbally, or ideologically, then the question arises: what is my

responsibility? We are asking each other this question, please. When you realize that, not verbally but in your blood, that you are no longer an individual, which is a great shock for most people, they don't accept that. We think our minds, our problems, our anxieties are ours, mine, not yours.

And if one sees the truth of this matter, then what is our responsibility? Not only one has a family, wife and children, one has to be responsible for them naturally, but what is your responsibility globally? You understand my question? For the whole of mankind, because you are the mankind, you have your illusions, your images of god, your images of heaven and so on and so on. You have your rituals, you know, the whole business, exactly like the rest of the world, only in different names, they don't call themselves Christians they call themselves Muslims, or Hindus, or Buddhists, but the pattern is the same. Right?

So when you realize that, what is our responsibility? That is, how do you respond to the challenge? You understand my question? How do you answer? What is your reaction when you feel that you are humanity? This is a challenge - you understand? How do you meet a challenge? If you meet it from your old individual conditioning, your response will naturally be totally inadequate - right? It will be fragmentary, it will be rather shoddy. So one has to find out what is our response to this great challenge? Does your mind meet it greatly, or with your fears, with your anxieties? You follow? The little concern about yourself?

So the responsibility depends, if I may point out, upon the response to the challenge. If one says this is your responsibility, join - not the League of Nations but some other nations, form a

group, do this and do that, that is not an adequate challenge. How do you respond to this challenge psychologically? Inwardly? Is it just a flutter, a romantic appeal? Or something profound that will transform your whole way of looking at life? Then you are no longer British, American, French - you follow? Will you give up all that? Or merely play with the idea that it is a marvellous Utopian concept? Right?

So the responsibility to this challenge depends on you, whether your mind is capable of meeting this enormous human wholeness, this human current.

4th QUESTION: When I listen to you there is an urgency to change. When I return home it fades. What am I to do?

What are we to do? Is the urgency to change influenced or pointed out by the speaker and therefore while you are here you are driven into a corner, and when you leave naturally you are no longer in the corner. That means you are being influenced, challenged, driven, persuaded, and when all that is gone you are where you were. Right?

Now, what is one to do? Please let's think it out, the right answer to this. What is one to do? I come to this Gathering from a distant place. It is a lovely day. I put up a tent, I am really interested. I have read not only what the speaker has said and written, but I have read a great deal. I have followed the Christian concepts, the Buddhist investigation, the Hindu mythology, I have also done different forms of meditation, the TM, the Tibetan, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Zen. And I am dissatisfied with all those. And I come here and I listen. And am I prepared to listen completely? I cannot listen completely if I bring all my knowledge

here. I cannot listen or learn, or comprehend completely if I belong to some sect, if I am attached to one particular concept and I want to add what has been said here to that also - right? I must come, if I am serious, with a free mind, with a mind that says let's find out for god's sake. Not I want to add what you are saying to what I already know. You are following all this?

So what is one's attitude about all this? The speaker has been saying constantly: freedom is absolutely necessary. Psychological freedom first, not physical freedom - that you have in these countries except in the totalitarian countries. So without inward freedom, which can only come about when one understands one's conditioning, the conditioning which is both cultural, religious, economic, social, physical, and can one be free of that? Free primarily of the psychological conditioning? One fact which is: that you are no longer an individual. The very word 'individual' means undivided, not broken up, and we are. We are not individuals. So will you move away from that conditioning? Me first everybody else second!

So what is difficult in all this is that we cling to something so deeply that we are unwilling to let go. Perhaps one has studied various things and one is attracted to a particular thing - a particular psychological, you know, something or other. And one goes into it, studies it and finds out that by jove there is a great deal in it and sticks to it. And then comes here and listens and adds what he has heard to that. Then he becomes a melange, a mixture of everything - right? Aren't we doing that? So our minds become very confused. And for the time being when you are in the tent that confusion is somewhat pushed away or less, and when you leave it

is back there again.

So can one be aware of this confusion, not only while you are here but when you are at home, which is much more important than being clear here. Nobody cares if you are or you are not. But when you go back home to face all that business, going to the office every day for the rest of your life - you understand what it all means? Day after day, day after day, coming home, children, the worry - all that goes on.

So what does it all indicate? We have the intelligence to solve technological problems. The problem-solving mind. We all have it. And that is not intelligence. The capacity to think clearly, objectively, and know the limitation of thinking. To know, to be aware of the limitation of thinking is the beginning of intelligence. I wonder if you follow all this. We worship thinking, the more cleverly we can think, the greater we seem to be. All the philosophers who spin a lot of theories. But whereas if we could observe our own confusion, our own individual narrow way of looking at life, at home, not here, to be aware of all that, and to see how thought is perpetually creating problems. Thought creates the image and that image divides. To see that is intelligence. To see danger is intelligence. To see psychological dangers is intelligence. But apparently we don't see those things. That means somebody has to goad you all the time, persuade you, push you, drive you, ask you, beg you, do something or other all the time to make one aware of oneself. And move from there, not just stay there. And I am afraid nobody is going to do that, even the most enlightened human being. Then you become his slave - you understand?

So if one has the vitality, physical vitality, the psychological

energy which is now being dissipated in conflict, in worrying, in chattering, in endless gossip - you know, not only with others but with oneself. This endless chattering. All that dissipates energy, the psychological energy. And that energy is needed to observe. To observe ourselves in the mirror of relationship, and we are all related to somebody or other, and to observe there and to discover the illusions, the images, the absurdities, the idiocies, then out of that freedom comes intelligence which will show the way of our life. Right? Are we moving together?

5th QUESTION: Is suffering necessary to make us face the necessity to change?

This is one of our traditions that says you must suffer in order to be good. In the Christian world, and in the Hindu world, they try to put different words for it, karma and so on and so on, and everywhere they say you must go through suffering, which is not only physical suffering but also psychologically. That is, you must strive, you must make an effort, you must sacrifice, you must give up, you must abandon, you must suppress, you know. That is our tradition, both in the East and in the West. And suffering, being common to all mankind, one says you must go through that particular door. Someone comes along, like the speaker, and says, suffering must end, not go through it, it must end. You understand what I am saying? Suffering is not necessary. It is the most destructive element in life. Like pleasure suffering is made personal, secretive, mine, not yours. There is not only global suffering, mankind has been through enormous sorrows, wars, starvations, violence - you follow? He has faced suffering in different forms and so he accepts it as inevitable and uses that as a

means to become noble, or change himself.

We are saying on the contrary, you may reject it, question it, doubt it, but let's find out. That, is let us seek the right answer to this, together, not because the speaker says so. Can sorrow end? Sorrow being our grief, so many ways we suffer, an insult, a look, a gesture, a wound that we have received from childhood, a wound that is very deep of which we may be conscious, or unconscious, the suffering of another, the loss of another. And if you examine it closely, taking one fact, which is, that we are wounded from childhood, by the parents, by the teachers, by other boys, girls, it is happening all the time. And this wound is deep, covered up, and one builds a wall round oneself not to be hurt, and so that very wall creates fear. I don't know if you are following all this? And one asks: can this hurt, can it be wiped away completely so that it leaves no scar? Please we are going over this together - you understand? I am sure you have been hurt, haven't you, all of you, in some way or another. It is there. And we carry it throughout our life. The consequences of that are that we become more and more isolated, more and more apprehensive. We don't want to be hurt anymore so we build a wall round ourselves and gradually withdraw. Isolation takes place. You know all this. So one asks: is it possible not to be hurt? Not only not to be hurt in the future, today, but also to wipe out the hurt that one has had from childhood. You understand? We are thinking this together, please. Is it possible to wipe away the wound, the hurt that one carries about all the time?

If one is serious one should discover for oneself the cause of the hurt and what is hurt, and who is hurt - you are following all this?

Please. Which means: is it possible not to register the insult, the flattery, the gesture that cuts you down, the look of annoyance, anger, the impatience? Not to register any of that. Do you want to go into it deeply? Shall we go into it deeply?

The brain is the instrument of registration - right? Like a computer it registers. It registers because in that registration it finds security, safety, it is a form of protecting itself - right? You are following this? Right sirs? And when one is called an idiot, or some other insult takes place, the immediate reaction is to register it, verbally, the word has its significance, wanting to hurt and it is registered. Like flattery is also registered. Right? Now can this registering process come to an end? Bearing in mind that the mind, the brain must register, otherwise you wouldn't know where your house is, you wouldn't be able to drive your car, or use any language. But not to register any psychological reactions. You understand? You are following all this?

Then one will ask: how? How will I prevent registration of an insult, or a flattery? Flattery is more pleasant and therefore I like to register, but the insult or the hurt I want to get rid of. But both factors, insult, flattery, are registered. Now is it possible not to register psychologically? Right? Can we go on with this?

What is it that gets hurt? You say, "I am hurt", what is that entity that gets hurt? Is it an actuality? You understand what I mean? Something concrete, something tactile, something that you can talk about you know? Or is it something that you have created for yourself about yourself? Are you following all this?

All right. I have an image about myself, most of us have. That image has been created from childhood - you must be like your

brother who is so clever, you must be better, you must be good - you follow? This image is gradually being built, through education, through relationships and so on and so on. That image is me. I wonder if you accept that? That image which is me gets hurt. Right? Are you following? So as long as I have an image it is going to be trodden on by everybody, not only by the top intellectuals but by anybody. So is it possible to prevent the formation of images? Go into it sir. Come with me, will you? You understand, the image-making machinery. What is this machinery that makes the images? You understand? The images about my country, about the politicians, about the priests, about god - you follow? - the whole fabrication of images. Who makes these images? And why are images made? You understand? Who makes them and why are they made? We can see very easily why they are made - for security, for reasons of self protection, because if I call myself a Communist in a non Communist world I have a rather difficult time. Or in a Communist world, if I am not a Communist, terrible things might happen. So identifying myself with an image gives one a great security. That is the cause, that is the reason, why all of us, in some form or another, have images. And who creates this image? What is the machinery? You understand? What is the process of it? Please think it out with me, don't wait for me to tell you.

Will there be - please listen to it - will the machinery come to an end when there is complete attention? Or, the machinery is set going when there is no attention? Do you follow the question? Do you follow this sir? Where am I to look? When there is complete attention when you call me an idiot - you understand - you call me

an idiot and the verbal stone has an impact and the response is "You are also"! Now can I receive that word, the meaning of that word, the insult that you want me to feel by using that word, can I be attentive of all that instantly? You understand what I am saying? Are we following each other? Can I be aware or attentive completely when you use that word? And you are using that word to hurt me. And to be completely attentive at that moment. It is not a shield. It is not something that you put up in order to avoid. In that attention there is no reception. I wonder if you see it. Whereas when you call me an idiot and I am inattentive, not paying attention, then registration takes place. You can experiment with this, do it now for god's sake.

So that not only the past wounds, past hurts, but also your mind then is so sensitive, vulnerable, it is so moving, living, acting, it has no moment of static moment where you can hurt. I wonder if you follow all this? No. All right?

6th QUESTION: My problem is I have a ten foot wall around me. It is no use trying to overcome it, so I ignore it. It is still there. What do I do?

What's the height of the wall you have around you? Is it possible to be vulnerable, to be so sensitive, to be alive in fact that you need never build a wall? There are walls round a property - listen carefully. There are walls round a property, and you treat yourself as a property and so build a wall round yourselves. You understand what I am saying? Again sirs, why do we do all these kind of things? Why do we build a wall and then try to tear it down, and not being able to break it down we avoid it, we run away from it, we hide behind it. Why do we do all these things?

Why do we create problems for ourselves? Why can't we be so sane, normal, healthy - not normal, sorry!

This is a problem to the questioner. What is a problem? You have a problem, right, haven't you? No? Oh my god! What is the problem? Something that you have not been able to resolve - right? You have analysed it, you have been to a psychiatrist, you have been to a confession, or you have analysed yourself and the problem remains, the cause remains. And you have examined the effects, analysed the effects - right? And the peculiarity of a cause is the cause becomes the effect - you follow what I am saying? And the effect becomes the cause. I wonder if you understand all this? Is this too intellectual? All right.

So what is a problem for all of us? What is our problem? And why do we have problems? Let's take a common problem: does god exist? I am taking that as a silly example. Because we say, "If god exists how can he create this monstrous world?" Right? So it becomes more and more and more of a problem. First of all I assume god has created it, this world, and then I get involved in it. Or I have a certain ideal, I want to live up to that ideal, that becomes a problem. I don't see why I should have ideals at all. First I create an ideal, then I try to live up to it, then all the problem arises. I am not good, I must be good, tell me what to do to achieve and so on and so on. You follow how we create a problem, create something illusory first, like non-violence is illusory. The fact is violence; and then my problem arises: how am I to be non-violent? You follow? Whereas I am violent, let me deal with that, not with non-violence. I wonder if you get this?

So is this what we are doing, at one level? Or I cannot get on

with my wife. I am rather nervous about this! I cannot get on with somebody or other. You follow what I am trying to say? We make problems out of everything. The question is, much more important than the resolution of the problem is not to have problems at all so that your mind is free from this everlasting struggle to resolve something or other. What is the core of all problems? Not technological problems, not mathematical problems, but the human, deep, inward psychological problems - what is the root of it? Come on sirs. Is there a root that can be pulled out, or withered away so that the mind has no problems whatsoever? Go on sirs.

What is a problem? Something to be dissolved in the present, or in the future - right? A problem only exists in time. You understand what I am saying? Someone please tell me. You understand this, my question? A problem exists as long as we are thinking in terms of time, not only chronological time but inward psychological time. As long as I have not understood the nature of psychological time I must have problems. You understand? Are you meeting me? We are moving together. That is, I want to be successful in the worldly sense, and also I want to be spiritually successful - they are both the same. Now wanting to be successful is a movement in time - right, you are following this? And that creates the problem. That is, wanting to be something is time and that wanting to be is the problem. Do you understand or not? Right? So I am saying, what is the root of this that creates problems, problems, problems. Not only time, but go on sirs investigate with me.

Is it thought? Or is there the centre which is always moving within its own radius - do you understand what I am saying? Won't

problems exist as long as I am concerned about myself? As long as I am wanting to be good, wanting to be this, wanting to be that and so and so on, I must create problems. Which means can I live without a single image about myself? You understand? As long as I have an image to be successful, I must achieve enlightenment, I must reach god, I must be good, I must be more loving, I mustn't be greedy, I mustn't hurt, I must live peacefully, I must have a quiet mind, I must know what meditation is - you follow? Is it possible to live so freely and so on. You follow? That is, as long as there is a centre there must be problems. Now that centre is the essence of inattention. Are you getting it? Oh come on with me. When there is attention there is no centre. I wonder if you meet this - right?

Now look: when you listen, if you are listening, when you listen to what is being said and attending, not trying to understand what he says, attending, in that attention there is no you. The moment there is no attention the 'you' creeps up. And that centre creates the problems. Got it? No, sir, this is very, very serious if you go into it: to have a mind that has no problems, and therefore no experience. The moment you have an experience and you hold on to it, then it becomes memory and you want more of it. So a mind that has no problem has no experience. Oh, you don't see the beauty of it.

7th QUESTION: I derive strength from concentrating on a symbol. I belong to a group that encourages this. Is this an illusion?

May I respectfully point out: don't belong to anything - right? But you can't help it, you do.

Sir, see the reason of this: we cannot stand alone, we want support, we want the strength of others, we want to be identified with a group, with an organization. The Foundation is not such an

organization, it merely exists to publish books and so on, you can't belong to it because you can't publish books, you can't run schools. But the idea that we must be part of something or other - right? And belonging to something gives one strength - right? I am an Englishman - there is a flare up - or a Frenchman. Once I was talking in India and I said, "I am not a Hindu", and a man came up to me afterwards and said, "You mean you are not a Hindu? You must feel terribly lonely" (Laughter).

Now the questioner asks: he derives strength from concentrating on a symbol. We have all had symbols. The Christian world is filled with symbols - right? The whole Christian world of religious movement is symbols; symbols, images, concepts, beliefs, ideals, dogmas, rituals - the same in India, only they don't call themselves Christians but it is exactly the same thing, or in the Far East, and so on. Now when one belongs to a large group which adores the same symbol, you derive enormous strength out of it, it is natural - or rather unnatural. It keeps you excited, it creates a feeling that at last you are understanding something beyond the symbol and so on.

First, you invent the symbol - see how our mind works - first we invent the symbol, the image in the church or in the temple, or the letters in the mosque - they are beautiful letters if you have been in a mosque - and we create those and after creating those we worship those, and in worshipping that which we have created out of our thought, we derive strength. See what is happening - you follow? Now the symbol is not the actual - right? The actual may never exist, but the symbol satisfies and the symbol gives us vitality, energy, by looking, thinking, observing, being with it. Surely that which has been created by thought, psychologically, must be

illusion - no? You create me, I hope you won't, you create me into your guru. I refuse to be a guru, it is too absurd because I see how the followers destroy the guru and the guru destroys the followers. You understand this? I see that. To me the whole thing is an abomination - I am sorry to use strong language. But you create an image about me, about the speaker, and the whole business begins.

So first, if I may point out, thought is the mischief maker in this. All the things in the churches, in the temples, in the mosques, are not truth, are not actual. They have been invented by the priests, by thought, by us out of our fear, out of our anxiety, uncertainty of the future - you follow - all that. We have created a symbol and we are caught in that. So first to realize that thought will always create the things which give it satisfaction, psychologically. Pleasure - you follow? - gives it comfort, therefore the reassuring image is a great comfort. It may be a total illusion - and it is - but it gives me comfort therefore I will never look beyond the illusion. Right?

I have talked an hour and twenty five minutes. We will continue with the rest of the questions on Thursday. Is that all right?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 4TH SEPTEMBER 1980

This is the last day of questions and answers. On Saturday and Sunday there will be a talk.

As we said the other day, the question implies that we are seeking an answer. The answer is in the question, not away from the question. And in asking these questions and finding their answer we are together investigating the question. It is not that the speaker talks or answers but together we are trying to find the right answer. It is not the answer according to me or according to you, but what is the right, true answer to these questions.

I have been handed over nearly one hundred and fifty questions probably and we cannot possibly answer all those and I hope you won't mind if some of them are not answered. It isn't that we have chosen something that suits us, that can be answered by us, but rather we have tried to find out what are the most significant and worthwhile questions to be answered.

1st QUESTION: What is the relationship between thought and consciousness? Why do we seem unable to go beyond thought?

Do we want to be serious about all this? All right, let's be serious.

First of all what is thinking, what is thought? And what is consciousness? Are the two different? When you say, what is the relationship between thought and consciousness, it implies, does it not, that there are two different entities, or two different movements. We are trying to find out, the questioner is trying to find out: what is the relationship between thought and

consciousness. So first of all we have to consider together what is thought, what is this whole question of thinking upon which all our conduct, our activities, political, religious, economic, social and all other factors of life, are based on thought. Thought is part of emotions, sentiment, reactions, the recognition of those reactions and so on. And what is consciousness? When you use the word 'conscious', to be conscious of something, to be aware of, to be able to recognize, to understand, to have a whole field in which the mind is operating. That is more or less what we mean by consciousness. And the questioner says: what is the relationship between the two?

So first we have to find out what is thought upon which all our activities are based, with all its images, all the past remembrance and future projections, this enormous activity. Technologically, psychologically, physically, almost in every direction, thought is operating. And our relationship with each other is based on thought, the thought which has created the image about you and the other, and the other about you. Now what is that thought? That thought surely is, is it not, based on knowledge: experience, knowledge, memory. And the reaction of that memory is thinking. So it is experience, knowledge, memory and the movement of thought, which is a material process. So thought is always limited because knowledge is always limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything except the ending of knowledge, that is quite a different matter. So where there is the operation of knowledge and the movement of memory, thought is limited, finite, definite.

And what part does thought play in consciousness? I hope we

are together in this, thinking together. What is consciousness? Our consciousness - all the knowledge which we have accumulated, all the experiences, not only personal but collective, memories, genetic responses, the accumulated experience of generations after generations, all the travail, the trouble, the anxiety, the fears, the pleasures, the dogmas, the beliefs, the attachments, the pain of sorrow and all that is our consciousness. I think there is no question about that, no one would doubt that or argue about it. You can add or take away from it but it is still the movement of thought as consciousness. One can say that there is super consciousness but it would still be part of thought. This consciousness is in constant movement and breaking up the you and the me, my nationality with all its technological development which is becoming a tremendous danger in the world, nationalism, plus technology. My religious beliefs, my dogmas, my rituals, my wounds, my beliefs, my ideals, my constant struggle to become something, all that is part of our consciousness, not only the consciousness of a particular person but it is the consciousness of mankind, because mankind wherever he lives, goes through sorrow, agony, doubt, despair, depression, great uncertainty, insecurity and so clinging to some image, belief, all that is part of our being, our consciousness. So our consciousness is its content. I hope we are meeting each other. Our consciousness is made up of its content. Without the content what is our consciousness? You understand my question? Is there a consciousness totally different from that which is made up of the various activities of thought which we call consciousness?

To come to that point one has to find out if thought can end, not

temporarily, not between two thoughts, where there is a gap and a period of silence or unconscious movement. Can thought ever end? This has been the problem of most serious people who have gone into this very deeply through meditation to end thought. I hope we are following each other in all this and I am not talking to myself.

Can thought, which is so enormously powerful, which has got such a volume of energy behind it, that energy created through millenia, both in the scientific field, economic, religious, social, personal, all that activity can that come to an end? Which means can those things that thought has built into our consciousness, of which we are, can that consciousness with its content end? Why do we want to end it? What is the motive behind this desire to end thought? Is it that we have discovered for ourselves how thought creates enormous trouble, a great deal of travail, great anxiety of the future, of the past, of the present, the thought that brings about a sense of utter isolation and loneliness. Can all that come to an end?

When one asks that question: can it come to an end? - are we seeking a method to end it? A system of meditation? A system of which you practise day after day so as end thought? If you practise day after day to end thought, that very practice intensifies thought, naturally. So what is one to do? I hope we are meeting each other. One realizes the nature of thought, its superficiality, its intellectual game. One knows all this, how thought divides, divides into nationalities, into religious beliefs and so and so on. And conflict, that is all we know, perpetual conflict from the moment we are born until we die. Is that the reason why you want to end thought? So one has to be very clear, if one may point out, of the motive.

One must be very clear why one wants to end thought, if that is possible. Because the motive will dictate, will direct. One can live in the illusion that thought has come to an end. Many people do but that illusion is merely another projection of thought which desires to end itself.

So realizing the whole complex problem of this, thought and the things that thought has built as consciousness with its content, can all that come to an end? If the speaker says it can, what value has it? None whatever. But if one realizes the nature of our consciousness and the movement of thought as a material process and to observe it, can you do this? To observe the movement of thought, not as an observer different from thought - are you following, can we go a little bit into this? Can one observe the movement of thought, not as an observer looking at thought, but thought itself becoming aware of its own movement - do you follow what I am saying? The awakening of thought and thought itself observing its movement. Can you do this?

Take a very simple example, either greed or nationalism, which are both the same: to observe it as it arises in one and then to discover for oneself, is the observer, is the thinker different from thought? I hope you are following all this. Am I making myself somewhat clear? I observe thinking, that is fairly easy. I separate myself as an observer and watch my thinking, which most of us do. But this division is illusory, is fallacious, because the thinker is thought - right? So can the observer be absent in his observation? Am I meeting you? The observer, the thinker is the past, the remembrance, the images, the knowledge, the experiences, all the things that he has accumulated during that time, the past, is the

observer. The observer names a reaction as greed and when he names it he is already caught in the past. I don't know if you are following all this? Whereas to observe this reaction without naming it. This reaction which we call greed, by the very naming of it you have established it in the past. It becomes the past.

Whereas if there is no naming but pure observation in which there is no division as the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experience, then what takes place? You are following all this? Are we coming along together somewhat?

You see our conditioning is this division between the observer and the observed. That is why we make such enormous trouble to control the thing that is observed - right? I am greedy, that is the reaction. I am different from greed and therefore I can control it, I can operate on it, I can suppress it, I can enjoy it, I can do something about it. But the fact is the thinker is the thought. There is no thinker without thought.

So to observe without the past memories, reactions, all that projecting itself immediately in observation - right? So to observe purely without any direction, without any motive, then one will find if one has gone into it pretty deeply, that thought does come to an end, thought being time - right? Thought is a movement and so time is a movement, so time is thought - right sirs? This is real meditation, not all this stuff that goes on in the name of meditation, this is real meditation, which is: to see the movement of thought, for thought to see its own movement, how it arises, the creating of the image and the pursuit of that image, and to observe it so that there is no recognition of what is being observed. You understand

what I am saying? That is, to make it very simple: to observe a tree without naming it, without wondering what use it can be put to, just to observe it. Then the division between the tree and you comes to an end, but you don't become the tree - I hope not! You understand? The division which the word creates, the division, the physical, nervous, neurological responses to that tree creates the division. That is, can I observe my wife, if I have one, or my girl if I have one, or another, without the word and so without the image, without all the remembrances in that relationship, which is to observe purely? Then in that observation, which is complete attention, has not thought come to an end? This requires a great deal of attention, step by step watching, like a good scientist who watches very, very carefully. When one does that thought does come to an end, therefore time has a stop - right? Has this question been sufficiently answered?

2nd QUESTION: Does compassion spring from observation, or thought? Is not compassion an emotional feeling?

I don't know how to answer this. What is compassion? Is it an emotion? Is it something romantic? Does it expend itself in some kind of social work? So one has to go into this. To find out what is compassion, one has to enquire what is love? Then that means is love desire? Is love pleasure? Please sirs, question yourselves. And can there be love where there is ambition? Can there be love when one is trying to become something, not only the outward world but also psychologically, this constant struggle to be or to become something? Can there be love? Can there be love when there is jealousy, violence, when there is division between you and me? And can there be love when you are nationalistic? Please sirs, think

about it. You hear on the television every evening, British, British, British. The same thing in Italy, the same thing in France, in Russia, in India, we and they. When there is such nationalistic, religious, division of beliefs, images, can there be love? Go on sirs. Of course there can be no love when there is such division. But all of us are so heavily conditioned. And we accept that condition as normal.

A friend the other day said, "I read about what you are talking about, conditioning. Wouldn't it be very dangerous if I unconditioned myself and drove on the right side in England?" So don't uncondition ourselves too much!

And what relationship is love to sorrow? I have lost my son and I suffer enormously because I loved him. Can suffering and love go together? Please sirs, ask these questions. Not only personal suffering but the enormous suffering of mankind, the suffering that wars have brought about and are still bringing about, the suffering of people living in totalitarian states. So can there be love when there is suffering? Or only with the ending of suffering there is this passionate compassion.

After stating all this, where are we? Is love just an ideal? Something which we don't know and therefore we want to have that thing, we want to have that extraordinary sense of great compassion? But we won't pay the price for it. We would like to have the marvellous jewel but we are unwilling to either make a gesture, or do something that will bring it about. If you want peace you must live peacefully, not divided into nations and wars and all the hideousness that is going on. So what price do we pay for this? Not coins, not with coins and paper but inwardly how deeply is this

reality to come? How deeply, profoundly do we see nationalism, that all division must end in myself as a human being? Because we human beings, you and I, are like the rest of the world, psychologically. You may have a different colour, short, tall, darker, black, white and so on, but inwardly psychologically we are like the rest of mankind. We all suffer, we all go through agonies, we all go through great fears, uncertainties, confusion, we all are caught in this absurd religious nonsense. We are that. And can we see the totality of this, not as an idea, not as something longed for, but as a fact, as a burning, actual, daily fact? Then out of that perception the responsibility of compassion comes. Compassion goes with great intelligence. That intelligence is not the operation of knowledge. Knowledge can solve many problems, intellectual, technical and so on, but intelligence is something entirely different. Please don't accept what I am saying, just look at it. You may have read a great deal and be capable of great arguments, the mind can solve problems. The problem-solving mind is not an intelligent mind. Intelligence comes with compassion, with love. And when that intelligence is an action of compassion it is global not a particular action. I hope we can go on to the next question.

3rd QUESTION: Why is it that in the balance of nature there is always death and suffering?

Why is it man has killed fifty million whales? Do you understand what I am saying? Fifty million - you understand? And still Russia and Japan are killing whales. We are killing every kind of species, man. The tigers are coming to an end, the cheetahs, the leopards and elephants, for their tusks, for their flesh - you know

all that. Is not man a much more dangerous animal than the rest of the animals? And you want to know why in nature there is death and suffering. You see a tiger killing a cow, or a deer. That is their natural way of life but the moment we interfere with it it becomes real cruelty. You have seen, I am quite sure, baby seals being knocked on the head, and when there is a great protest against it, the Unions say that we have to live that way. You know all this.

So where shall we start to understand the world about us and the world within us? The world within us is so enormously complex but we want to understand the world of nature first. All that becomes our mania. Perhaps if we could start with ourselves, not to hurt, not to be violent, not to be nationalistic, but to feel for the whole of mankind, then perhaps we shall have a proper relationship between ourselves and nature. Now we are destroying the earth, the air, the sea, the things of the sea because we are the greatest danger to the world, with our atomic bombs - you know all that kind of thing.

4th QUESTION: Why do you say attachment is corruption? Are we not attached to those we love?

Does this need explanation? When you are attached to an idea, to a concept, to an ideal as the Communists are, or the Catholics, or the Protestants or the Nationalists, isn't there the beginning of corruption? Corruption being to corrupt, to break up, the meaning of that word is to break up. When I am a devout Marxist and to me that is the only solution to all our problems and then I am unwilling to examine any other questions, any other avenues, I am committed, I am tied. When I am tied to a belief, to a god, to an image, to a person, is there not the beginning of corruption? Please

sirs, it is not what I am saying, just look at it for yourselves. Is attachment love? When I am attached to you as an audience - god forbid! - when I am attached to you as an audience I am exploiting you, I am deriving great comfort, I am fulfilling myself. Is that not corruption? When I am attached to my wife, or to my friend, or whatever it is, to a piece of furniture, especially antique furniture - somebody has put an antique furniture in the room I happen to live! When I am attached to that piece of furniture I become that furniture - right? And then corruption begins, I have to guard it, I have to protect it - you follow? - fear. Fear begins with attachment. I may derive pleasure in that attachment, comfort, encouragement but in that there is always the shadow of fear in it, anxiety, jealousy, possessiveness, and people like to be possessed and to possess, is that not corruption because in that there is an enormous sense of fear, anxiety that I might lose it?

So can one live in this world without a single sense of attachment to anything? - to your beliefs, dogmas, to god, to various symbols, ideologies and images, wife, furniture, house, experience - all that, which doesn't mean that one becomes detached. When there is an attempt to be detached then detachment is part of attachment - right? Because the opposite has its roots in its own opposite. Is that clear? So to understand the nature of attachment, the consequences of it, to see the whole movement of attachment, not just one particular attachment to a person, to an idea, to a piece of furniture, but to have the comprehension, the insight into this whole movement of attachment, when you have an insight into it, which I have gone into, we explained it the other day, then attachment drops away immediately without any conflict.

Then perhaps one has love because love and fear and jealousy cannot go together.

5th QUESTION: You say we are the world but the majority of the world seem to be heading for mass destruction. Can a minority of integrated people outweigh the majority?

Are you the minority? (Laughter) No, I am not joking. It is not a callous question. Are we the minority? Or is there one amongst us who is totally free of all this? Or partially we are contributing to the hatred of each other? Psychologically. You may not be able to stop Russia attacking Afghanistan or some other country - or America, or England, or Japan, or whatever country it is, but psychologically are we free of our common inheritance, which is our tribal glorified nationalism? Are we free from violence? Violence exists where there is a wall around ourselves. Please understand all this. And we have built ourselves walls, ten feet high or fifteen feet thick. All of us have walls around us. And from that arises violence, this sense of immense loneliness. So the minority and the majority is you. If a group of us fundamentally have psychologically transformed ourselves you will never ask this question, because we are then something entirely different.

6th QUESTION: Christian mystics describe certain forms of mental prayer in which they speak to god, or what they call god. They say that in such prayer something tremendous happens which they call union with god. They are convinced this is not an illusion. Are they deceiving themselves? And what is faith? It appears to give people the power to do extraordinary things.

When you are tremendously national it gives you extraordinary power to kill others - right? Look what they are doing! So can an

illusion really give you enormous vitality, enormous strength to do extraordinary things? Apparently it does. The Christian missionaries, what they have done in the world because they believe in something. That belief may be totally unreal, the image that the mind has created, they believe in that and they are attached to that, and they want to convert all the others of the world to that. And they put up with extraordinary discomforts, with diseases, and every kind of trouble. And those mystics who talk to god through prayer - I don't know what god is, nobody knows but to have an image that there is a supreme entity and through prayer, through faith, through dedication, through devotion, you can achieve mountains. Because sirs, if you look, what America and Russia and England and France are doing. They have tremendous faith in their country, in their nationalism, and they are building an enormous technological world to destroy the others who are also doing exactly the same thing. To go to the moon, what enormous energy it needed, what technological capacity, faith, the American first on the moon with their flag. Or the British with their flag - equally the same.

And in the Christian world they place faith first and not doubt. Faith has taken the place of doubt. Doubt is very cleansing, it purifies the mind. If you doubt your experiences, your opinions, all the rest of it, doubt it - you are free, you can observe clearly then. If you doubt your gods, your saviours, everything that comes along. In the Eastern world, like Buddhism and Hinduism, doubt is one of the major factors, it is demanded that you must doubt, you must question, you must not accept - be a light to yourself and that light cannot be given to you by anyone. Of course now in India and

Asia it has all gone to pieces, they are just like anybody else, they are becoming merchants. But to have great strength, it doesn't come through prayer, it doesn't come through illusions, or faith, it comes through clarity, when the mind can see clearly, and that clarity doesn't come and go. When you see something clearly like nationalism is the most destructive thing in the world, then you are finished with it. And the ending of that burden gives you vitality, energy, strength.

Similarly if one is totally free of all attachments it gives you the strength of love, and that can do much more than all the other experiences and prayers. But you see it is an easy way to escape through an illusion, through a symbol, through an idea. It is much more arduous, it demands a great deal of energy, perception, and action to see exactly what we are and go beyond it. That means we have to become astonishingly aware of all our activities and feelings and all that. But we are unwilling to do all that. We think that through some easy prayer you can talk to god. God is, after all, put together by thought - the Christian god, the Hindu gods, the Buddhists have no gods but they have their own images.

7th QUESTION: If there is a supreme truth and order why does it allow mankind to behave on earth in such a shocking way?

If there is such a supreme entity they must be a very odd person because if he created us then we are part of him - right? And if he is order, sane, rational, compassionate, we wouldn't be like this. Either you accept the evolutionary process of man, or that man has suddenly come into being created by god. And god, that supreme entity, is order, goodness, compassion and all the rest of it, all the attributes that we give to it. So you have these two choices, that

there is a supreme entity and made man according to his image, or there is the evolutionary process of man, which life has brought about from the beginning of small molecules and so on, right up to now.

If you accept the idea of god, the supreme person in whom total order exists and you are part of that entity, then that person must be extraordinarily cruel - right? Extraordinarily intolerant to make us behave as we are doing, destroying each other.

Or, there is the other, which is man has made the world as it is, the human beings have made this world, the social world, the world of relationship, the technological world, the world of society, our relationship with each other, we have made it, not god or some supreme entity. We are responsible for this horror that we have perpetuated. And to rely on a certain external agency to transform all this - this game has been played for millenia and you are still the same. I don't know if you know all this. Perhaps a little changed, a little more kind, a little more tolerant - tolerance is something ugly.

So to have order in ourselves, then you are supreme gods because the universe is order - right? Sun sets, the sun rises, the stars, the heavens the nature, this whole universe is order - not according to us, it is order, explosion, destruction, whatever is going on out there but it is order. With us there is no order. We live in confusion, we live in conflict, we live in every kind of disorder. Can there be in us total complete order? That order is not created by thought, that order has no relationship whatsoever to any system, method, which are all put together by thought. Order comes only when there is the complete ending of thought, because

then thought has no place as a divisive movement - right?

8th QUESTION: I have been a member of a Gurdjeiff group (from order to disorder!) I find it has given me a background to better understanding to what you are saying. Should I continue with such a group to possibly help others, as I was helped? Or does a group make for fragmentation?

It is an extraordinary idea of helping others, as though you have got extraordinary comprehension, beauty, love and truth and the whole world of order, and that great immense sense of wholeness. If you have that you don't talk about helping others - right?

First of all why do we want to belong to something? Belong to some Sect, some group, some religious body - why? Is it because it gives us strength? It gives one great strength if you are British living in this country, to feel that you are in Britain - or in Russia, in China or in India. Is it that we cannot stand alone? The word 'alone' means all one. Is it that we need encouragement, we need somebody to tell this is the right way? And the questioner asks: as I belong to certain groups, they have helped me to understand you - understand what? Me? Do please look at it. Understood what we are talking about? Do we need interpreters to understand what we are talking about? To be kind, to love, to have no sense of nationality. Does it need anybody to tell you?

Why do we depend on others, whether the others be an image in a church, or in a temple or a mosque or the preacher, or the psychologist, or anybody - why do we depend on others? If we do depend on others psychologically we become second hand people, which we are. The whole history of mankind, is in us, the whole story of mankind is not in books - there is in outward things but the

whole history is here. And we don't know how to read that; if we could read it, and to read it you are not the reader. You understand what I am saying? You are the book. But when you read the book as a reader it has no meaning. But if you are the book and the book is showing you, telling you the story, and you are not telling the story but the book is telling, then you will not depend on a single person, you will be a light to oneself. But we are all waiting for the match of another, the fire of another. And perhaps that is why you are all here. And that is where the tragedy lies because we cannot see clearly for ourselves. And before we help others we have to see clearly, for god's sake. It is like the blind leading the blind.

Questioner: Excuse me but I wanted to say you flower and we see the flower and you also help year after year those who come again and again.

K: Sir, I am glad you come here year after year. I would too. Like going to see the mountain day after day. There is great beauty in the mountain. I am not saying I am the mountain. There is great beauty in the mountain - the skyline, the snow, the valleys, the absolute quietness, and the river flowing, rippling along, chattering. There is great beauty in that and the lake that is so still. I would go and see it everyday. The more I see it the more beauty there is in it. Not one casual look of a weekend but the constant looking, asking, observing the truth and the beauty of it. Naturally one must go, move.

9th QUESTION: What is freedom? (This is the last question, thank god!)

You know many philosophers have written, talked, about freedom. We talk about freedom - freedom to do what we like.

Freedom to have any job we like, freedom to choose a woman or a man, freedom to read any literature, or freedom not to read at all. We are free and so what do we do with that freedom? We use that freedom to express ourselves, to do what we like - right? Whatever we like. More and more it is becoming permissive - you can have sex in the open garden - right?

You have every kind of freedom and what have we done with that freedom? We think where there is choice we have freedom. I can go to Italy, to France, a choice - one has to have a passport and a visa. And does choice give freedom? Please follow me. Why do we have to choose? If you are very clear, clear, purely perceive, clear, there is no choice. Out of that comes right action. It is only when there is doubt, uncertainty that we begin to choose. So choice, if you will forgive my saying so, choice prevents freedom.

And the totalitarian states have no freedom at all. Because they have the idea that freedom brings about the degeneration of man, therefore control, suppress - you are following what is happening and all the rest of it.

So what is freedom? Is it based on choice? Is it to do exactly what we like? Some of the psychologists are saying, that if you feel something do it immediately, don't suppress it, don't restrain it, don't control it - express. And we are doing that very well, too well. And it is called also freedom. Throwing bombs is also freedom - right? Just look what we have reduced our freedom to.

So what is freedom? Does freedom lie out there, or here? I am just asking, I am not saying. Where do you begin to search for freedom? In the outward world, which is to express and do, act whatever you like, so-called individual freedom. Or does freedom

begin inwardly, which then expresses itself intelligently outwardly? You understand my question? That is, freedom exists only when there is no confusion - right? Confusion inside me, when I am seeking perhaps psychologically and religiously, not to be caught in any trap - you understand? There are innumerable traps - gurus, saviours, preachers, the excellent books, psychologists, and psychiatrists, they are all there. And if I am confused and there is disorder, mustn't I first be free of that disorder before I talk of freedom? If I have no relationship with my wife, or with my husband, with another person, because we haven't got relationship with another; our relationship is based on images. You have an image about me and I have an image about you. And so the conflict which is inevitable where there is a division - right sirs? So shouldn't I begin here, inside me, in my skin, in my mind, in my heart to be totally free of all the fears and anxieties, despairs, hurts and wounds that one has received through some psychic disorder - you follow? All that, to watch it for oneself and be free of it.

But apparently we haven't got the energy. We go to another to give us energy. The psychiatrists, by talking to him you feel much more relieved, confession and all the rest of it. Always depending on somebody else. And so that dependence inevitably brings great conflict, disorder. So one has to begin to understand the depth and the greatness of freedom, we must begin quite near. And the nearest is you. As long as there is you and me there is no freedom. As long as you have your prejudices, and I have my prejudice, your experience, my experience, etc. etc. and so on, there is no freedom. We can express, we can criticize each other, we can do all that, that

is called freedom. The right to think what you like. But freedom, the greatness of freedom, and the enormity, the dignity, the beauty of it is in oneself when there is completely order. And that order comes only when we are a light to ourselves. Finished. May I go please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 6TH SEPTEMBER 1980

There are a lot of people aren't there? I wonder why you all come? The last two talks that we have had here we talked a great deal about relationship. We talked about taking life as a whole, so we are going to start with that this morning.

One wonders why, observing what is going on in the world, why there is so much disorder, why man is destroying man. Why are they building up such enormous expenditure on armaments? Why have people divided themselves into tribal romantic nationalism? Why religions throughout the world, the organized religions, the accepted religions, have also divided themselves - the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Christians, the Muslims, and all the rest of it; why is there such division in the world? And we are inclined to think that an outside agency has created all this mess: god, or some other supreme entity, having created man, has let him loose on the earth. And what man has done is quite incredible and shocking, not only towards the other man, but also to himself. Why in the world there are so many neurosis, neurotic people. Why is there this constant battle between man and woman? Why is there this inward disorder which naturally must express itself in outward disorder?

If we could this morning and tomorrow morning, go into this question, not only why we have become like this after millions of years, slightly modified, slightly more tolerant, less vicious - which I question - we ought to, together, as we said, go into these problems. Tomorrow we will talk about what is religion, what

place has, in the religious life, a career, marriage and all the things that we go through? But this morning if we could think together. As we said, it is not a talk by the speaker when you listen to him disagreeing or agreeing, but rather together examine all this, our lives. Our lives which have produced the society in which we live. The society is not created by some extraordinary events but by the extraordinary lives we lead, not only by us but also by past generations. If we could go together into it. That is, think it out together, not only think it out but also go beyond the realm of thought. As we pointed out over and over again, that thought is born of memory, memory is the result of knowledge and experience. And thought therefore is always limited, for knowledge is everlastingly limited because there can be no complete knowledge about anything. And thought born out of that must also be very, very limited. And the world in which we live, our daily life, our careers, our anxieties, fears and sorrows, are the result of our thinking, are the product of our daily activity.

So if we could together this morning take life as a whole, our education, our occupations, our hobbies, work, and all the travail that exists inwardly, the psychological conflicts, the anxieties, the fears, the pleasures, the sorrows, all that, to take all that as a whole; and not let thought occupy itself with one particular part, with one particular pattern, or cling to one particular experience and look at life from that point of view. Could we this morning together go into this? Together, not I go into it and you listen, but together enquire very seriously why we live the way we are living. Why there is so much disorder in the world, and also this disorder in ourselves. Is the world disorder different from our disorder? Please

let's talk together as though we were two people, not this large audience but two people sitting quietly in a room, or in a garden or walking along in a wood, amicably, hesitantly enquiring into this. Why there is disorder outwardly and disorder inwardly. Are they two separate disorders? Or are they one unitary process? It is not disorder out there different from the disorder in me. But rather this disorder is a movement which goes outward and comes inward. It is like a tide going back and forth endlessly. And can we begin to bring about order in our life? Because without order there is no freedom, without complete order, not occasionally or once a week, but in our daily life to have this complete total order not only brings freedom but there is then in that order, love. A disordered, confused, conflicting mind cannot have or be aware of what love is.

So should we not go together into this question of what is order? Can there be absolute order? We are using the word 'absolute' in its right sense - complete, total, not an order that is intellectually brought about, an order that is based on values, not order that is the outcome of environmental pressures, or adaption to a certain norm, certain pattern. But when we are talking about absolute total order, in that there is no division as disorder at all. We are going to enquire into that. I hope we understand this: we are enquiring whether there is an order in which there can never be disorder. Not that we have disorder and occasionally have order, but order, complete, total. So let us together, together go into this question.

Why is the mind, which includes the brain, our emotional responses, sensory responses and so on, why does the mind, our

mind accept and live in disorder? If you observe your own mind, that is your own life, which is based on your mind, your thoughts, your emotions, your experiences, your memories, regrets, apprehensions, why is that mind, which has all this in its consciousness, why does it accept disorder? Which is not only the neurotic disorder, the acceptance of disorder and living with disorder, getting used to disorder, why does the mind have this sense of division, this sense of order, disorder, this constant adjustment? You understand? I hope we are meeting together - are we? Is this inevitable? Is this our natural state? If it is natural then one must live with this conflict from the moment you are born until you die, in this disorder. And if it is unnatural, which obviously it is, what is the cause of it? What is the basis of it, what is the root of all this? Does the basis depend on our particular attitudes, on our particular desire? One wants to find out what is the basis of this disorder, the root of it. To find out how do we approach it? You understand my question? Please, how do we approach this problem? The problem being, we live in disorder, both outwardly and inwardly. How do we approach the problem in order to totally resolve it? What is your approach? You understand my question? Are you approaching to find order out of disorder, therefore your approach is already directed? You understand? Because I am in disorder - suppose I am in disorder - I have the desire to bring about order, and that very desire dictates what the order must be - right? Whereas if I approach the problem of disorder as though I want to find out the root of it, then my direction is not diverted, wasted in various intellectual, verbal, emotional directions, but my whole attention is directed to the cause of it. You are following all

this?

So how do you, as a human being, living in this world, both outwardly and inwardly in disorder, what is your approach? Because we must be very clear what our approach is. If it is clear then let's find out together what is the root of it. Is it self-contradiction? Is it desire that has created this division in us because wherever there is division there must be conflict, and therefore the conflict means disorder. Right? Conflict is disorder, whether it is minor, major or conflict that brings about a great crisis. So is our conflict self-contradictory, saying one thing, doing another, having ideals and always trying to accommodate ourselves to that ideal and therefore conflict? Is it our desire to become something? You are following all this? Or this conflict is created by thought? Because thought in itself, as we said, is limited and therefore it breaks up as the outer and the inner, the 'you' and the 'me', thought struggling to become something which it is not. This constant division, becoming, contradicting, conforming, comparing, imitating psychologically, is that the various expressions of a central cause? You understand? Are we clear so far?

So what is the central cause, the root of all this? Please we are thinking together and therefore you are exercising your mind, therefore you are aware of how you approach the problem, you are aware of your own contradictions, your own conflicts, your own divisions, your own apprehensions. And in that consciousness, which is made up of divisions, conflicts, beliefs, non beliefs and so on and so on, is one aware of all that? Or one is only aware of a fragment of it? A fragment being that which demands an

immediate response. If I am concerned about my livelihood I am not concerned about anything else because that is an immediate demand. I need money, food, I have children, responsibility, therefore my approach to this whole problem will be directed by my desire to have a job. Or I have been thinking along a certain pattern, along a certain direction, and I am unaware that I am caught in that pattern and therefore when I approach this question I am always approaching it according to the pattern which my mind has established. Or if I am emotional, romantic, all that business, then my approach will be sloppy, not precise, not exact.

So one must be very clear for oneself how we approach this problem, because if we approach it with any pattern at all we shall not be able to solve this problem. Therefore is our mind free from patterns? From ideals? From a direction? You understand my question? Please go into it with me, with us, together. Are you aware first of the confusion of the world which is becoming worse and worse and worse every day? And the confusion in us which we have inherited, to which we have added, the society in which we live which is so utterly confused, there is such immense injustice, millions starving and the affluent society. Tyranny and democratic freedom, to vote, to think what you like, to express what you like.

So as we pointed out the other day, we human beings, our minds and our consciousness, is the consciousness and the mind of the world. Wherever you go, the most remote part of the world, there, man is suffering, anxious, uncertain, lonely, desperate in his loneliness, burdened with sorrow, insecure like the rest of the world. Psychologically, as we have pointed out over and over again, you are the humanity, you are not separate from the rest of

mankind. This idea that you are an individual with a mind specially yours, which is an absurdity because this brain has evolved through time, the brain of mankind, and that brain is part of mankind, genetically and so on and so on. So you are the world and the world is you. It is not an idea or a concept, a Utopian nonsense, it is a fact. And that mind is utterly confused. And we are trying to discover for ourselves the root of it. Right?

What is the cause of this division? As we said, wherever there is a division, with man, woman, between nation and nation, with a group and a group, this division of belief, ideals, concepts, historical conclusions, and materialistic attitudes, all these are divisions. The Arab and the Jew, you know. This division must inevitably create conflict. That is a fact. And we are saying: what is the cause of this division in us as well as in the world? Through division we thought or we imagined that there can be security - right? Where there is division as the British there is certain physical security; as the French, the German - you know. Each group holding together as an idea, as a concept, under a flag, they think there is security in this isolation. Right? And this isolation must inevitably create division - the Arabs and the Israelis say "I must be secure" - as a group, and all the rest of it. So do we understand, realize, very, very deeply the truth of this: that as long as there is division there must be conflict? Because in that division we think there is, in this isolation, this seclusion, we think there is security and obviously there is no security. You can build a wall around yourself as a nation but that wall is going to be broken down.

So what is the cause, the root of this division? Right? Please.

Which is, each one, each human being in the world thinks, lives according to the pattern that he is separate from another - right? His problems, his anxieties, his neurosis, his particular way of thinking and so on and so on. The centre of this is this idea that "I am separate from you". Right? Could we go along there?

Now, is that a fact? As a fact as the microphone, is that a fact that we are separate individuals, totally different from another? You may be tall, you may be short, black hair, white and all the rest of it, division, but inwardly are we different? Inwardly we go through all the - you know. And those who live in the Far East, they go through exactly the same, or similar, like yourselves. So there is no division psychologically. And as long as we accept that idea that we are separate you must have conflict and therefore division, and confusion. Right?

Are we thinking together? Are you accepting this as an idea and then saying to yourself, "Let us examine this idea, whether it is true or false" - the idea - you see, you understand what I am saying? You hear a statement like this, that as long as you think you are separate from another human being psychologically, there must be conflict and disorder. That is a fact. When you hear that, do you make an abstraction of it as an idea and then see how that idea can be carried out? I don't know if you follow this? Or it is a fact? If it is a fact then you can do something about it. But if you are merely making an abstraction of a fact into an idea then we are getting lost, because you have your idea and I have my idea and so on and so on and so on. But it is a common fact upon which we stand as human beings, that as long as there is division inside me and you, there must be conflict and disorder and confusion. But our minds

are so conditioned, for millenia, thousands of years, we have been conditioned by what other people have said, that we are separate, by religions that have said we are separate, that each individual must save himself - you know the whole pattern repeated over and over and over again. Being so conditioned it is very difficult to accept something which perhaps is true - I am using the word 'perhaps' because I am not being dogmatic. But it is a fact.

(Laughter!) And when the speaker is willing to go into it analytically, with argument, intellectually, reason, at the end of it, if you are willing too, we come to the same fact. Then it won't be dogmatic! We are not dogmatic about this fact, it is a fact.

So are we, if we want to understand the nature of confusion and the ending of confusion, completely, not relatively, are we aware of this fact? If we are aware then the question arises: what shall I do? You understand? I know I am divided, that we have accepted. Now how am I to put away this division? Now please follow this a little bit, carefully, if you will.

Is the fact of this division different from the observer who is observing the fact? You understand my question? No? I will explain a little. I observe greed. I am greedy. Is that greed which I observe different from me, from the observer who says, "I am greedy"? You understand my question? Or greed is the observer? Right? So there is no division between the observer who says, "I am greedy" and acts upon greed - right? Saying, "I must not be greedy. I must control it. I must suppress it. I must go beyond it" - or whatever. So there is a division, and that division is conflict and therefore disorder. But the fact is the observer who says "I am greedy", that observer is greed himself. Right? Have you gone so

far? If you have gone so far, then I am asking: is this confusion, this division, different from the observer who is me observing it? Or this confusion, this division, is me? My whole being is that - right? I wonder if you come to that point, otherwise you can't go much further. Please come! This is really important if you can really understand this once and for all, the fact. If you understand it, it will make life totally different, because in that there is no conflict. But I will point it out.

Suppose I am attached to a person. In that attachment and in the consequences of that attachment are innumerable pains, jealousy, anxiety, dependency, the whole sequence of attachment. Is that attachment to the person, which brings about a division - I am attached to you - right? - as an audience. Thank god I am not! But I am attached to you. Please do pay attention to this. I am attached to you. In that attachment there is division immediately - right? Now is that attachment, the feeling of dependence, clinging, holding on to somebody, different from me? Or I am that? You understand? I am attachment. So if one realizes that conflict ends - you understand? It is so. Not that I must get rid of it, not that I must be independent, detached. Detachment is attachment. Do you understand? If I try to become detached I am attached to that detachment. Right? I wonder if you follow all this?

So am I very clear that there is no division when I say "I am attached" - I am attachment, I am the state of attachment - right? Therefore you have removed completely all conflict, haven't you? Do you realize that? I am that. I wonder if you understand this? Right? May I go on from there?

So I, me, is confusion, not that I realize I am confusion, or that I

have been told that I am confusion, but the fact is: I, as a human being, am in a state of confusion. Right? Any action I do will bring more confusion - right? You understand? So I am in a state of total confusion. And all the struggle to overcome it, suppress it, to be detached, all that is gone - right? I wonder if it has! You see how difficult it is for our minds to be precise in this, to learn about it, to be free to have the leisure to learn.

Then what takes place? I am confusion; not I realize I am confusion. You see the difference? I am that. Therefore what has happened? All movement of escapes, suppression, have completely come to an end - right? If it has not, don't move from there. Be free first of all escapes, of all verbal, symbolic escapes but remain totally with the fact that you are, as a human being, in a state of confusion - right? Then what has taken place? We are two friends talking this over, this is not a group therapy, or any of that nonsense, or psychological analysis. It is not that. Two people talking over together, saying now we have come to that point, logically, rationally, unemotionally, therefore sanely. Because to be sane is the most difficult thing. So we have come to that point: that is I am that. What has taken place in the mind? Right, can we go on from there?

Before I wasted energy in suppressing it, trying to find how not to be confused, going to some guru, somebody, you follow, all that I have done which is a wastage of energy. Now when there is the realization that I am confused, what has happened? Go on sirs, come with me. My mind therefore is completely attentive to confusion - right? My mind is in a state of complete attention with regard to confusion. Right? You are following this? Are you?

Therefore what takes place? It is when there is complete attention there is no confusion - right? It is only when there is no attention then confusion arises. Confusion arises when there is division, which is inattention. I wonder if you get this? Right?

So where there is total attention without any dissipation of energy, saying, "How am I to get this total attention?" - that is a wastage of energy - right? But you see that where there is confusion and that is brought about by inattention, then that very inattention is attention. You get it? Come on sirs. You have got something, right? Now with that attention, we are going to follow, we are going to examine not only fear, pleasure, suffering - right?

Because it is important to be free of fear. The mind has never been free of fear. You may cover it, you may suppress it, you may be unaware of it, you may be so enchanted by the world outside that you are never aware of your own deep rooted fears - right? And where there is fear there is no freedom, there is no love, there is discontent. You are following all this? Please sirs, don't let's waste time on all this. So you must have the capacity to run, not physically but inwardly run, jump, not go step by step like a snail.

One sees what fear does in our life. If I am afraid of you because you bully me, because you oppress me, because you dictate what I should do, you have told me as the priest that I must do this - you know, all the rest of it, and I am not doing it. I am not doing it because I am discontent with something else and therefore fear. You understand? So discontentment also has fear within it - right? And fear brings darkness to the mind - right? We are not talking of a particular neurotic fear, but we are talking about fear itself, not about something - right? When we understand the root of

fear, fear about something disappears. You understand what I am saying? If I am afraid of the dark, that is my particular fear and I want that particular fear to be resolved. I am not concerned with the whole field of fear. But if I understand the whole field of fear the other thing doesn't exist. I wonder if you see that?

So we are now concerned not with a particular form of fear, a man who is afraid to face the public, a man who is afraid, or a woman who is afraid of something or other, but we are concerned with the whole field of fear. Can that fear be dissolved completely, so that the physical fear - you understand? - we will go into this little by little - the physical fear and the complex fears of the psyche, the inward fears dissolve? The physical fears one can deal with fairly simply - right? But if you are attached to physical fears and are concerned only with resolving the physical fears then you are attached to that which will then create division and therefore conflict. You follow all this? So if we understand first, first the psychological fears then you can deal with the physical fears - not the other way round - clear? See the reason of it? Because if I am concerned only with my fear, which is: I have got cancer or some disease, or some incident that has warped my mind, and therefore I am frightened, and I am only concerned with that and I am asking first solve that please before you go into the other. You understand? Whereas we are saying first deal with the wider fear, the depth and the nature and the darkness of fear, then you will yourself resolve the particular physical fear - right? Don't start the other way - the physical first and then the other. That is what we all want to do. You understand? Give me bread first, we will talk about the other.

So we are saying psychological fears are far more important, they make us such ugly human beings. When there is fear we become violent, we want to destroy in the name of god, in the name of religion, in the name of social revolution and so on and so on. Now can we as human beings who have lived with this fear for immeasurable time, can we be free of it? Right? We have asked the question. Now how do you approach the problem of fear? Do you approach it with the desire to resolve it? You understand? If you do you are again separating yourself from the fact of fear. I wonder if you get this. Right? Can we go on?

So are you approaching it as an observer who is afraid and want to resolve it? Or you realize that you are fear? Right sirs? Can we go on from there? Have you given your total attention to this fact? That you, as a human being, who is the rest of humanity, and that human being is frightened, lives in fear, consciously or unconsciously, superficial, psychological superficial fears, or deep hidden fears. The hidden fear becomes completely open when you are attentive. You understand? Are you following? Can we go on? Don't agree with me, please. You are investigating, you are looking at yourself, not agreeing with the speaker, the speaker is not important. And I mean it, he is not important. What is important is that you walk out of this tent without a single shadow of fear. So when you become aware of fear, do you escape from it? Do you try to find an answer for it? Do you try to overcome it? If you do you are dissipating, therefore you are dividing, and therefore conflict about fear, how to be free of it. You follow? All that arises. But if you realize that fear is you, therefore there is no movement to be made - right? No movement to be made, you are that, and therefore

all your attention is directed, is that, in that attention fear is held.

Right?

Are you getting tired? It is up to you. You see as long as we try to overcome, the very overcoming has to be overcome. You understand? But if you say, "Yes, it is a fact and I realize I won't move from that", then the thing dissolves completely, not relative, not one day and then the next day full of fears. It is gone, when you have given complete attention to it. Similarly with regard to pleasure. Be careful now! We have to be very careful here.

I don't know if you have noticed right from the time of man, one thing that has driven him everlastingly forward is pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of sorrow. You understand? You see the pictures, the paintings, the ancient writing, the symbols, everything says, "Pursue that, avoid that". As though you can divide life, fear, pleasure, sorrow, job - you understand? They are all one. Aren't they? But see what we have done. Our mind has been conditioned, accepting, living in this norm of constant pursuit of pleasure. God, if you have that image, is the essence of pleasure. You name it differently but your urge is to attain that ultimate sublime pleasure so that you will never be disturbed, you will never be in conflict, and so on and so on and so on. And we must understand it, not suppress it, not run away from it.

Why has pleasure, like sorrow, like fear, become so all important in life? Like sorrow - do you understand the word 'sorrow', the suffering of man, the suffering of centuries, war after war, destroying human beings, destroying nature, destroying animals, whales, everything. Man not only suffers but causes suffering. That is part of us, part of our consciousness. And we try

to avoid that because we haven't solved it but we think the pursuit of pleasure is the main thing. We at least can have something accurate, something real that will go on. Right? So that becomes dominant and fear, sorrow, anxiety, all that is in the background; not only sexual pleasure, the remembrance, the pictures and all the rest of the thing that goes on in the mind, if you watch it, see what is happening. Your own minds become full of that, not the actual act but the whole build-up, and that building-up is called love. So pleasure, love, suffering, fear are all entangled, all interrelated.

So the question is: will you take fear, pleasure, sorrow, separately? You understand? One by one. Or will you have the capacity to deal with the whole of it? Because our minds are being broken up, we take one by one, hoping to resolve one by one that we will come to the end of the breaking up, the fragments. Now how will you deal with the whole of it? You understand my question? Deal with your disorder, pleasure, fear, sorrow as a total movement of life. You understand my question? Please come with me, not as something separate, but as a whole. Can you do it? That is, can you look at yourself as though it were in a mirror, psychologically, as a whole being? Or you only look at a part. Do you understand? Go with it sirs. How do you look at yourself? Your job is different, your wife and children are different, your religion is different, your particular way of thinking is different, opposed to so many other ways, you have your own experiences which are different from others, your own ideas, you own intentions, ambitions, all that - you follow? Can you take all that as one unitary movement? You understand what I am saying? Come on sirs. That is the only way to solve the whole thing, not through

fragments - right?

Now how will a mind that has been broken up for generations upon generations, how will that mind, the brain, the emotions, mind, how will that mind approach or realize the totality? Right? Which is more important? Not more - which is necessary - you follow what I am saying? Will you approach it fragmentarily, the whole of life, business first, money first, house first, wife, children, sex, bit by bit? Or the whole of existence? Can your mind see the whole of it at all, is it capable? Or are you striving to see the whole of it? If you are striving to see the whole of it, that is finished, you will never have it, because then you create a division, conflict, confusion. But when you see that life is one movement and to see that you need really to learn. You understand? Learn, not from me, learn from yourself by observing. Learn to observe the division and see the futility of approaching that, the obvious fact, you can't - through one fragment you can't approach the whole universe. You must have a mind that is capable of receiving the whole universe and that is possible only when the mind is clear of confusion, fear, then there is no shadow of division, as the 'me' and 'you', my country, your country, my dogma - all that. That means when there is complete freedom then there is the perception of the whole. And from that comprehension, from that intelligence, that intelligence can act in the world, to get a job, to get no job, to do anything. But now we approach it as parts and we are creating havoc in the world. Right?

Finished for this morning. May we go on tomorrow when we meet again?

BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH SEPTEMBER 1980

This is the last talk. We have been talking about so many things, about the very complexity of life, and whether one can disentangle all the confusion and have a clear mind, so that our actions are precise, accurate, without any regrets, without wounding another or being wounded. We also talked about relationship, that all life is a movement in relationship, and that relationship is destroyed when we have an image of each other, and that image separates people. And also we talked about discontent, order. And as this is the last talk, I think we ought to talk over together what is religion, and what is meditation, and death - sorry to bring such a subject as death in on a lovely morning. We ought to consider together all these problems: death, what is religion, and what is the meaning of meditation?

First of all, if we may point out again, this is not an entertainment, intellectual or otherwise, romantic, stimulating your emotions or imaginations, but rather a gathering of serious people who are concerned with the transformation of themselves and therefore of society. That is the real meaning of these talks and gatherings, that as we have created this unfortunate shocking society, and it is we who have created it, past generations and we are adding to that, we have been talking over together whether it is possible to transform our whole attitudes and values and activities so that perhaps we can bring about a different society altogether. We have gone into all this very carefully. And also I think we ought to go into these other matters, like death, meditation and

what is religion.

I think they are all connected together. And also one would like to point out that there is no Eastern thinking, or Western thinking. There is only thinking, not of the East nor of the West. Thinking. And thinking can take a particular channel, a particular direction, following some specialist, religious or economic, but it is still thought, therefore there is no actual division between the East and the West, nor South and North. Though the North has all the technological capacity - they should not be divided as East and West, but only North and South. The more South you go, as at present, the less technological evolution. But whereas in the North there is much more. So there is only thinking. It is not East or West. I think we ought to be very clear on this matter. The Eastern world has its own particular philosophy, its own religion, its own superstitions, idiosyncrasies and rubbish. As the West also has its own superstitions, idiosyncrasies and a lot of rubbish. They are both the same, East and West, and North and South.

So we are, as we pointed out together, we are thinking over these problems together. Not only thinking together, but going beyond that. Because the intellect has a certain value, its capacity is to discern, evaluate, distinguish, calculate, design, remember. That is the intellect. And if the intellect predominates our life then it brings about imbalance. And if our emotions dominate that also brings about imbalance. So we must be very clear from the very beginning of these talks and the ending of these talks that we are not concerned with a particular sect, religion, a form of mediation and so on. We are concerned with the investigation of these matters and together find the truth of these. Truth is not yours or mine. It

has no path to it. When there is a path to it, it is not truth. So if you don't mind we are repeating again that we are talking over together as two friends who are deeply concerned, not only of what is happening in the world but also what is taking place inwardly. The outward is the reflection of the inner. There is a constant interrelationship between the two. It is really one movement. And that movement has brought about such confusion in the world, such misery, anxiety, uncertainty, total insecurity. And we are now together, you and I, we will investigate into the nature of what is religion.

The word 'religion', the root of it, has not been established. I think from observing and looking into various dictionaries, it really means gathering together all energy to find out the truth. I think that is what it means, after looking at various French, English, Italian dictionaries. It implies also diligence and negligence. A mind must be utterly diligent to find out what is truth. And if there is any kind of negligence it is a distraction and a wastage of energy. We are not stating this, it is a fact. Where the mind is dissipating itself in all the trivialities, in gossip, in getting hurt and wounding others, violence, caught up in its own self-centred activity, all that is negligence. Whereas a religious mind demands diligence to be precise, to be accurate, objectively and inwardly, so that there is no illusion, no deception, total integrity. That is what can be called a mind that is religious. But religion as it exists is not religion at all. All the propaganda, the images in the West, and the images in the East, you know, the whole rituals, the whole dressing up and all that business, has nothing whatsoever to do with religion. You may disagree with this. If you are a devout Christian,

a practising Catholic, probably you will even not listen. And when the speaker goes to India he tells them the same thing, that their religion, their superstitions, their images, all the nonsensical meaningless rituals have nothing to do whatsoever with truth. And many of them have said, "You should be burnt"! Or sent to a concentration camp. Probably, if you were living in the Middle Ages you would be: tortured, called a heretic, burnt in the name of god, peace and all the rest of it. In India they are a little more absorbing, they see a part of all this, but it is not meant for you, for us, you go away.

So what we are saying is: a mind that is religious does not belong to any society, any nationality, has no belief, but such a mind exercises the quality of doubt so that it questions, doesn't accept, doesn't obey the edicts of any religious organization, sect, gurus. So the mind is utterly free so that it can observe without the observer, which we talked about yesterday and in the previous talks. And our minds have been so conditioned, so captivated, enslaved by all the priests in the world, that is their business. It began with the Egyptians, four thousand five hundred BC, the priests were the directors, the people who knew, they were the interpreters of god and man, they were the middlemen, the retail experts! And that has been continued until now - in India, Asia, in the West. And our minds after two thousand years or five thousand years, have been conditioned to that, that we cannot as human beings find truth for ourselves, somebody must lead us to it, somebody must point out the way because our own minds are incapable of it. That has been the song of three thousand, five thousands years.

So if one sets aside all that, that there is no saviour, no guru, no sect, no group can lead you to it, is it possible to have such a mind? We are talking over together as one human being to another human being. As we said the other day, and we are repeating it again, if you don't mind, that we are the rest of mankind, because each one of us goes through all kinds of anxieties, struggles, sorrows, fears, insecurity and it is the same with every human being right through the world. One may live in a more affluent society but inwardly, psychologically there is the same uncertainty, depression, disintegration, anxiety as in the West, as in the East. It is exactly the same, or similar. So we are humanity.

And so when we are talking about religion, we are concerned with a mind that is religious, not a particular religious mind. If it is a particular religious mind it is not a religious mind. I hope you are meeting this. Religion, as we said, implies a mind that is free from negligence, neglecting the whole movement of learning, not learning from books only but learning the movement of oneself, the movement of thought, what it does, its consequences, learning about attachment, its consequences, learning. Not learning about something but the quality of a mind that is learning, not merely accumulating knowledge but moving without a particular direction, but the quality of learning. I hope you understand all this. And that learning brings about its own discipline. Discipline means to learn, not to follow, not to imitate, not to conform, not to compare, but to learn about comparison, about imitation, about conformity. Such a mind is a diligent mind. Learning about the actual so-called religions of the world. If you understand one religion of which you are, you understand the whole of the world's religions, you don't

have to read all the books about various religions, or go through comparative religious studies. If you know how the human mind works then you have understood the whole religious structure and their rituals and all the nonsense.

And why has man always talked about religion? From the ancient Egyptians and before them, religion has played an extraordinary part in life - why? Is it that we are seeking happiness, peace, an end which will not be destructive, secure, peaceful, and demanding that and not finding it in life, not finding all that in our daily life, we project. Thought projects something that is enduring, something that is eternal, something that cannot be corrupted, something beyond all imagination, all thought. One projects that as opposite of our own condition and then worships that. This is what has happened, if you have observed, not only now but throughout history; man wants to escape from himself because he lives in a constant bitter anxiety, struggle, pain. And he wants to find something beyond all that. So he lives in a world of make-belief. This is a fact, and that is not a fact. Can we be free of the non-fact and live with facts? And transform the facts? You understand what I am saying? Please let's move together, we have got a lot to talk together this morning.

Which means, a mind that has no escape. After all the rituals, all that goes on in the name of religion, has actually nothing whatsoever to do with our daily life, and therefore it is an escape from this daily torture. It may not be torture, it may be a conflict, it may be pain, it may be anxiety. So a mind that escapes from what actually is going on is not a religious mind. That is not a dogmatic statement. It is logical, sane, rational. And if it isn't actual religion,

believing something, we commit ourselves to some form, or follow somebody who has clever interpretations and we commit ourselves to that. So the mind is never free to observe itself. And all such escapes, all such commitments, is negligence. It is not a dogmatic statement. So don't brush it aside as being dogmatic. We are investigating the very complex process of living. And if we do not understand that, if we are not free of our sorrow, of our pain, of our anxiety, of our depression, of our neurosis, to find what truth is becomes an illusion, meaningless. What we have to do first is to clear the decks, as it were. Lay the foundation in our life, in our daily life so that there is not a shadow of conflict, which we talked about the other day.

So we are saying, together we are investigating, and seeing, can such a mind come about? Not through will, because that is again meaningless. Not through compulsion, not through reward or punishment. We have tried all that. And we are still where we are! So if we are serious, and life demands that we be serious, circumstances demand that we be serious. The world, which is destroying itself through nationalism, division and so on, seeing all that, merely verbally, discussing arguing has very little value, but if we are serious to find out whether the human mind, human condition can be changed, radically, then such a mind must inevitably enquire, not only into various parts of life but the whole structure of life, the whole pattern of living.

And, as we said, one of the factors of this is death. We have banished religion from our life. We have banished death from our life - right? We have postponed it. Why do we do this? Why do we, human minds, banish the actual demand for truth? Not live in

illusions, but why have we - religiously, I am talking about - banished the demand that we live a tremendously diligent life? Why? You understand my question? Because probably most of us want an easy way. We are probably very lazy. We never make supreme demand of ourselves. We are always satisfied with the little things of life, and not respond to a great challenge. And also we have banished death from our life - why? Is not death part of life? Whether we are young or old, diseased or senile - it is rather interesting to find out why human beings become senile. I don't know if you are interested in that? (Laughter) - no, seriously I am talking. Why human beings become senile. You understand my question? Why? As one grows older senility begins slowly. We forget, we repeat, we become either rather childish or join one of the recognised religious organizations - which is also senility. (Laughter) No, please don't laugh. This is not a laughing matter. This is what is happening in the world. And the tragedy of it.

So if your mother, if your husband, if your son, if your daughter, is already beginning to be senile, you wouldn't laugh. You would cry. And we are asking, as a side issue, why human beings become senile? Look at it sirs. What is senility? The brain cells wear themselves out - right? This is a fact. By constant effort, constant struggle, this everlasting to become something, the inward stress, inward strain, which must inevitably affect the brain - right? Must, logically. And also senility comes inevitably when there is such division, a great gulf between business, family, religion, and entertainment. You understand? This division, which is schizophrenic. I wonder if you realize all this?

So this constant struggle to be, or to become and then not to

become, which is the same thing, to become, must inevitably wear out the cells of the brain faster than they can renew themselves - you understand this? And the brain has the capacity to renew itself. We talked about the other day, having an insight - you remember? Perhaps some of you were here. That is, sir, to have an insight into the whole question of religion. What is religion? Not all the rituals, and all that circus that goes on, but why human beings have sought from time beyond measure, why human beings have sought some kind of otherness, to have an insight into that - not through logic, not through reason, not through knowledge, not through accumulation of argument, and opinion opposing another opinion, but to find the truth of it, which is to have an insight into the whole demand of man wanting something beyond. You are following all this? That insight, as we said, brings about a mutation in the brain cells. I have discussed this with several other scientists, some of them agree, so perhaps you will too.

So can the mind keep young, never grow senile? You understand my question? After all innocence means not to hurt and not to be hurt. The meaning of that word is that: not to hurt and not to be hurt. Such a mind which has never been hurt - you follow all this? - such a mind can never become senile. You understand? And that requires a great diligence of learning about itself.

So, as we were saying, to come back from senility: why have we banished death from our life? Which means: why have we, why have our minds got caught in time? - you understand? Please this is not intellectual fireworks. This is enquiring into our complex life. Time is by the day, yesterday, today and tomorrow, twenty four hours. But also there is time which is inward - right? Psychological

time. Right, we are following this? Why - we are asking - why the human mind is caught in psychological time? Are you following all this? Please we are talking over together. I am not talking to myself. We are asking: why has the mind been crippled by yesterday's memories, regrets, attachments and strangely attachments are always in the past? - I won't go into it now. By yesterday, a thousand yesterdays, today, modified itself and the future, which is time movement. This movement is time psychologically - right? We are asking: why is the mind caught in that, which is time? Right? That is, hope - you understand? - hope plays an important part in our life. "I hope to become" "I hope to meet you tomorrow" - psychologically. "I will meet you tomorrow" - but I have already projected my desire to meet you and create a hope out of that. You understand all that?

So we are saying: why does the mind live in time? It has evolved in time - right? The present mind that we have has evolved through millenia, thousands of years. And that is normal, healthy, obvious. But we are asking: why psychologically, inwardly time has become so important? You understand my question? You are asking yourself, please. Is it because we are always avoiding 'what is' in order to become something else? Do you understand what I am saying? Moving from this to that. Psychologically I am this, but I should not be this but that. Psychologically I am unhappy but I must be happy - right? The 'must', or 'will', or 'shall be' is the movement of time. " wonder if you are following? Please it's your life. So the mind is caught in time because it is always moving away from this, from 'what is' - right? It will change in time - 'I will be good, give me time', which is like developing a muscle - right?

Your muscle may not be sufficiently strong but if you keep on doing something to strengthen it, it will become strong. With the same mentality we say, "I am this, I will be that, so give me time." - right? And will 'what is' be changed through time? You understand my question? I am anxious, I have great anxiety. Can that anxiety be changed through time? You understand my question? That is, will I become, or be in a state where I have no anxiety? See what I have done? I have anxiety, I have projected a state of not being anxious, and to arrive at that state I must have time. But I never say can this anxiety I have be changed immediately. You understand my question? And not allow time. Are you following this? See what happens. I am anxious. I hope to be not anxious. There is a time interval, a lag. In that lag of time all other activities are going on, other pressures, negligence. You understand? So anxiety is never solved. I don't know if you are following all this.

I think I will come to a state when I have no anxiety, so I am struggling, struggling. It is like a man who is violent, he has invented non-violence, in that time interval he is violent, so he never reaches non-violence. I wonder if you understand all this? Right?

So the question is then: can 'what is' be transformed immediately? Which means never allowing time to interfere. Are we coming together? Listen to this, you will find out, it is really simple. If we apply our mind we can solve anything, as has been done, they have been to the moon, built marvellous submarines, incredible things they have done. Here, psychologically we are so reluctant, so incapable, or have made ourselves incapable. So if

you do not allow time, or never think in terms of time, then the fact is not - right? I wonder if you see this? Because we allow time the fact becomes important. If there is no time it is resolved. Suppose I died this second, there is no problem. You understand what I am saying? When I allow time I am afraid of death. I wonder if you understand all this? But if I live without time, which is an extraordinary thing if you go into it, psychologically, never. Time means accumulation - right? Time means remembrance, time means accumulating knowledge about oneself, all that involves time. But when there is no time at all, psychologically, there is nothing - you follow? You are capturing something? Are you understanding something? Please come on.

So we are saying, rather thinking together, because we have allowed time as a factor to intervene between living and dying, fear arises. Right? So unless you understand the nature of living, and therefore the nature of dying, which can be found in the living - you understand? Are you meeting me? No. That is sirs: death is the ending, isn't it? The ending. The ending of my possessions, my wife, my children, my house, my bank account, special bank account (Laughter). The ending of something. In that ending there is no argument - right? I don't say to death, "Please hold on a minute" (Laughter). So where there is ending, a beginning. You follow? I will go into it.

When the speaker ends attachment, completely - you understand? - not to persons, ideas, the whole process of attachment, with all the consequences of that, when there is an ending to it, there is a totally different state of mind - right? Isn't there? I have been attached to my furniture - and that attachment

has been a burden and with the ending of that burden there is freedom - right? So ending is more important than beginning - right? So can I living end? End my anxiety, end my fears - you follow? End, not the bank account, that is too risky! (Laughter) No, no, I mean that. We are not going to end the bank account. I am not talking of that. Ending psychologically. You understand? Ending my uncertainty. When I am confused, to end it, not say, "I must find out why I am confused, what is the cause of confusion, and I must be free from confusion" - all that is time. That is negligence. I wonder if you follow this? Whereas diligence is to be aware of the whole movement of time and to end anxiety immediately. Therefore there is no accumulation psychologically as knowledge - right?

Now death is ending - right? Ending of everything. I know what you will say afterwards, "What about reincarnation?" I know all that. We will come to it, if we have time. I am not avoiding it. If I say I don't know, I say I don't know. I don't play hypocrisy with all this. Death is an ending and I am living - right? We are living, active, business, all the rest of it. Can we psychologically end everything? You understand what I am saying? Can you end your attachment instantly, immediately, your anger, your violence, your greed, your this and that, end while living? Therefore then living is dying. You understand? Not living and ultimately dying. I wonder if you follow this. Living means the dying otherwise you are not alive. And most of us are frightened of dying because we have never been able to live properly, we have never lived. You understand? But we have lived in conflict, in struggle, in pain, in anxiety - you know all the rest of it. So we call that living. Living

is not all that - right? So if all that can be ended then there is living. So you are then living and dying - you follow? They go together, like a flower with perfume, the perfume is not away from the flower, it is there.

And this is actual ending of senility, if you go into it very deeply, so the mind never gets old. A machine with internal combustion, a machine like a car, is always wearing itself out because of friction - right? But when there is no friction whatsoever the mind keeps - you follow? But it is not your mind, it is the human mind. I wonder if you understand this? Because you, your mind is the result of a million years, your mind is the mind of the Indian, of the Chinese, Russians, the other human beings, because they go through similar pain, anxiety, sorrow, pleasures, occasional joys and occasional love. So our brain, our mind is the mind of humanity. If you can understand that one real fact then we will live without any division, which is causing such disaster in the world.

Now with regard to reincarnation, what is it that reincarnates? You understand? That is, I am living, I shall die and I hope next life I will have an opportunity to live in a bigger house. (Laughter) No, no, please. Or a better life, more money, this or that or the other. Now what is it that continues? You understand my question? Please, you have to think it out together carefully. I have lived fifty years, thirty years, a hundred years. I have accumulated a great deal of information, knowledge, I have struggled, I have tried to be virtuous, I have tried to be all that. And there is this accumulated entity - right? The 'me' that has accumulated, struggled, achieved, experienced, been through sorrow, depression, poverty, every kind

of penury. And I die. And I say to myself, "Why shouldn't I go on so that I will improve myself next life?" You understand? By good deeds, by etc. etc. I will be better. Right? So what is this centre which has accumulated, remembered, suffered, what is that centre? You understand? If that centre has a continuity then there is reincarnation - right? It will reincarnate next life, the soul for the Christian, the Hindus have a different word for it and so on. But the essence of that is the centre - right? Right? You can call it by whatever name you like but it is that. Now what is that centre? Is it permanent? Right? If it is permanent it can go on? Right? Modifying itself, changing itself, but the core of it will go on. I wonder if you are following all this? It is fairly simple.

So we have to find out what that centre is. If we say it is the centre of god - right? Then that centre which is creating such mischief - right - god must also be mischievous - right? I wonder if you get all this? Or that centre is put together by thought. You understand what I am saying? The name, the form, the family, my previous families, my father's and mother's and so on, genetically, heredity, the accumulation of all the pain and sorrow of generations is that centre - right? Put together by thought. I say I am a Hindu. You say you are a Catholic because you have been from childhood trained to accept Catholicism. And I was born in India, if I am stupid enough, I say, "Yes, I am a Hindu". So that centre is the result of continuous, modifying movement of thought. Right? I know the people who believe in reincarnation will object to all this because they like to believe that they have a future. It may be illusory, it is nonsensical but it gives them comfort. Right? And we all want comfort, in one way or the other. So dying means

the ending of that also. And when there is an ending of it, the mind is totally different. I wonder if you see? It is no longer accumulating. It is no longer experiencing. It isn't dead, it isn't static, but so alive there is nothing to collect - you understand?

Then there is the problem now - not a problem - what is meditation? Please take proper positions! (Laughter). I can see it happening! (Laughter) You know man, human beings have always sought because their minds are everlasting chattering, everlastingly moving from one thing to another, driven by desire, driven by reward and avoidance, pain, it is always trying to find some kind of quietness - right? Some kind of peace in which at least for ten minutes it can be quiet. Right? So man has sought this. Go to the church, sit there quietly. Go to a marvellous cathedral, when there is no circus going on, and be quiet. And it is a strange fact that in all these churches there is never a moment of quietness, except when it is empty. You understand what I am saying? The priest is doing something, you are doing something, everybody is chanting, replying, incense, this, that, never, never quiet, except in the cathedral when it is really empty of human beings. The same in the temples, the same in the mosques. Is it because those people in authority of the church, temple and so on, never want you to be quiet so that you will begin to question? You understand? Because if you are quiet you might enquire. If you are quiet you might begin to doubt. But if you are occupied all the time, you never have time to look around, to question, to doubt, to ask. That may be one of the great tricks of the human mind.

So we are asking: what is meditation? And why one should meditate? Is it natural? Natural - you understand? Like breathing,

like seeing, like hearing. Is it natural? And why have we made it so unnatural? Taking postures, following systems - Buddhist meditation, Tibetan meditation, Christian meditation - you understand? The Tantra meditations - you don't know them, perhaps, some of you may know, and the meditations set by your favourite guru - right? We are asking aren't all those really abnormal? Right? Are you following? Why should I take a certain position to meditate? Why should I practise, practise, practise, to arrive where? You understand my question? To follow a system: twenty minutes in the morning, twenty minutes in the afternoon, twenty minutes in the evening, to have a quiet mind? Having achieved a little quiet mind I can go off and do other mischief all day long. These are actual facts I am telling you.

Is there a way of meditating which is none of these things? You understand my question? Up till now we say meditation is to quieten the mind, first, to have a mind that is capable of observation. To have a mind that is completely centred - right? Completely concentrated - right? So that there is no thought except one thought. Right? One picture, one image, one centre upon which you are looking - right? I don't know if you have gone through all this? The speaker has played with them. For half an hour for each of these meditations, ten minutes, five minutes and they meant nothing.

So you have to go into this question: who is the controller and the controlled? You understand? Are you getting tired? Our whole life, if you observe is this: controlling and not controlling. Right? I must control my emotions, I must control my thinking. I can only control my thinking by constant practice. And to practise I must

have a system. The system implies a mechanical process, making the mind mechanical, more and more and it is already mechanical now but we want to make it much more so that it gradually becomes more and more dull. We go through all this - right? Why? If you are meditating according to TM - right - or according to somebody else, why? Because you want to have an experience either through drugs, and you know drugs do you harm, therefore you put that aside, but by practising something you will experience something else - right?

I do not know if you have all gone into the question of experience; why human beings are demanding experience. Either the mind is asleep, therefore experience means a challenge - right? Or the mind is awake and therefore doesn't need an experience. I don't know if you are following this? So you have to find out if your mind is asleep, or bored with the experience that you have, sex, drugs, and all the rest of the experiences, you want something far beyond all that. Because you are always craving for experience, more delightful, more extravagant, the more communicable and all the rest of it. Why does the mind demand experience? Ask yourself please. There is only one thing: a mind that is very clear is free from all entanglements of attachments and so on, such a mind is a light to itself - right? Therefore it doesn't want an experience, there is nothing to experience. You cannot experience enlightenment. The very idea of experience, it is such a stupid thing to say, "I have achieved enlightenment" - it is really dishonest. You cannot experience truth because there must be an experiencer to experience - right? If there is no experiencer there is no experience at all. I wonder if you see that? But we are attached to our

experiencer and therefore we are always asking more and more and more.

So meditation generally as is accepted now, is the practice of a system, breathing properly, sitting in the right position, the lotus position or whatever position you take, wanting or craving for greater experience, or the ultimate experience - right? This is what we are doing. And therefore all that is a constant struggle - right? A never ending struggle. This never ending struggle which is hoping to end all struggles. You understand? Look what we have done. I am struggling, struggling, struggling to end struggling, which is sometime in the future. Right? See what tricks I have played on myself. I am caught in time - right? I don't say, "Why should I struggle at all?" If I can end this struggle that is enlightenment. You understand? To have no shadow of conflict. But we do not want to make all those efforts. We are caught in time - right? And to be free of time is to be free to have pure observation, and then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet. You don't have to make the mind quiet - you understand? If you end all conflict the mind naturally becomes quiet. And when the mind is absolutely silent, without any movement of thought, then perhaps you will see something, perhaps there is something sacred beyond all words. And this man has sought everlastingly, something that is beyond measure, beyond thought, which is incorruptible, unnameable, eternal That can only take place when the mind is absolutely free and completely silent.

So one must begin very near - you understand? Very near. And when you begin very near there is no far - you understand? When you begin near there is no distance and therefore there is no time.

And it is only then that which is most holy can be. Right sirs.

I hope you will all have a pleasant day.

BROCKWOOD PARK 11TH CONVERSATION WITH DAVID BOHM 14TH SEPTEMBER 1980

Krishnamurti: Dr. Bohm and I started these dialogues between himself and myself at Ojai in California at the beginning of this year. And we had eight dialogues there and two here, if I remember rightly, so we have had altogether ten dialogues this year, with Dr. Bohm and I. And so we are continuing that dialogue.

We talked about - it's rather difficult to remember. I've no memory of it. I think we asked, if I remember rightly, what is the origin of all this, of all human movement. Is there an original source, a ground? Is that right, sir? A ground from which all this sprang, nature, man, the whole universe. Was it bound by time? Was it in itself complete order, and beyond which there is nothing more?

And, Dr Bohm reminded me yesterday, we talked about order, whether the universe is based on time at all. I don't know if you are interested in all this. And whether man can ever comprehend and live in that supreme order. That's right, sir? I think that's rather vaguely where we stopped. I don't know if you are interested in all this. But Dr Bohm and I wanted to investigate, not merely intellectually but also profoundly, how to comprehend or live from that ground, move from that ground, the ground that is timeless, there is nothing beyond it. And I think we had better begin from there.

Dr Bohm: Begin from the ground.

K: Sir, I don't know if you will agree as a scientist of eminence, whether there is such a ground, whether man can ever comprehend

it, live in it - live in the sense, not as something, he living in it, but that living in it, that itself living - and whether we can as human beings come to that. That is more or less, if I remember, what we talked about.

B: Yes, well, I don't know if science as it is now constituted can say much about that.

K: Science doesn't talk about it. But you as a scientist, would you give your mind to the investigation of that?

B: Yes. Well, I think, implicitly science has always been concerned with trying to come to this ground, but we discussed in Ojai, studying matter to the greatest possible depth. But of course, that is not enough.

K: Is this too abstract?

B: It's hard to say.

K: Didn't we ask, sir, if I remember rightly - it's so long ago - as a human being, living in this world, which is in such turmoil, whether there can be that absolute order first, as the universe is in absolute order, and comprehend an order which is universal.

B: Yes.

K: I don't know if I am making my question clear. I can have order in myself, by careful observation, self-study, self-investigation, and understand the nature of disorder, and the very understanding, the very insight of it dispels that disorder. And that's one level of order.

B: Yes, well, that's the level that most of us have been concerned with till now, you see. We say, we see this disorder going on in the world, and in ourselves, and we say it is necessary to be aware, observe all that, to be aware of that and as you say, to

dispel it.

K: Yes, but that's a very small affair.

B: Yes, we discussed that in Ojai but I feel that, you know, people generally don't feel it as a small affair. We've discussed it at great length, but at first people feel that clearing up the disorder in themselves and the world would be a very big thing. And perhaps all that's necessary.

K: No, but, I mean, fairly intelligent and knowledgeable and fairly cultured human beings, cultured in the sense civilized - he can, with a great deal of enquiry and investigation, come to the point when in himself he can bring order.

B: Yes, and then some people would now begin to say if only we could bring that order into the whole of society.

K: Well, we will, if human beings, if all of us in this room, if we are all tremendously in that inward sense orderly, we'll perhaps create a new society. But that again is a very small affair.

B: Yes, I understand that. I feel that, you know, one should go into it carefully because it is not, you know, people commonly don't see it as small, although a few have, you know, seeing that there's something beyond that.

K: Much more beyond that, that's what I want, I mean, I don't know if others are following this.

B: Perhaps what might be worth thinking about would be, why is it that it is not enough to go into this order of man and society. You see, why just produce orderly living - let's put it that way.

K: Yes, orderly living.

B: In what sense is that not enough? You feel it's very small but...

K: I mean, because we live in chaos, to bring order, we think that's a tremendous affair.

B: Yes, that's agreed, it looks very big. From the present state of this, it looks very big.

K: Yes, very enormous, but in itself it isn't.

B: Yes, could you make it a little more clear why it isn't.

K: Oh dear.

B: I think it's important now to...

K: All right. Because I can put my room in order, so that it gives me certain space, certain freedom. And I know where things are, I can go directly to them. That's a physical thing. Can I, as a human being, put things in myself in order, which is, not to have conflict, not to have comparison, not to have any sense of me and you and they, you know, all that, which brings about such division, and out of that division grows conflict. That's simple.

B: Yes.

K: If I'm a Hindu and you are a Muslim, and we are eternally at war with each other.

B: Yes, and in every community people fall apart in the same way.

K: Yes, the same way, the whole society breaks up that way.

B: Yes.

K: So if one understands that, and profoundly realizes it, that's finished.

B: Yes. Then suppose we say we have achieved that, then what?

K: That's what I want to get at. I don't know if you are interested in this.

B: Yes, you see, I think some people might say it's so far away

that it doesn't interest us - wait till we achieve it before we worry about the other.

K: All right - let us - no. You and I, this was a dialogue between you and me, not with...

B: Yes, but I meant, just for the sake of trying to make sure everybody here sees it, before we go on to see what the question is.

K: All right, sir, let's start. I'm in disorder, physically, psychologically and around me the society in which I live is also utterly confused, there is a great deal of injustice - a miserable affair. And I can see that, very simply. I can see my generation, past generations and generations, have contributed to this. And I can do something about it. That's simple. I can say, well, I'll put my house in order - myself is the house, my house must be in order before I can move further.

B: Well, would you say that this question, suppose somebody says, my house is not in order, so before I worry about that...

K: All right, my house is in disorder.

B: Yes.

K: Let me put that into order, which is fairly simple. If I apply my mind and my heart to the resolution of that, of that question, it's fairly clear. But we don't want to do that.

B: Well, that's another question.

K: Yes, we find it tremendously difficult, we are so bound to the past or to our habits and to our attitudes, we don't seem to have the energy, the courage, the vitality, to move out of it.

B: Yes, that's what's doesn't seem to be so simple as what will produce that energy and courage, you know, what will change all this.

K: I think what will change all this, as we discussed at Ojai, is to have this insight into all this.

B: Yes, I think that really is the key point, that without insight, nothing can change.

K: Nothing can change.

B: So even if we try to bring order in daily life, without this much broader insight into the very root of it...

K: That's right.

B:... or into the ground of it.

K: Now, will that insight really alter my whole structure and nature of my being. That is the question. Isn't it?

B: Yes. Then it seems to me that, what was implied was that if we look at a rather small question like the order of daily life, it will not involve your whole being.

K: No, of course not.

B: And therefore the insight will be inadequate.

K: Yes. So what is insight - we discussed that too, a great deal, and we talked about it at the gathering here and at Saanen. Do we go through that?

B: Well, just sum it up, I think, I mean, because I think it would make it more intelligible.

K: Could we start with being tied to something. Being tied to a belief, to a person, to an idea, to some habit, some experience, which inevitably must create disorder. Because being tied implies dependence, the escape from one's own loneliness, fear, and all that. Now to have total insight into this attachment, that very insight clears away all attachment.

B: Yes. I think we were saying that the self is the centre of

darkness, it could be considered like a centre creating darkness in the mind, or clouds, and the insight penetrates that, it would dispel the cloud so that there would be clarity and therefore this problem would vanish.

K: Vanish, that's right.

B: But it would take a very strong, intense insight.

K: Yes, but that needs...

B: A total insight.

K: That's right, but are we willing to go through that? Or my attachment to, or my tie to, something is so strong, that I'm unwilling to let go.

B: Yes, but then what?

K: And that is what most people are.

B: Yes.

K: It's only, I think, unfortunately, it's only the very few who want to do this kind of thing.

Now, we are discussing the nature of insight, whether that insight can wipe away or banish, dissolve this whole movement of being tied, attached, dependent, lonely, all that, with one blow, as it were. I think it can. I think it does when there is profound insight into this thing. That insight is not mere memory, the movement of memory, knowledge, experience, which is totally different from all that movement.

B: Well, it seems that it's insight into the whole of disorder, into the source of disorder.

K: Yes.

B: Of all disorder of a psychological nature, not just say, attachment or greed.

K: It is all that.

B: Yes, so that with that insight then the mind can clear up and then it would be possible to approach the cosmic order.

K: That's what I want to get at.

B: Yes.

K: That's much more interesting than this, because this is all rather immature - sorry, forgive the word - any serious man must put his house in order. Right? And that must be complete order, not order in a particular direction, but order in the wholeness of man. If that can be done, and if that is necessary, because society as it is disintegrating and it's destructive and all the rest of it, and it destroys human beings. It's a machine that is destructive in itself and if a human being is caught in it, it destroys him. Right. And realizing that, any ordinary human intelligence says, 'I must do something about it', not just sit back and talk about it.

B: Well just to finish things, you see most people might feel doing something about it consists of solving particular problems like attachment or removing disagreements between people, or something.

K: The particular resolution of a particular problem, and its resolution, is not the resolution of the whole.

B: That's the key point that if you find the source that generates this, which generates this whole, then getting at this source, at this root is the only way.

K: Yes, that's right.

B: Because if we try to deal with a particular problem, it's still always coming from the source.

K: The source is the 'me', understood.

B: Yes.

K: The source, apart from the great source, the little source, little pond, the little stream, must dry up.

B: Yes, the little stream confuses itself with the great one, I think.

K: Yes, we're not talking about the great stream, the immense movement of life, we're talking about the little me with the little movement, little apprehensions and so on that is creating disorder. And as long as there is that centre which is the very essence of disorder, unless that is dissolved there is no order.

So at that level it is clear. Can we go on from there?

B: Yes, I think so.

K: Now, I'd like to ask, is there another order totally different from this? This is man-made disorder, and therefore man-made order. Right?

B: Yes.

K: The chaos and the cosmos is man-made.

B: Not the real cosmos.

K: No, I beg your pardon - cosmos is not. No, the real thing.

B: I mean, the order which we see in this room, the microphone, see the television is man-made, which is a high degree of order, and also we see all the fighting going on.

K: It's man-made.

B: Man made the terrible programmes to put on this orderly television system.

K: Yes. So realizing that, seeing disorder which the human mind can bring about in itself, order, then it begins to ask, is there an order which is totally different, of a dimension which is

necessary to find, because this is so small an affair.

B: Yes.

K: I put my house in order. All right. Then what? And if perhaps, many of us do it, we'll have a better society, better etc., etc. But yes, that is admitted, that is relevant, that is necessary, But that has its limitation.

B: Yes, eventually people won't be able to be satisfied with that, so they'll be bored with that.

K: It's not.

B: But as you say, we have to have it.

K: Yes. Now how do we find, how does a human being who has really deeply understood disorder, disorder made by human beings, and therefore effecting society and all that, he says, 'Is there an order that's beyond all this?'

B: Yes, and how do we get into that question?

K: Yes, how do we? The human mind isn't satisfied by merely having physical, social order, it has its limitations, it has its boundaries, and says, 'Yes, I've understood that, let's move.'

B: Yes, or even say in science men are seeking the order of the whole universe, looking to, what they feel to be the end or the beginning.

K: Yes.

B: Or to the depth of its structure, not noted to get useful results but because the question fascinates them.

K: Yes, this is not a fascinating question.

B: No, but I'm saying it does.

K: Yes.

B: It interests them, let's put it that way. And I think that,

perhaps I was thinking that many have been seeking the absolute and the word 'absolute' means to be free of all limitation, of all dependence, of all imperfection.

K: Yes, of all motives and all the rest of it - absolute.

B: Yes, so the absolute has been the source of tremendous illusion, of course because the limited self seeks to capture the absolute.

K: Of course, I mean, that's impossible.

B: But that's the common...

K: Of course, of course.

B: But supposing we recognize that the absolute is a very dangerous concept, when the mind tries to grasp it, and yet it seems to be in some sense what is necessary, you see, that, in the sense of freedom, freedom could only mean the same as absolute, you see.

K: Yes.

B: Because anything that is dependent in any way is not free.

K: So how do we approach this, how do we answer this question? As a scientist, would you say there is an order which is beyond all human order and disorder?

B: Yes, well, I would say it. I don't think that a scientist is particularly significant in the sense that science is not may be seeking this sort of thing, but it really has no more to say on it, it is not able to say anything on this question because any order discovered by science is relative.

K: Of course. Because their own egotism...

B: Not only that but also the information we have is limited.

K: Limited, quite.

B: And we can only say it goes so far.

K: So are we moving to a world of either illusion, because demanding it may create it.

B: I feel it does create illusion, that if man demands the absolute and tries to...

K: Of course, of course.

B:... satisfy it, although it is illusion.

K: I'm not asking that question, from that point of view.

B: But not knowing what to do, men have felt the need for the absolute and not knowing how to get it they have created the illusion of it in religion and in science or in many other ways.

K: So what shall I do? As a human being, a human being who is the totality of human beings, there is order in my life. That order is naturally brought about through insight and so perhaps it will effect society. Move from that. The enquiry then is, is there an order which is not man-made. Let's put it that way. I won't even call it absolute order, or any kind of...

B: At least it's free of man's construction.

K: Yes.

B: And now we have the order of nature, the cosmos which we don't really know in its depth but we could consider that to be that sort of order.

K: I mean, the very word 'cosmos' means order.

B: Yes, it's the Greek word for order.

K: Yes. Nature is order. Unless man interferes with it, nature is an order, has its own order. We won't say that.

B: Yes, it has its own order and even when we're told this order in nature is part of the order.

K: Part of the order.

B: It's not really disorder.

K: No, no. We call it disorder but in itself it is not disorder. All right. Finished with that. Now let's move to something else.

Man has sought a different dimension and perhaps used the word 'order'. He has sought a different dimension, because he has understood this dimension. He has lived in it, he has suffered in it, he has gone through all kinds of mess and misery, he says, 'I've come to the end of all that.' I mean not verbally - actually come to the end of all that. And you may say there are very few people who do that, but this question must be put.

B: Yes, I could ask what is the significance of this question to say the vast number of people who have not gone through that?

K: I don't quite follow.

B: Well, we're putting this question, you say that the man who has gone through that may put this question. But then is it of any interest to one who hasn't gone through it?

K: I think it is.

B: All right, what is it?

K: Because he sees even intellectually, he may see the limitations of it.

B: Yes, it's important for him to see even before he has finished up with it.

K: Yes.

B: It's important to see this point, not to say wait until I clear it up and then...

K: Of course not - that would be too stupid. So how does the mind approach this problem? (pause) I think man has struggled to find this out, sir. I mean, all religious people, you know, so-called

religious people have attempted to grasp this - the mystics, the saints, with their illusions, all the rest of it, but they have tried to understand something which is not all this. Does it come about through, if I may use the word, meditation as measure.

B: Well, we've discussed that here in Brockwood, that the original meaning of the word 'meditation' is to measure, to ponder, to weigh the value and significance.

K: Weigh means to measure.

B: Yes, but I think meditation would mean to measure in some deeper sense than just with a ruler but...

K: No, no, of course not.

B:... even so, perhaps that may have meant that such a measurement would only have significance for seeing that there is disorder.

K: That's what I would say - measurement can exist only where there is disorder.

B: Yes, but by looking at the measurement, at the way things are out of proportion in the mind, you can see there is disorder.

K: Yes.

B: That is not the order, of course.

K: No. So we are using the word meditation not as measure or even to ponder or think over, but a meditation that is the outcome of having kept, bringing about order in the house, and moving from there.

B: Right. So I think people may have used the word meditation in the distant past to indicate that by looking at measure you can see disorder as being out of proportion, but they may have meant to go on from there.

K: Yes, but they don't seem to, somehow.

B: People don't generally do it.

K: Yes, let's try to do it.

B: Yes.

K: Rather. Perhaps a preposterous statement but let's see.

B: So if we see things are in disorder in the mind, then what is meditation.

K: Yes. But first the mind must be free of measurement.

B: Yes.

K: Otherwise it can't enter into the other.

B: Well, that's an important point, to say that. Almost the instinctive reaction of seeing this disorder, this disorder is itself a disproportionate measurement and therefore the instinctive tendency is to try to make the measure come right, to correct it.

K: Correct it, quite. But we said...

B: And that might be a fundamental mistake.

K: We said that. I mean all effort to bring order into disorder is disorder.

B: Yes, and in that way this is very different from what almost everybody has been saying.

K: Yes.

B: Over the whole of history.

K: History - I know, I know. We are, perhaps exceptional.

B: There may be a few who implied it. I think it's implicit in what you have said but...

K: Yes.

B:... it's never been said explicitly to my knowledge.

K: All right, let's explicitly say it.

B: So we say that it is the attempt to control, as you've said, that is wrong, you see that it has no meaning.

K: No meaning, yes.

B: And now we say there's no control, what do we do?

K: No, no, no. If I have an insight into the whole nature of control...

B: Control is measure.

K:... - of course, control is measure - that liberates the mind from that burden.

B: Yes. Could you explain the nature of this insight, what it means.

K: We said that. Insight implies it is not a movement from knowledge, from thought, and therefore remembrance and all the rest of it, but the cessation of all that and to look at it, look at the problem with pure observation, without any pressure, without any motive, all that - to observe this whole movement of measurement.

B: Yes, I think we can see that measurement is the same as becoming and...

K: Of course, all that.

B: The attempt of the mind to measure itself, to control itself, to set itself a goal...

K: Compare itself and all the rest of it - yes.

B:... is the very source of the disorder.

K: That is the very source of disorder.

B: And in a way that was the wrong way of looking at it, this wrong turning, that man extended measurement from the external sphere into the mind.

K: Yes.

B: But now we say, I think the first reaction would be if we don't control this thing it will go wild. That's what somebody might fear.

K: Yes, but you see, if I have an insight into measurement, that very insight not only banishes all movement, measurement, there is a different order.

B: Yes, it does not go wild because...

K: It doesn't go wild, on the contrary.

B:... it has begun in order. That is really the attempt to measure it that makes it go wild.

K: Yes, that's it. The measurement becomes wild.

B: Yes.

K: Is confusion. Right? Now let's proceed, after establishing all this, can this mind through meditation - we're using the word meditation without any sense of measurement, comparison, all the rest of it - can that mind find an order, a state where there is no - let's be more positive - where there is something which is not man-made. Because I've been through all the man-made things. Right? And they are all limited, there is no freedom in them, there is chaos, there is mess and all that.

B: Well, when you say you've been through man-made things, what are they?

K: Everything.

B: Like religion.

K: Like religion, science, worship, prayers, anxieties, sorrow, attachment, detachment, loneliness and suffering and confusion and ache and anxiety, loneliness, all that.

B: It's also all the attempts by revolution.

K: Of course, physical revolution, psychological, all that. Those are all man-made. And so many people have put this question, obviously, must have. And therefore they say, god.

B: Yes.

K: Which is another concept, and that very concept creates disorder.

B: Well, that's clear that man has invented god and given him the power of the absolute.

K: Yes, quite.

B: Which is himself.

K: Which then becomes himself.

B: Yes, and therefore it becomes...

K: Chaotic.

B: It dominates him.

K: Yes. Of course. Now, one has finished with all that. Right? Now then the question is, is there something beyond all this, which is never touched by human thought, mind?

B: Yes, now, that makes a difficult point, not touched by the human mind, but mind might go beyond thought.

K: That's what I want - yes.

B: Then what do you mean - do you mean by the mind only thought, feeling, desire, will, or something much more?

K: No, that's for the time being, we have said the mind, the human mind is all that.

B: But it's not, the mind is now considered to be limited.

K: No. As long as the human mind is caught in that, it is limited.

B: Yes, the human mind has potential.

K: Tremendous potential.

B: Which it does not realize now, it is caught in thought, feeling, desire, will, and that sort of thing.

K: That's right.

B: Then we'll say that which is beyond this is not touched by this limited sort of mind.

K: Yes. (pause)

B: Now what will we mean by the mind which is beyond this limit?

K: First of all, sir, is there such a mind?

B: Yes, that's the first question.

K: Is there such a mind that is actually, not theoretically or romantically, all the rest of that nonsense, actually say, 'I've' been through this'?

B: You mean, through the limited stuff.

K: Yes. And being through it means finish with it. Is there such a mind? Or because it has finished with it, or it thinks it has finished with it, therefore creates the illusion that there is something else.

B: Yes.

K: I won't accept that. As a human being, one person, or 'X' says, 'I have understood this, I have seen the limitation of all this, I have been through it, and I have come to the end of it.' And this mind, having come to the end of it, is no longer the limited mind. And is there a mind which is totally limitless?

B: Yes.

K: You follow what I mean?

B: Yes, now that raises the question of how the brain is able to

be in contact with that mind, you know.

K: Which mind?

B: What is the relation between that limited mind and the brain?

K: I'm coming to that. First of all, I want to be clear on this point, it's rather interesting, if we go into it. This mind, brain, the whole of it, the whole nature and the structure of the mind, includes the emotions, the brain, the reactions, physical responses and all that, this mind has lived in turmoil, in chaos, in loneliness and has understood, has had a profound insight into all that. And having such a deep insight cleared the field. This mind is no longer that mind.

B: Yes, it's no longer the original mind.

K: Yes. Not only, no longer the limited mind.

B: That you began with.

K: Damaged mind. Let's use that word damaged.

B: Damaged mind, also damaged brain, that this damaged mind has been the same, working has damaged the brain.

K: Yes, all right.

B: So we have thought the damaged mind...

K: Damaged mind means damaged emotions, damaged brain, damaged...

B: The cells themselves are not in the right order.

K: Quite. But when there is this insight and therefore order, the damage is undone.

B: Yes. We discussed that.

K: Yes.

B: The previous time.

K: Previous time. I don't know if you agree to that even.

B: Yes, I see, certainly you see it's possible, by reasoning you can see it's quite possible, because you can say the damage was done by disorderly thoughts and feelings, which over-excite the cells and disrupt them and now with the insight, that stops and a new process...

K: Yes, it's like a person going for fifty years in a certain direction and realizes suddenly that that's not the direction, the whole brain changes.

B: It changes at the core and then the wrong structure is dismantled and healed, that may take time.

K: That's right.

B: But the insight which...

K:... is the factor that changes.

B: Yes, and that insight does not take time.

K: Time, that's right.

B: But it means that the whole process has changed the origin.

K: Again, that mind, the limited mind with all its consciousness and its content, all the rest of it, says, it's over, that part. Now is that mind which has been limited, and having had insight into this limitation, and therefore moved away from that limitation, is that an actuality, a something that is really tremendously revolutionary? You follow? And therefore it is no longer the human mind. Forgive me for using that word.

B: Well, I think we should clear that up, what we mean by the human mind.

K: Human mind with its consciousness, which is limited.

B: Yes, that limited consciousness which is conditioned and not free.

K: That is ended.

B: Yes, so that is the general consciousness which has been the case, I mean, not just in individual's but it has been all round.

K: All, of course not, I'm not talking of an individual, that's too silly.

B: Yes. But I think we discussed that, that the individual is the outcome of the general consciousness.

K: Yes.

B: Particular outcome, rather than an independent thing. You see, that's one of the difficulties.

K: That's one of the confusions.

B: The confusion is we take the individual mind to be the concrete actuality.

K: Yes.

B: We've been discussing, it's necessary to consider this general mind to be the actuality from which the individual mind is formed.

K: Yes. That's all very clear.

B: But now you are saying we move away even from that general mind, but what does it mean?

K: Yes, general and the particular.

B: And the particular mind.

K: Now, if one has totally moved away from it, then what is the mind?

B: Yes, and what is the person, what is the human being? Right?

K: What is a human being then. And then what is the relationship between that mind, which is not man-made, and the man-made mind?

B: Yes.

K: I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

B: Well, did we agree to call it universal mind, or would you prefer not to?

K: I don't like that word universal mind, lots of people used it. Let's use a much simpler word.

B: Well, it's the mind which was not made by man.

K: I think that's simpler, keep it to that. A mind that is not made by man.

B: Neither individually nor in general.

K: Generally or individually, it's not made by man. Sir, can one observe, really, deeply, without any prejudice, and all the rest, does such a mind exist? You follow what I'm trying to say?

B: Yes, let's see what that means to observe that. I think there are some difficulties of language here, because you see, we say one must observe things like that, whereas...

K: I observe it. I observe.

B: Yes, who observes it, you see, that's one of the problems that comes up.

K: We've been through all that. There is no division in observation. Not, I observe, but there is only observation.

B: Observation takes place.

K: Yes.

B: Would you say it takes place in a particular brain, for example, or a particular brain takes part in the observation?

K: I know the catch in this. No, sir, it doesn't take in a particular brain.

B: Yes, but it seems that a particular brain may respond.

K: Of course, it is not K's brain.

B: I don't mean that, what I mean by the word particular brain, you see, we could say that given the particulars of where a certain human being is in space and time or whatever his form is, not giving him a name, is distinguished from another one which might be there, there.

K: Look, sir, let's get clear on this point. We live in a man-made world, man-made mind, man-made and all that, we are the result of man-made mind - our brains and so on. Brain with all its responses not the actual.

B: Well, the brain itself is not man-made but it has been conditioned.

K: Conditioned by man, right, that's what I mean. Now, can that mind uncondition itself so completely that it's no longer man-made?

B: Yes, that's the question.

K: That is the question - let's keep it to that simple level. Can that mind, man-made mind as it is now, can it go to that extent, to so completely liberate itself from itself.

B: Yes, of course that's a somewhat paradoxical statement.

K: Of course. Paradoxical but it's actual, it is so. I can - let's begin again. I can, one can observe the consciousness of humanity is its content. And its content is all the man-made things - anxiety, fear, and all the rest of it. And it is not only the particular it is the general. Having had an insight into this, it has cleansed itself from that.

B: Well, that implies that it was always potentially more than that but that insight enabled it to be free of that. Is that what you

mean?

K: That insight - I won't say it is potential.

B: Yes, well, there is a little difficulty of language, that if you say the brain or the mind had an insight into its own conditioning and then almost you're saying it became into something else.

K: Yes, I am saying that, I am saying that.

B: Right. OK.

K: The insight transforms the man-made mind.

B: Yes. So but then it's no longer the man-made mind.

K: It's no longer. That insight means the wiping away of all the content of consciousness. Right? Not bit by bit by bit, the totality of it. And that insight is not the result of man's endeavour.

B: Yes, but then that seems to raise the question of where does it come from.

K: All right. Where does it come from? Yes. In the brain itself, in the mind itself.

B: Which, the brain or the mind?

K: Mind, I'm saying the whole of it.

B: We say there is mind, right?

K: Just a minute, sir. Let's go slowly - it's rather interesting, let's go slowly. The consciousness is man-made, general and particular. And logically, reasonably one sees the limitations of it. Then the mind has gone much further. Then it comes to a point when it says, 'Can all this be wiped away at one breath, one blow, one movement.' And that movement is insight, the movement of insight. It is still in the mind. But not born of that consciousness. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

B: Yes. Then you are saying the mind has the possibility of

potential, of moving beyond the consciousness.

K: Yes.

B: But we haven't actually done much other.

K: Of course. It must be a part of the brain, a part of the mind.

B: The brain, mind can do that, but it hasn't generally done it.

K: Yes. Now, having done all this, is there a mind which is not not only man-made, man cannot conceive, cannot create this, it is not an illusion, is there such a mind? I don't know if I am making myself clear.

B: Well, I think what you are saying is, having freed itself the mind has...

K: General and particular.

B:... freed it from the general and particular structure of consciousness of mankind, from its limits, and now this mind is now much greater. Now you say that this mind is raising a question.

K: This mind is raising the question.

B: Which is what?

K: Which is, first, is that mind free from the man-made mind?

B: Yes.

K: That's the first question.

B: It may be an illusion.

K: Illusion - that's what I want to get at, one has to be very clear. No, it is not an illusion, because he sees measurement is an illusion, he knows the nature of illusion, born of where there is desire there must be etc., illusions. And illusions must create limitation, and so on. He's not only understood it, he's over it.

B: He's free of desire.

K: Free of desire. That is the nature. I don't want to put it so brutally. Free of desire.

B: It is full of energy.

K: Yes. So this mind, which is no longer general and particular, and therefore not limited, and this limitation has been broken down through insight, and therefore the mind is no longer that conditioned mind. Right?

B: Yes.

K: Now, then what is that mind? Being aware that it is no longer caught in illusion.

B: Yes, but you were saying it was raising a question about whether there is some much greater.

K: Yes, that's why I'm raising the question.

B: Whatever.

K: Yes. Is there a mind which is not man-made? And if there is, what is its relationship to the man-made mind?

B: Yes.

K: This is very difficult. It is half past twelve, do we go on?

B: If you feel like it.

K: I can go on. Go up to a quarter to one.

B: Quarter to one, yes that's good, yes.

K: You see every form of assertion, every form of verbal statement is not that. Right? So we're asking, is there a mind which is not man-made. And I think that can only be asked when the other, when the limitations are ended, otherwise it's just a foolish question.

B: That'll be the same...

K: Just a waste of time, then. I mean, that becomes theoretical,

nonsensical.

B: Part of the man-made structure.

K: Of course, of course. So one must be absolute - I'm using the word - one must be...

B: I think the word 'absolute' can be used there if we are very careful.

K: Very carefully, yes. Absolutely free of all this. Then only can you put that question. When you put that question, not you - when that question is raised, is there a mind that is not man-made, and if there is such a mind, what is its relationship to the man-made mind. Now, is there such a mind, first. Of course there is. Of course, sir. Without being dogmatic or personal or all that business, there is. But it is not god.

B: Right, well.

K: Because god - we've been through all that.

B: It is part of the man-made structure.

K: Which has created chaos in the world. There is. Then, the next question is, what is, if there is such a mind, and someone says there is, then what is the relationship of that to the human mind, man-made mind?

B: Yes, the general.

K: Particular and general. Has it any relationship?

B: Yes, the question's a difficult one because you could say that the man-made mind is pervaded with illusion, most of its content is not real.

K: No. So this is real.

B: Actual or whatever.

K: We'll use the word 'real' in the sense actual, and that is

measurable, confused - has this relationship to that? Obviously not.

B: Well, I would say a superficial one in the sense that the man-made mind has some real content at a certain level, a technical level, let's say, the television system and so on.

K: Well.

B: So in that sense in that area there could be a relationship but as you were saying that is a very small area. But fundamentally...

K: No, as we discussed - you remember, sir?

B: Yes.

K: The man-made mind has no relationship to that.

B: Yes.

K: But that has a relationship to this.

B: Yes, but not to the illusions in the man-made mind.

K: Wait a minute, let's be clear. My mind is the human mind. It has got illusions, desires and all the rest of it. And there is that other mind which is not, which is beyond all limitations. This illusory mind, the man-made mind, is always seeking that.

B: Yes, that's its main trouble.

K: Yes, that's its main trouble. It is measuring it, it is advancing, am I getting nearer, farther, all the rest of it. And this mind, the human mind, the mind that's made by human beings, human mind, the man-made mind is always seeking that, and therefore it's creating more and more mischief, confusion. This man-made mind has no relationship to that.

B: Yes, because from...

K: Obvious, obvious.

B: Any attempt to get that is the source of illusion.

K: Of course, of course, obvious. Now has that any relationship

to this?

B: Well, what I was suggesting was, that it would have to have, that if we take the illusions which are in the mind such as desire and fear and so on, it has no relationship to that, because they are figments anyway.

K: Yes, understood.

B: Now but that can have a relationship to the man-made mind in understanding its true structure.

K: Are you saying, sir, that that mind has a relationship to the human mind the moment it's moving away from the limitations?

B: Yes, but in understanding those limitations it moves away.

K: Yes, moves away. Then that has a relationship.

B: Then it has a genuine relationship to what this other mind, to what this limited mind actually is, not to the illusions as to what it thinks it is.

K: Let's be clear.

B: Well, we have to get the words right - the mind which is not limited, right, which is not man-made, cannot be related to the illusions which are in the man-made mind.

K: No, agreed.

B: But it has to be related to as it were, to the source, to the real nature of the man-made mind, which is behind the illusion.

K: Which is, the man-made mind is based on what?

B: Well, on all these things we have said.

K: Yes, which is its nature.

B: Yes.

K: Therefore how can that have a relationship to this, even basically?

B: The only relationship is in understanding it, so that some communication would be possible, which might end, might communicate to the other person.

K: No, I'm questioning that.

B: Yes. Because you were saying that the mind that is not man-made may be related to the limited mind and not the other way round.

K: I even question that.

B: Yes, all right, you are changing that.

K: Yes. No, I'm just pushing it a little.

B: It may or may not be so, is that what you're saying, by questioning it.

K: Yes, I'm questioning it.

B: OK.

K: What is the relationship then of love to jealousy? It has nothing.

B: Not to jealousy itself, no, which is an illusion, but...

K: No.

B:... to the human being who is jealous, there may be.

K: I'm taking love and hatred - two words, love and hatred, love or hatred have no relationship to each other.

B: No, not really.

K: None, not really.

B: I think that one might understand the origin of hatred, you see.

K: Ah, it might - yes, yes.

B: In that sense I would think a relationship.

K: I see, you're using the word - I understand. You're saying,

love can understand the origin of hatred and how hatred arises and all the rest of it. Does love understand that?

B: Well, I think in some sense that it understands its origin in the man-made mind, you see, that having seen the man-made mind and all its structure and moved away...

K: Are we saying, sir, that love - we use that word for the moment - that love has relationship to non-love?

B: Only in the sense of dissolving it.

K: I'm not sure, I'm not sure, we must be awfully careful here. Or the ending of itself...

B: Which is it?

K: The ending of hatred, the other is, not the other has relationship to the understanding of hatred.

B: Yes, well, we have to ask how it gets started then, you see.

K: That's very simple.

B: No, but I mean, if, supposing we say we have hatred.

K: I have hatred. Suppose I have hatred. I can see the origin of it. Because you insulted me.

B: Well that's a superficial notion of the origin, I mean, why does one behave so irrationally is the deeper origin. You see, there's no real - if you merely say you've insulted me, and I say why should you respond to the insult.

K: Because all my conditioning is that.

B: Yes, that's what I mean by your understanding the origin of...

K: I understand that, but does love help me to understand the origin of hatred?

B: No, but I think that someone in hatred, moving, understanding this origin and moving away.

K: Moving away.

B: Yes.

K: Then the other is. The other cannot help the movement away.

B: No, but the question is, suppose one person, if you want to put it that way, one human being has this love and the other has not, and can the first one communicate something which will start the movement in the second one?

K: That means, A can influence B.

B: Not influence but simply I mean, one could raise the question for example, why should anybody be talking about any of this.

K: That's a different matter - that's a different matter. No, the question, sir, which is, is hate dispelled by love.

B: No, not that, no.

K: Or the understanding of hatred and the ending of it, the other is.

B: That's right, but now, if we say that here in A the other now is - right? A has reached that.

K: Yes.

B: The other is, love is for A and he sees B...

K: B has got the other.

B: Now we're saying, what is he going to do, you see, that's the question.

K: What is the relationship between the two?

B: That's the same question.

K: Same question, yes.

B: Say, what is he going to do is another way of putting it.

K: I think - just a minute, sir. I hate, another loves. My wife

loves and I hate. She can talk to me, she can point it out to me, the unreasonable and so on, but her love is not going to transform the source of my hatred.

B: That's clear, yes, except love is the energy which will be behind the talk.

K: Behind the talk, yes.

B: The love itself doesn't sort of go in there.

K: Of course - that's romantic and all that business. So the man who hates, the source of it, the cause of it, the movement of it, having an insight and ending it, has the other.

B: Yes, I think that, we say A is the man who has seen all this and he now has the energy to put it to B - it's up to B what happens.

K: Of course. I think we had better pursue this. It is now a quarter to one. It's over, the circus!

BROCKWOOD PARK 12TH CONVERSATION WITH DAVID BOHM 16TH SEPTEMBER 1980

Krishnamurti: This is a dialogue which we had in Ojai, California, there we had eight dialogues between Dr Bohm and myself, and two here, and one the day before yesterday. So may we continue with that dialogue. Should anybody join this or not at all? We're asking if anybody feels like joining this, unless it is very, very serious, would they join, or if they don't want to, it's all right. So it's a conversation between Dr Bohm and myself. Let's get on with it.

We were saying the other day, man, a human being, who has worked his way through all the problems of life, both physical and psychological, and has really grasped the full significance of freedom from psychological memories and conflicts and travails, he comes to a point where the mind finds itself free but hasn't gathered that supreme energy to go beyond itself. That's what we were discussing the other day. Can we start, go on from there?

Bohm: If you like, yes.

K: Right, sir?

B: Yes.

K: Can the mind really, mind, brain, the whole psychological structure, ever be free from all conflict, from all shadow of any disturbance?

B: Self-disturbance.

K: Self-disturbance, and all that. Can it ever be free? Or the idea of complete freedom is an illusion.

B: Yes, well, that's one possibility.

K: One possibility.

B: Yes. Then some people would say we could have partial freedom.

K: Yes, partial freedom. Or human condition is so determined by the past, by its own conditioning, it can never free itself from it, like some of those intellectual philosophers have stated this.

B: Well, some people feel that's the case.

K: And really the deep non-sectarian religious people, if there are, there must be some who are totally free from all organized religions and beliefs, rituals, dogmas - they have said it can be done. Very few have said this.

B: Well, of course there are those who have said it is done through reincarnation.

K: Yes.

B: And in addition, that group say it will take a very long time.

K: Yes, they say it will take a very long time. You must go through various lives and suffer and go through all kinds of miseries and ultimately you come to that. But we are not thinking in terms of time. We're asking, a human being granting, knowing that he is conditioned, deeply, profoundly, so that his whole being is that, can it ever free itself. And if it does, what is beyond? That's what we were coming to.

B: Right.

K: Would that question be reasonable or valid, unless the mind has really finished with it, finished all the travail of life? As we said, yesterday, the other day, our minds are man-made. And is there a mind which is not man-made? Right, sir? That's what we came to. How shall we find this out. We all know the man-made

mind, with its consciousness, with all its content and so on. Need we go through that?

B: No.

K: No.

B: We've done that already.

K: Already. It's a man-made mind. It is possible that it can free itself from its own man-made mechanical mind.

B: I think there's this kind of a tangle, a difficult thing to express there, which is, if this mind is totally man-made, totally conditioned, then in what sense can it get out of it? This is the kind of thing to say, if you said that it had at least the possibility of something beyond...

K: Then it becomes a reward, a temptation, a thing to be...

B: I think the question is, being able to put this consistently, logically, there seems to be inconsistency in saying that the mind is totally conditioned and yet it's going to get out. I mean, I'm not saying it is inconsistent but it may appear to be inconsistent.

K: I understand that question, but if you admit, if one admits that there is a part which is not conditioned, then we enter into quite another...

B: Yes, well, that's another inconsistency.

K: Yes, into another inconsistency. We, in our discussions, we've said, the mind being deeply conditioned, it can free itself through insight - that is the real clue to this. Would you agree to that?

B: Yes.

K: That insight we went into, what it is, the nature of it, and can that insight uncondition the mind completely, wipe away all the

illusions, all the desires and so on, can that insight completely wipe it out? Or is it partial?

B: Well, I think the first point is, if we say, mind is not static, when one says it's totally conditioned it suggests something static, which would never change.

K: Yes.

B: Now, if we say the mind is always in movement, then it seems in some way it becomes impossible to say what it is at this moment, we could say it has been totally conditioned.

K: No, let's say - suppose I'm totally conditioned, it's in movement, but the movement is within a border.

B: It's within a border, yes.

K: Within a certain field.

B: Yes.

K: And the field is very definitely marked out, it can expand it and contract, but the field is, the boundary is very, very limited, definite.

B: Yes. And also this whole, this whole structure can die away, you see if we try to move within that structure, then we stay in the same boundary.

K: Now, it is always moving within that limitation. Can it die away from that?

B: That's the point, that's another kind of movement, I mean, it's a kind of...

K: Yes.

B: In another dimension, I think you've said.

K: Yes. And we say it is possible through insight, which is, also a movement, a totally different kind of movement.

B: Yes, but then we say that movement does not originate in the individual, we said that.

K: Yes.

B: Nor in the general mind.

K: It is not - quite right, yes. That's what we discussed the other day. It is not an insight of a particular, or the general. We are then stating something quite outrageous.

B: Yes, I think that, looking at that, it rather violates most of the sort of logic that people have been using, that either the particular and the general should cover everything, in terms of ordinary logic.

K: Yes.

B: Now if you're saying there's something beyond both, this is already a question which has not been stated, at least. And I think it has a great importance.

K: How do we then state it, or how do we then come to it?

B: Yes, well, I've been noticing that I think people divide themselves roughly into two groups, one group feels the most important thing, the ground is the particular, concrete particular daily activity. The other group feels that the general, the universal is the ground.

K: Quite.

B: You see, the one is the more practical type, and the other the more philosophical type.

K: Yes.

B: And in general this division has been visible throughout history, also in everyday life, wherever you look.

K: But, sir, is the general - we can discuss a little bit - separate from the particular?

B: It's not, but I think most people agree with that, but the question is what is it that's going to be given primary value, people tend to give emphasis to one or the other. That some people give the main emphasis to the particular.

K: Or to the...

B: They say the general is there but if you take care of the particular the general will be all right.

K: Yes.

B: The others say the general is the main thing and the universal and getting that right you'll get the particular right.

K: Quite.

B: So there's been a kind of unbalance to one side or the other, a bias in the mind of man. Now what's being raised here is the notion, neither the general nor the particular.

K: That's right. That's just it. Can we discuss it or have a conversation about it logically? Using your expertise, your scientific brain and all the rest of it; and there is this man who is not all that, so can't we have a conversation to find out if the general and particular are the one, not divided at all.

B: Also that there's to be no bias to one or the other.

K: One or the other, quite. And not laying emphasis on one or the other. Then if we don't do that, then what is, what is there? I don't know if I'm...

B: Well, then we have no easy way to talk about it.

K: Yes.

B: But we did discuss I think in California the ground. The question was we could say the particular mind dies to the general universal mind or to the emptiness, then saying that ultimately the

emptiness and the universal die into the ground.

K: That's right, we discussed that.

B: I think that's the kind of lead in.

K: Would an ordinary person, fairly intelligent, agree to all this?

See all this?

B: I'm not sure.

K: Or would he say, 'What nonsense all this is.'

B: Well, if it were just thrown at him, he would reject it as nonsense - it would require very careful presentation and some people might see it, I think. But if you just say it to anybody...

K: Of course.

B:... they would say, whoever heard of that.

K: So where are we now? Wait. We are neither particular nor the general.

B: Yes.

K: That's a statement which hardly reasonably can be accepted.

B: Well, it can, it's reasonable in the sense that if you take thought to be a movement, rather than a content...

K: Thought to be a movement - quite, we agree to that.

B:... then the thought is the movement between the particular and the general.

K: But thought is the general, thought is the particular.

B: But thought is also the movement.

K: Yes.

B: So in the movement it goes beyond being one or the other, that is, in movement.

K: Does it?

B: Well, it can, I said that ordinarily it does not, because

ordinarily thought is caught on one side or the other.

K: That's the whole point, isn't it? Ordinarily the general and the particular are in the same area.

B: Yes, and either you fix on one or the other.

K: Yes, but in the same area, in the same field. And thought is the movement between the two.

B: Yes.

K: Or thought has created both.

B: Yes, it has created both and moves between.

K: Between and around it.

B: Around and in that area.

K: Yes, in that area. And it has been doing this for millennia.

B: Yes, and most people would feel that's all it could do.

K: All it can do. Now, we say, we are saying, that when thought ends, that movement which thought has created also comes to an end, therefore time comes to an end.

B: We should go more slowly here, because...

K: Sorry.

B:... you see it's a jump from thought to time, which we've gone into before but it's still a jump.

K: Right. Because first, sir, let's see. Thought has created the general and the particular, and thought is a movement that connects the two, thought moves round it, so it is still in the same area.

B: Yes, and doing that it has created time, which is part of the general and the particular, time is a particular time and also a general time.

K: General time.

B: All time, for ever. And sees that this particular time and the

whole of time.

K: Yes, but you see, thought is time.

B: Well that's another question, you were saying, thought is about, we were discussing thought has a content which is about time, and besides that we said thought is a movement which is time, that it could be said to be moving from the past into the future. Right?

K: But, sir, thought is based on time, thought is the outcome of time.

B: Yes, but then does that mean that time, that time exists beyond thought? If you say thought is based on time, then time is more fundamental than thought - is that what you want to say?

K: Yes.

B: So we have to go into that. You could say that time is something which was there before thought, or at least is at the origin of thought.

K: Time was there when there is the accumulation of knowledge.

B: Well, that has come out of thought to some extent.

K: No.

B: No.

K: No, I act and learn.

B: Yes.

K: Right? That action is based not on previous knowledge, but I do something, and in the doing I learn.

B: Yes, well then, that learning is registered in the memory.

K: In the memory and so on. So is not thought essentially the movement of time?

B: Well, we have to say in what sense is this learning the movement of time. You can say, when we learn it is registered. Right? And then that same learning operates in the next experience, what you have learned.

K: Yes. The past is always moving to the present.

B: Yes.

K: All the time.

B: Yes, and mixing, confusing with the present.

K: Yes,

B: And the two together are again registered as the next experience.

K: So are we saying, time is different from thought, or time is thought.

B: Yes, well, this movement of learning and the response of memory into experience and then re-registering, we say that is time, and that is also thought.

K: Yes, that is thought. Is there a time apart from thought?

B: Well, that's another question. Would we say that physically or in the cosmos that time has a significance apart from thought?

K: Physically, yes, I understand that.

B: Yes. Right. So then we're saying, in the mind or psychologically.

K: Psychologically, as long as there is psychological accumulation as knowledge, as the 'me' and so on, there is time.

B: Yes, well we say...

K: It is based on time.

B:... wherever there is accumulation there is time.

K: Yes, that's the point. Wherever there is accumulation there is

time.

B: Which turns the thing around because usually you say time is first and then time you accumulate.

K: No, I would put it round the other way, personally.

B: Yes. But it's important to see that it's put the other way. Then we'd say suppose there is no accumulation, then what?

K: Then - that's the whole point - there is no time. And as long as I am accumulating, gathering, becoming, there is the process of time. But if there is no gathering, no becoming, no accumulation, where does psychological time exist?

B: Yes. Well, probably you could say even physical time must depend on some kind of physical accumulation.

K: Of course, that's quite a different matter.

B: That we are not denying - we're denying the significance of the psychological accumulation.

K: That's right. So thought is the outcome of psychological accumulation, and that accumulation, that gathering, gives it a sense of continuity, which is time.

B: Well, it seems it's in movement, that whatever has been accumulated is responding to the present, with the projection of the future...

K: Of course.

B:... and then that is again registered. Now the accumulation of all that's registered is in the order of time, I mean, one time, the next time and all that.

K: That's right. So we're saying, thought is time.

B: Yes, or time is thought.

K: Or, one way or the other.

B: But the movement of time is thought.

K: Movement of time...

B: Psychological time.

K: Movement - what are you saying, sir?

B: Movement of psychological time, which is that accumulation.

K: Is time.

B: That's time but that's also thought. Right - that the two mean the same thing

K: So psychological accumulation is thought and time.

B: Yes, we're saying that we happen to have two words when really we only need one.

K: One word. That's right.

B: But because we have two words we look for two things.

K: Yes. There is only one movement, which is time and thought, time plus thought, or time/thought. Now can the mind which has moved for millennia in that area, all the time, free itself from that?

B: Yes, now why is the mind bound up? Let's see exactly what's holding the mind.

K: Accumulation.

B: Yes, but I meant that's going in a circle. Why does the mind continue to accumulate?

K: I think that is fairly clear because in accumulation there is safety, there is security - apparent security.

B: I think that needs a little discussion - you see, in a certain area that is even true, that the accumulation of physical food may provide a certain kind of security.

K: Of course.

B: And then since no distinction was made between the outer and the inner, there was the feeling that one could accumulate inwardly either experiences or some knowledge of what to do.

K: Are we saying the outward necessity of physical accumulation for security is necessary?

B: Yes.

K: And that same movement, same idea, same urge moves into the field of the psychological.

B: Yes.

K: There you accumulate hoping to be secure.

B: Yes, inwardly hoping to accumulate present memories, or...

K: Yes, all that.

B:... relationships, or...

K: Yes.

B:... things you could count on, principles you could count on.

K: So accumulation, psychological accumulation is safety, protection, security.

B: The illusion, anyway.

K: All right, the illusion of security and in this illusion it has lived.

B: Yes, so it does seem that the first mistake was that man never understood the distinction between what he has to do outside and what he has to do inside, right?

K: Yes, we said that. It is the same movement, outer and inner.

B: But now man carried the movement, that procedure which was right outwardly he carried inwardly, without knowing, perhaps entirely ignorant, not knowing that that would make trouble.

K: So where am I now - where are we now? I, a human being, realizes all this, has come to the point when he says, 'Can I really be free from this accumulated security and thought and time, psychological time?' Right?

B: Yes.

K: Is that possible?

B: Well, if we say that it had this origin, then it should be possible to dismantle it, if it were built into us, nothing could be done.

K: Of course not, it is not built into us.

B: Most people act as though they believe it was.

K: Of course, that's absurd.

B: If it's not built into us, then the possibility exists for us to change. Because in some way we said it was built up in the first place through time.

K: If we say it is built in, then we are in a hopeless state.

B: Yes, and I think that's one of the difficulties of people who use evolution, they are hoping by bringing in evolution they hope to get out of this static boundary.

K: Boundary, quite.

B: But they don't realize the evolution is the same thing, that it's even worse, it's the very means by which the trap was made.

K: Yes. So I have come to that point, as a human being, I realize all this, I'm fully aware of the nature of this, and my next question is: can this mind move on from this field altogether, and enter, perhaps, into a totally different dimension? And we said, the means, the way - it can only happen when there is insight - that we've been through.

B: Yes, and it seems that insight arises when one questions this whole thing very deeply.

K: The whole thing - yes.

B: One sees it doesn't make sense.

K: Now having had insight into this and seen its limitation and therefore go beyond it, what is there beyond? This we talked about a little bit, not only at Ojai, also here.

B: Yes. I think we felt that, you know, it's very difficult to even bring this into words, but I think we said something has to be done on this line, right?

K: Yes. I think it has to be put into words.

B: Could you say why because many people might feel we should leave this entirely non-verbal.

K: Can we say, the word is not the thing.

B: That's clear, yes.

K: Whatever the description is not the real, is not the truth, however much you embellish or diminish it, just the word is not that, recognising that, then what is there beyond all this. Can my mind be so desire-less, so it won't create an illusion, something beyond?

B: Yes, well, then that's a question of desire, you see desire must be in this time process.

K: Of course, desire is time.

B: Yes, now that is a thing we might try - since there are very subtle forms of desire, as well as the obvious forms...

K: Sir, after all, desire, being, becoming is based on desire.

B: Yes. They are one and the same, really.

K: Yes, one and the same. Now, when one has an insight - I

hate to use that word over and over again - into that whole movement of desire, and its capacity to create illusion, it's finished.

B: Yes, but you see I think we should perhaps, since this is a very crucial point, we should try to say a little more about desire, how it's intrinsic in this accumulating process, how it comes out in many ways. For one thing you could say that as you accumulate there comes a sense of something missing.

K: Of course.

B: I mean, you feel you should have more, something to finish, complete it, right. Whatever you have accumulated is not complete.

K: So, could we go into the question of becoming first, then desire comes into it. Why is it that all human beings right through the world have this urge to become?

B: Well, I...

K: Outwardly understand that, simple enough.

B: Well, we have to become stronger and stronger.

K: Physically develop your muscle and...

B: Yes, your language, your logic.

K: And all that, and so, a better job, more comfort and so on.

But why is there this need in the human mind of trying to become enlightened - let's use that word for the moment - trying to become more good, more or better.

B: Well, there must be a sense of dissatisfaction with what's in there already, that's one thing.

K: Is it dissatisfaction?

B: Well, you know, a person feels he would like it to be complete. You see suppose for example he has accumulated memories of pleasure, but these memories are no longer adequate...

K: Adequate.

B:... and he feels something more is needed.

K: Is that it?

B: Well, to get more, that's one of the questions - eventually he feels that he must have the whole, the ultimate.

K: I'm not at all sure whether the word 'more' is not the real thorn.

B: The word 'more'?

K: Yes, more. More, I will be more, I will have more, I will become - you follow? - this whole movement of moving forward, moving, gaining, comparing, advancing, achieving - psychologically.

B: The word 'more' is just implicit in the whole meaning of the word 'accumulate'.

K: Of course.

B: So if you're accumulating you have to be accumulating more, there's no other way to do it.

K: So why is there this seed in the human mind.

B: Well, he didn't see that this more is wrong, inwardly. Right? Now if he started outwardly to use the term 'more', but then he carried it inward, now for some reason he didn't see how destructive it was.

K: Why? Why have fairly intelligent philosophers and religious people who have spent a great part of their life in achieving, you know - why haven't they seen this very simple thing, the great intellectuals and the so-called evolutionary concept and so on, why haven't they seen this simple fact that where there is accumulation there must be more.

B: Yes, well, they've seen that but they don't see any harm in it.

K: Wait, no, I'm not sure they see it.

B: They've seen, they are trying to get more, so they're saying, we are trying to get a better life - you see. During the nineteenth century it was the century of progress...

K: Progress, I understand.

B:... improving all the time.

K: All right, progress outwardly.

B: But they felt inwardly too that man would be improving himself inwardly.

K: But why haven't they ever questioned this?

B: Well, what would make them question it?

K: Obviously this constant struggle for the more.

B: But they thought that was necessary for progress.

K: But is that progress?

B: Well, can we make it clear, suppose you had to answer one of the nineteenth century optimists, that man is progressing all the time, to be better inwardly as well as outwardly.

K: Yes, let us admit outwardly.

B: Yes, he could do that.

K: Outwardly. Is that same outward urge to be better moved into the psychological realm?

B: Yes. Now, can we make it clear why it does harm in the psychological realm.

K: The harm is - wait a minute, let's think it out - the harm. What is the harm in accumulating, psychologically? Oh yes, it divides.

B: What does it divide, then?

K: The very nature of accumulation brings about a division between you and me, and so on.

B: Could we make that clear, because it is a crucial point. I mean, I can see one thing, that suppose you are accumulating in your way and I accumulate in my way.

K: That's just it. And he, she, accumulates in another way.

B: And then we try to impose a common way of accumulating and...

K: Which is impossible, that never takes place.

B:... that's conflict. They say everybody should be more...

K: Yes. I have accumulated psychologically as a Hindu. Right?

B: Yes.

K: Another has accumulated as a Muslim.

B: There are thousands of divisions.

K: Thousands of divisions.

B: Because you could say in one profession or in another.

K: Thousands of divisions.

B: In one place or another.

K: Therefore accumulation in its very nature divides people.

B: Because each accumulates...

K: And therefore conflict.

B: Each person accumulates in his particular way. Right?

Which is different from someone else, you cannot make a common way of accumulating.

K: Can't we? So let's all accumulate.

B: Well, it doesn't work. Because everybody already has a different...

K: Of course.

B:... relationship, no matter what we do.

K: So can we say then, in accumulation man has sought psychological security, and that security with its accumulation is the factor of human division.

B: Yes.

K: Psychologically.

B: Yes, any attempt to accumulate will divide. I think, even that at present some sociologist, like Carl Marx has said that it was this accumulation of capital by some people which divided them from other people, that started tremendous conflict.

K: So, we said that's why human beings have accumulated, not realizing its consequences. And realizing that, is it possible not to accumulate?

B: Yes.

K: I mean, that's tremendous.

B: Yes, because it seems the human mind automatically accumulates.

K: I know. Why? For the very clear and simple reason, in accumulation, as outwardly, it feels safe, secure.

B: Yes. Well perhaps you could say that having got on into this trap it was very hard for the mind to get out, because it was already occupied, the mind was filled with this process of accumulation and...

K: Yes.

B:... it becomes very hard to see anything.

K: Yes, suppose my mind is filled with this process of occupation, which is psychological knowledge, all that, can it end?

B: Yes.

K: Of course it can.

B: But if the mind will get to the root of it.

K: Of course it can, which is that it is an illusion that in accumulation there is security.

B: Well, now, one can see this at a certain level, let's say, one discusses this, I don't, intellectually, but I would prefer to say as a map, that one has drawn a map of this whole process. Then the question is, when you have a map you must now be able to look at the country.

K: Yes.

B: See what's on the map, right.

K: Yes. When you are looking at the map you don't see the country.

B: No, the map may be useful but it's not quite enough. Right?

K: Quite.

B: But now we are saying, that desire is what keeps people going on with it.

K: Not only desire but this deep-rooted instinct to accumulate.

B: Like the squirrel.

K: What? Like the squirrel, yes. For the future, for safety. That and desire go together. Right?

B: Well, it builds up into intense desire.

K: Of course. So desire plus accumulation is the factor of division, conflict and all the rest of it.

B: You can say desire really, really the word means need, a person feels he must accumulate more because he needs more.

K: Needs, yes. Now, I'm asking, can that end. If it ends through an action of will, it is still the same thing.

B: Well, that's part of desire.

K: Of course. If it ends because of punishment or reward, it's still the same thing. So the mind, one's mind sees this and puts all that aside. Right? But does the mind become free of accumulation?

B: Yes, I think that...

K: Yes sir, I think it can, with us. That is, have no psychological knowledge at all, knowledge is accumulation, and so on and so on.

B: Yes, I think that we have to consider that knowledge goes very much further than is ordinarily meant.

K: Of course.

B: Not just...

K: Book knowledge.

B:... book knowledge or...

K: Experience - of course.

B: But, I think that in accumulating, for example if you're getting knowledge of this microphone, then you build up an image, a picture of the microphone and everything goes into that and one expects it to continue. Right?

K: Of course.

B: So if you have knowledge of yourself, it builds up a picture of yourself.

K: Can one have knowledge of oneself?

B: No, but if you think you have, I mean, if one thinks that there is knowledge about what sort of person you are, that builds up into a picture, with the expectation.

K: But after all, if you have knowledge of yourself, you have built an image already.

B: That's right, yes, but that's the same, the tendency is to say

that there's a transfer of what you do with the outside, saying, as you observe this microphone you build up knowledge, that enters into your picture of it, your perception of it, then you say I do the same with myself. That I know the sort of person I should be or I am and it builds up, there's a lot of accumulation that builds up in forms that we don't ordinarily call knowledge, for example, preferences...

K: Yes, I understand.

B:... likes and dislikes.

K: But once you realize psychological accumulation as knowledge is an illusion and destructive and causes infinite pain and misery, when you see, it's finished.

B: I was trying to say that, when you say that, then the question is very often the word knowledge does not convey all that has to be included.

K: Of course.

B: I could say, OK, I know certain things in knowledge and it's foolish to have that kind of knowledge about myself, but then there may be other kinds of knowledge which I don't recognise as knowledge, I say that's...

K: What kind, what other kinds of knowledge does one have? ` preferences, like and dislike.

B: Yes.

K: Prejudice.

B: Habits, yes.

K: Habit. All that is in the image that one has created.

B: Yes. Now, man has developed in such a way that that image seems extraordinarily real.

K: Yes.

B: And therefore its qualities don't seem to be knowledge.

K: All right, sir. So we have said, accumulation is time and accumulation is security, and where there is psychological accumulation there must be division. And thought is the movement between the particular and the general, and thought is also born out of the image of what has been accumulated.

B: Yes.

K: Right? All that is one's inward state. That is deeply imbedded in me.

B: Yes, physically and mentally.

K: All round. I recognize physically it is necessary, somewhat.

B: Yes, but it is overdone physically.

K: Of course, one can overdo anything. But psychologically to realize that, how do I set about it? How do I, who has accumulated, accumulated for millennia, general and particular, that has been the habit, and how do I, not only recognize the habit, and when I do recognize the habit, how does that movement come to an end? That is the real question.

B: Yes.

K: Where does intelligence play a part in all this? You follow what I mean?

B: Yes. Well, there has to be intelligence to see this.

K: Is it intelligence? Is it so-called ordinary intelligence, or some other intelligence, something entirely different?

B: Well, yes, I don't know what people mean by intelligence, but if they mean just merely the capacity to...

K: To discern, to distinguish.

B: And all that, yes.

K: To solve technical problems, economic problems and so on. I wouldn't call that - I would call that partial intelligence because it is not really.

B: Yes, call that skill in thought.

K: Skill in thought, all right, skill in thought. But intelligence - now wait a minute, that's what I'm trying to find out. I realize this, accumulation, division, security, the general and particular, thought. I can see the reason of all that, the logic of all that. But logic, reason and explanation doesn't end the thing. Another quality is necessary. Is that quality intelligence? I'm trying to move away from insight for a while.

B: Yes, not to repeat the word. Not to repeat the word so much.

K: Too much. Is intelligence associated with thought?

B: We don't know what we mean by the word 'associate'.

K: Is it related, is it part of thought, is it the outcome of very clear precise, exact, logical, conclusions of thought.

B: That would still be more and more skill.

K: Skill, I agree. Yes.

B: Yes, but you have to say intelligence, at least we suggest the intelligence is a different quality.

K: Yes. Is that intelligence related to love?

B: I'd say they go together.

K: Yes, I'm just moving, slowly to that. You see, I've come to - I realize all that we have discussed this morning, and I've come to a blank wall, solid wall, I can't go beyond. And in observing, looking, fishing around, I come upon this word 'intelligence'. And I see the so-called intelligence of thought, skill and all that, is not

intelligence. So I'm asking further, is this intelligence associated or related, or part of love? You cannot - one cannot accumulate love. Right?

B: No, people might try.

K: It sounds silly!

B: People do try to guarantee love.

K: That is all romantic nonsense, cinema stuff, all that. You cannot accumulate love, you cannot associate it with hate, all that. So it's something entirely different, that love. And has that love intelligence? Which then operates - you follow? - which then breaks down the wall. I don't know if I'm...

B: Yes.

K: All right, sir - let's begin again. I don't know what the love is. I know all the physical bit, all that, that I realize, pleasure, desire, accumulation, remembrance, pictures, is not love. All that, I realized long ago. But I've come to the point where this wall is so enormous that I can't even jump over it. So I'm now fishing around to see if there is a different movement which is not a man-made movement. And that movement may be love. I'm sorry to use that word, but we'll use it for the time being, because that word has been so spoilt and misused.

B: Yes, you are saying there is a movement, you see, not just a feeling?

K: No.

B: It may involve feeling, but it's not feeling.

K: So is that love, with its intelligence, is that the factor that will break down or dissolve or break up this wall? Not, I love you, or you love me. Right? It's not personal or particular, it's not

general or particular, it is something beyond. Right?

B: Yes, that's a point that of course, it's hard, you know, that has never been part of the background, a man tends to make love particularized, a particular thing or individual, but...

K: I think when one loves with that intelligence it covers the whole, it's not the particular or general - it is that, it's light, it's not particular light. All right. Then if that is the factor that'll break down the wall which is in front of me, then I don't know that love. As a human being, having reached a certain point, I can't go beyond it to find that love - what shall I do? What is - not do or not do - but what is the state of my mind when I realize any movement this side of the wall is still strengthening the wall? Right? So I realize that, through meditation or whatever you do, there is no movement, but the mind can't go beyond it.

But you come along and say, 'Look, that wall can be dissolved, broken down, if you have that quality of love with intelligence.' And I say, 'Excellent, but I don't know what it is.' What shall I do? I can't do anything, I realize that. Whatever I do is still within this side of the wall. Right?

So am I in despair? Obviously not, because if I am in despair or depressed, I'm still moving in the same field. So all that has stopped. Realizing that I cannot possibly do anything, any movement, what takes place in my mind? You follow, sir, what I'm asking? Is that right? I think that's fairly logical. I realize I cannot do a thing. Right? So what has happened to the quality of my mind, which has always moved either to accumulate, to become, all that has stopped. The moment I realize this, no movement. Right? Is that possible? Or am I living an illusion? Or have I really gone

through all this to come to that point. Or I suddenly say, I must be quiet. I don't know if I am conveying it.

B: Yes, I understand, that's part of the same process.

K: Same process.

B: To project from the past.

K: So has my mind - is there in my mind a revolution?

Revolution in the sense that movement has completely stopped.

And if it has, is love something beyond the wall?

B: Well, it wouldn't mean anything.

K: Of course, it couldn't be.

B: The wall itself is the product of the process which is illusion.

K: Exactly, I realize - you follow? - I'm realizing the wall is this movement. So when this movement ends, that quality of intelligence, love and so on, is there. That's the whole point.

B: Yes, could one say the movement ends, the movement sees that it has no point.

K: It is like, it is so-called skilful, skill to see a danger.

B: Well, it could be.

K: Yes. Any danger demands a certain amount of awareness.

B: Yes.

K: But I have never realized as a human being, the accumulated process is a tremendous danger.

B: Yes, because that seems to be the essence of security.

K: Of course, and all the rest of it. You come along and point it out to me, and I'm listening to you very carefully and I see, and I actually perceive the danger of that. And perception is part of love, isn't it?

B: Yes.

K: I'm getting at it.

B: But, you're suggesting that love is a kind of energy which is not specific or general and that it may momentarily envelop certain things.

K: So perception without any motive, without any direction, etc., perception of the wall which has been brought into being by this movement of accumulation, the very perception of that is intelligence and love. Right? We'd better stop - it's half past twelve.

B: Right.

K: Shall we go on?

B: How do you feel? Maybe it's best to stop.

K: Best - no, better stop. When do we meet again?

B: It's on Thursday, in two days.

K: Thursday. Right, sir.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 27TH DECEMBER 1980

I suppose I have to talk. If one may I would like to point out that it is not an entertainment, nor is it an intellectual appreciation and the capacity to argue opinion against another opinion, or counter one conclusion against another. We are not trying to find what is truth through dialectical methods, but rather together, you and the speaker, investigate, explore cautiously, without any bias, without any opposition, neither agreeing nor disagreeing, but together, you and the speaker, go into the human problem.

It is becoming more and more obvious that human beings throughout the world are gradually deteriorating, degenerating, becoming more and more corrupt through seeking power, position, money and not caring at all for another. It is becoming more and more clear. And as the speaker has come to this country for the last sixty, or fifty years, every winter, he sees there is a rapid decline in this part of the world, old India. And it does not indicate when you talk about this particular part of the country that this problem does not exist in other countries. Please do not say, does not corruption exist in other countries. That's an avoidance of facing the facts. And how can we, as human beings, living in this country, save this country, salvage it? Not only morally, ethically, aesthetically but religiously. The human mind in this country, as well as in other countries, is becoming more and more mechanical, repetitive, accepting things as they are, or trying to save their own particular corner on this earth. And if one is to salvage this country, save it, rescue it, it does not lie in the hands of politicians, nor in the hands

of the scientists, nor with the economists, and certainly not with the gurus.

And if we are to investigate together the salvage of this country, knowing that the speaker is not a nationalist, nor adheres to any particular belief, ideal, faith, organized religion, bearing that in mind, what is one to do? As most of the people here in this audience are Indians, what is one to do? What are you going to do? What's your responsibility, knowing that there is corruption, and apparently this corruption has become the way of life. The country apparently is falling apart, each one struggling for himself, each one more or less both outwardly and inwardly corrupt, how is one, if you are facing the problem, as one should, how are we human beings going to save this particular part of the country, salvage it? Are there a group of people who are absolutely incorruptible, absolutely have integrity, incorruptibility and integrity, not say one thing and do another, believe in some kind of ideal, some kind of belief, worship an image, and then be utterly selfish in other directions? To bring about a salvage of this country there must be some people who have this sense of deep integrity, and absolutely incorruptible. Is that possible? This is not only in this part of the world, but also in every country this is going on, each one for himself. This has been going on throughout history, since man probably began, that we are operating from the centre of the self, the 'me' first, and so each one is fighting the other, convincing the other of his own particular point of view, and so on. And religiously also; going to the temple, or the mosque, or the church, has lost all its meaning. Fear has made us go to the temples, not love. One wonders whether in this part of the world love exists at

all. Or are we all ruled by the intellect? - the intellect being the capacity to think, to discern, to choose, to distinguish. And when intellect becomes far more important than love, as is happening throughout the world, there must be inevitably not only physical destruction like war, but also there must be deterioration of morality, ethics, and a way of living that is essentially worthwhile, significant.

Now, having stated that, what is our responsibility? Most religions, as one observes, have tried to find salvation for the individual: the individual soul, the individuality, the individual freedom, the individual enterprise and so on and so on. Individuality has been emphasized, and what we are saying is not the salvation of the individual. There is no redemption for the individual.

I will explain very carefully every statement that is made. So please throughout these talks bear that fact in mind, that there is no salvation for the person, for the individual, for the you. There is only the mind, the humanity, of which we are. We are the representative of all human beings. And if one is merely concerned with one's own particular salvation then that salvation is the furtherance of selfishness.

So bearing this in mind throughout the talks, we have to examine why human beings have become what we are. Please, as the speaker said, we are examining it together, you are not merely listening to a talk, to a sermon, to a lecture. We are together examining why we human beings, wherever we live, have come to this state where we have become corrupt, mechanical, without any sense of integrity, why, what is the cause? We all want to do

something when we face a crisis like this, psychological crisis as well as physical crisis, it is becoming more and more dangerous to live in this world, more and more frightening. You must have noticed all this. And why is it, what is the cause, or many causes, that have reduced man, that is you, to the present state? We know what is happening in the world: poverty, overpopulation, bad governments, relying on specialists, and so on. There is a great deal of confusion, from the very top to the very lower strata of society. And when one observes all this, what is the cause of it?

Before asking what shall we do, what action shall we take, we must first examine the causes. When we understand the causes, from that action takes place. But most of us are so eager to act, to do something about this mess, and we join groups, become social reformers, join the communist party, or the socialist party, or whatever party politically you belong - left, right, centre and so on. We are all concerned with action: feed the poor, help the lower strata of society and so on. Surely, we are not denying that, but before we act we must find out for ourselves what is the cause of all this mess that we human beings live in? Why has man become so selfish, so corrupt, has no sense of integrity? And why there is no love at all.

That is, we say, let's first before we take action find out for ourselves what are the causes, or only the single cause, that has produced the present world crisis, not only in the family but also in the community, in the nation, one nation against another, wars, and all the rest of the chaos that goes on around us. So please you are not merely listening to the talk, to the speaker, you are, both of us are exercising our brains because we are all responsible for the

present state; not the governments, not the economists, not the gurus, but we as human beings living wherever we are. Why is it that we are becoming more and more self-centred, more and more dishonest, more and more superstitious, so frightened of this world. This is a beautiful earth, it is our earth, we are meant to live on it happily with a sense of affection, care, love, and apparently all that doesn't exist.

So can we ask ourselves, what is the cause of all this. Is it our religion, which is invented by man? Is it our ideals, again projected by thought, by man? Is it our self-centred activity? Is it that we have given tremendous importance to thought, to the intellect? Why is there national division, religious divisions, more and more there is a breaking up of human beings, all that we know? You know all this, probably if you have thought about it at all. So what shall we, not only act, but together find out what is the cause of this human misery. Are you waiting for an answer from the speaker? If he does answer, or explain the causes, or the cause, then there will be arguments. There will be opposing explanations, each according to his own particular experience, according to his own particular knowledge, his prejudice, his conclusions, and so on. So what shall we do? You understand my question? There is, and there must be a cause for all this, or causes. How do you approach the problem? How do you regard the problem? Or how do you receive the problem that there is no love in this country? The love of a tree, love of a rock, love of a man, love of a woman, it doesn't exist. When you are asked, why doesn't it exist, you are totally unaware of this word even.

So how do you, as a human being, living in this country, with

all the things that are happening here, how do you find out the cause of all this? How do you, or how does one examine a problem? A problem being, for the moment, why love doesn't exist in your heart. Love being care, concern, responsibility, and that sense of great beauty that goes with love. Why is it that it doesn't exist? That's perhaps the major problem. And how do you approach it? Do you love anybody? Do you love your wife? Do you love the earth? The wandering beggar? Love is different from devotion. When you are devoted to some god, to some temples, to some ideals, to some country, behind that there is a motive, which is an exchange, I give you this and you return me that. That's why you go to the temples. Or you go to your gurus. It is an exchange. Love has no motive. It doesn't ask anything. When we are asking, that may be the major problem that we are facing in this world. And why is it that human beings have not that perfume, that quality, that blessedness?

Now if that is the major cause, then how will you approach the problem? The problem being why you, as a human being living in this marvellous world, on this beautiful earth, why this quality, this sense of love, compassion, care, deep affection, why is it that human beings have not that? After having put that question, how do you regard it? Do you say, 'Yes, we do love our family'? Do you actually? Please sirs, go along with me, let's go together, take the journey together, to find out. Because you see without that one quality, do what you will, have marvellous governments - and there can be no marvellous governments ever - you can have great statesman, you can have all your economic problems solved, but without that, our life becomes empty, shallow.

Is love to be cultivated? As you cultivate a plant, or cultivate knowledge, is it to be cultivated? Or does it only exist without any sense of the activity of thought, when there is no self, when there is utter denial of selfishness? So is that the reason why human beings throughout the world are becoming more and more selfish, more and more self-centred, more and more this sense of individual achievement, individual salvation? When that is emphasized selfishness becomes all important, rationalized, intellectually accepting the necessity of it, and unconsciously, deeply, never being free from it, is that the reason why human beings have become what we are?

So what is your responsibility? How can we salvage this country? Can there be a group of people who are absolutely incorruptible? Corruption is not merely at the superficial level, passing money under the table. That's a very small affair. But corruption is much deeper, corruption is in the mind, corruption is the exercise of thought for his own benefit. Corruption is when there is contradiction in the very psyche, when there is conflict and that conflict is continued for any length of time it breeds corruption. When thought is attached to a particular idea, experience, to a particular nation, to a particular belief, dogma, such attachment must inevitably breed corruption. And why is it that we have no sense of integrity? The word integrity means being whole, integral. And when we observe, we are broken up human beings, fragmented, violent and yet trying to seek peace, greedy and having its opposite, so we are always in conflict. That is corruption. That indicates the lack of integrity, dishonesty.

So what shall we, as human beings, seeing perhaps the basic

cause of our degeneration, from there, what shall we do? You understand my question? It is this: that having found a cause, or many causes - many causes being this utter disregard for another, the total concern with oneself, which identifies itself with the nation, with the family, with the gods you believe in - it is all the movement of the egotistic action. And that may be one of the causes of this present misery. Realizing that, what is our action? - not only as a human being living in this part of the world but every human being is representative of all other human beings. I do not know if you have gone into that. Your brain is not your brain. That brain has evolved through time, millions and millions of years, and when you regard it as your particular brain you have reduced this enormous capacity of its energy to a very small point. And when you regard yourself as an individual, free to choose, free to do what he likes, are you actually an individual? Or are you the result of your culture, of your tradition, of your superstition, of all the books that you have read, or not read? Are you actually a total integrated human being, undivided, indivisible, not broken up? It is only such a person is an individual.

So having listened to all this, what's your action? How are you, living in this country, going to salvage this country? Or are you allowing, going to let this country go to pieces? It is breaking up, as individuals, as human beings are breaking up.

There is another factor too that is coming into the world: our brains are programmed, like the computer. You are Hindus, Buddhists, Catholics, whatever it is. That is, your brain is programmed, conditioned by constant repetition, tradition, knowledge, which is what the computer is. And the computer with

the robot is going to take over the world. This is coming. All the labour, which man has gone into, factories will be run by computers and so on and so on. And what is man to do then? You understand my question? It is going to come. It is happening already.

So you have this problem: not only the salvaging of this country, which is your responsibility totally. You are totally responsible for yourself. If you are corrupt your government, your country, everything is corrupt. If you have no sense of integrity whatever you do will be destructive. That is one problem.

The other is, you are going to have a great deal of leisure, perhaps not within a few years, now, perhaps in about twenty years you will have a great deal of leisure, and what are you going to do with it? You understand? These are the problems that you have to face. Not find an answer. Problems exist only when you are trying to find an answer. You understand this? But when you examine the problem itself with all its complexity, in that problem is the answer, not away from it.

So our minds - the mind is different from the brain. I don't know if you are interested in all this. As a human being you must be. The brain has evolved through time. Time has been the central factor of the activity of the brain: time to learn, time to acquire knowledge, time to learn a skill, time to learn a language and so on, to drive a car. So time is the central factor of the brain. And mind is totally different from the brain. Mind is the whole movement, which is not involved in time. This requires - you are not used to all this. This is where meditation comes in, which we will talk about another day.

Whatever knowledge man has acquired, stored in the brain, and

from that knowledge thought arises, so it is part of our daily activity. So thought is time. And all our outlook is within the field of time. That is, I will be, I must, if I am greedy, I will not be greedy, violent, if one is violent you will take time to be not violent and so on and so on. So our whole movement of thought is based on time. So the structure of the psyche, psychological structure, is also based on time. As long as we do not understand the nature of time, the mind then becomes part of time. Is this all Greek? Probably it is. But it doesn't matter.

So, sirs, and ladies, what is our responsibility in saving this country? It is your responsibility, yours alone and nobody else's - not the government's, not the scientists', not the economists', not the environmentalists', the social workers', nobody. You are the only responsible person. Therefore it matters very much that we not only feel it, but undertake this responsibility so that from that responsibility one begins to have care. Responsibility is not duty. Duty is an ugly word. Responsibility has great significance. You are responsible for your family, for your child, for your neighbour. And when that responsibility is given over to another, to your guru, to your politician, to the specialist, then you become merely a robot. And that's what we have done, we have handed ourselves over to all the authorities that exist in the world. We have become incapable of thinking for ourselves, looking at facts as they are. The fact that you do not love, that's a fact. And to live with that fact, to realize how without it one becomes brutal, careless. And when you live with that fact that you do not love, realize what happens to your mind and your whole being, to realize it not as an idea but as an actual daily fact, then your whole approach to life is

totally different. You become sensitive, you become alive, you become passionate to change that which is not true.

So if you find the cause of this catastrophe in this country, finding the cause you have to act; that is, to remove the cause. And to remove the cause is to observe the cause, not try to change the cause. If I am corrupt, I observe what that corruption is. As I pointed out, there is corruption when there is attachment, whether it is to your family, to your belief, to your profession, to a particular dogma, belief, inevitably corruption takes place. Haven't you noticed this? If I am attached to a belief, I am attached to it because I find satisfaction, security in that belief, that belief may be illusion, but I am attached to it. So that attachment separates me from another who believes in another, who has his own particular attachment, so there is conflict between us. If you are attached to your wife or your husband, what takes place? You are anxious, you are frightened, you are jealous. And the more you are attached, the more the agony becomes.

So where there is attachment there must be corruption. That is a fact, that is the truth. Now what will you do with it? Or will you find lots of explanations, or rationalize and say, 'Yes, I accept that, but we have to live in this world'? So such a mind is a corrupt mind. So the responsibility is yours, to be absolutely incorruptible. And to have such integrity is like a rock. Have you ever watched a river flowing, in the midst of it there is a great boulder, and the great volume of water cannot push it aside, it is stable, immovable, and the water goes round it. Our minds, our lives have to be like that to bring about the salvage of this country, which means the salvage of human beings.

Right sirs.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 28TH DECEMBER 1980

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday?
Perhaps if what was said briefly could be repeated, I hope you don't mind.

We were considering together the decline of man, morally, aesthetically and in the real sense, religious sacredness. We were considering together what has happened to man: his decline, his degeneration which is expressed in violence, in self-centred activity, in perhaps total selfishness, and throughout the world there is a great deal of corruption not only at the high level but everywhere, and specially in this country where bribery, corruption of every kind is going on. Observing this country, as the speaker has done for the last sixty years or so, the degeneration is rather rapid, and we seem to be totally indifferent to what is happening, or we don't know what to do. And if we do know what to do, we either join some party, left, right, centre, hoping thereby to resolve the appalling condition, the mess, the disorder, the total lack of care.

We said before we take action we should consider what is the cause of all this misery, this living in illusion in which there is such contradiction, in our private life as well as public life. There may be many causes, or one cause - we went into that somewhat, perhaps briefly, but it is evident that throughout the world this sense of love, this sense of care, the feeling for another has come to an end. When you do feel for another it is so superficial. And pleasure in the form of sex, money, power, status has become all

important.

And does the cause of this decline, does it rest on each individual? We said there is no such thing as an individual. We explained very carefully that our mind, which is the source of our thought, has created the idea that you are separate from another. You may be separate in colour, in height, and so on, linguistically, culturally, but are we individuals at all. Or are we the result of a great many influences, economic, social, political, religious, climatic and so on, these influences have created the idea that you are an individual separate from another. And this idea has been encouraged throughout the religions: personal salvation, personal achievement both externally and inwardly, this emphasis on the individual which is utterly false for there is no individuality. We are the mixture of so many influences, cultures, traditions. Individuality means that state of mind which is whole, unbroken. And we are not that. We are broken up entities.

And we said that if you have come here with the understanding that you are going to be personally salvaged, or personally seek enlightenment, I am afraid you will be disappointed. You cannot seek enlightenment. There is no practice, no system, no effort which will bring about enlightenment. It requires a mind that is beyond time, a mind that is free of all knowledge, that is free from all experience. And that sense of wholeness cannot be come by through any combination of thought.

So we were saying yesterday, as there is corruption in this world, lack of integrity, and we human beings have created this society in which we live, we have created it: our fathers, grandfathers, past generation upon generation and we are the result

of all that. And we are contributing to this corruption. And to blame society seems to be rather absurd, there is no society. Please we are talking over together, we are not arguing, we are not exercising one opinion against another, one conclusion against another, but rather intelligently, sceptically, with considerable doubt we are investigating into what is the nature of man, both intellect, the sense of great affection, and the quality of mind that can transcend this appalling misery, confusion of all human beings throughout the world. So we are talking over together, please bear in mind through all these talks and discussions that we are together, you and the speaker examining why, this problem why human beings, you who actually represent the whole of mankind, if you go into it you will see it, why you have become what you are - violent, superstitious, obeying, accepting authority, apart from the technological understanding, why you have given yourselves over to another, to a book, whether it be the Gita, the Bible or the Koran, why you, as a human being, are not thinking clearly for yourself but merely following. These are the problems we talked about yesterday.

After the talk yesterday I was walking along, the speaker was walking along, and a man came up to me and said, 'I understand everything you said at the talk very clearly, only why don't you lead us?' Do you understand the mentality of most of us? We want leaders - politically, religiously, the so-called specialists. And we are willing to subjugate ourselves to higher authority, either spiritually, if you can use that word, or blame society. Society doesn't exist. Society is a word in abstraction, it is an abstract idea. Society is not there, there is nothing concrete about it. But man,

human beings, his relationship to another, that's what matters, not society. If we can understand our relationship to each other, not the relationship of a Hindu to a Muslim, a Christian, Catholic to a Protestant, those are just propaganda of thousands of years, which has programmed our brain, conditioned our brain to say, 'I am a Hindu, I believe in this, I don't believe in that'. It is the result of thousands of years of careful propaganda. So what matters is to find the right kind of relationship with another then the world in which we live... (short break in tape)

Please we are talking over as two friends, I am not your guru, you are not my followers. That's an abomination. You are free human beings to investigate, to question, to doubt. And what is important is to find out, as we said, what is right relationship between human beings, not according to some theory, not according to some religious book, not according to what you wish a relationship should be, but rather to examine actually what is going on, what is our relationship to another, actually, not theoretically, not according to what somebody said in ancient times, or modern times, what actually your relationship is with another. If that relationship is corrupt, dishonest, exploiting, then in that relationship there is corruption and therefore in the world corruption comes into being. This is logic, rational. This isn't something invented by the speaker over which we can argue, dispute, exercise our verbal intellectual game, but we are asking, not only why man has become what he is, confused, unhappy, uncertain, anxious, full of sorrow and everlasting fear, but why we live in conflict from the moment we are born until we die. The books, the modern psychology may explain, very carefully,

logically, but the explanation is not the actual. The word is not the thing. I hope you are following all this. The word 'tree' is not the actual tree. But we are so enamoured of words because words have extraordinary significance - they are merely a means of communication. If we both of us understand English, or French or Hindi, or whatever one speaks, and we are both speaking the same language then communication becomes fairly simple if each of us have understood the meaning of every word that we use.

So if I may request please don't take notes. You can't listen and take notes. It isn't a matter that you may think about when you go home. We are together examining all this. So have, please, the courtesy, the care to listen to somebody. You are here to listen, to find out, but if you are taking notes or yawning, or bored, or tired, it isn't worth it. You had better go home and have a good sleep. You won't miss anything. You have missed a lot all your life, but one day more doesn't matter.

When we use the word 'right' it means whole, not broken up. Right relationship. The meaning of that word, if you go into the word etymologically and look up various dictionaries and so on, right means correct, precise, actual, and also much more, which is, an action, a way of life that is whole, not fragmented. When that word is made clear then we can examine what our human relationship is.

There can be a wholeness only when there is love. The word 'whole' means healthy, sane, rational, and also it means holy, sacred. So is our relationship with another born out of love, or is it the outcome of convenience, a social contract? We are examining you life, not my life. Examine it for yourself. I am not married, I

have lived all my life alone. I have no money, so I can talk about it quite easily. But talking about it has very little meaning, what matters is that one lives. And relationship means, the actual meaning of that word, to be related, not only through blood and so on, but to relate, it comes from the word 'relate', that is to look back, to relate a story, to relate an incident. It comes from that. That is, if you examine very carefully, you only know your relationship through memory. You are facing all this? Which is, your relationship is based on knowledge. Right sirs? And is knowledge love? Find out, sirs, enquire with me, with the speaker. When relationship is based on memory, on convenience, on sex, of one needing the other, both physically, psychologically, then there is mutual, if I may use the word without hurting you, exploitation. So our whole process of relationship is the operation of the past controlling our actions in the present. Which is, knowledge controlling your action, your behaviour, your moral attitude, and action is the outcome of past knowledge. That is so.

Are we all asleep? Don't laugh, sir. This is really very, very serious. Your house is burning and you don't seem to be aware of it. Your country, this beautiful earth, is being destroyed by you, and we don't seem to find a way of action that is right. And that action is the understanding of the whole nature of knowledge, not knowledge of books, that's merely superficial learning so that you can have some kind of skill, so that you can have a job. We are talking of a much deeper knowledge, the knowledge that is acquired through experience, through various incidents, not the knowledge of god, or your particular book or quotations and all that, the knowledge which you have in your relationship with

another.

Computers are programmed by anybody who can talk to it. And it will give you replies according to what you have programmed it to be. You understand? I hope I am making myself clear. Our minds are programmed by knowledge. Is this all right? Are we going together? Sir, your minds - your brains, rather, have been conditioned through thousands and thousands of years. At the end of these years you say, 'I am a Hindu', 'I am a Muslim', 'I am a Christian', which is that you have been programmed. You may not like the word. Your mind is programmed, conditioned to react, like the computer, of which perhaps some of you may know.

So we are asking, is knowledge the basis of relationship? Please I wish you would discuss this, I wish you would understand what the speaker is saying. Please don't go to sleep, come with me. So let's both talk over things, see what the speaker is saying.

So knowledge is the basis of our relationship - which it is, actually. And so this knowledge is essentially the past. There is no future knowledge. And knowledge is always within the shadow of ignorance because there is no complete knowledge about anything. So knowledge may be, and probably is - examine it please - is the beginning of corruption.

So is there an action, a relationship, which is not based on knowledge? Knowledge is the image you have created about him, or her, or them, or we, or they. You understand, the image. That is the word. He is a communist, he is a socialist, he is a Russian, he is a Hindu. The words are not the actual human being. They are merely symbols. And when symbols become all important, as they are becoming now, there is no actual relationship. Do you

understand all this? Are we together somewhat? Yes sir?

So we are asking, what is actual relationship with our intimate or non intimate. Look into yourself, sirs. And that relationship creates this world in which we live. If that relationship is fragmented, selfish, self-centred, merely for convenience, a social contract, then you have a corrupt world, then you have a relationship that is most destructive.

Now can one see this fact, not the idea of the fact? You understand? The idea is an abstraction. The word 'tree' is an abstraction of the actual fact which indicates that particular thing. So are we dealing with abstractions, with ideas, with conclusions or seeing what is actually going on? We must be very clear on this. You all understand English, don't you? Are we communicating with each other? Please have the goodness to tell me that we are. You understand, sir, when we hear a statement like this, that we have no actual relationship with another, but we have a relationship based on memory, knowledge, convenience, or a relationship born out of a fear of loneliness, despair, then when you hear a statement of that kind do you make an abstraction of it, abstract what you hear into an idea, or are you actually observing the fact? You understand, sir, what I am saying? Which is what you are doing now. So the word 'idea' comes from the Greek, and Latin and so on, which means to observe, to observe what is actually taking place. But we have made the word 'idea' into an abstraction. So could you, please, not make an idea of what you hear, but actually observe what is going on in your life. (Noise of bird) That bird is very persistent! Probably you hear that better than the speaker! But if you hear that bird completely without any resistance, hear it

completely with all your heart and mind, you know then the art of listening to something. The art of listening is to give your whole mind and heart to that bird that is calling. If you can listen to that bird in that way you can also listen to your wife, to your husband, to your child, to your neighbour, and perhaps you can also listen to the speaker in that way. But we have lost the art of listening because we are so concerned about ourselves, about our problems, our fears, our anguish, and so we are hardly capable of listening so completely. And when you listen so completely with your heart and with your mind, with total attention, that very listening is a miracle of action.

So we know the facts of our daily relationship with each other, however intimate or not, can that relationship be transformed, not through effort, but through intelligence. You understand sir? As we said (noise of birds) - probably they are objecting to our sitting here. So we are saying (noise of birds) - I had better go on, this is not a competition between the crow and myself!

All right, sir, let's go on. We know what our relationship actually is, unless you are totally blind, unaware, you know what it is. Now can that be totally transformed so that there can be love? And that transformation can only take place through intelligence. Now we are going carefully into that word. It has various meanings which we won't go into etymologically. But it means to be able to see clearly the danger and to act so that you are moving away from danger. That's one meaning of it. That is, if you see danger you move; it is only the blind, the neurotic, the deaf and the dumb and the people who see danger and don't move. Right? Intelligence is an action which instantly comes when you something that is a great

danger. Right? That is one meaning of that word. We will stick to that word for the moment, the meaning of that word. Now do you see the danger - please listen carefully - do you see the danger of what you call your present relationship? Do you understand? Right sir? Do you see the danger of it? Or you say, we are used to it, this is the way we have lived for thirty, forty years, our fathers have lived that way, our whole neighbourhood lives that way. Which means you don't see the actual danger of your present relationship, which is conflict, jealousy, anxiety, attachment. As we explained yesterday, where there is attachment there must be corruption. We will go into the sequence of this: when you are attached to somebody, or to a belief, or to a book, or to an idea, the consequences of that are, you are frightened of losing, jealousy, antagonism. Right? Frightened to be disturbed. If you are attached to a belief you hold on to it, you are attached, you cling to it, because that belief is created by thought and in that you find security. And that security is just non-existent, it is an illusory security therefore it is corrupt. And so on.

Now do you see to bring about a world in which human beings can live healthily, sanely, rationally, with a sense of sacredness, the present relationship is destructive of the other, is dangerous. Do you see the danger of it? If you don't see the danger of it then either you are callous, totally indifferent, and consequently brutal, violent, which is a danger to human existence. Right sirs? Do you see it as danger, or you make an abstraction of it? For god's sake, come on, sirs. If you see the danger of it, why is there not action to move away from it? Either you are not intelligently observing the fact, or your mind has become so dull by habit that you are

incapable of seeing the fact, actually what is going on.

Intelligence is not knowledge. I want to talk to somebody who understands what I am talking about. Intelligence is - all right, let me put it the other way. Knowledge is acquired through time. Right? You have an experience, that experience leaves a mark on the brain, which becomes knowledge, and from that knowledge memory and thought. We will go into that another time, much more deeply into the whole question of thought. And on that movement we live. That is, experience, knowledge, memory, thought, and action. From that action you learn more, which becomes knowledge. So we move in this cycle: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, and from that action you learn, acquire more knowledge, and keep in that cycle. That's what our life is. This is what we are doing all the time. And as we said, experience can never be complete, any kind of experience, therefore action is always incomplete.

And we are saying that knowledge is not intelligence. Intelligence is something totally away from that. We will go into if time allows it. We have got another eight or ten minutes. Please understand this, this is your life, not mine. Because if you understand this very deeply perhaps you will then bring about a radical revolution in relationship.

First understand the cycle in which our brain, our human mind works. Always acquiring knowledge, modifying it or adding to it all the time, and therefore we are living all the time in the cycle of time. Right? Do you see that? Is that clear at least? Yes, sir? Now, at last somebody. And therefore in that cycle there can never be a wholeness. Right? A completeness. Do you actually see that, or is

it a theory? You follow what I am saying? Do you actually perceive how your life operates: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, from that action you learn more, add more knowledge and have kept moving in this constant cycle. That's our life, both technologically as well as psychologically, inwardly. Technologically it is useful. Right? To build a computer, to build a dynamo, to build a bridge, to build a car, you must have knowledge, accumulated, experiment, add, change, move. That same thing operates in our daily life. Right? So we are asking, can that bring about a right relationship. Is relationship based on knowledge? If it is, it is incomplete. You follow? Therefore there must be conflict in it. If you understand that, not verbally, not theoretically but actually, then we can investigate how - not how - whether it is possible to move away from that. You understand? I'll show you. I'm boiling with it but you are all asleep. But it doesn't matter.

Is there an action, a way of living, which is not based on memory, based on experience, therefore based on knowledge? Knowledge becomes repetitive, mechanical. Right? So our life becomes mechanical, which it is. Right? Now we are going to try and find out if there is a way of living with knowledge technologically - the office, driving a car, going to your home, learning a language, doing a skilful job, efficiently and all that. That is, there you need memory, knowledge, experience. And we are saying, psychologically, inwardly, is knowledge necessary? You understand my question? Because as long as you are depending psychologically on your relationship then it is based on knowledge, therefore it is incomplete, therefore there must be

conflict in your relationship. That is inevitable. So can our brain, which has been so accustomed to this habit of knowledge, see, or move away even for a few minutes, see how important it is to find out a way of living which is not based on knowledge. Don't agree with me, sir, this is real meditation, if you want to go into it.

Our action is of time. Right? That is, I have learnt, I have acquired knowledge, and I act from that knowledge. The acquisition of knowledge is time. Right? It takes time. So is there an action which is not based on time? You understand my question? Just understand the logic, the sequence of this question. Our brains are used to time, the habit of this - experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, from that action learn more knowledge. So it is caught in that. Our brain is conditioned to that. And being conditioned to that our relationship to another is partial, never complete, and therefore that which is incomplete must inevitably breed conflict, strife, anxiety, jealousy, misery. Now is there a way of living, acting, which is not of that? To come upon that you have to investigate the nature of an action which is not born of time, therefore not born of knowledge. That is, what is intelligence? Please listen to it carefully, if you are interested, if you are not asleep, please listen to it. The computer can do all this - what a human being does. That is acquire experience, stored up memory, respond, learn, and add more knowledge to it. You understand this? That is, it can play chess with an expert, a master chess player, a computer. It can play, the computer can play with a master chess player. First time it may be beaten, it is beaten, so it learns the moves, why it has been beaten. That learning is stored up in the tape as memory. Then the second time it plays it learns

more, and the third time, fourth time, after that it beats every chess master. You understand this? That's how our brains are working. That is, learn, knowledge, fail, more knowledge - you follow - so gradually you become expert.

Now what is the difference between the human brain and the computer? You understand? The computer, if you have studied it a little bit, I have talked to some computer experts therefore I am talking glibly about it, I am not an expert about it, I have talked to experts in California, in Europe, in Brockwood and here. So this is what the computer is doing: learning constantly, acquiring knowledge so that it can reply instantly. And that's what the mind is doing, our brain is doing. So what is the difference between the human brain and the computer? There isn't any. I wonder if you see this. No, sir. So they are beginning to enquire, what is intelligence. If the machine can do it, and the human brain can do it too, there is not much difference, but the human brain has some other quality, which is to find out what is intelligence. Oh, you people are so dull. Probably you all go to the temple, go to the office every day, become more and more dull, and when something new is put before you, you don't even comprehend the beauty of it, the enormity of it.

We are enquiring into what is intelligence. If the machine can do - if the computer can do what the human brain can do then we are not intelligent. Therefore must be a quality of intelligence which we can find out. Right?

First there is the quality of observation. I am talking about the same thing. To observe. Do you observe anything, or your brain is observing, not your eyes observing? You understand? There is a

difference between optical observation and the observation of thought. Now which is it that you do? Do you do both? Observe visually, optically, or as you observe thought intercedes, therefore thought is observing? Do you understand what I am saying? Do you get what I am saying? Thank god there is somebody. Now can you observe without the interference of thought? No, please, madam, don't play with it. Can you observe without the interference of thought? So observation then is pure, clear, and from that clarity and purity there is action. But the moment thought comes in it begins with knowledge - you are following the whole movement?

So there is an action which is born out of pure observation and therefore without time, which is immediate. That is intelligence. You have got it?

Now can that intelligence operate in your relationship, in your daily relationship? It's only then that you end all conflict. You understand? Because where there is conflict there can be no love. Where there is jealousy the other is not. Where there is anxiety, fear, attachment, that which is the greatest thing in life is not. Right sirs.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 3RD JANUARY 1981

If one is expecting something from the speaker - a blessing, a new direction, a new set of ideals, or a pattern of conduct and so on, one is afraid you will be disappointed because we are thinking together. It's our life, it's the human life, the humanity that you represent. And if one may point out again, if you are seeking personal salvation, personal improvement, to get better jobs, more money, a better way to heaven, I am afraid again you will be disappointed. We are not talking about personal salvation at all. We are trying together to see if it is possible to salvage the mind, the human brain, which has become so corrupt, so mechanical, so utterly careless, concerned chiefly with itself, its own security, its own little family, or identified with a nation, and so bringing about a great deal of misery to mankind. And we are asking ourselves why the human brain has so deteriorated: depending on others, becoming immoral, corrupt, trying to find out a way of living from others, if one is unfortunately labelled as a guru, a way of life.

As we pointed out the other day and in the last two talks, this is a serious gathering where both of us are concerned and deeply enquiring into why human beings right throughout the world have become what they are. There it is.

I suppose I have to talk. One observes in this country, in this part of the world there is a great deal of corruption, not merely the bribing under the table but the corruption that exists in the very depths of one's being. The word 'corruption' means from rumpere, the Latin and so on, to break up. The essence of corruption is

fragmentation, to say one thing and do another, to have ideals and not face actuality, this constant struggle to become something, not only in this world but also inwardly, the becoming; from a bank clerk to the manager, from the local priest to become an archbishop, and a disciple trying to become the master. This constant struggle to become something, that is part of corruption.

And, as we pointed out also last week, we are losing more integrity - integrity being observing the whole of life as one unit, as a whole, not as fragments, as we do. And also, if one may point out, we lack co-operation. We co-operate for commercial purposes: to have more money, we co-operated with an authority, political, religious, or some kind of crank, we are too willing to co-operate with those people because there we gain something for ourselves. We are not talking of such co-operation. Co-operation can only come when there is love, not profit, motive. And when there is that co-operative spirit there is also an action which is non-co-operative. Right? Because when we turn from not being co-operative we become rather antagonistic, violent. But when we co-operate when there is love in our heart then we also know how not to co-operate, without bitterness, without anxiety, without any sense of violence.

And seeing all this in this country, or in this part of the world, what is the responsibility of those who live here? This is a very serious question, this is not a political rhetoric. Seriously one asks, living here, why this state of disaster, confusion, utter neglect, carelessness, brutality, exists, though you talk about and go to the various temples, do all kinds of imaginary, illusory, worship, utterly satisfying and at the same time contradict everything that

you look up to.

So we are concerned with the salvaging of the brain, of the human mind, your mind, your brain. As we said, the brain has evolved through time, it has evolved through millions of years and we have arrived at this present condition. This brain is not the individual brain. There is no individual brain. There is the brain of humanity. This I think, if one may point out, one has to understand seriously. Thought has identified itself with the psyche, the psychological world and established a sense of individuality. We will go into that presently. But first one must be very clear in understanding that the human brain, our brain, your brain, is the result of many, many million years, it has evolved through time with a great many experiences, accumulating knowledge, that knowledge stored up in the brain cells which becomes memory, and from that memory thought arises. This is the common factor of all human beings at whatever strata of society they may be. It is the common factor of every human being that they accumulate knowledge through experience, that experience as knowledge stored up in the brain which becomes the memory, from that thought and action. This is what we are doing every day. From that action you learn more, so there is this constant accumulation of knowledge, action, knowledge - this chain in which we are caught - the human brain is caught and acting. Nobody can deny this fact. This is the only fact which is actual.

And this memory, this knowledge acquired through experience being common to the whole of mankind, that mankind is you. So your brain is not your individual brain, there is no such thing as individual. This is really important to understand because all our

activity, all our thinking both psychologically as a reaction, we are trained, programmed, if I may use that word, the computer word 'programmed', conditioned for many, many, many millions of years. This is the habit in which you are caught. And if you enquire very deeply, seriously, with scepticism, with doubt, not accepting a thing from anybody, even the neurologists, the brain specialists, or from your religious books and so on, if you examine with great critical scepticism because that is the essence of religion. The investigation, sceptical investigation into the whole structure of human beings, not merely physical but the psychological world which is far more important than the mere physical examination, then you will find that human beings have lived this way for millennia, accepting individuality and from that all the problems arise - conflict with each other, conflict with the community, conflict with society, conflict as war and so on and so on. Now is this a fact, or a theory invented by the speaker, and trying to prove that theory? As the speaker said often, he has no belief, no ideals, no direction and he is certainly not doing propaganda for any particular system, establishment or organization. Organizations and institutions are actually destroying mankind whether it is political or religious - specially religious.

So to depend on institutions and organizations for the salvation of mankind seems so utterly meaningless. And mankind has depended, looks up to, respects the scientists, the political authority, the economists, the specialists, and these are not going to save mankind either. Please see the actuality of all this. We depend on institutions, which is normal, like the post office, bank - I don't know all those kinds of institutions - but also we depend on

religious institutions, the authority of a guru, of a book. And so when you hand yourself over to an authority which gradually builds up an institution or a structure, then in that web we are caught hoping our brain will be salvaged.

So the question is - not a problem; to solve a problem of any kind the brain must have no problem. Right? Go into it and you will see. A brain cluttered up with problems, sexual, fear, pleasure, sorrow, all kinds of problems that human beings have, how can such a mind except - such a brain - except engineer, doctor, a physician, they may solve those problems but the human psychological problems can never be solved if the brain itself is in a mess, is in confusion, is in decay. It is in decay when it is completely caught in knowledge. Please understand this. That is, experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, that is the chain in which the brain is caught. Watch it yourself, this is not the speaker's invention. And such a brain will inevitably become mechanical: you specialize as an engineer, as a lawyer, and everlastingly carry that for the next fifty, sixty years until you die. Which is mechanical, though in that mechanical process there may be expansion, contraction, learning more but it is in the same pattern. So the brain becomes mechanical. And it must become mechanical because it cannot possibly live in a constant flux. I don't know if you understand all this.

Are we thinking together, at least some of us? Because it becomes very important, at least for a group of people, to see the imminent necessity of bringing about a different kind of life, a different way of acting, a different behaviour. But if it is mechanical, as it is becoming the brain will inevitably deteriorate,

though there are biologists, scientists, saying, 'Only through knowledge there is the ascent of man. Man can only grow through knowledge' - we are questioning that. We are questioning the idea that knowledge is the way of salvaging the brain, salvaging the human being, because knowledge, which is experience, there is no divine knowledge except in the books, which are after all just printed words to which you may attribute the quality of sacredness, but they are just a lot of words put on a page, and if you worship that of course then it is just nonsense. You are not a religious person because you read the Gita from morning until night. Or there are those who preach about the Gita, everlastingly reading about it. Like every book, the Koran, the Bible, the Gita and all the so-called religious books, may be absolute theories, and they are because they don't actually affect our daily life. And we are concerned with the radical movement in which there is the total breaking down of this routine process of the brain.

In this mechanical process of life there is no freedom. And freedom is not from something, from prison, from sorrow, from pain, and it certainly is not freedom of choice because that is another one of our illusions that because we can choose we are free. Is that so? Does a clear unconfused mind, brain ever choose, because it is so clear there is no choice? It is only the confused mind, the contradictory mind, the mind that is not certain, that's always caught in this trap of choice. I hope you are following all this. You know when there is such a large audience with so many contradictory faces, contradictory opinions, it is very difficult to go into something very, very serious. And we are trying to go into something very, very serious. So there is no large audience, there is

only you and the speaker. And between us we are talking over together, talking over together in friendship, with affection, with care, but being very sceptical, doubting, questioning, enquiring, never, never accepting because there is no authority. If one is seeking truth there is no authority. When there is the question of freedom there can be no authority, either political, religious or any other authority. But most of us don't want to be free, we want to be secure. And this search for security, individual, national, group, idealistic and so on, this security which each one wants, this brings about contradiction, this brings about division - you want your security, I want mine.

So perhaps this search for security, psychologically as well as physically, may be one of the causes of this corruption in this country. So we are together - please bear in mind we are together, you are not listening to a talk by the speaker, we are examining together the condition of man.

Thought is the dominant factor in our life. Thought dictates all our action. Thought has built this structure which we call society. Thought has built all the religions in the world, the churches, the images in the churches, the temples with their goddesses and all the rest of that nonsense, and the mosque, everything in all that area thought has created - the rituals, the puja, the tradition, everything thought has built. This is a fact. Thought, which is the outcome of the desire for security, that's what we all want, not so much perhaps physically, unless you are utterly poor, then that is a different matter, but psychologically, inwardly, we all want security, so we invent gods. God has not shaped us, we have shaped god. I don't know if you realize all this. What we have shaped we worship. It

becomes so utterly nonsensical. But in order to have this security we live in illusion, we don't want to face facts.

So thought has created the psychological structure of man, the psychological structure is the characteristics of the ego, the 'me', the 'I'. The 'I' is fear, anxiety, depression, violence, cruelty, the ideals of being non-violent, all that is in the psychological world, the world inside you, inside your skin, as it were. That is the world in which we live which dominates the external. Those idealists, socialists and the communists, say, change the structure of society outside then man will change. This has been the old dream of every reformer, of every socialist, but you may change the outer as much as you like, as has been proved by the communist world with its recent revolution, the inward savage, the inward barbarian, who is afraid, who wants his personal - you know, all that, that overcomes the outward structure. You know all this.

So we are enquiring together as two people the nature of thought and thought which has created the inward psyche, the inward responses, both neurological as well as psychological. You are following all this? Thought has created this. Right? Then thought separates itself and then begins to dominate the psyche - I must control my reactions, I mustn't be afraid, if I am jealous I find a rational excuse for jealousy, hatred, violence, as though all those reactions are separate from thought. Thought has created this. I don't know if you follow all this. Right, sir, can we go on together, you and I?

So it is in a constant movement. Right? You know we have solved the problems of communication, more or less, we are trying to solve through robots, and computers, more production, better

production, more consumer goods, all those, in those fields, the technological world we are solving a great many things. Right? I don't know if you are aware of all this. Like in Japan for example, they are using robots with computers to free man. And there is going to be another problem - in the manufacture of cars and other things they are using robots. So we are solving all those kinds of problems, but we have never solved the problem of conflict. You understand my question? Never, though we have lived for thousands and thousands of years this problem of conflict has never been solved: conflict between man and man, man and woman, family against another family, one group against another group, one religious sect against another religious sect, however big, however well established, however powerful. We have never throughout this million years never solved the problem of conflict. Why? You understand my question? Please ask yourself this - why. Is it possible to live a life completely without a shadow of conflict? We are going to enquire into that.

First we must be aware, conscious, know actually, not theoretically, not as an abstraction, but fact, in our daily life we live an astonishing way which brings conflict after conflict. Now can that be solved completely so that we can live in freedom, in beauty and in morality, and of course that can only come when there is love. So let's find out. You are not listening to the speaker, we are together going into this problem.

Conflict must exist when there is division. That's law. Right? Division between me and you, we and they, the Hindus, Muslims, the Jew, Arabs, the communists and socialists, and so on and so on, externally. But the external reaction is brought about by the inward

state of the brain, which is thought dividing. Right? Thought dividing the thinker and the thought. Right, you are following this? There is no thinker without thought. Right? Right, sir? So thought has created the psychological world, the 'me' with all its characteristics, which is fear, sorrow, pain, depression, a sense of immense loneliness, a sense of fear of death, the future, all that is the area of the psyche. Right? The psyche being what is generally considered the soul, the higher self, you know, all that, it is still within the area of thought. There is no question about it, you can doubt it, you can examine it sceptically, rationally, exercising the highest quality of your brain to see why human beings live in perpetual conflict from the moment they are born until they die, with tears, with occasional laughter, without any sense of love.

I do not know if you have realized that this constant movement in the brain - that is, outwardly acting, going to the office, factory, labour, day after day, day after day, for fifty years, think of the monstrosity of it all. And that becomes a routine, and when that routine stops you die. And that's our life. And psychologically there is this constant movement, becoming, not becoming, should, must not - you follow - fear, loneliness, all the sense of despairing loneliness. In this constant movement thought says there must be some element which will be permanent. Right. I don't know if you are following all this. Therefore thought establishes a centre as the 'me' which is permanent. But that 'me' is the movement of fear, anxiety, all that. Are you following all this? This constant movement of uncertainty, confusion, misery, and the desire to be secure knowing that there is no security. There may be if you are lucky in this world, fortunate enough, you might have a little

money, a career, a corrupting lawyer and so on, there you might have a little security; but inwardly, which is your relationship with another there is no security. So there is this constant movement in uncertainty. This is what is happening. And because you are so utterly uncertain, confused, you go to gurus, to all the absurd cults that exist in the world, to all the temples that have utterly no meaning.

See the map of all this. You understand what I say when I say, a map? That is, when you are looking at an actual map of the world, of this country for example, can you look at it without direction? You understand my question? You look at a map to go from this place to that place, and you judge how many miles, and all the rest of it. So your brain is always looking with a direction, therefore you never see the whole of the map, the whole of the world. So can we look without direction at this nature of conflict, not how to solve it, not, 'Tell me the way so that I can live without conflict', that would be too stupid to ask such a question anyway. But can we look at this nature of conflict without any motive, without any direction, without wanting to be free of it, then only you are capable of sceptical examination. You understand what I am saying sir? We are doing it together now.

As we said, conflict must exist when there is a division between thought and the psyche. Right? Be clear on this point please. The psyche being all the characteristics of the 'me: I am nobody, but I will be somebody; I am anxious, lonely, unhappy, a dull, miserable life, and I want to escape from it, run away from it, and so on. All that is the psyche, which is the 'me'. Right? The 'me' is that, created by thought. If you had no thought, this would not exist. You

understand? Of course, naturally. So as this exists, and thought says, I am different from this, therefore I must control this. That's what you are doing. I wonder if you see this. Right, sir, clear enough? Clear as crystal, so that there is no doubt about it.

Thought, which is the outcome of memory - memory, knowledge, experience, from that experience you act, learn more from that action, add to that knowledge, and keep the cycle going. And that thought has established the structure of the psyche, the inward world of me, with my peculiarities, with my peculiar tendencies, with my anxieties, loneliness, despair, sorrow. Right? Why has thought done this? I don't know if you follow all this. Right sir, ask this question, not me. Why has thought done this? Why has it separated itself from something which it has created? I don't know if you are following this. Don't you say, 'I must control'? And the 'I' is the structure of thought, that which is controlling is also the structure of thought. I wonder if you see this. Please do see this very clearly. If we don't, let's examine it more. That's is, let's go into it a little more.

Suppose I am very lonely, lonely though I am married, children, go to the office, go to the temple and all that nonsense that goes on, I am utterly, profoundly lonely. And being lonely I escape because I don't know how to tackle that loneliness, I don't understand what loneliness is, but I am frightened, there is a sense of utter existence for a day, month, in which there is no relationship with another, no sense of communication with another, thoroughly enclosed. Don't you know all these feelings? Wake up! And as my brain doesn't know how to solve it, it then escapes. Escapes into entertainment. Right? Whether it is religious entertainment or football, they are

both the same. You agree? Are you really agreeing to this, that religious entertainment, going to the temple, the puja and all the thing that goes on, which is an entertainment, but that doesn't alter your life, it is just an amusement, and football are the same. Do you agree to this? Is it mental agreement, just a verbal agreement or an actual saying, 'This is the same', therefore finish with it?

So what is loneliness? You understand? Without escaping, without running away into some illusory, imaginary ideal, the actual fact is that I am despairingly, anxiously lonely. I may be married, I may have sex, I may have children, but this thing is rotting. Like a man who is deeply hurt, as most of us are, from childhood we are hurt, and he carries that hurt throughout life, and we can say it doesn't matter, it will not affect my action, but it does affect your action because unconsciously, deeply your actions are guided by your hurt, you build a wall round yourself not to be hurt more and all that business goes on, the consequences of that hurt is bitterness, more loneliness. And this loneliness, why do human beings go through this? Ask yourself. As two friends we are talking about this. Why? It must exist because of your actions. Go into it, go into it, don't agree. Your daily actions are self-centred. Right? Your daily thoughts, your daily activities, are concerned with yourself. You may pretend to be a social worker and give your life to that but the 'me' is still going on only you have identified yourself with something. Like the communist identifies with the State, with the ideal, with blah, blah, you identify yourself with something else.

So as long as there is self-centred activity there must be loneliness. I don't know if you see this. If your chief concern is me

then that 'me' must act in a very narrow circle, however that circle may be wide or deep, but it is a narrow circle. And that action must inevitably produce this exhausting, despairing loneliness. You understand all this? Not verbally but actually.

So we are asking why human beings live with conflict. The essence of that conflict is that division between thought and that which thought has created as the 'me', the psyche, the characteristics of the self - my name, my form, my ambition, my desire for power, money, position, my dishonesty, my corruption. So does one realize this fact that as long as thought divides itself as the 'me' and thought as being different from me, which is, the thinker being different from the 'me'. You are following all this? Be clear, for god's sake.

Then what takes place when you see it clearly? This is your test. You have to test this thing, not just verbally accept all this. Then what happens when you test it in life? That is, when thought has divided itself into the observer and the observed. You understand this? Right sirs? When you see actually the observer is the observed, thought is me with all its characteristics, when you see this fact when there is only thought dividing itself constantly - right - what takes place? You understand? You have totally removed the contradiction. Do you understand all this? Totally annihilated, dissolved, this division which exists. Which is, where there is division there must be conflict inwardly, as well as outwardly. So you are no longer a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian. You understand? You understand, sir, you don't belong to a thing. That's the outward fact. You may carry a passport but you don't belong to any country. Are you like that? That's the test.

And when this division utterly comes to an end what takes place? You understand my question? Don't say, 'It's peace', don't say, 'It's the end of conflict', then you are playing with words, it doesn't mean a thing. What actually takes place when there is the observation, critical, sceptical observation of this fact, thought divides itself as the 'me', the thought controlling and so on, the whole process which the speaker has explained very carefully. When you see the fact, and not the abstraction of the fact. Abstraction is an ideal which has no reality. What has reality is this. Then what takes place? You have to find out what actually takes place in the brain when there is no contradiction. You understand? There is contradiction between the observer and the observed, when there is no contraction what takes place in the brain? Are you waiting for me to reply? Are you waiting to find out what the speaker has to say, or are you discovering for yourself? Which is more important? Not what the speaker explains, that is just words, but if you discover it for yourself then you can throw away all the religious books in the world.

Then the brain has only one factor, and that is the only instrument you have. And is there an observation - please just listen, find out, I am just suggesting this, look into it - is there an observation without knowledge, an observation in which there is no experience. The moment you have experience there must be an experiencer. I don't know if you follow this. Therefore division. So is there an observation without any quality of remembrance, any quality of observing with knowledge? You understand? That is, sir, when you look at your wife, or your husband, or at the tree, or the cloud or something or other, do you observe without the word - the

word being merely the symbol? Can you observe - please do it as you are sitting, perhaps you are sitting next to your wife, or your husband, can you look without the word? Which means, can you look without the image you have created about her or him? Do you understand? Can you? Or you discover that you are caught in a verbal structure. You understand? And the verbal structure is not the wife or the husband. Are you all tired? So you have to find out is there an observation and therefore action, because when you observe danger you act instantly, physical danger; meeting a tiger, a cobra, there is instant action.

Now you have observed, examined sceptically the structure of man's existence - of course all kinds of details which we can go into it for which we haven't time, nor is this the occasion for it - but have you seen as clearly as you see the danger of a tiger, or a cobra, this movement of thought? Which means, is there action which is not divisive, which is whole. That is the test. When the brain is completely non-fragmented by thought, because thought born of knowledge is always limited because knowledge is never complete. Right? It's obvious. And thought born of knowledge must be incomplete. It can invent, or think about completeness, eternity, immortality - that's all just words. But when that division ceases then there is totally a different observation and action in daily life, not in some monastery or in becoming a sannyasi and all the rest of it, that has also very little significance when you are trying to salvage the mind, the brain of humanity.

So, sir, the question really is deeply: thought is not love. Right? No, please see love is not pleasure. And without that, do what you will, go to all the temples in the world, discipline yourself until you

are sick of discipline, do all kinds of things, you will not save the brain from its atrophy.

Right sirs.

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 4TH JANUARY 1981

If one may, if one is allowed, the speaker will not go over what we have talked about during the last three gatherings here.

I think it is necessary to go into the question of what is order, and why the mind, the brain has not been able to function in an orderly way. Our education, whether in the West, or in the East, North or South, is making human beings mediocre. I mean by that word, following a routine, fitting into a slot, whether it is an administrative slot, or a surgical slot, or a lawyer, or engineer. We are all being educated to conform to a pattern, whether that pattern be highly paid, highly respected, or a pattern that may be socially convenient, profitable and perhaps worthwhile. I do not know if you have examined your own minds and your own activities and whether you have not discovered for yourself, if one may be so presumptuous, whether your brain, and therefore your whole series of chain reactions, have not conformed, have not followed a pattern, have not become a machine of identification, conformity, imitation, whether it be religious, political, economic, social and so on.

I think it is very important to find out why we have become neither excellent - I am going to use that word 'excellent' very carefully - excellent, not in profession, not in a career, there are thousands of people, perhaps millions, of people throughout the world who are very, very efficient, who are earning a great deal of money - but we are talking about mediocrity of a brain that refuses to alter the pattern in which it is caught. The brain becomes dull, it

hasn't got the rapidity or freedom in which it can see its own movement. I think most of us are frightened of freedom, not that rebellion that takes place against the establishment, that's only a reaction which pushes you in the opposite direction - permissiveness, drugs and all that business. We are afraid to be radically deeply free of mediocrity. We want to be very safe, both outwardly and inwardly. And this search for certainty is, if one may point out, is a form of mediocrity; wanting to be successful as a painter, as an artist, as a lawyer, as an engineer and so on.

And excellence is not achieved through competition: excellence in aesthetics, in the appreciation and the perception of that which is beautiful, excellence in morality, morality in the sense of conduct, behaviour, a sense of dignity, which freedom brings. And when one looks at the world, as you must, not the little world around oneself - the office, the factory, the family, the happenings of the politicians and so on, but the human world, the world in which human beings are suffering, the world in which almost everyone is in a great sense of anxiety, sorrow, pain, which has nothing to do with any kind of career or religious belief, it actually is going on in the world. When one regards all that, why has the brain, which has been capable of such extraordinary activity in the technological world, as regards the computer and the robot, why the brain has become sluggish, why, though it is capable of action in a certain direction, it is incapable of perceiving the whole structure and the nature of man and acting from that. One would call a mediocre person one who is incapable of such perception.

One asks, why the brain in one direction, in the technological world, which is so extraordinarily advancing of which we know

very little, like the computer, it can do almost anything that human beings can - write poems, paint pictures, any problem the human has can be answered through the computer. The computer is going to take over our brains. I don't know if you are aware of all these facts. The robot and the computer are going to manage factories, all the manual labour and so on and so on. And so if one is not aware of all this, our brains are going to become more and more sluggish because there will be no physical problems, technological problems, but there will be psychological problems. Even there perhaps the computer will take over because we will be just human beings without any occupation, empty, sluggish. You understand, this is coming, perhaps within the next fifteen, twenty years.

And then what does education mean? You are following all this? Then what is a human being who is deprived, or whom the machine has taken over, what is the quality of your brain then? You are following? And why is it that we live such a disorderly life? We live in disorder. Of that there is no question. Is the brain itself in a state of disorder? That is, is our consciousness in disorder?

Consciousness, human consciousness is its content. Right? The content of human consciousness is its beliefs, its educated conditioning which is called information, knowledge, to act, to live in a world where skill is necessary, where knowledge is necessary in the outer world, to earn a livelihood; the content of our consciousness is anxiety, jealousy, aggressiveness, ambition in different forms, and the pursuit of pleasure, fear, and the vast weight of sorrow. That's our consciousness. All our superstitions, the gods that we have created. In that consciousness there is

constant movement. I don't know - please, let's begin again. We are talking over together.

That is, you and the speaker are together investigating the nature of order, and the nature of disorder. Why we human beings after so many millennia live such an extraordinarily disordered life, there is no sense of total harmony of a human being, the harmony both physical and psychological and intellectual, a sense of wholeness, a sense of a comprehensive outlook on life.

In enquiring into what is order and disorder we must first enquire whether thought can ever bring about order. You understand? Please meet me half way at least. Has thought created disorder in our lives? Is thinking itself disorder? In a country like this, this part of the world, there is extraordinary disorder: politically, religiously, in every direction there is disorder, the thing is coming to pieces, disintegrating. And we are all trying to solve the problem of this disorder in this part of the world either through political means, or military means, or go back to tradition where you accept authority, follow certain rules, be disciplined, and so on. Now can the politicians, the economists, the business people solve this problem of disorder? Or one must ask this question whether thought which has been exercised as the intellect, which wants order - you follow? Everybody wants order in their own life, in their house, in their environment, one wants everything to run properly. And we are exercising thought as a means to bring about order. I am sure you are aware of all this. Perhaps you are not aware of it. Probably you have never put this question to yourself, which is whether thought, that is thinking which is the operation of the intellect, reason, logic, discernment, all that is part

of the intellect, whether the exercise of that intellect with its thought is going to bring order in the world, in the human relationship. You follow?

And we are asking, what is the cause of this disorder, first before we begin to enquire into what is order. What is the deep rooted cause of this disorder, not only outwardly but in our relationship with each other, not only in our action but in the very structure of our consciousness? What is at the root of it? Are you interested in all this? Not a passing interest, not a weekend interest, but a demand, a deep challenge to yourself why human beings live so disorderly - in their action, primarily in their relationship. And seeing this disorder, if you are a religious person - religious in the ordinary sense of that word - you escape from that disorder into some fanciful godly worship, or ungodly worship, go off to some temple, shave your head, you know what is happening in this country, and also in the other parts of the world.

We are trying to find out the root of this disorder, in consciousness, in action, and in our relationship with each other. We are trying to find out the root of it, not trim the branches of disorder but go into it so that the very exploration brings its own understanding and therefore its clarity. That is the purpose, or the intention of exploring, investigating, in the very movement of investigation clarity comes, and that clarity clears disorder. Which means you cannot investigate intellectually, verbally, but investigate one's life, the life that one leads. And for that you need energy. And that energy is dissipated if you are escaping from the question, which is, why human beings throughout the world live in such chaotic disorder. And if you are serious, and I hope we are -

one means by 'seriousness' being committed to the investigation, giving your energy, your interest, your observation, your scepticism, your vitality to find out.

So we have to ask, is all this confusion, disorder, conformity, imitation, which is part of disorder, and the disorder caused in our relationship, is all that based on thinking? Is thought responsible for this disorder? And if it is responsible for this disorder then what is the relationship of thought to our daily life? You are following all this? It's no good looking at me. You have to look into yourself. The speaker is only a mirror in which you are looking. And when you have looked very carefully you can destroy the mirror, otherwise the mirror becomes the authority. As we said, thought, the whole process of thinking is the result of experience, knowledge, memory, and action. So thought is always limited. That one has to see completely, not just verbally, that thought, whatever it does, either in the technological world, or in the investigative process of sceptical exploration, which is essentially the action of religion, for that you need energy, vitality. And if thought is the origin of this disorder - we are not saying it is, we are going to find out - and as thought is limited because thought is born of experience, and knowledge can never be complete, never, and from that knowledge, memory, thought, which is the movement of time - I won't go into that for the moment, we will come back to it later - therefore it is basically in its very nature limited. Right? Can we meet this? See the logic of it, the reality of it, the actuality of it.

So thought must create disorder. Thought itself is disorder, whatever its action. We will come to find out whether there is an

order which is not brought about by thought, but first we must understand the movement of thought in relation to order and disorder. Right, sirs, may we go on? But one must be absolutely clear, not verbally, intellectually, but actually, that thought brings about, by its very nature, conflict and therefore disorder. Disorder in action because action is based on thought, which is the result of knowledge, experience, and knowledge and experience can never be complete, you may have a thousand experiences, they must always be incomplete, and therefore knowledge must be incomplete. And thought with its action must create disorder. That is the basis of what we are investigating. If that is not clear let's explore it together so that you are absolutely clear that thought whatever it does, except in the technological world and so on - thought has created the most beautiful architecture, great poems, marvellous engineering, beautiful bridges, great music, astonishing statues. And thought has also created great images in the temples, in the cathedrals, the idol worship, all that is responsible for thought, though the priests say, no, it is divine revelation and all that, it is still within the area of thought.

So let us first examine why thought has created disorder in our relationship - relationship whether it is intimate or not. Before we investigate into our relationship we must first understand the nature of desire. Right? Is this getting too complicated? You see, sirs, and ladies, we are not used to this kind of enquiry. We are used to be talked at, lectured at, helped to think what to think, but not how to think. We are all trained in what to think, like a good lawyer, good engineer, you know, but we never say, enquire how the brain works ourselves, not according to some specialists, watching our

own brain, its own reactions, its chemical responses and so on and so on. So we are going first to examine the whole movement of desire because we live by desire. Desire is part of our life. And when we are enquiring into it we must not say it is right or wrong. Like many priests, like many sannyasis, like many monks, they suppress it, or the desire is urged in a particular direction where they worship Jesus, you follow, all that, identify with something greater. We are not doing that; we are examining the whole movement of desire and what is its relationship to thought, and the action that must inevitably follow. You understand all this? Examining desire, the relationship of desire to thought and action. This may be one of the causes of disorder.

So the mind - we are enquiring freely into it, not saying it is right, or wrong, it must be suppressed, we must escape from it, you must transcend and go beyond desire, and all that nonsense. Because they have never examined desire deeply and gone into it.

What is desire? How does desire arise? And what gives it impetus, vitality, drive? Must I explain all this? Let's go. Please, we are observing desire, the speaker is only describing it, the description is not the actual, the explanation is not what is going on, so please let us be very clear from the beginning that the word is not the thing. Right? The word 'tree', the word, is not the actual tree, but for most of us the word is more important, the symbol is more important than the actuality. So we must be free of the word to look. You are following this? We are examining what is desire, and why man has been driven by this constant desire to fulfil, to become, to achieve, this tremendous energy behind it. The man who wishes to climb Everest, tremendous energy is required, the

desire behind it, going through every kind of difficulty, pain, but to achieve. And is desire - or rather, is illumination, the understanding of what is truth, a matter of desire? We will go into that presently. You are interested in all this? Not interested, I don't care, it's up to you.

Desire comes through perception, seeing, contact, sensation. Right? Seeing a tree, touching it and having sensation; or seeing a woman, a man, seeing, touching, contact, sensation. This is the normal process. Then if you see a shirt in the window, or a robe, or a car, you see it, touch it, sensation, then thought creates the image of you sitting in the car and driving it. Right? See the car, touch it, the sensation, the beauty, the lines - not the Indian cars, sorry! - the lines of it and so on, and thought creates the image of you sitting in the car, driving it. You follow? Which is what? Thought has created the image of you in the car and driving it, when thought creates the image then there is the beginning of desire. You have got it? This is logical, you don't have to accept what I am saying, it is so if you examine it closely. Seeing, contact, sensation, thought creating the image of you in that shirt, or you in that dress, or you in that sari, or whatever it is, and wanting to possess it and so on and so on. Seeing, contact, sensation. Is there a possibility - please listen to this - is there a possibility of thought not creating the image? You follow? The moment when thought creates the image then desire begins. Right? So one begins to discover thought, when it has created an image with regard to the sensation, desire is born. So thought plus sensation, desire. I wonder if you see this.

So you see if one understands this very clearly desire then becomes not so intensely powerful because thought sees all the

possibilities of pain, achievement. You follow? You don't, I'll explain. Why is there conflict with regard - why does desire breed conflict? Right? Why? As we said, desire begins when thought creates the image of you sitting in the car, that building an image by thought is the beginning of desire. If that is clearly seen as an actuality, that is what is happening in all of us, then desire brings about conflict because in the fulfilment of that desire time is involved. Right? Time. And during that time other incidents take place, so there must be contradictions, wanting, not wanting, all the rest of it follows.

I'll make it much simpler. Why is there conflict between you, your husband, your wife, your neighbour? You follow? Why? In that relationship thought plays a great part. Right? Thought. Both sexually and in other ways. I won't go into all the details of it because it is fairly simple. Thought plays a great part in our intimate relationship. Thought creates the image of the man or the woman, and the relationship is between these two images. Are you following all this? Or you are all asleep. So actual relationship doesn't exist. It exists between these two images which thought has created. So thought may be responsible for conflict. I wonder if you see all this. So is it possible not to create the image? You follow? That is, seeing, contact, sensation, car, the image you have built of you sitting in that car, putting your hands on the steering wheel and driving off. It is the same thing as in our personal relationship, which is the image you have built, or you have accumulated a series of images and she also has created a series of images. So thought is the origin of conflict. I wonder if you see this. Right? At least a few of us, let's go together.

Then the problem arises, how is one to put an end to this movement of creating images all the time? You are following? Is that at all possible? Because we live by images, the images of the past, the remembrance of incidents, pleasant, unpleasant and all the rest of it. This is our life. And if thought is the origin of this disorder in our relationship then what place has thought at all? You understand? I wonder if you are understanding what I am talking about.

You see, let's go into it. You see this, you see it very clearly, at least verbally, intellectually, that thought begins all the mess in our relationship, then the question arises, how am I to stop thought? Which is a totally wrong question. I wonder if you see that. Because you, who want to stop thought, you are created by thought. I wonder if you see that. Right? So thought has divided itself as the controller and the controlled. Then you ask the question, how am I to control thought. So we are saying that is a wrong question. That question indicates that you haven't grasped the whole movement of thought, that thought has broken itself up as the thinker and thought, the controller and the controlled. So do we realize this fact that the controller is the controlled? So what takes place? You understand my question? I see very clearly - if one sees it - I see very clearly that thought is the root of this disorder because thought in itself is utterly limited, it can imagine it is the limitless but in fact it is limited. It can conceive theoretically what is time, what is beyond time, I've got it and all that but it has no value. What has value is our daily life.

So the question when you say, how am I to stop thought, is a wrong question because thought is the controller and the

controlled. Right? Does one see this obvious fact? Or you make an abstraction of it as an idea and say, how am I to carry out that idea? Which means you haven't grasped the full significance of this fact. Right? When you make an abstraction you are dealing with non-fact. What is fact is the conflict which thought has created, the disorder. So do you actually perceive - perceive - that the thinker is the root of this? You have created the image between you and your wife, husband and so on, and that image is not actual, it is a material structure created by thought which acts as a barrier, and therefore no love. Thought is not love. We will go into that some time.

So the question is: does your mind, your brain actually perceive the fact that thought is responsible for our confusion, disorder? When you perceive the fact what takes place? That's what I want to get at. Let's move from there. Do you understand? When you see danger, physical danger, there is instant action, unless you are neurotic, or drugged, or drunk, or whatever it is, if you see something dangerous there is immediate response. Now why does your brain not see the danger that thought creates disorder? The danger of disorder. Why? There, your brain is tremendously active when you see a danger, the adrenalin, the blood, everything responds. There your life is threatened. Here also your life is threatened, which is, living in disorder is a great threat, a great danger to human beings, why doesn't the brain equally see, instantly see the danger of this as it sees the other, why? You are following my question? Come on, sirs! Why do we not see to live in disorder is the greatest danger? Is it because we are used to disorder? Please, don't accept what the speaker is saying. We are

accustomed to disorder, we put up with disorder, we haven't the energy to create order. Which all means what? Please go into your brain, look at it please. Laziness, indifference, lack of aesthetic appreciation of that which is beautiful? Is it the brain having accepted disorder, disregards it, is indifferent to it, and therefore what happens to the brain that has created disorder, thought which has created disorder, and accepts it, what happens to such a brain? Come on, sirs! It becomes naturally very dull. When you accept anything it must be dull. Right? When you accept your relationship with another, which is essentially conflict, when you accept it, you have accepted something which is disorderly, unaesthetic, immoral. So what happens? Your life becomes mediocre, dull, and sit there and just listen to some rubbish.

So listening to all this, is there order now in your life, not tomorrow, immediately because you see the danger? I wonder if you see this. You understand? You act instantly to danger, physical danger. And here you don't act, for various reasons. A brain that is awake, alert, sees the danger of disorder. Which means what? The brain with its thought has created this disorder. So the brain sees the danger of it and the brain acts because it must have security, safety. You understand all this? Now is your brain active in that sense? Which is never accepting anything, therefore questioning, asking, looking.

So if thought brings disorder in life, then what is order? Can there be order without the movement of thought? Please, sir, this is a real meditation. You understand? We are meditating now. When we are enquiring into order and disorder, your whole brain is active, there is no sluggish part in it. That means your whole brain

is alert, not caught in a particular groove. If order is not discipline, if order is not conformity, imitation, suppression, following a particular system, then what is order which is not put together by thought? You are following all this? Please just follow it. Just five or ten minutes more and you can go home.

What is order which is not put together by thought? See the beauty of the question first sirs, you understand. Is there such order? The universe, the heavens, the stars, sunrise, sunset, that is in total order. Nature is in total order, that nature which is the hills, the rivers, birds, tigers, you know, nature, the trees, that is in total order. It is only when man interferes with it there is disorder.

We are asking, is there order which thought has never touched? You understand? Because when thought touches anything it creates disorder. What is that order? Come on sirs, join me. In listening for an hour, are you learning? Or remembering what is said? You understand my question? Are you learning or you have gathered some information which has become knowledge and you say that knowledge will act? Which is one process. Or, listening you are learning. Right? Right sir? So have you found something in that? Come on, sirs! That where there is learning there is order. Do you understand this? No? Now, look sir, can you go on with me for a while?

To us learning is the accumulation of information and knowledge. Right? That's what you are, from school, college, university, if you are lucky enough to go through all that, accumulating, knowledge, so as to acquire a job, act skilfully. That's the whole idea. There you are accumulating knowledge, layer after layer, after layer, if you are an engineer, if you a doctor

ten years, practise and so on. All that demands time, so knowledge is time. Right? Now is there a learning without time? You are following all this? Please, sir, see the difference, first see the difference. We take time to learn a language, mathematics, biology, go to various universities and so on and so on, so you acquire a great deal knowledge, spend years through books, through listening, through experiment, science, laboratories and all the rest of it, gather a great deal of knowledge. And having acquired you act, or expand in that knowledge, getting more knowledge, more challenges, and responding according to your knowledge. Right? That is going on. Now all that requires a great deal of time. Is there a learning - please find out - in which there is no time, which means immediate perception? I wonder if you see this. You understand? To see instantly the truth of this, which doesn't require time. Oh, my lord!

Look sir, let's look at it carefully. The brain is accustomed to the time factor. I have listened to you, I may agree or disagree, if I agree then how am I to put that into action? I must study, I must learn more about it, I must hear you half a dozen times, or read your books and so on and so on, until I completely understand and then I will act. All that is a movement in time, which is part of our life. That, you see that very clearly, every school boy does, so it is very common. Now we are asking something totally different, which is, there is a learning, not accumulation, there is a learning through immediate perception and action. I'll show you in a minute if you follow it. When you see danger, physical danger, there is immediate reaction because from childhood, all through the ages, when you see a precipice, danger - you are conditioned to that and

you act instantly. Learning and acting through knowledge: knowledge - learn, knowledge, act. Our brains are used to that, so completely mechanical it has become. So anything new says, 'I don't understand it. Explain to me, talk to me, show me.' I read about it, I must be convinced, what you say may be not true, I must go to the scientist, the neurologist and all the rest of it. Which means what? Again the same process, time. So the brain has become used to time. And they are inventing, scientists are inventing, to learn a language in a few hours, breaking time - you understand? So what the speaker is saying is, there is a learning, or acting, without the whole movement of time. Which is, to see, to perceive, to see, when you see you act. Wait, I'll show you.

I realize I am greedy, suppose I am greedy. I see it, and I act instantly. I don't take time over it and say, 'Why shouldn't I be greedy? Is it right to be not greedy?' - all that. Human beings are violent. We can go into the cause of it, going into the cause of it is a waste of time. You will discover many causes according to many opinions, and you are stuck. Or you invent non-violence and you pursue that idiotic ideal. When you are really violent it is hypocrisy. You follow? So when you see that your mind is violent, your brain, your reaction, to see it instantly and end it instantly. You understand? Which is to learn to act instantly, which is not of time. I wonder if you get this. Do you get some of this? Do it! When you are violent, be aware that you are violent, and end it immediately, which is perception, action, movement - moving away from 'what was'. I wonder if you see this. So that your brain is tremendously active. Not stimulated by the speaker, as you are being now, but stimulated by your very perception. And when you

do this, you know, you will have such tremendous energy, not to do mischief, energy of clarity.

So we have talked about mediocrity, we have talked about order and disorder. When you get up from here, have you understood the nature of order so that your life is totally in order? Which means, totally order in your relationship, no image between you and another. And when there is that extraordinary sense of freedom, in that there is love. And without that life is empty. So please give your thought, give your attention to all this because it's your own life.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 6TH JANUARY 1981

There are several questions that have been given to me and before we answer the questions, what is the intention of these questions? Are the questions in themselves the answer, or the answer is outside the question? I don't know if I am making that clear. Is the solution of a problem more important than the problem itself; or if one is seeking an answer, a solution, a resolution of a problem then we are not concerned with the problem itself? But in understanding the problem with all its complexities, its causes and so on, with the problem itself then the answer is in the problem. I think that is fairly clear. But for most of us answers are more important than the problem or the question because our mind is trying to seek an answer, a solution, a resolution rather than investigate the whole source of the problem, observe its complexities and investigate it deeply. And so we are always lost in asking the answer. So if you don't mind in answering these questions - rather we are going to investigate the question together, then perhaps the solution of the question will be in the problem itself. I hope that is clear.

1st QUESTION: During your first talk here your appeal to stand up against the corrupt and immoral society like a rock protruding from the mid-stream of the river, confuses me deeply. You see, sir, this rock means, to me, to be an outsider. Such an outsider is his own light and does not need to stand up against anything or anybody. Your clarification and answer is very important to me.

First of all, are we clear at what level, at what depth, when we use the word 'corruption' it implies? There is the physical

corruption of the pollution of the air, in cities, in manufacturing towns, they are destroying the seas, they are killing nearly fifteen million and more whales, they are killing baby seals and so on and so on. There is the physical pollution in the world. Then there is the overpopulation. Then there is the corruption politically, religiously, and so on. At what depth is this corruption in the human brain, in the human activity? So we must be very clear when we talk about corruption what we mean by that word, and at what level are we talking about it.

Throughout the world, and more so in certain countries, as you travel around, observe, talk to people and so on, there is corruption everywhere. And more so, unfortunately, in this part of the world - passing money under the table, if you want to buy a ticket you have to bribe, you know all the game that goes on in this country. I am not insulting the country. As somebody said to me the other day that I was insulting the country when I said there were no good cars here, beautiful cars. Is the corruption - the word 'corrupt' means to break up, rompere comes from Latin, French and so on, it means to break up - not only in the country, various parts against the other communities and states and so on, but basically corruption of the brain and the heart. So we must be clear at what level we are talking about this corruption: at the financial level, at the bureaucratic level, political level, or the religious world which is ridden with all kinds of superstition, without any sense at all, just a lot of words that have lost all meaning, both in the Christian world and in the Eastern world - the repetition of rituals, you know all that goes on. Is that not corruption? Please, sir, let's talk it over. Is it not corruption?

Are not ideals a form of corruption? We may have ideals, say for example, non-violence, because one is violent, and when you have ideals of non-violence and you are pursuing the ideals in the meantime you are violent. Right? So is that not corruption of a brain that disregards the action to end violence? Right, that seems all very clear.

And is there not corruption when there is no love at all, only pleasure, with its suffering? Perhaps throughout the world this word is heavily loaded, and being associated with sex and when it is associated with pleasure, with anxiety, with jealousy, with attachment, is that not corruption? Is not attachment itself corruption? Please sirs. When one is attached to an ideal, or to a house, or to a person, the consequences are when you are attached to a person jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, domination. The consequences are obvious when you investigate attachment. And is not attachment then corruption?

And the questioner says, we must stand like a rock in the midst of a stream, that's only a metaphor, don't carry metaphors too far. A simile is merely a description of what is taking place, but if you make the symbol all important then you lose the significance of what is actually going on.

So the question is basically, a society in which we live is essentially based on relationship with each other, if that relationship is corrupt, in which there is no love, just mutual exploitation, mutual comforting each other sexually and in various other ways, it must inevitably bring about corruption. So what will you do about all this? That's really the question: what will you, as a human being, living in this world, which is a marvellous world, the

beauty of the world, the beauty of the earth, the sense of extraordinary quality of a tree, and we are destroying the earth, as we are destroying ourselves. So what will you, as a human being living here, act, do? So will we, each one of us, see that we are not corrupt? We create the thing which we call - the abstraction which we call society. If our relationship with each other is destructive, constant battle, struggle, pain, despair, then we will inevitably create an environment which will represent what we are. So what are we going to do about it, each one of us? Is this corruption, this sense of lack of integrity, is it an abstraction, is it an idea, or an actuality which we want to change? It's up to you.

2nd QUESTION: You often switch over from mind to brain. Is there any difference between them? If so, what is the mind?

I am afraid it is a slip of the tongue. That is, I have often said the mind and the brain. So the gentleman, the questioner says, what is the mind. Why do you switch over from one word to the other, and I apologize for that because it is a slip of the tongue, I am only talking about the brain.

The questioner wants to know what is the mind. Is the mind different from the brain? Is the mind something untouched by the brain, is the mind not the result of time, because the brain is? You are following all this? Does this interest you all? Let's go into it.

First of all to understand what the mind is, we must be very clear how our brain operates, as much as possible. Not according to the brain specialists, not according to the neurologists, according to those who have studied a great deal about the brain's of rats and pigeons and all that, but we are studying, each one of us if we are willing, the nature of our own brain: how we think, what we think,

how we act, what's our behaviour, what are the immediate, spontaneous, instant responses, are we aware of that. Are we aware that our thinking is extraordinarily along a narrow groove? Are we aware that our thinking is mechanical, along a certain particular trained activity, how our education has conditioned our thinking, how our careers, whether it is bureaucratic, engineering, or surgical and so on and so on, are they not all of them a directional, conditioned knowledge. Are we aware of all this? How the brain, with its thought - and the scientists now are saying thought is the expression of memory, of the mind, of the brain, which is experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action - they are gradually coming to that, about which we have been talking endlessly, from the beginning, that thought is a material process, there is nothing sacred about thought, and whatever thought creates whether mechanically or idealistically or projecting a future in the hope of reaching some kind of happiness, peace, are all the movement of thought. Are we aware of all this? That when you go to a temple it is nothing but a material process. You mightn't like to hear that, but that is the fact: thought has created the architecture and the thing that is put inside the building, the temple, the mosque, the church, they are all the result of thought. Are we really aware of it, and therefore move totally in a different direction? That tradition, when we accept tradition it makes the mind extraordinarily dull, you just repeat, it is very convenient, so gradually the brain becomes dull, stupid, routine, you can read endlessly the Gita, talk about the book. This is what is happening when in the world there is so much uncertainty, so much pain, so much disorder, chaos, you turn to tradition. That's what is

happening both in the West and in the East. They are becoming more and more fanatical, worshipping local deities and so on. Are we aware of this? And can we stop all that, in yourself? Or you are so dull, so used to this confusion, misery, we put up with it?

So we have to understand very clearly what the activity of the brain is, which is the activity of our consciousness, which is the activity of our psychology, the psychological world in which we live. The whole of that, the brain, consciousness, psychological world, all that is one. Right? Would you question that? Probably you haven't thought even about all this. You see one reads a great deal about all these matters; if you are a psychologist, if you are a psychoanalyst, if you are therapeutically inclined and so on, you read a lot, but you never look at yourself, never observe your own actions, your own behaviour. So that's why it is very important if you would understand what the mind is, to understand what the activities of thoughts are, which has created the content of our consciousness and the psychological world in which we live, which is part of thought, the structure which thought has built in man, the 'me' and the 'not me', the 'we' and 'they', the quarrels, the battles between ourselves, between each human being.

And the brain has evolved through time. That's obvious. Evolved through millennia, millions of years, accumulating knowledge, experience, memory, danger and so on. It is the result of time. Right? There is no question of argument about it. And is love, compassion, with its intelligence, is that the product of thought? You understand this? Is compassion, is love, the product, the result, the movement of thought? You understand my question? Can you cultivate love? Please sirs. I am afraid that feeling perhaps

doesn't exist in this country. You may read about it, you may talk about it, the books talk sometimes about it, but the word is not the thing.

So that which is not of time, which is not the product of thought, which is not the material process, is the mind. Thought, as we pointed out the other day, is in itself disorder, and mind is entirely, absolutely order, like the cosmos, like the universe. But to enquire, to go into that, not to understand the nature of the mind unless you have understood deeply the nature of thought, all its activities, comprehend it not verbally, in yourself; which means thought realizes its own place, thought realizes its place in the technological world, when you drive a car, when you speak a language, when you go to the office, or to the factory, or anything, skill needs the operation of thought. But when thought realizes its own limitation, and its place, then perhaps we can begin to see the nature of the mind.

3rd QUESTION: I am a student of chartered accountancy. Even though I could understand each and every word of JK, the message remains vague. What should I do to understand his message fully?

Don't understand his message! He is not bringing a message. He is pointing out your life, not his life, or his message, he is pointing out how you live, what's your daily life. And we are unwilling to face that. We are unwilling to go into our sorrow, our tortures of anxiety, loneliness, the depressions we go through, the desire to fulfil, to become something. You are unwilling to face all that, and wanting to be lead by somebody, wanting to understand the message of the Gita, or some other nonsensical book, including the speaker. The speaker says over and over again, he acts as a mirror

into which you can look, the activity of your own self. And to look very carefully you have to pay attention, you have to listen - if you are interested - listen and find out the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. It's all there as a book, which is yourself. The book of mankind is you. Please sir, see all the truth of all this. And we are unwilling to read that book. We want somebody to tell us about the book, or help us to analyze the book, to understand the book. So we invent the priest, the swami, the yogi, the sannyasi, who will tell you all about it. And so we escape from ourselves. So can we read the book, which is so ancient, which contains all the history of mankind, which is you. Can we read that book carefully, word by word, not distorting it, not choosing one chapter and neglecting the other chapter, taking one sentence and meditating about it, but the whole book. Either you read the whole book chapter by chapter, page after page, which may take a long time, if you read page by page it will take all your life; or is there a way of reading it completely with one glance? You understand my question? How can one read this book, which is the 'me', which is the 'you', which is the mankind - all the experiences of miseries, suffering, confusion, lack of integrity, all that is in there - how can you read it at one glance? You understand? Not take month after month, that's impossible. When you do that, taking time over the book, time is going to destroy the book. The book is you, and if you take time to investigate, read the book, that very time is going to destroy because our brain functions in time. You understand all this? So one must have the capacity to listen to what the book, the entire book says. To see clearly, which means that the brain is so alert, so tremendously active, not active as a bureaucrat, or as an

engineer, or a businessman, or as a desperate crook, but the total activity of the brain. Can you observe yourself in the mirror of that book, which is yourself completely, instantly, because the book is nothing. I wonder if you understand this. You may read the book from the first page to the last page and you will find there is nothing in it. You understand what I am saying? That means, can you be nothing. Don't become something. You understand? The book is the becoming, the history of becoming. Do you understand all this?

Sir, when you have examined yourself, if you examine yourself, if you look into yourself, what are you? A physical appearance, short, tall, beard or no beard, man, woman, name, form, and all the educated capacity, the travail, the pursuit - it's all a movement in becoming something, isn't it? Becoming what? A business manager, achieving, getting more money, becoming a saint? When a man tries to become a saint, he is no longer a saint, just caught in the trap of tradition. So you can glance at the book and see it is absolutely nothing. And to live in this world with nothing. You understand, sirs? No, you don't.

So sirs, and ladies, you hear all this, perhaps if you are going, following, travelling with the speaker you hear this at every talk, put in different words, different context, different sentences, but to bring about a complete understanding in oneself that's far more important than anything else in life because we are destroying the world, ourselves, we have no love, no care - you follow, all that.

So the speaker has no message. The message is you. The speaker - this is not a matter of cleverness - he is just pointing out this.

4th QUESTION: Is there really such a thing as transformation?
What is it to be transformed?

When you are not observing, seeing around oneself, the dirt on the road, your politicians, how they behave, your own attitude towards your wife, your children and so on, transformation is there. You understand? To bring about some kind of order in daily life, that is transformation, not something extraordinary, outside the world. That is, when one is not clearly thinking objectively, sanely, rationally, to be aware of that and change it, break it. That is transformation. If I am jealous, watch it, and not give it time to flower, change it immediately. That is transformation. When you are greedy, violent, ambitious, trying to become some kind of god, or some kind of holy man, or in business, see the whole business of ambition, how it is creating a world of tremendous ruthlessness. I don't know if you are aware of all this. Competition, sir, is destroying the world, becoming more and more competitive, the world is, more and more aggressive, and if you are, change it immediately. That is transformation.

And if you go very much deeper into the problem, first of all who is a saint? The man who struggles to become something. Right? The man who gives up the world - really he hasn't given up the world, the world is himself. He may burn inside because he may be sexual, he may be angry, but he is boiling inside. Outwardly he may torture himself, put on strange clothes, slightly neurotic, and soon you will begin to worship him. Out of the window the speaker was watching one day in Benares, a sannyasi in robes came along, sat under a tree with some kind of stick or steel something in his hand and began to shout. Nobody paid any

attention to him for the first four, five, six days. The speaker was watching all this from his window at Rajghat. Then an old lady comes along and give him a flower; and a few days later there were about half a dozen people around him, he has a garland. At the end of a fortnight he became a saint. I don't know if you realize in the West a man who is slightly distorted in his brain is sent to a mental hospital, here he becomes a saint. I am not being cynical, I am not being rude, insulting, but this is what is happening. A sannyasi is no longer a sannyasi, he is just following a tradition. And have the saints created the world, brought about through stories, ideals, a good society, a good human being? You are the result of all that. Are we good human beings? Good in the sense, whole, non-fragmented, not broken up; good means also holy, not just good qualities, I don't mean that, good behaviour, being kind, that's only part of it. Being good implies an unbroken, unfragmented, harmonious human being. Are we that, after these thousands of years of saints, and Upanishads, and Gitas and all the rest of that? Or are we just like everybody else? So we are the humanity. To be good is not to follow, to be able to understand the whole movement of life. I must go on.

5th QUESTION: You say that if one individual changes he can transform the world. May I submit that in spite of your sincerity, love and truthful statement, and that power which cannot be described, the world has gone from bad to worse. Is there such a thing as destiny?

What is the world? What is the individual? What has one individual done individually, as we understand it generally describing an individual, what have individuals done in the world

which has influenced the world? Hitler has influenced the world. Right? Mao Zedong has influenced the world; Stalin has influenced the world, Lenin, Lincoln, and also totally different, the Buddha has influenced the world. One person. One person killed millions and millions of people, Mao Zedong, Stalin, Lenin, Hitler and all the warmongers, the Generals, they have all killed, killed, killed. That has affected the world. Right? That is obvious. History is filled with wars. Within the last historical five thousand years where history has been kept, there has been a war every year, practically, right throughout the world, that has affected millions of people. And you have the Buddha on one side, he has also affected the human mind, the human brain throughout the East. And there have been others who have distorted. So when we talk about individual change, and will that individual change bring about any transformation in society, I think that is a wrong question to put.

Are we really concerned about the transformation of society? Really, actually, if you go into it seriously, are we really concerned? Society which is corrupt, which is immoral, which is based on competition, ruthlessness - right? - that is society in which we are living, wars, are you really, deeply interested in changing that, even as a single human being? If you are, then you have to enquire what is society. Is society a word, an abstraction, or a reality? You are following all this? Is it a reality, or is it an abstraction of human relationship? You understand? An abstraction of human relationship. Therefore it is human relationship that is society. Can that human relationship with all its complexities, with its contradictions, with its hatreds, you understand, sir, relationship, can you alter all that? You can. You can stop being

cruel, you know all the rest of it. What your relationship is, your environment is. If your relationship is possessive, and selfish, self-centred, and all the rest of it, you are creating a thing around you which will be equally destructive. So the individual is you, you are the rest of mankind. I don't know if you realize it. Psychologically, inwardly, you suffer, you are anxious, you are lonely, you are competitive, you try to be something, and this is the common factor throughout the world. Every human being throughout the world is doing this, so you are actually the rest of mankind. So if you perceive that, and if you bring about a different way of living in yourself you are affecting the whole consciousness of mankind, like Hitler did. That's if you are really serious and go into it deeply. If you don't, it's all right, it's up to you.

6th QUESTION: Is it possible for an ideal teacher to discharge his duties in the classroom of a school without making use of reward and punishment? Can a teacher inculcate certain decent behaviour of poverty-stricken children who are in need of true education? Kindly give your answer with special reference to the poor children and the problem of a teacher who is working in poverty-stricken areas.

First of all, let's look at it large, not just a poverty-stricken teacher teaching poor children - we will come to that. Let's look at it, the question, widely. Who is a teacher? What is a teacher? What is a student? What is the relationship between a teacher and a student? What is education? You understand? You must take all these factors and look at it widely, not just say, I am a teacher in a particular little school with poor children - we will come to that. But first let's look what is education, what do we mean by

education? Are we educated? You may have a degree, BA, MA, or FBA, or whatever it is, you know all that kind of stuff, you might have all those degrees, are you educated? You may be able to read and write, go to the office, have a job, earn a livelihood and so on and so on, but are you actually deeply educated, or you have educated only a very, very small part of the brain, so that that training gives you a livelihood, a skill, and the rest you neglect totally. So are we educated? You see, answer this question, put to yourself these questions. Then who is a teacher? The man who knows mathematics, who can help you to write a good essay, a biologist? So who is the educator? You see, what we are saying is we are being educated, and this education which is conditioning us is destroying us. Right? You may not see it because you are only concerned with getting a degree, earning a livelihood, getting married, a good job, settle down, and slowly die, going to the office from morning until evening, nine hours a day, or eight hours a day, that's your life. And you are all very, very educated. Right? Right, sirs? Face it! So you want to produce more such human beings, whether they are poor or well-to-do. Right?

So what is education? Apart from this, which is necessary at certain times, certain periods, and so on, then what is real education? Education of the understanding of the whole psychological world which is you. Right sirs? Do you understand? That is totally neglected. It's like developing an arm, one arm, getting it very, very strong, and the other almost paralysed, and you call this education. And there are all the teachers who are helping you to be educated. That is, to cultivate a very small part of the brain through information, knowledge, to have a livelihood. So

education means the cultivation of the whole of the brain, the whole of one's psychological structure. You understand, sirs? I know you will shake your head, nod your head, agree, but you will do nothing. This is the calamity of this country, you are all so full of words and ideas but when it comes to action, nothing.

And is there a teacher who has an actual relationship with the student? Which is, what is the relationship between the teacher and the student in a school, whether he is poor, well-to-do, top schools, what's the relationship? Go on sirs, this is your children. Is the teacher concerned with his behaviour, with his conduct, with the words he uses, linguistically, whether he is aggressive, violent, brutal, a bully, is he concerned with all that, or only teaching mathematics? So one has to be, if one is a teacher, one has to find out whether you are really a teacher, really a teacher, or merely you have become a teacher because you haven't got any other better job. Teaching, a teacher is the highest profession in the world. The highest profession, not the governments, not the prime ministers, not the engineers, because they are responsible for the future generation. And you don't respect them. They are the lowest paid, they are treated with disrespect. You respect those people above you, in the ladder of success, and you despise all those below you, and one of those below you is like me, like the teacher.

So please, if you are an educator, and I hope you are, all of you are educators because you have children, family, yourself, your wife, your neighbour, if you are an educator, are you there merely as an informer giving information about biology, physics, or are you a teacher in the highest sense. Which means, you care, you care how you and the student behave, you care to have good taste,

cultivate aesthetics, a sense of beauty, which doesn't exist in this country. And if you are a teacher of poor children, poverty, why has this poverty existed, exist at all, what is the fault, whose fault is it? You understand, sirs? Is it the government, overpopulation, birth control, all the rest of it, who is responsible for all this? You see poverty around you all the time in this country. It's despairing, if you watch it you cry. And who is responsible for it? And by educating the poor children, what are they going to become? Bureaucrats, lawyers, doctors, join the good old establishment? You understand all these questions, sirs? So it is not the poor or the rich, they are children. You understand? Don't put them as poor children or rich, they are children. And if you have care, affection, love, then education becomes something entirely different. But you don't care, that's what is happening.

So you see, sirs, if you have a son, or a daughter - I am sure you have - all your concern is that they should have a good job, get married, settle down. That's all you are concerned with, and that you call responsibility, you don't call it love, you call it responsibility. And so what happens to those poor children of yours? They become like you, go to the office day after day, day after day, until you are sixty, and then wither away, and talk about god, rebirth, and lovely heaven. We are not being cynical, this is what is happening. So if a teacher, and the teacher's profession is the highest profession in the world - the speaker says this in all the schools he goes to, Rishi Valley, Rajghat and here, all these places, you are the highest profession because you are bringing about a new generation of people, not the old, don't turn them out like machines. But the parents are the trouble - you are the trouble, not

the children. You want them all to be like the rest of the mediocre world. So, sirs, it's up to you.

7th QUESTION: What is the source of thought? How does one go to the very source of thought so that there is a possibility of silencing the thinking process itself?

This is a wrong question. Sir, what is thinking? I am asking you. What is thinking? You do that all day long. Right? When you go to the office, when you go to the temple, when you talk, when you are destructive. What is thinking? Go on, sirs. Have you ever even thought about what is thinking? What is the movement of thought? Let's begin slowly. This is the last question. It's quarter to nine. Good lord! We have been an hour and a quarter here, I'm sorry.

Now, what is thinking? Not what to think, not what you think about, not what thought should do, or not do, but we are asking what is thinking itself. You think if you are a businessman in one way, you think as a lawyer in another way, an engineer, a computer expert, you think in these ways; but we are asking, what is thinking itself. If one is asked your name, you reply instantly. There is no hesitation - hesitation being time interval. Please just follow this for a little. When you are familiar with something there is no activity of thought, there is instant response. You know the house you live in, the street you go by, that is familiarity, constant repetition as your name, there is instant response. That response has been immediate because there has been past repetition: my name is so-and-so, I have been called that name since I was a small boy, and I repeat it, repeat it, repeat it, when you ask what my name is, out it comes.

Then if one asks a more complicated question, a very

complicated question, which is, suppose, what is the distance between here and London, you hesitate, you have read about it somewhere, or you begin to enquire what is the distance, so a time interval between the question and the answer, during that interval there is the operation of thinking. Right? That is, asking somebody, reading about it, looking to see whether it is exact and so on, that is the operation of thinking is going on, searching. Then there is the reply. That is, between the question and the answer there is a time interval, in that time interval there is the movement of thought. Right?

Now if one is asked a question for which you have no answer, no answer, which means you are not looking, you are not waiting to be told, you are not searching, asking, you have said, 'I don't know'. When you say, I don't know, actually I don't know, what has happened to the quality of thinking? You are following this? Please, sir, do follow this. Do it with me. When you actually say, I don't know, and you mean it, not say, 'Well I'll find out. I am waiting for an answer. I am doing it', but when you are absolutely clear that you don't know, what happens to the movement of thought? Go on, sir, tell me what happens. Oh, for god's sake! The activity of thought comes to an end for the moment. Which means - follow it, sir, slowly, follow it carefully - which means the brain is no longer seeking, asking, searching, tentatively feeling out, it is absolutely quiet because it doesn't know. Right? Do you see this?

So is your brain ever in a state of not knowing about anything? Or your brain is always full of knowledge? You follow, sir? You are following all this? Which is, your brain is occupied - occupied with what you are doing, how you will tell this, quarrels with your

wife, husband, business, churning. That churning process, the chattering, whether it is business chattering, whether it is social gossip, whether it is physicists' gossip, you follow, the whole of that is the movement of thought, acquiring more and more knowledge and responding, from that knowledge thought, action. And so our brain is full of occupation. Which is so, you can see it. It's only when you say, 'I really don't know', that's a very frightening statement for most people because we are all so vain, conceited, arrogant, we are so full of other people's knowledge, we are secondhand people. It's only the mind, the brain that says, 'I don't know'. You understand the beauty of this, sirs?

Such a brain is a quiet brain because it is totally unoccupied. It is occupied when necessary, but otherwise absolutely in a state of not-knowing. You understand this?

Now thought - the source of thought is memory. Memory is knowledge, knowledge is experience. That's a fact. And so the source of thought is experience, whether your experience, or thousands of years of experience, which is stored up in the brain as knowledge. Therefore thought is a material process, matter. Anything that thought creates is matter. Your gods are matter. I know you don't like this. There is nothing sacred that thought has created. It is the mind that is beyond thought, beyond time, that knows what it is to be sacred. Right sirs.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 7TH JANUARY 1981

I see there are several questions here, and before we go into them may I point out that we seem to live on explanations. You put a question, and if there is an answer to it we are either satisfied or dissatisfied, and explanations, descriptions and commentaries are really a lot of words, a lot of theories. And we seem to live on those, on words, and it is like living on ashes. So we are generally starved, if we live on words, both physically, psychologically and intellectually. So if one may point out this, that we are together going into these questions, and the explanation, if it is merely the investigation of words then I am afraid we shan't get very far.

Do you want to deal with that question first, investigation into death, that somebody asked? Or shall we begin with this first? Shall I begin with this and later on answer your question, sir?

1st QUESTION: We are medical students in college, why is it we never notice things in the way you do? Why are we not serious enough to change ourselves?

Does this only apply to medical students? Or does it apply to most of us? We never notice the morning clouds, the parrots and their wayward flight. We never notice the dog on the wayside, or the goats that lie in the middle of the road. Or we never notice the beauty of a tree. And why is it, the questioner says, that we do not change. What is the root of all this? A civilization like in India, which has probably existed for three to four thousand years, a culture that has almost disappeared, which has now become extraordinarily mundane, worldly, money-minded, corruption, and

all the rest of it, why it is that we don't change? Ask yourself, if you are serious enough, ask yourself, why is it I don't change, what is it that prevents us. Is it financial security, which we are seeking; physical stability? That's one point. Is it that we are intellectually, that is able to discern, to distinguish, to understand, to be critical, to sustain sceptical outlook on life, intellectually, which we don't do. Is it emotionally we are starved? We are very sensuous people, sex, pleasure, therefore the demand for money, position, power, ambition, and all the rest of it - is this what is preventing us?

Because we are all of us from childhood, from the moment the baby is born it seeks security - physical, psychological security. It wants to be safe with the mother; if anyone dislikes the mother the baby feels it. This has been tested out - in the West, not here.

The question is, why, realizing all this, do we not change? Or we never realize this fact? We just carry on in the good old tradition - Rama, Seti and all the rest of it - and our brains have become so accustomed to this pattern of living, so it refuses to change because it is very comfortable to live in a pattern. Is that the reason why we don't change? Is it that we have not enough energy - both physical, psychological energy? We have plenty of energy, you go to the office everyday for the rest of your life, that indicates a great deal of energy. The energy that we waste through quarrels, cruelty, indifference. We have got plenty of energy. And again, why don't we change, we know all this? Some of you perhaps have heard the speaker for the last thirty, forty, fifty years and there is very little change, why? Answer it yourselves, sirs. Why is it that we have become so dull? Is it the tradition, your religion, your sacred books? I am asking you, please investigate with me. Are all

these the reasons why we don't change?

It's natural and healthy to want security; you need food, clothes and shelter, everyone does, that's natural. And is there security psychologically, which we want? We want security in our relationship, however intimate or not, we want to be quite sure my wife, my husband, remains with me. We are so terribly attached. If one could understand the nature of attachment with all its consequences, and see the very danger of such an attachment, which denies love, if one really saw that and dropped it immediately, then perhaps some change can take place. But we don't. You hear this, that attachment in any form, to anything, is very, very corrupting, destructive. The explanation, we can go into it, when you are attached to somebody or to a principle, or to an ideal, to a belief, you are not only separating yourself from another but from that attachment to a belief, to a person, to an ideal, there is fear, there is jealousy, there is anxiety, a sense of possessive pleasure, and therefore always in a state of uncertainty inwardly. One knows the consequences of attachment.

Now, would you change that immediately? Or just listen, fold your hands most respectfully, and turn up the next day while we talk about attachment. You understand my question? Why? Why are we so sluggish? You ask it, sirs.

One realizes that basically, deeply, one doesn't want to change, and therefore there are various forms of escape. There are not only drugs, chemical drugs one takes in order to escape from one's narrow, ugly, sloppy life, one takes them to have more experience and have a different vision, through alcohol, LSD, marijuana, all those things that are going on in this world. Why is our mind so

dull that we don't see danger and change immediately, why? Do please, go on, sirs. This is real sorrow. You understand? This incapacity to bring about a change in ourselves and therefore in society, in our relationship, this incapacity makes one not only time-bound but we don't flower, we don't grow, we don't move. So what is one to do? Do you want more shocks, more pain, more suffering to make one change?

So there are those people who say, as human beings will not change, therefore create a society that will control the human being - the communist world, the totalitarian world, the socialist world. The more we are uncertain, as is now taking place in the world, more insecure, we turn to tradition, we turn to gurus, or join some political party. All this is going on, if you have realized. So at the end of all this, why don't we change? You understand? Why? Is it the utter unwillingness, the utter stupidity?

When you observe all this right through the world, it is a very sad affair. There is marvellous technology, which is growing at such immense speed, and man cannot keep up with it psychologically, and so he is going to destroy human beings. I don't know if you are aware of all this. So what are you going to do? Carry on as before? Probably you will.

2nd QUESTION: Having been recently hurt, and having heard you saying, when you tread on the image you have created for yourself, about yourself, can we not record the hurt. Can we get rid of the image? How can this be done?

Shall we go into it deeply, together? I hope the questioner is here: one generally puts the question and goes away, because one hasn't the time, the energy, the interest, but only the sense of being

hurt.

We are hurt from childhood. This is a fact. The scolding of the parents, the constant, 'do this', 'don't do that', 'it must be like this and it must not be like that' - the constant reproach, that hurts the child. And in schools, the constant comparison through examinations; in college, university, the process goes on all the time. And as you get a little older you are hurt by your wife, or your husband, you are afraid of public opinion, you are hurt by a gesture, by a look, by a word. And you carry this hurt throughout life. And the questioner asks, how am I to be free of the hurt. It may be recent, or long, deeply established. Are you interested in this question? Do you know, sir, are you hurt? Or you are totally unaware of it?

What is being hurt when you say, 'I am hurt' - not physically but psychologically, inwardly, when you say, 'I am hurt by what you said, by not invited to lunch', by not having a good position and so on, what is it that is hurt? Go on sir, we are investigating, don't go to sleep, it's too early in the morning. What is it that is hurt? Is it you that is hurt? What is the 'you'? Please think together, work together. What is the 'you' who is hurt? You have an image about yourself, that you are a Hindu, Brahmin, non-Brahmin, you know, you have an image about yourself: you are very clever, or dull, competing with somebody, you are a clever lawyer. You follow, you have got a certain image, a certain picture about yourself. Right? That's obvious, isn't it? If I have a picture about myself, that I am rather a great man, that I am very well known, that I am a great something or other, somebody comes along and says, 'You are a bit of an ass, you are rather silly', I naturally get hurt because

I think I am a big person. You come and say, 'Don't be silly, don't be an idiot', I get hurt. What is the thing that gets hurt? Is it my picture about myself? The image that I have built about myself, that I am very clever, that I can do this or that, that I have a large audience, and somebody comes along and says, 'Your audience is old, gaga, a dead audience, you ought to consider bigger audience', I get hurt. You understand? This is the normal process that goes on in life - rather, an unnatural process that goes on in life.

So we are asking, what is it that gets hurt? The picture, the image, the concept I have about myself, which we all have, therefore it gets trodden upon, somebody puts a pin into it, somebody calls it by a name, and that image gets hurt. That image is you. Then you say, I am hurt. Right? Is this clear?

Then the questioner says, how am I to be free of the image. Right? How am I not to record the hurt? How am I to be free so that there can be no hurt whatsoever? The consequences of being hurt are that I build a wall round myself. Right? Because I don't want to be hurt more, so I build a wall. Building a wall round myself makes me more isolated. Right? And the consequences of that isolation are that I have actually no relationship at all with another. I may have a physical, sensuous response, or intimacy with another, but actually I have no relationship. So when I am hurt I build a wall round myself which creates more fear, makes me a little more vulnerable, and so I keep that hurt for the rest of my life. This is what is happening. So what shall we do?

Why do we create images about ourselves? I am a PhD, I am the president of some idiotic company, I am a high bureaucrat, or I am the archbishop of something or other. You see how society is

built on this principle. I do not know if you are aware of it in yourself. And as long as you have that image somebody is going to put a pin into it. So the question is: not only how to be free of the image, but also is it possible not to record? You understand? The brain is recording, recording that crow, the noise of the crow, recording various things in life, all the time recording. I don't know if you see. This is the function of the brain. If you don't record you are not able to continue in action. You understand? So there must be recording going on. We record in order to be secure. The recording is to learn a language so that I can communicate. The recording is to become a lawyer, a surgeon, a politician. There is this constant process of recording. In that process there is a sense of security, which is, in becoming something one feels secure. I wonder if you are following all this. It's your life, please follow all this. So the brain is trained through millennia to record. And when you call another an idiot, or a foolish person, it is recorded. So that is one of the problems: is it possible not to record; only record what is necessary, and not to record anything else? I wonder if you follow all this?

So the question is: when you are not invited to a luncheon where important people are you get hurt, and not to record the invitation, and not being invited there. You follow? Not to record it. Is that possible? You understand my question? It is possible only when you have no image about yourself. Is that possible? Living in this world, which is very competitive, ruthless, totally indifferent to what happens to another, merciless, to live in this world, go to the office, a good lawyer, a good surgeon, etc., not to have an image about oneself - is that possible? If you have an image you are going

to be hurt. If you have an image somebody is going to smash it. You have an image that you are a religious person, and somebody says, are you really, or is it just a lot of words. You follow? Is it possible not to have an image and live in this world? It is possible, completely possible. Which means you are nobody. To live in this world and be nobody, except to be a good lawyer, to be a good engineer. You understand? That's our livelihood, to be an excellent teacher, excellent - efficiency of any kind, there you need a capacity, not an image, to be efficient doesn't mean that you have an image. But psychologically, inwardly, not to have a single shadow of image, then nobody can hurt you. There is no hurt. Right?

This concept that you must become something, that is, in the world you are a clerk, then you become a manager, you become an executive, you become the top boss. An apprentice carpenter, then learn, spend several years and then you can become a master carpenter. You are the priest, then you become the top priest, then you become the higher priest, then you become, god knows what else. So this is the process that is going on. That same process is moved to the psychological world, that you must become something - reach heaven. You understand? That ultimately you will attain, god knows what. So the same process has moved to the psychological world. Right? The becoming. So as long as you are becoming something you are going to be hurt. Right?

Now, you have heard all this, logically, reasonably, sanely, put before you. You have exercised your mind, your brain, in looking at it, in considering it. Now, will you drop your image? No, sir. If you don't you are going to be hurt, and being hurt you are going to

be isolated, and in isolation there is greater fear, and in isolation there is no love. So it's up to you.

3rd QUESTION: When I love someone I find myself deeply attached. When I really love someone I am intensely concerned, and deeply interested in the person, which always involves attachment. How can we be so intensely concerned and yet not be attached?

What do you mean when you love someone? Go on, sir, investigate it. Is it attraction? Don't be ashamed. We are going to go into this. Is it attraction, a sensual attraction, sexual attraction? You are young, all your glands are functioning, you are healthy, and the natural urge, sexual urge for procreation and all the rest of that, there is this 'falling in love' as it is called. Right? And in that love there is the sexual urge, there is the pleasure of companionship. Am I telling you all this? You already know all this.

So there is the sexual attraction, the pleasure of companionship, the escape from loneliness. Right? And you say, 'I love that person intensely'. After a few years, you know what takes place. We are not being cynical, we are just pointing out. And you get bored, tired, the same old repetitive sexual reactions, seeing the same person who was nice looking at the beginning, and now has become coarse, vulgar, stupid. And you yourself are growing old, ugly, stupid, and that love goes overboard. Right? And what are you attached to? To the person, deeply concerned about the person? Are you really deeply concerned about the person? Which means what? Go on, sir, examine it, for god's sake, your life this is. When you are deeply concerned about a person what do you do?

You don't want to hurt her or him. You won't nag, you won't get angry, you won't scold, you won't bully, you won't use her for your sexual purposes. Therefore one questions whether one is deeply concerned about anything at all. Probably you are deeply concerned with only one thing, money, position, power.

And the questioner says, in this so-called love I am attached. Attached to what? To the person? Please watch it carefully. To the person? Or to the image you have about that person? Go on, sir, think it out. You have built an image about that person: the sexual image, the image of endless chattering. Right? The image of being kind, comfortable, flattering and nagging, you know the whole thing that goes on. And you have built this marvellous image about her, and she about you and there you are. And you are attached not to her, the image you have about her, or him.

Then the questioner says, to be deeply concerned and yet not be attached. Silly! If you are really concerned, are you attached? No, sir, you are never attached if you are really concerned about another.

4th QUESTION: What is your stand with regard to miracles? We are told that even you have performed what would normally be called miracles. Do you deny that fact?

How do you know the speaker has performed miracles? How do you know? Somebody told you about it? Naturally. And is it very important? In the Christian world miracles are very important. Right? Jesus is supposed to have performed many miracles, and that has become one of the factors. Is it very important to perform miracles? That is, to change something out of nothing, to cure somebody without medicine, without surgery, without going

through all that misery, to heal somebody. Which is more important, to heal physically somebody or heal psychologically? You are not interested in all that. You are interested only in miracles that will give you more money.

Sir, do you see how sad all this is, how childish all this is? Isn't it very sad what human beings have reduced themselves to, to be so easily satisfied by miracles. Obviously you can produce miracles. What? What's important about it? The speaker has probably healed somebody. All right. Physically. All right, what? A doctor heals somebody, they do, surgeons heal people. Right? You don't give them importance. But a man who does something without medicine, without this and without that, that's a miracle and you are astonished and worship that person. You follow, it is all becoming so childish, immature.

So one asks, not what is the fact, but why have we become so childish about all these matters? You understand, sir? You understand, the world is going to pieces, you understand, in this country there is such degeneration, you are degenerating, you understand? You are corrupt, you are making things ugly in life. To change that is the miracle. Not some silly person doing some kinds of tricks. This is the greatest miracle that can happen to a human being, to completely change and flower into something extraordinary. That's possible. But you are not interested. You want somebody to do everything for you. Nobody is going to help you psychologically.

5th QUESTION: You say, sir, that one should look at things totally and not fragmentarily, and that such observation is possible only when the brain is completely attentive. What should I do now

to make the brain behave rightly?

Good lord! First of all, sirs, isn't it obvious that we look at things partially? Right, that's clear. You look at your wife, your husband, your friend partially. And our life is fragmented. Right? Say one thing, do another, go to all the temples with their nonsense, and be a very good lawyer. The two are incompatible. You follow? I don't know if you follow all this. So we live a life of hypocrisy. You may not like to have that pointed out, but that's a fact. The pretensions that we have of being very religious, and yet be ambitious, be competitive, ready to kill another, violence, and all the rest of it. So there's great contradiction in our life. And that contradiction shows our brain thinks in contradictions, which is fragmentation. Right? You understand this? So is it possible for the brain to observe totally? It's not possible when you are living a fragmentary life, you cannot possibly see totally. That's so simple. Right? So can you not live a hypocritical life? It's very simple, a simple question, which is, can you live with great integrity, never, never saying something you don't really understand, which you have not lived, experienced. You understand? Don't repeat what others have said, have ideals and never live those ideals, that is hypocrisy. Right? A man who says, I am violent but I am trying to be non-violent - that is hypocrisy. Right? Right sirs? You don't agree with that? You are all very silent.

Q: It is only a metaphor.

K: Oh, no, it's not a metaphor. To live a life, as we do, it is fragmentary. Right? It is so obvious. And therefore our outlook on life is fragmentary, broken up. And that indicates saying one thing and doing another. You know this, don't you? So how can a mind -

a brain, which is fragmentary, and thought is fragmentary - right, would you agree to that? Oh, for god's sake - thought which is fragmentary, and anything thought does is fragmentary because thought is the result of experience, knowledge, memory, and the response of memory is thought. And thought brings its action, which is fragmentary and this fragmentary process of thought must create hypocrisy. Right? Say one thing, do another, think one thing and pretend to say, to do something else. This is the nature of thought. I do not know if you realize thought can never be honest. Right? Because thought in itself is fragmentary.

And the questioner asks, as the brain cannot perceive the whole, then what is one to do? Quieten the brain, have patience with it, don't pretend. That's all. Don't put on masks; when you meet an important person you put on a mask, and are very, very respectful, and when you meet your servant you kick him. So to have a brain not fragmented, means it has to slow down, watch, be patient, look at it, observe what is happening to you. Then to see something wholly, completely, you can only do that when you hear completely. You understand? Are you listening to what the speaker is saying now completely? No, you are not. That is, to listen without translating what he is saying to suit your own condition, or to listen, or listening you say, 'Well I have heard that before', or when you listen, not say, 'This is what I have read in books', which all indicates that you are not listening. Obviously. So to listen completely, that means you have to give attention to what you are listening to, which means that you are facing the problem. Right? Are you? Or your mind is wandering off, you are doing all kinds of tricks.

So sir, to be aware, to be aware of yourself, choicelessly, to look at yourself, the gestures you are making, the positions you are taking, the way you sit and look, to observe entirely, totally, without any motive, direction. That is possible.

6th QUESTION: Is there any survival after death? When man dies full of attachments, sorrow, regrets, what happens to this residue?

I don't quite understand, to this residue of what? Is there any survival after death - that is the real question, isn't it sir? No? You want to talk about death? Shall we go into it? Are you interested in it? Probably not, are you? Are you? You are not interested in death? What a lot of fuss you make when somebody dies close to you. Have you noticed that? Everybody else cries with you, you know what goes on in India when somebody dies, the appalling fuss they make about it. Not that it doesn't happen elsewhere. Let's go into it.

First of all, do you perceive, do you actually realize that your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind? Do you realize that? Is that a fact to you? As factual as somebody puts a pin into your arm, you feel the pain of it, is it as actual, not the pain, but the fact? That is, your brain has evolved through time and that brain is the result of a million years, and that brain may be conditioned if it lives in one part of the world, under a different culture, different climate, but it is the common brain of mankind. Right? Be quite sure of that. It's not your individual brain. That brain has inherited various responses, that brain with its genes which is also partly inheritance, partly of time, that is the common factor of mankind. Right? Do you understand this? It's not your brain. Thought may

say, it is my brain, thought may say, I am the individual. Right? That's our conditioning. Are you an individual? Go into it, sirs. Are you an individual? You have a name, you have a different form, a different name, different form, a different face, short, tall, dark, etc., etc., does that make individuality? Does your belonging to a certain type, or a group, or a community, or a country, does that make you different, or make you an individual? Come on, sirs, move.

So what is an individual? An individual is one who is not fragmented. But since you are all fragmented you are not individuals. You are the result of the climate, etc., etc., with all its trappings. If that fact is soaked into your blood, that it is a fact. You may consider yourself an individual, but that's merely the expression of thought. Thought is common to all mankind, based on experience, knowledge, memory, stored up in the brain. Right? The brain is the centre of all the sensory responses, which is common to all mankind. I don't know if you are following all this. This is all logical.

So when you say, what happens to me after I die - right, have you understood sir, that's what you are interested in, me that is going to die. What is 'me'? Your name, how you look, how you are educated, the knowledge, the career, the family tradition, and the religious tradition, the beliefs, the superstitions, the greed, the ambition. Right? Look at it, sir. All the chicanery that goes on, the ideals that you have, all that is you. Right? Which is your consciousness. That consciousness is common to all mankind because they all so greedy, they are all so envious. Right? They are frightened, they want security, they are superstitious, they believe

in one kind of god and you believe in another kind of god. Some are communists, some are socialists, some are capitalists. Right? So it is all part of all that. So that is the common factor that you are the rest of mankind. Right? You may agree, say, yes that's perfectly right, but you go on acting as individuals. That's what is so ugly, so hypocritical.

Now what is it that dies? You follow? If my consciousness is the consciousness of mankind, modified, etc., etc., it is the consciousness which I think is me is the common consciousness of man - right? - then what happens when I die? The body is burnt, or buried, or burnt up in an accident, what happens? The common consciousness goes on. I wonder if you realize it. Therefore when there is a perception of that truth then death has very little meaning. There is no fear of death then. There is fear of death only when I, as an individual, which is the tradition, which the brain has been programmed like a computer, saying, I am an individual, I am an individual, I believe in god, I believe this, I believe that - the computer can do all that. You understand? Can repeat.

So you see sirs, there is one factor that you miss in all this: love knows no death, compassion knows no death. It's only the person that doesn't love, or has no compassion, is afraid of death. Then you will say, 'How am I to love?' Right? How am I to have compassion, as though you can buy it in the market. But if you saw, if you realized that love alone has no death, sir that is real illumination, that is beyond all wisdom, all words, all kinds of intellectual trappings.

So, shall we have some more questions? It is a quarter to nine. You have heard the speaker on several occasions, probably read

something he has written or said - I don't know why you read books, we live on other people's ideas. Right? We never read the book which is ourselves. We are the history of mankind. Right, that's obvious. That book is us. And to read that book carefully, never skipping a word, a page, a chapter, but to read the whole book, and the reading of that book cannot be taught by another, no guru, no saviour, no master, no psychologist, no professor, nobody is going to help you read that book. That's the first thing to realize. That you are to read that book by yourself, which is you, you are that book, to read that. Either you read it slowly, page by page, year after year, until you die, therefore you have never read it completely, you understand, or you read it with one glance, the whole book. And that can be done only when the brain is so sharp, so alert, without any motive, without any direction, alert, awake, in which there is no contradiction, no sense of hypocrisy. Then you can read that book without even looking at it, the book is over. Then you will find out for yourself what lies beyond the book.

MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH JANUARY 1981

Will it be necessary to repeat what we have been talking about during the last four gatherings here? Perhaps some of you have come for the first time here, or some of you may have not really listened at all, and some of you are here probably out of curiosity and an unfortunate reputation, but I think we should go over what we said in the last few talks very briefly, and those who have heard it please have the goodness to forgive if you hear what has already been said.

We were saying not only in this part of the world but probably everywhere else the human brain, the human conduct, the behaviour, the morality and so on must be salvaged, that is to be saved, to be rescued. And people perhaps don't seem to care very much what is happening to them both in their psychology, to the earth, to the air, to the sea, which is being polluted, which is slowly being destroyed by human beings, by you, by the rest of us. And we hardly give any thought to it, and if we do, we join some kind of little group to do something about it, and get lost with the group's quarrels, with the group therapy and so on and so on. But seeing that the salvage can only be made, or brought about in the brain of the human being themselves, the brain itself has to be rescued. The brain itself is losing its quality, its quickness, its perceptibility, its sensitivity, its capacity to think objectively, sanely, rationally, not according to any philosopher however clever, or any particular political division - right, left, centre. Nor can the politicians solve this problem, nor the scientists, the

biologists, the economists, the gurus, and the various religious organizations, whether it be Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and so on. It is fairly obvious to any observant thinking man that none of these can solve our problems.

And as we said, we have to enquire. And a sceptical enquiry into the nature of man, the psychological world as well as the intellectual world, the investigation of that through scepticism, never believing anything, never following anybody, nor obeying - except the laws, of course, if you don't pay taxes you will be had up. But also there is so much corruption going on with regard to all that, not only in this country but everywhere else - perhaps more so in this country, corruption has become the way of life here. Seeing all this, that no philosopher, no politician, no organized religious group can ever solve this problem of human existence, which is now degenerating, which has become corrupt, which lacks utter integrity, then there is no spirit of co-operation. Naturally from all this, as we said last week, we have great disorder in our lives, not only in our daily life but in the society in which we live - the society being our relationship with each other, our daily human relationship in which there is a great deal of conflict, pain, anxiety, loneliness and all the rest of that.

And also we talked about, the last time we met here, about order and disorder. We said, disorder, as we explained very carefully, is caused by thought itself; thought is the origin of this disorder in which we live. Disorder that exists between nations, that nation invented, thought out by thought, the division between religions, the division between political parties, the division that exists among the scientists who are competing with each other, jealous,

more money, more Noble prizes. All this indicates a great deal of disorder, and finally war.

So in observing all this we enquired, what is the cause of all this, why man after so many millions of years has come down to the lowest point in his existence, why. We like to attribute this disorder to some fantastic causes, but actually this disorder is in our minds, in our brains. Perhaps we would not like to admit that: our consciousness is in disorder. It is in confusion. Disorder is where there is conflict within oneself and outwardly.

And we also said, and we will continue with what we are going to talk about this afternoon, that knowledge which we have acquired through experience of millions and millions of years, that knowledge as memory is stored up in the brain, from which arises thought and action. This is the chain in which we are caught: experience, knowledge, stored in the brain as memory, from which thought arises, and from that action. This is the chain in which the brain through millennia is caught. And knowledge has become extraordinarily important for all of us, because knowledge gives us a means of livelihood. That's why our education has so conditioned our minds to pursue a career, earn a livelihood, skilfully or not, efficiently or not, and survive some way or another. And knowledge, which we so cherish and worship, knowledge which we have acquired from the books, whether religious or technical, knowledge which we have acquired from our own personal experiences, knowledge which has been given to us through tradition, this knowledge that is stored up in our brain is now being transferred to the computer. Please follow all this, if you care to.

And let me also if one may ask and suggest that we think

together, observe these things together. Together, I mean together. The speaker is sitting on a platform a little bit higher than you for convenience, but he is not sitting in any state of authority. It's merely for convenience. So in this enquiry there is no authority whatsoever. We are together exploring into the cause of this present confusion, why man is declining so rapidly, morally, even physically, and intellectually.

Of course in all this there is no love. We have relationship - sexual, pleasure and all the rest of it, that is not love. Desire is not love. And this confusion which is brought about by thought, thought itself is the cause of confusion. We went into that very, very carefully. It is not that the speaker is saying something with which you disagree, or agree, but you can investigate it for yourself and test it. You can enquire into it sceptically, with a great deal of doubt - not doubt about what you have learnt, what the books say, what the Gita or the Bible or your pet religious book says, but question, doubt, be sceptical in your enquiry. And that is the religious mind, the mind that is capable of being sceptical in its investigation. Not who is religious, the man with a beard, the man with a loin cloth, the man who goes to a temple ten times a day, or to the mosque, he is not a religious man. Religion requires a great deal diligence, and that diligence, which is to observe conduct, conduct in our daily life with each other, which has nothing whatever to do with any philosophy, with any religion. They talk about it, but actually in our lives, in our daily confusing unhappy life. We are investigating that, not some theory, belief, ideals, or what some book says.

So together we are going to this evening, as on all the previous

evenings, together walk the same path, the same road, take the same journey, so that we both understand. Communication is necessary through words. The speaker has no particular jargon, neither scientific, nor religious, nor any other words, except simply, ordinary daily words, spoken in English. And the words are not the thing: your wife, or your husband, the word 'husband, the 'wife' is not the person. So in enquiring we must be very, very careful about words, knowing that the word is never the thing, knowing explanations are not the actualities.

So our mind, brain is caught in a verbal structure, because to us words mean a great deal - to be called a Muslim means a great deal to a Muslim, or to a Hindu or to a Buddhist, or to a communist, if you call him a fascist he will be very, very upset, but the communist is a fascist. So one must be extremely alert that in investigating we are not investigating the words, or that in the process of examination there is no abstraction as an idea, but actual observation of what is going on, so that our brain is active, not sluggish with words, with conclusions, with beliefs.

So together we are going into the whole question of why knowledge, intellectual, knowledge through experience, knowledge which we have acquired through tradition, whether that very knowledge - please listen, I am questioning, I am not saying it yet, I am exploring - whether that knowledge itself is not the cause of this immense confusion: not knowledge about the Gita, the Upanishads, or any of those books - books are not sacred, the printed word is not sacred, but you can attribute to that book what you like. So please, if one may again point out, we are observing together, examining together, being aware that words, explanations

are not the actuality.

So this knowledge that we have acquired through education, through experience, through the past generation upon generations, this knowledge may be - please listen carefully - may be the cause of our disaster because we are burdened with the past. Knowledge is always the past, and that knowledge being the past is incomplete. And that knowledge being incomplete, and action then being incomplete, that action must inevitably create confusion, fragmentation. Where there is fragmentation there must be not only conflict but confusion, like nations, fragmented, like religious groups, fragmented, beliefs divide man, ideals divide man. All these are fragmentations, and therefore there must inevitably be conflict, and therefore confusion.

So we are enquiring together whether knowledge is not the cause - which is thought - thought is not the cause of this tremendous decay of man. Thought, as we said, has created extraordinary things: the whole technological world, the surgery, medicine, communication, going to the Moon, and so on; and also thought has created war and all the material to kill man. Thought has also written marvellous poems - I am just reading Keat's 'Ode to the Nightingale', a marvellous poem - but it is put into words by thought. The pictures, the architecture, the temples and what is inside the temples, inside the churches, all created by thought. So thought in the world, in the physical world in certain areas has brought benefit to man; in other areas it is destroying man, that is knowledge. And this knowledge, which we have acquired through our senses and therefore connected with the brain, this knowledge man has acquired is now being transferred to the computer. I do

not know if you are aware of all this.

The computer can do everything that man can do. It can learn. It has been programmed as our brain is programmed: to be a Catholic, to be a Protestant, to be a Hindu, to be a Buddhist. You understand all this. Of course your brain is programmed, whether you like it not you have to observe it. Otherwise you wouldn't call yourself a Hindu, or a communist. Your brain has been cultivated through time, and through that time, which is the acquisition of experience, knowledge and so on, that brain has been programmed, has been conditioned to respond according to certain reactions. It is inevitable. That brain is now being given over to the computer. Please realize this. The computer is becoming your brain, the human brain. The computer plus the robot are already operating in manufacturing things - like cars. All kinds of things are happening. In about ten or fifteen years you will be unemployed. You have to face all this. Society is going to be turned upside down. It is coming, whether you like it or not it's at your door. Do you understand the seriousness of all this? I wonder if you do. That your brain, which has been so extraordinarily capable, suffered innumerable sorrows, lives in great anxiety, frightened, insecure, the whole psychological world which is the result of thought, that thought with all its knowledge has been transferred to the computer, and the robot. So man then, what is he? Do you understand my question? If the computer can do everything that you can, that your brain can, which is, it can learn, it can correct itself, it can foresee much more than human beings can, its responses are instantaneous, because it is programmed that way.

Then what is man? Do you understand all this? Computers say,

I believe in god. Oh, you people laugh, you don't see the seriousness of all that is happening to all of us. The computer can compose a poem, can compose, can diagnose better than any doctor. You understand? Then one asks, what is man, what are you? If the machine can do everything even better than you, what are you? Which is, our brains have operated mechanically. Right? It believes, it doesn't believe, it creates its own gods, its own philosophies - the computer can create a philosophy better than any philosopher. So what have we left? You understand my question? If the machine can take over everything that man can do, and do it still better than us, then what is a human being, what are you? Your belief in god? The machine has belief in god. It will do rituals better than you can do. It can invent theories better than any philosopher. Do you understand all this?

So what have we left? What we have left is our psychological world. You understand? Our sorrow, our fears, our pleasures, our anxieties, our immense loneliness. Do you understand all this? That's what we are going to be left with. Not with your gods. The gods have been invented by man, by thought. You have shaped gods according to your desires, your fears. So the computer can do all that.

So what we are going to be left with is time: biological time, psychological time, and time as day and night. That's what we are going to be left with, time. And biologically time is necessary, that's part of the genes - genes are also probably computerized in time, to have time to grow physically. And you have psychological time, that is hope, the future, the burden of the past, the anxiety, the fear, the immense everlasting pursuit of pleasure, and not only your

own particular sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, of which you are. This is what we are going to be left with. Right? Please, I hope we both are together observing the same thing. Not the speaker is observing and telling you about it, but we are together observing the facts, what is actually going on, of which most of us are not aware. Technology is advancing so rapidly. And everything that we human beings are doing now - going to the office from nine to five for the next fifty years, and education that is being given to students, all that is going to be taken over. For god's sake realize this.

So we are going to be left with all our senses. Senses which create, which is the centre of the brain, and our senses either deteriorate gradually because we are incapable of using them any more because we are only pursuing pleasure. You are following all this? And so we have to find out what time means. Right? There is the biological time, psychological time, time by the sun, sunset and sunrise, the new moon and the full moon. So there are three times: biological, psychological, time by the watch.

We can perhaps control or change the biological time, which is, you see what is happening in the world, little boys and girls are already having babies, deformed because their wombs are small. I don't know what you are all doing. This is happening, sirs. And there is psychological time. You can't do anything about the chronological time. You can perhaps get up earlier and go later to bed, but you have only one factor and that is psychological time. That time is the movement of thought in consciousness. Don't agree with me, see it for yourself. Consciousness is made up of its content. Right? The computer has its conscience because it is

programmed to think this way, that way, answer rapidly and so on, which is what our consciousness is. I wonder if you see all the implications of it. Our consciousness which is the accumulated beliefs, the accumulated confusions, the accumulated problems, the beliefs, the superstitions, the fears, the nationalities, the ideals, being left, politically, left, centre, right, all that is our consciousness, which the computer is. You realize?

So what are we going to do with our life? You understand? Either because we have time, leisure, and all the trouble which we take now to go to factories, work, work, work, the computer and the robot are going to take over. Then what is man going to do? Either you are going to pursue entertainment, which is pleasure - you understand? The religious pleasures, entertainment, Rome, cathedrals, temples, either you enter into the whole area of entertainment and perhaps that is what is going to happen, because we have lived on entertainment - entertainment from books, if you are inclined to be a philosophic mind, books, being entertained in philosophy. If you are entertained by the Upanishads, the Bible, you go in for that entertainment. Or you are being entertained by rituals, the mass, the temple worship, you know all that is going on, which is all entertainment. Or you turn inwardly. You understand? Those are the only things we have left: entertainment or deep enquiry into oneself, enquiry into the psychological world, the senses, the fears, the pleasures, whether there is ever an ending to sorrow, what is love. You understand? What death means. Because the computer will say, 'I believe in the hereafter'. Do you understand what I am saying?

So together let's go inward. You understand what I am saying?

Let us together examine whether there is an ending to fear, whether there is an ending to insecurity, not physical insecurity because the computer may change the whole structure of society, as it is happening already. So we have only two things left to us: entertainment, or going deeply into the world of the psyche, and going beyond. The scientists are also becoming entertainers, like the priests. So you cannot possibly depend on scientists to salvage our inward state, nor the psychologists, nor the priest, there is nobody that can help us, except our own observation. Which doesn't mean that we become more and more selfish. We are examining the human consciousness, the human brain. Your brain is not yours, it is the brain of humanity, because it has lived millions and millions of years. So in examining, investigating through sceptical exploration, we are examining not to become more mischievous, more ugly, more inwardly despicable, crooked, corrupt; we are examining so that the brain with all its activity taken over by computers, then we are investigating nature, whether thought which has created the psyche, whether that thought which is time, can stop. You understand? Please follow.

Thought is time. Right? Thought is the result of memory. Memory is knowledge, experience, stored in the brain, therefore it is a movement, thought is a movement of time. Right? And we are going to enquire very, very deeply whether there is a stop to time. First of all to observe: to observe what is going on inwardly, which is the result of senses, the various senses centred in the brain, otherwise you wouldn't react. So the centre of the brain is the accumulation of the senses, from which thought arises, and thought has created the 'me' and the 'you', thought has created the

individual, but thought itself being fragmented, because knowledge can never be complete, that thought has invented the individual, and so the individual is incomplete. And there is no individual because your brain is the brain of humanity, your brain has evolved through millions and millions of years, therefore you are not an individual. That's the first thing to realize. It's logical, it's not something invented by the speaker. You can see it for yourself if you examine it. So the idea that in investigating this psyche you are becoming more and more selfish, or you are going to be saved: this is not an individual salvation, this is the salvation of the human being, not you, Mr Smith or Mr Rao, or Mr whatever you name is, sorry, including myself.

So first, as we said, to learn the art of listening; listening to yourself, never distorting what you listen to. Right? That is, are you listening now to what the speaker is saying, or you are distorting what the speaker is saying to suit your own theories, conveniences, happiness, comfort, this or that, or saying tradition has already said this, which indicates that you are not listening. So the first thing is to learn the art of listening, not only to the speaker, which is unimportant, but listening to your wife, listening to your son, listening to your husband. And you cannot listen if you have an image about him or her, a conclusion about him or her, that would prevent you from listening. Right? Do it sir. If you listen that way your brain becomes extraordinarily sensitive, alert, active, which it is not now.

Then the art of seeing: the seeing without the word. You understand sir? To see something like a flower and not name it, because the word prevents you from seeing. You understand?

Come on, move sir. That means the seeing implies, not bringing previous memory in perception. Right? Then you don't see. If you want to see your wife, or your husband as they actually are - do you want to see your wife or your husband actually, without the image you have created about her or him? If you want to look, observe, see your wife, not the physical form, not the pleasure you have derived through sex, through intimacy, through comfort and all that, but to see her or him, as it is purely, that's an art. Either you give - please listen - either you give time to learn the art, as you give time to learn a language, and then when you give time to learn the art of seeing, what have you done? You haven't seen your wife at all. It is like a man saying, 'I pursue non-violence, that's my ideal', while he is being violent. You understand this? So to see without time; that means without the previous conclusions, previous records. I wonder if you understand all this. This is necessary if you want to look into yourself, if you want to observe the whole psychological world of which you are, in which there is no guide, there is no priest, there is no psychologist, there is no psychotherapist, you are watching yourself. So you have to learn the art of listening to yourself. This is what it does if you do it now; you see how your brain becomes extraordinarily supple, sensitive, active. And to see without the previous records that you have accumulated, then memory is operating, not the optical clear observation. Right?

And also one has to find the art of learning. Learning as we know it now is merely accumulating knowledge, which is mechanical. The speaker learns to speak a language, English, French, or Italian, or whatever the language is, and you accumulate

it and then you speak. Our brain is used to that, which is time. Right? Is there a learning without time? Which is, seeing instantly. That is, sir, look: man is violent, probably inherited from the animal and so on, but don't let's go into the cause of it for the moment, because each person will say the cause is different and we will get lost in the disputation of various causes. But we are violent, human beings are violent. Now when you say, 'I will become non-violent', you are learning to become something. Right? Please see, sir, what you are doing. You are learning through time to become. Right? Right? That is, your whole conditioning psychologically is to become something: if you are naughty, you become good, if you are angry, you hope not to be angry, if you are violent, you become - so we use time as a means to learn to become something, or not to become something. That's our operation, that's how our brain works. Now to see violence, and not change it to become something else, but to see violence - you understand, careful. We are thinking together, please do it as I am talking about it. If you don't like violence, take your own particular form of greed, envy, or anger, whatever you do, take it, look at it. You say when you are greedy, 'I will get over it', or 'I will transmute it', or 'I will suppress it', which are all movements of time. During that time other things happen which prevent you from ultimately from becoming non-greedy.

So you see that, you see that's a fact. You see it, do you? That the becoming involves time, during that time you are learning how to become that, which is, you are being computerized or programmed to become that. I wonder if you see that. Whereas there is a different way of learning. Which is, you are observing

yourself. If you observe yourself and you've learnt something about yourself, and from that learning you observe, you are not observing yourself. You understand the difference? Are you coming with me? That is, if I am watching my greed and I say, 'I must not be greedy', because my brain has been conditioned, or been told, religiously and all that blah not to be greedy, so I say, 'I will learn not to be greedy', which involves learning, restraining, controlling, suppressing, all that. Right, that's clear, that's what we do. Now we are asking, is there a different way of looking at greed? The word, the meaning, the word 'greed' may create greed, or is there a division between the word and the fact? You are following all this? So I am watching what is greed. And the brain is not going to be caught in the old system of becoming, but seeing as it is and ending it instantly. Do you understand? Not going through the other process but ending that which is observed immediately. See what happens.

Look: if you want to go into it very deeply, extraordinarily clear it becomes. Our brains have problems. Right? Sexual problems, relation problems, money problems, many problems. Our brains are filled with problems, whether there is god, whether there is no god, what to believe, not to believe and so on and so on. Now every problem, new problem that arises you try to solve it with all the problems that you have already, so you never solve problems, except technologically. Please understand this. The technological brain can solve problems, but our brains psychologically are so full of problems, any new problem becomes another problem to be added to the old problem. So you understand, there is never an ending to problems. I don't know if you have realized all this, or

am I just pointing out to you. You are not learning from the speaker anything. Please realize this, nothing. You are learning from your own observation. Therefore you are a dignified human being, not depending on anybody.

So when you are observing yourself when greed arises, to look for the cause is very simple - desire, which we talked about the other day. To see greed and end it so that your brain is not caught in time. You get it, what I am saying? Do it, sir, as you are sitting now, you have own particular little problem, look at it, don't try to verbalize it, don't try to run away from it, but just look at it. Stay with it. The moment you try to change it - you follow - you are caught in the time. But if you stay with it quietly without any movement of thought, you will see it is not. Right?

So there is the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. With that you approach yourself. Right? You approach yourself, which is the whole psychological world - because the computer has taken over everything you have. So you are watching yourself. Which is, watching the human consciousness, watching the human psyche, it is not your psyche, because wherever you go in the world, it doesn't matter where, human beings are suffering. Right? Human beings have fear, human beings are pursuing pleasure, human beings are afraid of death, human beings have no love. Right? So it is a common factor. Your psyche is the common factor, so you are the whole of humanity. Do you understand, sir? I know this is something probably new to you therefore you are rebelling and resisting it, but if you just listen, listen to it you will see that it is a fact for yourself. You may have a different name, different colour, different stature, different manners, but deep

down psychologically you are like the rest of mankind - mankind that is lonely, mankind that is frightened, mankind that is longing to escape from itself and burdened with the sorrow of a thousand years. You are that. So you are the representative - you are the rest of mankind, you are mankind. So when we investigate we are investigating not your particular little me, which is part also, but investigating into the whole psyche of man, therefore there is nothing selfish, there is nothing to be saved. This is not a religion, we are not talking about a religion of salvation. We are talking about the ending of fear. Fear is the result of thought. Right? Fear is the result of time - fear of the past, fear of the future. Actual fear has no time, only when thought says, 'I am afraid'. I wonder if you understand this. At the moment of fear thought is absent, it is only a sensory response, centred in the brain and thought says, 'I am afraid'. Do you understand? I am afraid of losing my job. I am afraid of losing my wife, I am jealous because my wife, etc., etc. All that is the movement of thought, as pleasure is the movement of thought, sexual pleasure, the picture, the image, all that. And also the various types of pleasure - pleasure of having more money, the pleasure of power. Right? Pleasure of possession, pleasure in attachment, whether to the wife, to a child, to a building, to an idea, and that attachment is corruption. Yes, sir. Attachment is corruption. If you are attached to your wife, you are attached for various reasons, fairly simple - physical pleasure, psychological pleasure, and the comfort you derive, or whatever it is, you are attached. Without her you feel lost, lonely, therefore you are attached. So from that attachment arises jealousy, anxiety, fear of losing and so on. So where there is attachment of any kind there

must be corruption. Right? Sir, do you see it, the truth of it, do you see the fact of it? Then end it. But if you say, 'I'll think about it, I will learn about it. Why should I not be attached' and all the rest, back and forth, then you are back into the old system where time binds you. I wonder if you understand this. Our brains have become slaves to time. But if you see that you can end time, which is ending thought.

But before we go into much deeper things this you must be clear about. A brain, a psyche that is not afraid, that has no fear, that isn't everlastingly pursuing pleasure in different forms: possession, power, siddhis, becoming an aesthetic, controlling oneself, all the various forms of pleasure. To look at it, to see what it is. It is not a pleasure when you see a sunset, beauty, but it becomes pleasure when thought says, 'I must have it again, I must go there again.' You understand all this? Sir, see it and do it instantly.

Then we have to go into also the very complex problem of sorrow, whether sorrow can ever end. Because if it does not end there is no passion. Passion is totally different from lust, from desire, from pleasure. And we have lost that passion, probably we never had it. Passion which has its own intelligence and therefore its own action. But you cannot find that, that passion cannot come into being if you have not understood or ended sorrow. And we will go into that briefly perhaps tomorrow, and also find out what is a religious mind. It is only the religious mind that creates a new culture, not machines, not the politicians, not the economists, not the scientists or the gurus. The religious mind, the mind, the brain that is investigating into the nature of what is religion, but starts

with scepticism. And we should perhaps, if we have time, do that tomorrow.

MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 11TH JANUARY 1981

This is the last talk, so cheer up!

There are many things to talk over together this evening and I hope we shall have time for it. We haven't talked about freedom, about the whole sensory activity which is centred in the brain. We have not talked about the ending of fear and the pursuing of pleasure, and the ending of sorrow, and what it is, that word which has been so spoilt, love, and also a mind that is religious, death and again that much abused word, meditation. We have got a lot of ground to cover, and I hope we can do it by one of us thinking over, talking over together - not merely listening to the speaker.

We began by saying yesterday, also in the previous talks, that there must be freedom from the known; and we are going to enquire together first what do we mean by freedom. Whether man really wants freedom at all. Many volumes have been written about freedom, various revolutions that have been started to bring about freedom to man, ending up in terrible bureaucracy and so on. And also whether on earth, here, living this life of conflict, misery and confusion, we can ever have freedom. We think freedom exists when we have choice, to move from place to place, from job to job, from one career to another. That gives us the impression that we are free, free to choose, freewill and so on. And we should really enquire together what is freedom, how vital it is in our life, whether we demand freedom, and when there is such disorder created not only in this part of the world but elsewhere, each individual, each person thinking he is free to do what he likes and

so bringing about a great deal of disorder, chaos.

So one must, if we could together, enquire what is freedom. And also we will enquire into if it is at all possible to be free from the known. Is freedom associated with a restriction, with a bondage, with a concept, with suffering? Is there a freedom totally independent, not associated with any cause or with any motive, is there a freedom that is so complete, total? We only know freedom in a prison. Being imprisoned in a family, with all the troubles of a family, being in a great deal of trouble, problems one after another, his idea of freedom is, from something: from restraint, from pain, both physical and psychological, freedom from anxiety and so on and so on. Is not such freedom a reaction? If I am caught in a great deal of trouble, I want to be free of it, and that freedom is an escape or a reaction from the trouble I am in. And for most of us that is the kind of freedom we want - from something. Or, being in something having freedom there, like a man in a prison, he is free in the prison - if you call that freedom.

So is there a freedom which is totally unrelated, which is absolute - we are using the word 'absolute' in the sense absolved, free from any causation, from any motive. And is it possible for a brain, for a human mind, the immense struggles, the conflicts, the miseries, the loneliness, can there be a freedom from all this, so completely away from this? And being so free, able to act rightly in the world. We are going to enquire into all that presently.

And also, as we pointed out a few days ago, and also yesterday, can the brain ever be free from knowledge, which is the process of recording. Right? When there is recording, any incident, experience, any accident and so on, a word may be recorded, a

word loaded with insult or flattery, a gesture, a look, all that is being recorded, and that becomes knowledge, the known. And then the brain functions always within the known. That is what we are doing. And can there be freedom in the field of the known? I don't know if I am making myself clear. Shall we go on with all this?

We carry a great burden of knowledge, of hurts, of insults, of various emotional psychological reactions, various forms of experiences with their knowledge. Our brain is burdened with all that, not only the academic knowledge, the knowledge which we acquire through mathematics and so on, but also the whole psychological world which is loaded with knowledge, the known. And as long as thought is working in that field, can there be freedom? And is freedom from the known - you understand when we use the word 'known', all the psychological knowledge that one has acquired, all the various forms of emotional, intellectual gatherings which have become our knowledge, stored up in the brain, and as long our action is limited to that, can there ever be freedom? I don't know if I am conveying this at all.

After all we are always enquiring seriously, if we are at all serious, whether the past - the past - which is the accumulated knowledge of mankind, which guides us, shapes us, which brings about action, that's always limited, and therefore being limited such action will invariably cause conflict, misery, confusion and so on - one is always asking if it is possible to be free of the known, both the psychological known and the gatherings that one has accumulated through experience. I wonder if we are meeting each other. Are we? Please, as we said from the beginning of these talks, we are exploring together, examining together. This is real co-

operation in which there is no instruction, in which there is no passing of information, ideas. We are both of us looking into the problem, which is: can the brain ever be free from the known, except in the technological world? Do you understand? That is, the knowledge how to read and write, how to speak a language, when you become an engineer you have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about mathematics, stress and strain, if you are a physicist you have acquired knowledge through two or three hundred years of experimentation, hypothesis and so on. There you need knowledge. One needs knowledge to talk in English, or whatever language one has. We are not talking of such knowledge. We are talking about the psychological knowledge which we have gathered. Can the brain ever be free of that? If it is not, we are always living in a very, very narrow circle. Our actions will invariably be limited, fragmented. Our actions will never be whole.

So in asking this question we are also asking what is right action. Is there right action ever? Or must action always be limited? When we use the word 'right', one means whole, complete, not fragmented. That is, an action that is whole. Our action is based on thought - thought being, as we pointed out, the accretion, the gathering of experience, knowledge, memory, and thought and action. This is how our brains work. And thought being limited, because knowledge is always limited, such action born of thought, must always be incomplete, therefore fragmentary and bringing about division and conflict. Right? I think this is fairly clear.

Then what is right action? An action which is right under all circumstances, whether it is within the narrow limitations of the family, or social action, action in relationship and so on, what is

right action? Can that right action take place when there is the operation of thought? As we pointed out yesterday, the computer can do almost anything we do, but the difference between the computer and the human being is basically, freedom from the known; the computer can never be free in the sense it has been programmed, it has accumulated a lot of knowledge, programmed by human beings. Man has the capacity to be totally free. And the computer is not intelligent. So what is the difference between the computer and the human mind? Is it intelligence? Then what is intelligence? You are following all this? What is intelligence? Is intelligence the capacity of the intellect, which can discern, reason, logically or not logically, objectively, perhaps occasionally sanely? Has the intellect the capacity of intelligence, or is intelligence something entirely different? You are following all this? Is intelligence a matter of time? Please, time being accumulating knowledge, cleverness, capacity to think, and thought has its own activity which may be called intelligence, and is that intelligence?

So what is intelligence? Are you waiting for the speaker to tell you? When you see a danger, a physical danger there is immediate response. Right? That response has been the result of previous conditioning. When you see a snake, a cobra, there is instant response. And that response is the outcome of long tradition, but also the instinct to preserve the physical condition, that is self-preservation. That can also be called intelligence. But when we see psychological danger we don't act instantly. For example, attachment, as we pointed out on several occasions, is corruption - attachment to belief, to an idea, to a concept, to a conclusion, attachment to a particular deity, attachment to husband, wife, child,

attachment. One sees the danger of it, if one is alert, awake, see what are the consequences of attachment, and yet we go on. We can explain, argue, investigate, analyze, but that analysis, investigation, has very little value. So why is it the human brain does not act instantly and reject attachment altogether? You follow? The physical danger and psychological danger. Is that not lack of intelligence. I don't know if you are following this.

So perception of psychological conflicts, brought about through selfishness, see the danger of it, see what it does in our personal as well as public relationship, see what is happening in the world, see the consequences of all that, and yet we don't stop it. Is that a state of neuroticism, and therefore it is not intelligent.

And also we must investigate much more deeply the question of intelligence. As we said, the computer can do almost anything that we do. And what is the difference between the computer and our brain? Then one is asking, what is intelligence. If intelligence is immediate perception of danger and action, then we are unintelligent. Right?

So time as a factor of the resolution of any problem is an act of unintelligence. And we are talking about psychological problems. Our minds - our brain is trained to solving mechanical problems. It hasn't faced the problem of our daily living and resolving it, like conflict, not only within ourselves but around us. We see the consequences of conflict, ultimately leading to war, and yet we don't act. Therefore perception, which is seeing, comprehension of the whole, movement of attachment, for example, and seeing the danger of it and ending it instantly, such action is intelligence. Right?

So our psychological structure, which is far more important than the government laws, the superficial structures of establishments, organizations, all that, is overcome by our psychological demands. Man has the capacity to have this intelligence, to have an insight into something and acting instantly. Can we do that? Is it possible for us to do that? Right? Which means, you see the nature of fear, how fear arises. Shall we go into that?

All right sir, let's go through it. In analyzing - sorry, I won't use that word - in examining, which is different from analyzing, in - now, let's be clear. Analysis implies there is an analyzer and something to be analyzed. Right? I analyze my reactions. I analyze why I get hurt, which means the analyzer is different from that which he is analyzing. We are not analyzing, we are merely observing, which is entirely different. Observing the movement of fear. Please we are not dividing ourselves into examiner and the examined, the thinker and the thought, but examining, looking, observing, what is fear. Right? Which is entirely different from the analysis of fear. I wonder, can we go on from there?

What is fear, which man throughout the ages has been born with, burdened with? There are physical fears, which are natural, as we pointed out, when you meet a cobra, but we are talking of psychological fears, how they arise, why we haven't at all ended them, why the brain is not free of psychological fears. And is it possible to be totally free of fear psychologically? Is fear a movement of time? Right? Time being the future, the present and the past, the past modifying itself in the present and going on. That is, fear of being hurt psychologically. Right? And keeping that

hurt, holding on to it, and building a wall of resistance round oneself not to be hurt any more and therefore isolating oneself more and more and more, and so getting more and more hurt. Now we are asking, that fear is caused by time. I don't know if you understand? Or by thought. I am afraid I might lose my job, though I have a job I might lose it. That is the future, which is time. Or I have had pain, psychologically, it might be repeated and I am afraid it might come again. You follow? So is thought the cause of fear? And thought is time. Thought is a material process, and time is also a material process. I wonder if you follow this. Right sir.

So if thought is the movement of fear, then the problem is can thought end, or not record the hurt? You have understood? Right sir? The brain has recorded the hurt, the hurt is brought about because I have an image about myself and you come and tread on it and I get hurt. I, being the image which I have created about myself, and that image gets hurt. Now not to record that hurt, which means not to have an image about myself at all. I wonder, are we moving together in this? Not accepting the explanation but ending the image you have about yourself. Right?

So fear is a movement of thought as time. It is not, how to stop thought, but it is rather, not to record. I wonder if you see. Is that possible? Because our reactions are so quick; you call somebody an idiot, there is immediate response from it. So can the brain record what is absolutely necessary to live in this world, but not record at all psychologically? You understand? Please understand the question first. We must record technological knowledge, how to drive a car, the language we use and so on and so on and so on. But why should we, why should the psychological world, that is

my image and all that, record at all? If we see the importance, or the necessity, or the danger of recording, and you don't act on that danger, you are either neurotic, or totally unintelligent. That is, most of us are vain, proud about some footling thing or other - about our knowledge, our position, our capacity to argue, you know pride, pride of possession. Now can that pride which creates such extraordinary conflict between people, it is a form of ruthlessness, can that end? Which doesn't mean that we cultivate humility. You cannot cultivate humility, if you do, that is vanity. But to see that pride, the sense of, you know what pride is, I don't have to go into it - you see all the implications of it, at one glance, which is fairly simple, and end it instantly. In the same way, fear, so that the brain, the psychological structure which is centred in the brain through sensations, that instant action frees the brain from the continuance of fear. I don't know if you are following all this. Are we meeting each other? Are we?

Now wait a minute, we can test this out. Are you free of fear? Fear of public opinion, fear of your parents, fear of your husband, wife, fear of so many things. Which is, will you trim the tree of fear, or go to the very root of fear? Fear of not following your guru. You understand? Fear of your gods, fear of not doing the right thing, becoming respectable. You understand? Will you take one branch after another branch, or go to the very root of all fear, which is time and thought? Now can we see that, not an abstraction of it as an idea - please do listen to this - not as an idea but see the fact of it, the actuality of it. Then seeing the actuality, remain with that actuality. You understand what I'm saying? Not escaping from it, not suppressing it, not trying to overcome it, just like watching

a rock. Have you ever watched a rock, a boulder on the hill side? It doesn't move - though it has its own vitality and so on, that's a different matter - it doesn't move; so in that same way watch. Observe the whole movement of fear, watch it without any sense of deviation. Then one will find that fear goes away completely psychologically.

Or to put it round the other way, you have physical pain - dentist or various forms of physical pain - that pain is recorded, and from that record there is fear that it might occur again. Now when you have pain, watch it, observe it, don't say, 'I must detach myself', just watch the pain, and as you watch it, alert - not just saying 'I am in awful pain' and all the rest of it - watch pain and it won't be recorded if you are watching it.

So fear, which is the movement of thought and time, which is essentially thought, time is thought, it's a movement. Right? Time is movement, thought is movement. And thought is the origin of pain, of fear. Now pleasure is the movement of thought also. The pleasure that you derive sexually, the imagination and all the rest of it, it is the movement of thought, at the moment of pleasure you are not aware that it is pleasure. I don't know if you have watched it, all this. Only a little later thought says, how lovely that was. So thought, not only brings, gives continuance to fear but also to pleasure.

Now there is the other question, which is, suffering. I must go on. Suffering. Man has suffered, you can see it right through the ages, war after war, killing, how many mothers and wives and parents have cried and cried. Suffering. And suffering when you lose something, grief, when one loses a son, a daughter, death. And

all human beings know this, whatever part of the world they live, this is a common factor: fear, pleasure, sorrow. And human beings have not been able to solve this, end sorrow. What is sorrow? Why do human beings go through tortures? And because they suffer, and because they fear, because they are pursuing pleasure they invent gods. Right? Because we have not been able to solve these things, therefore some outside agency, we hope somehow, by some great miracle, or this or that, will solve our problems, this problem. And it has never been solved because the gods we have created - we have created the gods in our image, god hasn't created in his image us, if he has, he is a pretty poor god! No, don't laugh sir, you are going to your temple next week, fast for forty days to go to some hill.

So fear is at the bottom of all this. Fear, which means you want security, and you hope gods will give it to you, and you jolly well know they can't. So you become a hypocrite, you lead a double life, which is lack of utter integrity.

So what is suffering? Why, if I lose my son, my wife, my job, lose something in which I want to fulfil, this craze to fulfil, fulfil what? Your desires, your ambitions. Right? So when we talk about grief, why do human beings, why do you, we human beings, human beings who are the representative of all mankind, we went into that, we are mankind, we are not individuals, we talked about it the other day - why we have carried this burden. Is it a form of self-pity? Not being able to face loneliness, not being able to stand alone, not having capacity to look at things clearly and not get emotional about everything that we do. You understand? I lose my son, my brother, and I shed tears, why? I am attached to my son

because I hope he will be better than me, and all that stuff. I am attached to him. In that attachment I have found comfort, I have found a sense of deep relationship, I have found a sense of not being isolated. But I am isolated, so I am trying to escape from that isolation, that desperate loneliness. I can give many, many reasons for sorrow but the explanation, the cause will not dissolve your sorrow. What will dissolve it is to see what actually is taking place - not intellectually, not verbally, but with your heart look at things.

Without the ending of sorrow one cannot have love. Love is not pleasure, love is not desire. And without love life becomes what it has. Right? Then you will say, 'How am I to cultivate love?', or 'How am I to have that?' To come upon that is a benediction which you cannot do anything about. All that you can do is to say what is not love - your jealousy, your attachments, your ambitions, your greed, your beliefs, this self-centred activity. If all that is not, the other is. But we don't want to be free of all that. We want all that plus the other. Right?

And another question is death, of which you are all frightened. This is really a very important question to go into, because whether we are young or old, what is death. When there is love is there death? Find out, sirs. Let's go into it. First of all, our consciousness is the common consciousness of mankind. Our consciousness is our beliefs, our dogmas, our superstitions, our pains, our sorrows, our fears, our gods, all the things that we have accumulated as knowledge, the experiences, the agony, the depression, the anxiety, the isolation, the loneliness, the sense of deep sorrow, not only personal sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, war after war, war after war, the sorrow of divided nations, the Arab and the Jew, the

Hindu and the Muslim, the communist and the capitalist and so on, and so on, and so on. All that is part of our consciousness. Right? That is our consciousness. It is the consciousness of mankind, not your consciousness or mine, or his, because we all have innumerable problems, we all seek certainty, we all want security, a place where we can be psychologically safe, undisturbed. This is the common lot of mankind, whether they live in Russia, China, America, or here. So our consciousness is the consciousness of the human, yours, it is not your consciousness. It is so. There is no question of it. We can discuss endlessly to prove this, but it is so because you suffer, the man across the street suffers, whether 'across the street' be a thousand miles or many, many miles, he suffers, so there is a common factor. You may have a different colour, a different name, a different profession, different tendencies, different culture, your genes have inherited certain things but basically this is what we are.

And then what is it to die? You understand my question? We think our consciousness is mine, because the brain has been conditioned to think as though I was separate from everybody, and that separation as me, has been cultivated by religions: personal salvation, personal enlightenment, the Christian world, the Hindu world, everywhere this goes on, this is encouraged. And we accept it, because we think there is great delight in being separate. Are we actually? We are physically, with all the physical tendencies, because we have been placed under a certain culture, hot climate, hot food, or this or that, but underneath we are all so much similar. And when we say, 'What happens to me when I die?', it is a wrong question. Because we think that we are individuals, that is the

question we put: what will happen to me when I die. And so you want comfort in a belief of reincarnation, or this or that, but when you see the fact, the fact that we are so alike deeply, with so little affection, care, compassion. So death has no meaning when one realizes the fact that we are all total human beings. One hasn't time to go into this much more deeply. That's enough for the time.

The other question is meditation. Meditation is unpremeditated art. Have you got it? Am I right? I said, meditation is unpremeditated art. You can't prepare for meditation. There is no system, no method. The system, the method is premeditated. Somebody has thought he has meditated, invented a system, and we follow that hoping to get something. So one has to find out what it is - unpremeditated art, which is meditation. You understand sirs? I'll go into it.

First of all we can banish all the systems, all the methods, the postures, the breathing, forcing the mind, thought to be controlled and so on and so on. The controller is the controlled. Right? Thought creates the controller and then the controller says, 'I must control thought in order to meditate', or rather, to meditate, which is so obviously silly. So systems, methods, the idea of controlling thought, or thought identifying itself with something, a picture, an image, a symbol, and concentrating on that. I don't know if you are following all this. And there is this nonsensical transcendental meditation, which is really a glorified racket, a moneymaking racket. I know you won't like this, some of you who have probably done this, you pay to somebody ten rupees, or ten thousand rupees, and if you get it straight from the 'horse's mouth' you pay all your income, and he gives you a mantra. I have been told a mantra

means, the root meaning and the depth of that word means ponder, consider, meditate upon not becoming, and absolve, dissolve all self-centred activity. That's what that word apparently means. But look what it has become. You can repeat without giving somebody money to tell you the mantra, you can invent your own mantra - coca-cola, yes, yes, sir, don't laugh, you are all doing it. Or any other catch word, repeat it for twenty minutes in the morning, twenty minutes in the afternoon, twenty minutes in the evening, and the rest of the day you can do all the mischief you want, take a siesta. You understand, a siesta, what it means? Twenty minutes rest, go to sleep, put your brain to sleep, by repeating, repeating, repeating, in the afternoon and so on and so on. So that is not meditation.

So we are going to find out what is meditation, if you are really interested to find out. Not how to meditate - what is the depth and the beauty and the reality and immense possibility of meditation. The word means, ponder, to think over, be concerned - the dictionary meaning of that word. But the word is not the thing. Right? The word 'meditation' is not meditation. And why should one meditate at all? Is meditation separate from life, that is, our daily living - the office, the family, the sex, the pursuit of ambition - daily life, is that separate from meditation? Or is meditation part of life? You understand? You understand my question? Part of life. If it is separate and you meditate in order to live a better life, in order to be better, then you are imposing certain concepts on actuality, certain experience of others, essentially of others, on what you think should happen. Now if you can deny all that - you understand? Please this is very serious, what we are talking about,

unless you are really very serious to go into it, don't play with it. It is to deny everything that man has thought about meditation: about silence, about truth, about eternity, whether there is a timeless state and so on. To be free of other people's knowledge completely, and that goes very, very far. That is, to deny your gods, your sacred books, your tradition, your beliefs, everything wiped away because you understand they are the result of thought. Which means you are totally psychologically not dependent on anything. Which means you are free of fear, no longer touched by sorrow, which doesn't mean that you become hard, bitter, cruel.

And without love and compassion there is no meditation. So life, living every day in this world, which is corrupt beyond words, which is immoral, destructive, without any sense, a lack of integrity, living in that in this world, surrounded by all this, to have that sense of total freedom, which is absolute freedom, because you have denied everything that man has thought out, except the technological world - I don't have to repeat that over and over again. Because then you enter into quite a different dimension which is the mind - not, you enter - there is the mind. The mind is entirely different from the brain. And that mind cannot be understood or known, or perceived unless the brain with all its sensory responses is understood. That is, to see something, to see the sea, the sheet of water, or anything of nature, with all your senses, with all your senses, not merely with your eyes, or hear one thing, with all your senses, when you perceive with all your senses there is no recording, there is no 'I'. It's only when we perceive something partially, then the partial thing creates the me, which is partial.

So when the brain is totally free from all accumulated psychological knowledge, then there is the mind. I won't go into that, then that becomes a theory. You understand? Unless one has done all this actually - you can test it out, you can see it in your daily life - if that is not tested out in daily life, it is not worth it. So when there is this absolute denial of all the psychological accumulation then the brain becomes quiet. It hasn't to be induced to be quiet. Then illumination is not an experience. Illumination means to see things clearly as they are, and to go beyond them.

And in our lives there is very little beauty, not the beauty of form, actual beauty in our life. And that beauty cannot exist without love. And when there is love and compassion, it has its own intelligence. That intelligence acts, which is whole, which is right action. All this is meditation. And there is immense beauty in it, a great sense of aesthetic appreciation in the perception of the world. And in that there is great benediction, not from your gods, but the benediction of living a life which is whole.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 3RD MAY 1980

As you have been told, there will be six talks and four, what we consider, discussions or dialogues. But we thought it would be better to have those four non-talks, to have as questions. I think that will be better than having a dialogue, with so many people. Dialogue means really, actually conversation between two friends, between two people. And as that is not possible we thought it would be good to have questions. You can ask any question you like, the sillier or the most profound questions.

If I may suggest, please don't treat these gatherings as a weekend entertainment. They are rather serious, demanding from each one of us considerable exercise of thought, capacity to investigate, to observe. And during this process perhaps bring about a radical change in the human mind. That is what these meetings are meant to be: that we are here to observe what is happening in the world; and also to observe what is happening to each one of us, inwardly, psychologically, within the skin as it were.

So we're going to first observe what is happening right throughout the world. And to observe one must be necessarily free from any commitment, which is going to be rather difficult, for most of us are committed to something or other. To observe without any prejudice, to observe without any fixed conclusion, to observe without any rationalization, excuses, any form of belief; just to observe. Perhaps it may be rather difficult for most people, because we are so bound by our own beliefs, by our own prejudices, by our own conclusions, by our own personal

inclination and idiosyncracies. It becomes almost impossible to observe freely, choicelessly. And if we can do that together during these talks and question and answers, then perhaps we can go much deeper and further.

One can observe what is happening in the world: conflict. Wherever you go there is this terrible conflict between man and man, between nations and nations, between religions and religions; the conflict between theoreticians and theologians, Christian theologians and non-Christian theologians, the Communists, the totalitarians, and the believers, those who believe in systems, those who are bound by beliefs, those who are completely absorbed by images, religious images, Christian or Hindu, or Buddhist, or your own particular image. So there is this battle going on in the world; tremendous conflict between politicians, between gurus, between every human being outwardly, he is struggling, competing, trying to express himself, to identify himself, to become something. Probably more in this country where success is worshipped, where money, position, status becomes all important.

So there is this tremendous conflict going on, between the scientists, between the priests, between every human being on this unfortunate earth. And nobody seems to be able to resolve this conflict - the economic, the social, the political. Nobody seems to care in the struggle, the very destruction of man, of the human being. Nobody has applied their mind and their heart to resolve this problem, this everlasting conflict. Meditation becomes a conflict, to change ourselves becomes a conflict; in any of our relationships, both intimate and otherwise, there is still conflict. Man apparently has lived for many, many million years and has not resolved this

problem, after all this time. There is something radically wrong, that human beings, highly, so-called highly, civilized, with a great deal of knowledge, both psychological and scientific, a great deal of struggle, wars, tears, misery, man has not been able - human beings have not been able to resolve this problem. That is the outward world, what is happening there. And nobody seems to feel it is worthwhile to forget, or drop their own particular beliefs, dogmas, political opinions, theories, conclusions, beliefs, and say, come together and resolve this problem. No politicians will do it, no priest will do it, no psychologist will do it, and the scientists will not do it either. Right?

Do you understand the question? See the gravity of the question? Because we are destroying each other by our very strong beliefs, ideologies, concepts, images. And apparently we are incapable of coming together and resolving this problem. That is, thinking together. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats, in this country, will drop their particular line of thinking, or their personal ambitions, their craving for power, position. Because it is only when we all work together, feel together, the necessity, the absolute necessity, then perhaps we can resolve the problem. But none of them will do it because it means giving up their personal pride, vanity, position, power.

And the world is preparing for war, appalling violence. If you disagree with somebody they come and shoot you. All consideration for human feeling, human dignity, human freedom, has gradually been destroyed. So that is the outward world in which we live. I don't think anybody, in his mind, can deny all this.

And inwardly, in our psyche, inside our skin, in our thoughts, in

our feelings, we are also in conflict. Always striving to become better, to become something, to achieve success, position, inwardly. This battle is going on inside. And again we don't seem able to resolve it, in spite of the psychologists, in spite of the psychotherapists, in spite of the confessions of Catholics, in spite of all the institutions, organizations that they have in this country. If you don't feel well you take a pill. If you can't stop smoking, then people will help you to smoke. If you want to talk to god, they will help you. So gradually we are losing our own responsibility, being responsible for our own actions, for our own mind, for our own body. We are gradually, unfortunately, losing everything that matters. This again is true. We are not exaggerating.

So seeing what is happening in the world outside, and also seeing what is happening to each one of us as human beings, to observe this, and seeing the absolute necessity of thinking together. You understand my question? Thinking together. That is, we have conflict, outwardly and inwardly. And unless we resolve this conflict humanity is going to destroy itself.

And since you have been good enough to come here to listen to all this, it becomes very necessary that you and the speaker think together about this conflict. Thinking together implies that both of us put aside, if we are serious, if we know what is happening in the world, if we are responsible for all the things that human beings have done, and feel the necessity of bringing about a radical change in the human psyche, because society cannot be changed unless each human being changes. Seeing all that, we must think together. I do not know if you have observed how difficult it is that two people can think together. However intimate they are, man and

woman, friends, to think together about something. Here is a crisis we are facing. Not merely political, economic crisis, but much deeper crisis, the crisis in our consciousness, the crisis in our minds. And can we, you and the speaker, think about that together? That is, you give up your conclusion, your position, your beliefs, your personal psychological commitments, and the speaker does it, so that both of us meet, so as to think together whether it is possible to resolve this conflict. You understand my question?

The more you observe, as the speaker has done for the last sixty years, and talked all over the world for that period, the more human beings are becoming uncontrollably mischievous, more violent, asserting their own independence, each one doing what he wants to do, driven by his own pleasure, 'doing his own thing' as it is called in this country. So each one is isolating himself and forgetting the rest of mankind. This is happening, again if you observe carefully, both in yourself and the world, that each one of us is pursuing his own desires, his own wants, his own particular idiosyncrasy, what pleases you, do it. Right?

So can we, at least for an hour, and perhaps for the rest of our life, think together? There is thinking together about something. Right? We do think together when there is a crisis, like a terrible war, then we forget our own particular nonsense, and the threat of something much greater, as war, brings us together. That's obvious. And anybody who disagrees with that is either shot, sent to prison, or called a coward, conscientious objectors and so on. So apparently a great crisis brings man, human beings together; in the name of patriotism, in the name of god, in the name of peace, and so on. But we have no visible, actual crisis as war now, fortunately.

And so each one does what he wants. And that pursuit is encouraged. So we are gradually losing our freedom. I wonder if you observe all this.

Considering all this, can you and the speaker think together about this crisis which we are facing? A crisis which is not economic, nor politics, not social - those are all outward. The crisis is in each one of us. The crisis is in our consciousness, in our minds, in our hearts. And so can we observe that crisis, and come together to resolve that crisis? You understand my statement, so that we can think together about the crisis.

There is also a thinking together without an object, that's part of the complex. Do you understand? That is, we can think together about war. If there is a crisis as war we forget ourselves and be responsible for the whole. Right? So thinking about a crisis is comparatively easy. But thinking together without the object, thinking together without 'about something'. I wonder if you understand this. It doesn't matter, we will come to that much later.

So can we, this morning, and subsequent mornings, think together? That is, can we both see the crisis in our minds, in our consciousness, in our hearts, and let us talk about it together. As it is impossible to talk together with so many people, the speaker will talk about it as though he were talking to two people. You understand? That you are alone with the speaker. We are all sitting together in this lovely grove, and see if we can resolve this problem. Not ultimately, not in a few days time - you understand - but in the very process of talking over together resolve the problem. That is, our brain has evolved through time. Right? That brain is not your brain, or my brain, it is the brain of humanity.

Right? I wonder if you see. You are following all this? But what we have done is narrowed down that enormous capacity of the brain evolved through time, to the narrow little brain of the 'me'. You understand? The 'me' with my little problems, the 'me' with my quarrels, jealousies, anxieties, competition, my success, I must do this, I must not - you follow. This enormous capacity of the brain, which has evolved through millennia upon millennia, has been reduced to something tawdry, something that is, you know, rather dirty.

And the brain has become accustomed to protect itself against any fundamental change. I do not know if you have observed your own brains. I am not the brain specialist, not the psycho-biologist. See what is happening, sirs. That is, scientists are examining matter to find something beyond. You understand? If you have talked to any scientists, or if you are a scientist yourself, you are trying, if you are serious, if you are really deeply concerned, you are investigating matter to find or discover something which is the origin of all this, not god, because that is the mere invention of man. We won't go into that for the moment. Instead of going through matter to find something beyond. But we as human beings are part of that matter. You understand? But if we went through ourselves we would go much deeper, much further, we would really come to the truth of that. You are following what I am saying. If I am not clear in my talk, please stop me. Because after all we are trying to communicate with each other, words are necessary. If the speaker uses non-technical words, non any kind of jargon, just speaking ordinary daily language then perhaps it will be easier.

So our brain has evolved through time. Our brain has its own chemical capacity to heal itself, or to resist itself. You'll find out if you go into it. To resist any change which doesn't give it security. And this brain, which is the essence of time, you understand - need I explain all this? I'll have to I see. All right. Which is the essence of time, because it is the result of time, after many, many million years. It has established certain grooves, certain way of thinking, certain activities which are familiar, certain beliefs and conclusions, which gives it a sense of safety. All this has been developed through time. And we are saying, please listen to it, we are saying unless the capacity of that brain which has been conditioned according to certain concepts, beliefs, ideas, theories, by the theologians and so on, and on, the brain cannot radically change itself. Which is obvious. You have understood? May I go on with that?

And thinking is part of this traditional, time honoured process of the brain. Right? So when the speaker said, let us talk over together, as two people, though there are many people here, as two people, concerned with that question of ending conflict, ending conflict not gradually, which is the process of the brain conditioned to time - you are following all this - we are saying, unless that chain is broken there cannot possibly be a fundamental change in human nature. If you have observed your own brain in operation, not from books - they may help, but essentially the books, the writers about the brain, and the investigators and so on, they don't investigate their own brain. They investigate the brain. I don't know if you are following all this? We, if you are serious, we are investigating our own brain, not the brain according to some

psychologists, neurologists, psychobiologists and so on and so on. Because then if you examine it according to the authority, it is the authority you are examining, not your brain. You have understood? Is this clear? Please, this is very important because we are all so learned, we have read so much, or been told so much, that we depend on others to tell us what to do: how to feed your baby, how to walk, how to run. You follow? They tell you everything. And we unfortunate human beings comply, slightly resist, but conform. And as the speaker doesn't read any of these books, but has talked a great deal to other professors, psychologists and scientists, and has observed the activity of his own brain, which is, the brain, the activity is the reactions, the responses, the sensory response, the shock - you follow - all that to observe. Not secondhand, but actually. Then you have an extraordinary vitality; not to do mischief, an extraordinary vitality of the brain.

So what we are saying is, as the brain has evolved in time, and it can only think in terms of time, that the crisis will be resolved. The moment you use the words 'will be resolved', you are already thinking in terms of time. I don't know if you follow this. Right? Sir, you and I will talk together.

We are saying, this activity of the brain which has been cultivated through time can be broken when you face the crisis, and be free of the idea, the concept, the desire 'we will change it eventually'. You follow this point?

So in talking over together this question of conflict, we are asking, can the conflict end immediately. The moment it doesn't, when you have not the urgency of ending it immediately, you enter time. You have understood this? So we are now thinking together

about the conflict, and not thinking in terms of 'it will end eventually, gradually'. You get it? Please understand this. So the very urgency of the crisis ends time. I wonder if you see this. You have broken the pattern of the brain. Are you doing this as we are talking; or you are just listening to some kind of talk as an idea? You understand?

Now just a minute, we'll put it this way: is the crisis in our mind, in your heart, in your behaviour, is it an idea or an actuality? You understand my question? Is it a concept which has been presented to you verbally, and you accept that concept, and so it becomes an idea? But whereas in the very description of it is the fact of your own observation. I wonder if you see this. Which is it that is going on between us? Is it an idea, a concept, the concept of time, the concept that it can be broken? And so then you will ask, how is it to be achieved, which is again a process again admitting time. I wonder if you see all this.

You know, take for example - the speaker personally doesn't like taking examples, they are a rather easy way out - we human beings are violent, which has been demonstrated throughout the world. That is obvious. Violence derived genetically from the ancient times, from the animal and so on and so on. So we are by nature, by our behaviour, being very, very self-centred, violent. And we said that violence cannot be ended immediately, therefore we must pursue non-violence. You are following this? The non-violence is an idea, it is not a fact. I wonder if you see this. What is fact, what is fact, I mean by fact what is actually happening, which is violence. You may not be violent now, sitting under the trees in nice weather and so on, but the fact is that human beings, you are

violent. And our brain which has evolved through time, chemically protecting itself and so on and so on, conditioned to that, says, "I will eventually get rid of it". So the theorists, the theologians, the priests, all these people, because we have also said, we will get rid of it eventually. You follow? Whereas if you are only dealing with fact, not with idea, then you can do something immediately. You know the word 'idea' in Greek, means to observe. You follow? Merely to observe; not through observation make an abstraction of what has been observed. You understand, I wonder if you are following all this? You see what we generally do is, when we observe something, immediately we make an abstraction of it into an idea, and then try to carry out that idea. So it becomes extremely difficult to carry out an idea so there is conflict. Whereas if one is only observing what is actually happening then you can deal with it, not in the context of time, but in the necessity of moving from there. I wonder if you follow all this? Tant pis, if you don't follow, sir, let's go on! At least some of us will.

So together we are thinking about the ending of this conflict. Not the day after tomorrow, or next week but immediately. So if we understand this, then let's think together. What is the problem? Because in understanding the problem the answer is in the problem, not outside the problem. You understand this? Whereas we say it is outside the problem. The answer will somehow lie somewhere else, not in the problem itself. Right? Can we go together, please?

So what is the problem? The problem apparently is, society can only be changed if human beings who have created it change themselves. That is the real problem, the real core of the problem.

Right? Society, which is corrupt, which is immoral, which is ugly, there is injustice, cruelty, the rich and the poor, you follow, all that, the society, which human beings have created, not god, not some outside agency, but human beings have created it; created the division, the national division, religious divisions, economic divisions, and so on and so on, we humans, humanity has created it. Unless humanity, of which we are, changes fundamentally you cannot bring about a society which is healthy, sane, rational.

Right? The materialists won't accept this. They say, change the environment then man changes. That is the totalitarian attitude.

That is their whole historical experimental approach: change society, make laws, rules, control, control thought, don't let them be free - change that and then man, who is also purely material, will change. Right? What we are saying is totally different: which is, humanity has created society, unless humanity, each one, human beings, change, society cannot change. Which is being proved in the totalitarian world. The more intelligent you are in those states the more you revolt against all that. And so you are either sent to concentration camps or expelled from the country.

So the crisis is that. Now, how does each one of us - please listen to this for a few minutes - how does each one of us approach this crisis? You understand? Approach this fact that human beings have created society, society cannot change by itself, because society is part of human beings, unless human beings fundamentally change society cannot change. That is the real core of our problem. And how do you come to that? You understand? Is it a mental, rational conclusion, an abstraction you have, after observing, come to? Or this is a fact. You see the difference? Is it a

concept, an idea, or a fact? For you. If it is a concept, then see what happens. Concept is merely a conclusion derived cleverly, or unintelligently, rationally or irrationally, a conclusion that society cannot be changed, human beings cannot be changed, so carry on amicably. There are those people who are saying this: human beings are so conditioned, you cannot change that conditioning but make it a little better. You know the group, you know the tendency, all that.

So we are asking each other, is it an idea because we have been told; or it is a fact for yourself? You see the difference? When it is a fact for yourself, not given by another, then you have to deal with it. That is when you have pain you deal with it. When you have toothache you do something immediately. But if toothache is an idea then you say, perhaps we will postpone it! No, sir, see the rationality of it.

That brings up another point: scientists think human beings are rational. But they are not. You understand? The fact is human beings are irrational. But there is a concept that human beings are rational. And we live according to that concept that we are. So we are never rational. I don't know if you follow this.

What time is it, sir? We will continue every day for the next two weeks about this question. If it is a fact then how do you conceive - no, how do you look at that fact? You understand? How do you come to the fact? So the approach to the fact matters. Is your approach rational, or irrational? Is your approach pessimistic or optimistic? Is your approach based on hope, desire and so on? If it is, your approach has already been dictated, therefore you are not free to observe the fact. You see, sir, this is enormously difficult.

This isn't a thing you play around with. This is concerned with your life, not somebody else's theories, however clever, however ancient, however so-called religious. It's your life. And how do you approach your life? Do you understand my question? Is your approach conditioned according to your education? Examine it sirs, as we go along. According to your social position? According to your immediate demand? Or your approach is based on you believe in Jesus, or Buddha, or somebody? That is, is your approach to the problem imaginary? You understand? Because we live with images. I don't want to complicate this thing. Our whole life is formed through images. All our religions are images, either made by the hand or by the mind, but they are images, which we then worship. And that we consider marvellously religious, which is idiotic.

So is our approach free from our conclusions, from our experiences, from our knowledge, if it is from our experience, from our knowledge, you have already answered the problem, which will be according to time, which will be according to your conditioning. But if you come to it freely, to observe, then there is immediate action.

I think that's enough for today, isn't it? Because to spend an hour with this attention, probably you are not used to it. You get tired, your minds are wandering off, you are not fully centred. So after an hour we had better stop and continue tomorrow. Tomorrow we will continue with this, may we?

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 4TH MAY 1980

The day after tomorrow the speaker will answer questions; written down, please, not questions from the audience. Please write them down and we will try to answer them.

I wonder why you are all here. I think we ought to consider that this is not an entertainment, this is not something you go to on a Sunday morning, or a Saturday afternoon, to be entertained, to be stimulated, to be talked at. As we pointed out yesterday, we have got a great many problems confronting us: political, religious, economic, social, and also personal problems. And few of us are free from any kind of authority; religious, psychological, social. Apparently we have become incapable of being responsible for ourselves. The psychologists, the scientists, the preachers, the priests, the religious organizations tell us what to do. And happily the Indian gurus are no longer in favour in this country. That wave has passed. And there are people too eager to tell you what is enlightenment, how you should reach it, how to meditate, what to do, and so on and so on and so on.

Here we are doing nothing of that kind. The speaker means it. Here, if you are serious, we are thinking together, which does not mean that you accept what the speaker says, it does not mean that you have your own particular point of view, your own particular experience and hold on to it; then thinking together becomes utterly impossible. It is absolutely necessary, seeing what the world is: utter confusion, terrorism, kidnapping, the totalitarian states with their image of how society should be run, and the other side with their image are also very clear on this matter.

And so as you observe without any prejudice, that the world is in a great crisis. The crisis must be answered. Human beings have created this crisis by their lives, by their beliefs, by their parochial attitudes, by their so-called individualistic freedom, which is no longer free but controlled. We have created this conflict in the world. And I am sure most of you, if you have observed, would recognize that fact: that society has come into being by human greed, human behaviour, human illusions with their many, many images, with national divisions, religious adherence, accepting some doctrines, beliefs, dogmas, rituals. And so there has been throughout the world a series of wars, conflicts, brutalities, cruelties and so on.

And as we said yesterday, there are very few people who say, let us really solve this problem: this problem of conflict between man and man, between human beings. There are many explanations for this conflict; some historical, some factual, some imaginary, some based on their concepts, images and so on. But when the speaker says observe, he is not analysing. Please let's be very clear on that point.

Analysis, specially psychoanalysis like Communism, is an unfortunate incident in our life. All right? Please, if I may point out, what the speaker says, don't get irritated with him, don't get angry with him, don't throw a bomb, don't shoot, but let us talk it over together. Because life is very complex, and requires that we investigate it, that we look at it. You may not like what you see, you may disagree with it, you may say, what you are saying is nonsense; or contradict it angrily. But we are merely observing what is taking place first. In that observation analysis has no place

whatsoever.

We'll go into it. Please have patience. And if you are really serious don't just attend one talk and say, I have understood it, or he's talking nonsense, and walk away; you have to listen to the whole, you have to read the whole book. You have to, as the commercial people say, you have to buy the package! Not just one part of it, which may suit you, which may be pleasant, but you have to buy - an unfortunate word - you have to buy, if I may use it, the whole thing. So please, if you are serious, attend all the talks and go to the very end of it. This is not an invitation to have more people; just a person who is serious has to listen to the whole story, read the whole book. And then see if it is right, true, false, or illusory. But just reading the first page and saying, it is all nonsense, or the first chapter, which may not please you, and throw the book away. The book is your life. A very, very complex life. And you have to have the patience, integrity, observation and the responsibility of reading this book, which is yourself, so completely, so thoroughly, as a whole, so that we can go beyond the book - the book which is yourself.

So as we were saying, the world is in conflict. The world, which is the economic, social, religious, political, social, is created by all human beings, whether in this country, or in Europe, in India and so on. We are responsible for it. And a few people, the intellectuals, the psychologists, the psychobiologists, the scientists have said let us solve this problem of human conflict. And we, who are not professionals, we are just ordinary human beings with all our anxieties, fears, pleasures, sorrows, the fear of death and so on, we have to resolve them. It becomes more and more necessary that

we resolve them otherwise human beings are going to destroy each other. This is again a fact which is actually going on.

So it behoves us that we think about the problem together. To think together implies that you and the speaker must be free of our particular narrow, provincial parochial attitudes, beliefs, dogmas, experiences, so that we can meet each other. So what is the problem? As we asked yesterday, we are asking it again today: what is the problem? The problem is essentially a crisis in our consciousness, a crisis in our mind, in our brain, in our heart. That is the heart of the matter. And as we said also yesterday, and I hope you don't mind the thing being repeated, that our brain, which is the centre of all of our existence, our brain has evolved through time, through millions and millions of years. Through those years it has created for itself every form of self protective device. It has sought, if you go into it yourself and not merely repeat what psychologists and the brain specialists talk about, it has always sought security, otherwise it can't function. Right? It must have security. So it begins to create images, it begins to create illusions in which it takes safety. So it has created a certain pattern of existence for itself, which is our life. And it has developed through time, and therefore there is always this question of acquiring knowledge, using that knowledge to be secure in life. You are following all this, I hope.

Because after all knowledge is the most important factor in our life, knowledge with regard to technological activities, knowledge about the psyche, about ourselves. That knowledge has been acquired through millennia, stored up in the brain, the brain with all its cells and so on. As we said yesterday, the speaker has not

read any of these books, thank god! He has observed the activities of human beings, the activities of his own brain; which is through observing reactions, pleasurable, painful, sensitive, and so on and so on. So it is a direct perception, not acquired secondhand. And this is important in our communication with each other.

So this brain has acquired tremendous knowledge, so it has to be completely secure. Whether that knowledge is illusory, actual, fanciful, imaginary, pleasurable and so on, it has created a pattern of existence for itself so that it can never be harmed, wounded, both physically as well as psychologically. This is important to understand because we live with images. Our religions are nothing but images, created by the mind, by thought. And that which has been created as a holy image you then begin to worship. But it is essentially the desire, the necessity for it to be secure, to be safe, to be protected. But knowledge is always accompanied by ignorance. Right? Because knowledge can never be complete. Please see the importance of this: knowledge can never be complete. You may acquire great information about the world, about matter, about the heavens - not spiritual heavens, I don't mean that - heavens, the skies, the universe, but whatever knowledge science has acquired and transmitted through generations, it is still within the area of ignorance, within the area of shadow, the shadow which is non-knowledge.

So see what we have done; how the brain has tricked itself into security in knowledge, and holding on to that knowledge and yet it has never discovered for itself that knowledge can never be complete and therefore whatever action takes place from that knowledge must be incomplete. I hope you are following all this.

Please, we are not intellectual. Intellect has its place, the capacity of the intellect is to observe, distinguish, discern, but if that intellect becomes the whole of life, as it is now becoming, covering the whole field of life; that is, a part, which is the intellect is a part of the whole of human existence, but when a part takes supreme importance then inevitably all action must be fragmented, incomplete and therefore conflict. I hope you are following all this. Right, may I go on? No, I can go on, but as we said, we are thinking together. Because the speaker is not selling you anything - thank god! He is not asking you to follow him, all that tommy rot. The speaker says, the world is in such a misery, confusion, turmoil, for god's sake let's think together. And to think together implies we must be free to observe, not I observe and tell you, or you observe and say, oh, you don't see it properly. But together observe. Right?

As we said, analysis has no place in observation. Analysis is the discovery of the cause and the effect. Right? (It's all right, sir, the bird. Perhaps it likes us!) Please understand this, and go into it carefully because observation is entirely different from analysis. Observation is immediate: you see the tree; but if you begin to analyse you never see the tree. Right? Understand this. That is, to observe means seeing, being sensitive, aware, and without any movement of thought. Just to observe. I wonder. Right? I am going slowly. When I said 'without thought', I am going to go into it. Be patient.

So observation is not analysis. Analysis implies the analyser who is analysing something outside of himself. The analyser thinks he understands, has superior knowledge and he is analysing something outside of himself. But if you observe very carefully,

the analyser is the analysed. Right? You follow this? If you see that, not as an idea, but as a fact. You understand? Like anger is not different from you, you are anger. When you are angry, at the moment of anger there is no division between the I and the anger. But later on, a few seconds later, you say, I have been angry. So you have separated yourself from that reaction which you have called anger. So in the same way when you analyse yourself, or being analysed by another, the analyser is part of the analysis, part of the thing which is analysing, it is not separate from the analysed. Right? Please understand this, go into it in yourself as we are talking. This is thinking together. I am not - the speaker is not telling you what to think, which is generally what people do: the professors, the analysts, the preachers, and all the rest of it; we are not doing that. What we are saying is, as long as there is a division between the analyser and the analysed there must be conflict. Right? But that is an illusion, it is not a fact. The fact is the observer is the observed, psychologically. Right? I observe that tree, but the tree is not me, I am not the tree. But psychologically, inwardly, the reaction of anger, greed, jealousy, is me. I am not separate from that. But we have separated it in order to do something about it. You understand? I feel violence, and I create the idea of non-violence, and I will do something about the violence. But the fact is I am violence, I am not different from the fact. Then a totally different movement takes place. You understand? I wonder if you understand.

We are now thinking together to eliminate conflict. You understand? As long as there is a division between the observer, psychologically the analyser, and the analysed, there must be

conflict. As long as there are divisions between people there must be conflict: religious, economic, social, political. There must be conflict as long as there is a Jew, as long as there is an Arab, there must be conflict. So wherever there is division psychologically there must be conflict. That's a law.

So in thinking together we see that wherever there is analysis, psychoanalysis, psycho-therapy, all that, in that process there is division, and it must breed conflict. And observing is the total denial of analysis. I wonder if you understand this. Our whole conditioning is to analyse. Right? Our education, everything is either do, don't do, this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be, and so on and so on and so on. And recently, in the last hundred years, psychoanalytical processes have come into being, like communism, which are both unfortunate things to happen. Because really if you observe, both are the same. I won't go into it now, it's too long. They have analysed history and come to some conclusion - you follow - historical conclusion, according to that they have built a pattern, theories, with their images, with their analysed state, and created totalitarianism. And the psychologists with their analysis and so on have created the same pattern in a different field. You don't see it, but it doesn't matter.

So what we are saying is, together observe. Now observe the content. Right? So what is the content? Now how do you observe conflict? You understand my question? You, as a human being, if you will permit me, the speaker, to say so, you as a human being are in conflict; whether you are aware of it, or you have neglected it, or you don't want to look at it, or you think god, somebody is going to save you, you are essentially in conflict. And, as we said

yesterday, how do you approach this problem? You understand? How do you look at the problem? That is, how do you come to it, how do you look at it, how do you approach it, how do you observe it? You see we are talking over together. I am not telling you how to observe it. I am only asking you how you come to it, how you receive it, how you look at it. If you observe, are aware, are you aware of this conflict without any choice? A choiceless awareness. You understand? Or becoming aware of this conflict you say, I must resolve it. You understand? When you say, I must resolve it, you have already separated yourself from the fact. I wonder if you see this. Are you following me, some of you? Come on, sirs, let's move! Please, together we are thinking, together alone we can resolve this problem. Nobody else in the world can.

So your approach to the problem matters enormously. If you have a motive, that motive dictates the direction which the problem must take. You understand? So your approach must be free from motive. Your approach must be free of the desire to resolve it. See the difficulty. If your approach is conditioned by your education, by your desire, by your pleasure, you can never solve it. So the mind must observe this problem free from all its motives, desires, and trying to resolve it, because you are the problem. Right? Have you understood? You are the problem; not, conflict is the problem. Right? Can we go from there?

Please, conflict is you. I am not telling you this. You, in your observation, you have discovered it, in your thinking together we have discovered the fact that conflict is not outside, it is inside, and that conflict is you. You may say, I am god, or somebody is going to save me. You know, we have played this kind of trick for

millennia. You understand? For god's sake let's grow up.

So the problem now is our consciousness. You understand now? Our consciousness, which means the way you think, the way you live, the way you believe, the way you react, your behaviour, your thinking, all that is your consciousness, which is your life. That consciousness is you. Please, this is really important to understand, give your attention for a few minutes. The whole of that consciousness is essentially you. The content of that consciousness makes consciousness. You understand? The content of consciousness of a Protestant, is what he believes, his rituals, his images of religion, Jesus and all that, and his nationalistic, his particular attitudes, opinions, his relationship with another, his hurts, his anxiety, his sorrow. Right? And the Catholic with his content of his consciousness, and the Hindu with his, and the Buddhist and so on, the Arabs and the Jews. You follow all this? Consciousness is put together by its content. And as long as that content remains the conflict must go on. Have you got this point?

This content has been put together through time; it isn't one day's acquirement. Our brain is the result of time, evolution. Our brain is not your brain and my brain, but the brain of mankind. This is difficult for you to see, and even recognize, because we have been so conditioned that it is my brain. You understand? And it is your brain. But if you observe, human beings right throughout the world go through enormous turmoil, poverty, anxiety, insecurity, confusion, psychologically wounded, fear, fear of being hurt, physically, fear of psychological hurts, fear of death, and the enquiry, what is there beyond. And the innumerable images man has created in the name of god, and worshipping those images right

through the world. That is the content of our consciousness. And as long as there's that content, which is always divisive, which is always fragmented, our action must be fragmented. Right?

We are thinking together, I am not telling you.

So the problem then is: is it possible for the content of that consciousness to be dissolved? You understand? Go into it a little bit. That is, one of the contents of that consciousness is the psychological wounds that we have received from childhood. You know them, don't you? You are all familiar with it. That's probably one of the major conflicts, major factor, in our consciousness. We will go into that completely together so that together we dissolve it immediately. You understand, it is not analysis but pure observation. Analysis implies a concept from which you are working. You understand? Right sir? In observation there is no concept.

So we are thinking together. Human beings from the very beginning of time, have been hurt inwardly; by a casual remark, by a look, by a word, by being sarcastic, by denying what you hold dear, what you consider the most important thing in your life, and somebody comes and treads on it, you feel terribly wounded. Right? And we are asking: the consequences of that wound is to resist, build a wall round yourself, which is to isolate yourself. Observe all this, please, observe. We are not analysing, we are just observing the story, reading the story of the hurt, reading, which is not analysing. You understand? Come on, right?

You resist, fear enters into it, not to be hurt more. So gradually that hurt has helped you to isolate yourself. Right? See the fact. The consequences of that isolation is more fear, more anxiety and

so on and so on and so on - the consequences. So the fact is that you are hurt. And what is hurt? You follow? What is the thing that is hurt? Are you all interested in all this?

Audience: Yes.

K: It's your life anyhow. If you are not interested I am sorry for you. What is the thing that is hurt? Is it your psyche, is it your - we are observing, we are not analysing, observing - psyche, or basically the image that you have built about yourself? You understand my question? The image one has built about oneself; I might build an image about myself, saying, I am a great man, I have an audience, you know, blah, blah, I travel all over the world, how important it is, and so on. I have reached some state. You follow? I have built an image about myself, as you have built an image about yourself. I haven't got it, but it doesn't matter. Because from childhood I never wanted an image, it is too stupid.

So having created an image about oneself, noble, ignoble, or inferior or superior, whatever it is, ugly, beautiful, with fanciful decoration, and romantic, sentimental, you know the image that each one has, that gets hurt. Right? So can you - we are talking over together please - can one be free of the image? And who is the creator of the image? You are following all this? Oh lord, you see you are not thinking together, I am telling you, asking the questions. It doesn't matter. We are thinking together, I hope.

Who is the creator of this image? Because in that image there is safety. You understand? There is security, there is what you would call identification: national identification, religious identification, economic identification, a Democrat, Republican, this image has been created from childhood. Right? Through education and so on.

Who is the creator of all this?

As we said, knowledge is the factor of this image. Right? I wonder if you meet it? Our experience at all levels of life, as a carpenter, as a scientist, as a housewife, home-builder as it is called now, and so on and so on and so on, we all have created images for ourselves. And when that image is questioned, doubted, somebody puts a pin into it you get hurt. As long as you have an image about yourself you are going to get hurt. Like a man who says, I have achieved enlightenment - you follow - and he is talking about environment, preaching about environment, such a man knows knowing about environment - about enlightenment. It is just his concept. You follow?

So is it possible then to live a life, a daily life, without this image, and who creates this image? It is the result of knowledge. Obviously. Knowledge that the mind, the brain, has acquired through centuries, and that knowledge has been translated as the image, and that image predominates. But that image is always living within the field of ignorance. I wonder if you see that. Because knowledge can never be complete. Right? So whatever knowledge psychologically one has acquired, it is surrounded by the shadow of ignorance. Right? So the problem is - are you interested in all this - so the problem is: is it possible to be free of psychological knowledge and yet not identify the technological knowledge psychologically? You understand? I wonder if you see this. I'll go into it. We are talking together as two friends, enquiring into the problem of conflict, and seeing the necessity, the absolute urgency of ending conflict; because if we don't end it, you and I, the speaker, are going to destroy the world. Which we are doing

now.

So the question is: experience, knowledge, memory - see the sequence of it - first, experience, then out of that experience acquiring knowledge given by others or by oneself, and that is stored up in the brain as memory. Right? That memory, that knowledge, that experience, creates this image. But that knowledge has never acknowledged the fact that it is incomplete. You understand? It must live in the shadow of ignorance, however much it may advance, or ascend. Right? It must be in the field of ignorance. And therefore it must be in conflict. Right? So is it possible for that enormous knowledge that one has acquired - knowledge technologically, the tremendous knowledge which we have acquired technologically, as a carpenter, as a plumber, as a bureaucrat, as a politician and so on and so on, that knowledge not to be identified with the psyche and so the psychological knowledge is maintained. You are following? No, you are not following.

I'll explain it. Technological knowledge is necessary, absolutely, because otherwise we can't do anything. Why should we have psychological knowledge? You understand my question? We have. The knowledge has become the image. And that image is going to be hurt, and from that hurt, the consequences of that hurt, is isolation, more conflict, more fear, more misery, more destructive activity. So we are asking: why should there be any psychological knowledge at all? You understand, sir? Why? Go into it. Let's talk about it, let's look at it. Is it the fear - please listen - is it the fear of not being anything? You follow? All our education says be something. Right? Or become something;

successful, noble, brave, put away cowardice, become holy, meditate. You follow? So all knowledge is purely technological. Right? Why should we have the other? I don't know if you are thinking together, observing. Which means what? To have no psychological knowledge - you understand sir, what it means. And is one, in that observation, discovering the utter emptiness of life? You understand? The utter meaningless of life, and so deeply feeling that create the image and hold on to that image. You are following all this? Is it that, that because if you have no image you are nothing. Which means not-a-thing. You understand? Nothing means not-a-thing. That is, not a thing is created by thought, by the mind. I wonder if you follow all this? No, this is too much.

So is that why we acknowledge being hurt and hold on to it because that is something that we have, some precious thing that we hold on to; as your belief in some religious dogma, image and so on, you hold on to that because without that what are you?

So can we, in thinking over together, see this simple fact that our life as it is, is utterly meaningless. Right? You are unwilling to face it. Utterly meaningless, and so deeply meaningless so you create all the images, the dogmas, the rituals, the popes, the gurus, and you are going to get hurt. And a man who sees this, observes it, immediately is free of it. Right? I wonder if you see it. You are free of images.

So the next question is: who is the creator of all this mischief? What time is it?

Q: 12.30.

K: An hour passes very quickly. Shall we go on with it?

Audience: Yes.

K: Sir, ladies, please, we are thinking together. We are not selling you anything, we are not doing propaganda, we are not guiding you, we are not telling you what you should do; nothing of that kind, for god's sake. We are trying to be grown up. And that means the capacity to observe all this mischief that man has created for himself and for others, and feeling the responsibility of it, both physically and psychologically, we think together to resolve it. Not just discuss it, play around with words, and throw about words. Actually enter into the problem so completely that you are that - you are the problem anyhow.

So we are asking: who is the creator of all this mischief? So we must go into it very carefully. Man has given, human beings have given - when I say man, please I am including the woman, don't let's get agitated about that! Gosh, words have become so loaded that we can never talk freely about anything - human beings have given tremendous importance throughout the ages to thought. Right? Thought has created the wars; thought has created the content of the churches and the architecture; thought has created society; thought has created the whole complex technological world; thought has created the division between the Arab and the Jew, between the American and the English, the German, the Italian, the Hindu, the Buddhist: thought has created this. And we have lived with it, this division, which we have accepted as normal, natural, healthy, and thought is the maker of all this division, and therefore where there is division there must be conflict.

Our intention, our meeting together, these few mornings, is to eliminate conflict. Please see, only when you are free of conflict can there be love. Not all this nonsense talked about love. It's only

a mind and a heart that is really free from all conflict, then it is only possible to know what compassion, what love is.

I think we had better stop, hadn't we? I know we want to go on, we'll do it next Saturday, or the day after tomorrow in the questions. Sir, this is a very complex problem, which is the whole movement of thought. I'll go into it briefly and we will go on another time.

Once you observe that thought has been responsible for this division, for the religious images, attributing to it all kinds of virtue and so on, right through the world. When the speaker goes to India, as he does every year, he says, you are the most superstitious people on earth. And when he comes here he also sees exactly the same thing. The image-worship, the preachers, the gurus - you follow? So thought has built the world, both technologically, psychologically and the world of mischief, turmoil, anxiety, fear, destruction - you follow - thought has been responsible. So we have to enquire: what is thinking? What is the nature of thinking? Because we live by thinking. Everything you do is the result of thinking; your relationship with another, intimate or not, is in the movement of thinking. And if we do not understand the nature and the structure of thinking we will keep repeating the patterns of conflict, changing one pattern to another, hoping that pattern will solve the conflict, but these patterns, whether communist, capitalist, democratic, etc., etc., etc., are created by thought. So thinking becomes extraordinarily important. And to find out what is this thinking that is making this enormous misery in the world. Do you understand sirs?

You must think if you do anything; if you are going home, or

catching a bus, driving a car, there must be thinking, either it is automatic, purposeful, clear, otherwise you can't do anything. And thinking is the central factor of our being. That's a fact. Round that we build all kinds of pleasure, pain, fear, love, jealousy, that is the core, that is the heart of our existence. And what is thinking? And what is memory? If you have no memory there is no thinking. You understand? A man in a state of amnesia! So memory is the core of it. Right? Memory of your wife, or your husband, or girl friend, or whatever it is, your memory. That memory is put together through experience. Right? Which becomes the knowledge. So your brain, the brain, which is not yours or mine, it is the brain of human beings, which is a marvellous thing if you see the fact, it is not your petty little brain, but the brain that has been cultivated, grown, evolved, lived, suffered, pleasure, pain, that brain is our common factor. In that brain are the many cells which hold memory, like a computer. That memory is the result of experience, knowledge.

So in the world, the technological world, that memory is absolutely necessary, otherwise you can't write a letter, otherwise we can't speak English to each other, you may if you know French or Latin, that's a different matter. So memory at a certain level is absolutely necessary. And thinking, which has made this world into what it is, immoral, ugly, brutal, destructive, what place has thought? You understand? If it is only important in the technological world, then what place has thought? You understand what I am saying? I wonder if you do. Has it any place at all? No, we are thinking together, don't agree or disagree.

Look, sir - I must stop, we'll go on, I'll just stop in a minute. Are you also working with me together? Aren't you tired? No, you are

not tired because you are not talking. You are not putting tremendous vitality into it. Right? You are not putting all your energy, your heart, your mind into it, that's why you are not tired. Because to you conflict is natural, you have accepted it, you don't want to break it, resolve it. So if you don't mind we will continue tomorrow, not tomorrow, whenever it is.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 6TH MAY 1980

This is a question and answer meeting. About fifty questions, or more, have been given and we cannot possibly answer all of them. But we have chosen perhaps what might be representative of all these questions.

We have been talking over together why human beings who have lived apparently for millions and millions of years have not been able to solve their conflicts both outwardly and inwardly, why they are destroying the earth, polluting the air, why human beings are becoming more and more cruel, violent. And apparently none of these questions have been resolved. We are supposed to be highly civilized human beings, and one begins to doubt whether we are. And these questions that we have been put, perhaps by answering them we might begin to understand a way of living which might be totally different.

1st QUESTION: What is the significance of history in the education of the young?

I think if one has read history books it is fairly clear that man has struggled against nature, conquered it, destroying it, polluting everything that he touches; there have been wars, killings, renaissance, industrialization, and man's struggle to be free, and yet he becomes a slave to institutions, organizations, and he tries to break away from them, but again forms another series of institutions, another series of organizations. So this everlasting struggle to be free. That probably is the history of mankind according to books. And also the tribal wars, the feudal wars, the

baronial wars, the wars of the kings, nations, it is still going on, this tribal mind which has become national, sophisticated mind, but it is still the tribal mind.

And that is more or less - perhaps we are rather simplifying the history, with the culture, music, painting, you know, the whole thing, how is all that to be taught to the young? Surely history is the story of mankind - mankind, the human being who has gone through all kinds of suffering, through various diseases, through wars, through religious beliefs and dogmas, persecution, inquisition, torture, in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of ideals. And how is all that to be taught to the young? That is the question.

If it is the story of mankind, the story of human beings, then both the educator and the young are the human beings, it is their story, not the story of kings and wars, it is their story. That is, the story of themselves. Right? Now can the educator help the student to understand the story of himself? I don't know if you are following all this. The story, the past of which he is the result. Right? So can the educator help the student to understand himself, because he is the story. That is the problem. Would you agree to that?

That is, if you are the educator and I am the student, how would you help me as a young student to understand the whole nature and structure of myself? Myself being the whole of humanity; my brain is the result of many million years. How would you help me to understand myself, my story, the past, which is all in me - the violence, the competition, the aggressiveness, the brutality, the violence, the cruelty, the fear, the pleasure, occasional joy and that

slight perfume of love. How will you help me to understand all this? Which means the educator must also understand this. He is also understanding himself. Right? So helping the 'me', the student, to understand myself. So it is a communication between the teacher and myself and in that process of communication he is understanding himself and helping me to understand myself. I wonder if you see. It is not that the teacher or the educator must first understand himself and then teach - that would take the rest of his life, perhaps; but in the relationship between the educator and the person to be educated, there is a relationship of mutual investigation. Can this be done with the young child, with the young student? And in what manner would you set about it. That is the question, right.

Are you interested in this? How would you, as a parent, go into this? How would you help your child, your boy or a girl, to understand the whole nature, and structure of his mind, of his desires, of his fears, you follow, the whole momentum of life? Don't look at me! How would you deal with it? Don't say immediately, we must have love, and all that kind of stuff. But it is a great problem and are we prepared as parents and teachers to bring about a new generation of people? That's what is implied. A totally different generation of people, totally different mind and heart. Are we prepared for that? If you are a parent would you give up for the sake of your daughter and son, drink, cigarettes, pot, you know the whole drug culture, and see that both the parent and the child are good human beings.

The word 'good' means well fitted, psychologically without any friction, well fitted like a good door. You understand? Like a good

motor. But also good means whole, not broken up, not fragmented. So are we, the elder people, prepared to bring about through education a good human being, a human being who is not afraid - afraid of his neighbour, afraid of the future, afraid of so many, many things, disease, poverty, fear? And also are we prepared in the search of the good, or in establishing the good, prepared to help the child and ourselves to be integral - integrity? The word 'integrity' means, to be whole, and integrity also means to say what you mean and hold it, not say one thing and do something else. Integrity implies honesty. And are we prepared for that? Can we be honest if we have got any illusions, any romantic, speculative ideas, or ideals. If we have strong beliefs, can we be honest? You may be honest to the belief, but that doesn't imply integrity. Are we prepared for all this? Or we bring children into the world, spoil them until they are two or three and then throw them to the wolves. Right? Prepare them for war. You know what is happening in the world.

That's why history has not taught human beings. How many mothers must have cried, their sons being killed in wars, and yet we are incapable of stopping this monstrous movement of killing each other.

So if you are to teach the young one must have in oneself this sense of the demand of the good. Good is not an ideal. You understand? If we translate the good, which is to be whole, to have integrity, to have no fear, not to be confused. These are not ideals, they are facts. You understand? So can we be factual and so bring about a good human being through education? If we say, yes, then what will the parent and you do about it? What is your

responsibility? Because probably you have children, if you have, then what? You understand the problem?

So one asks, do we really want a different culture, a different human being with a mind that is not confused, that has no fear, that has this quality of integrity? I hope I have answered that question.

2nd QUESTION: Why is knowledge always incomplete? When one is observing is one aware that one is observing, or only aware of the thing that is being observed? Does awareness lead to analysis? What is psychological knowledge?

Whom do you expect to answer these questions? The Delphic Oracle? The highly elevated priests? The astrologers? The soothsayers? The reading of tea leaves?! Whom do you expect to answer this question? But if you are not expecting anyone to answer this question, but since you have put the question, can we talk it over together? You understand? Talk it over together, not that the speaker will answer it, and then you accept it or deny it, and go home being dissatisfied, saying, 'I have wasted my morning'. But if we could seriously talk over these questions so that we both penetrate into the problem, then it will be your own answer, not the answer of someone who has answered these questions that you have heard, then it is not yours. You understand? Like a man having cancer, you can talk about cancer - who haven't got - but if you have got it you are involved in it, there is pain, there is anxiety, there is fear.

So can we talk over these questions, all of them, not just this one but also the previous question. Why is knowledge always incomplete, as you said? What is knowledge? What do we mean when we say, 'I know'? Please go into it with me together, slowly.

When I say, 'I know mathematics', or 'I know the medicine, surgery', and also I know through experience, gathered some facts. So when we say, I know, or we know, what do we mean by that? You are following? To know. You may say, I know my wife, or my husband, or my girl, girl friend, or boy. Do you really know them? Can you ever know them? Please follow this step by step. Or you have, as we said the other day, an image about them. Is the image the fact? You understand what I am saying? Are we meeting each other? So the word, 'know' is very, very limited. Right? And the knowledge that has been acquired through science, not only the technological side of it, but also scientists are trying to find out through matter what is beyond, what is the origin of all this. And they have accumulated a great deal of knowledge; and what is beyond they have never been able to find out, so far. And knowledge, according to science, is limited, is narrow, therefore there is knowledge and ignorance always going together. The ignorance which is not knowing, and the knowing, they both go together always. Right? I think that is fairly clear.

But to answer this a bit further, which is scientists say through matter they will find that which may be beyond. We human beings are matter. You understand? Why don't we go through this rather than through that? You follow what I am saying? Are we talking together? Because if the mind can go through itself the possibility of coming upon that which is the origin of all things is much more likely than the other. I don't know? So to know oneself is always limited. I don't know if you follow. If I say, I must know myself, I can study psychology, I can discuss with the psychologists, psychoanalysts, psychotherapists, psychobiologists and so on and

so on, but it is always limited. Whereas if I understand myself, penetrate into this entity called myself, there is the possibility of going infinitely beyond; which we are going to discuss and perhaps we may be able to go beyond during the next talks, because it is a very important thing because otherwise life has very little meaning, naturally. Our life is pleasure, pain, you know the whole cycle of it, reward and punishment; that's the pattern in which we live. And that pattern has created the knowledge which psychologically we have acquired. That knowledge which we have acquired has created the pattern in which we are caught. Right? So knowledge, whether it is biological, medicine, science, must always be limited. Right?

When one is observing, is one aware that one is observing, or only aware of the thing being observed? Does the awareness lead to analysis? First of all let us talk over together what do we mean by observing. There is visual observation, the tree; the hearing, not only hearing with the ear but also hearing inwardly. You follow, you know this. So when we observe do we really observe at all? Or we observe with the word. You understand? Are you following this? That is, I observe that thing and I say, 'tree', so I observe with the word. I don't know if you are following this. Right sir? There is an observation with the word. So can I find out, can we find out to observe without the word? Do you understand? Right? Are we proceeding together? So the word has become all important rather than the seeing. Right? We observe, if we have a wife or a husband, with all the memory, pictures, sensations, the irritations and so on of each other, so we never observe.

So the next step is, can we observe a person with whom you

have lived intimately and so on and so on without the image, without the picture, without the idea? Can you do it? Perhaps we are able to perceive that thing which we call the tree without the word, that's fairly easy, if you have gone into it, that's fairly easy. But to observe that person with whom you have lived, and observe without the accumulation of memory about that person. If you have gone into it, if you are interested in it - no, first of all, this observation through the image, through the picture, through the sensations and all the rest of it, through this accumulated memory, is no relationship at all. It is a relationship of one picture with another picture, and that's what we call relationship. But when you examine it closely it is not relationship. It is my idea and your idea.

So can we in the observation not make an abstraction of what we observe as an idea? You are following all this? Don't be puzzled, sirs. You are not used to all this, are you? So this is what we mean by psychological knowledge. That is, I have built up psychologically a great deal of information about my wife - if I have a wife, or a girl friend. I have built up this knowledge about her, correctly or incorrectly, depending on my sensitivity, depending on my ambition, greed, envy and all that, depending on my self-centred activity - you are following all this? So that knowledge is preventing actual observation of the person, which is a living thing. Right? So I never want to meet that living thing because I am afraid. It is much safer to have an image about that person rather than to see the living thing. You are following this?

So my psychological knowledge is going to prevent pure observation. So can one be free of that? You follow? Can the machinery that builds these images come to an end? You

understand my question? Then you will say, 'How am I to end it? I have got an image about my friend, or whatever it is, and it is there, like a tremendous fact, like a stone round my neck, how am I to throw it away?' Right? Is the stone, the image round one's neck different from the observer? I am going slowly into this. Is that image, that weight round your neck, is that different from the observer who says, 'I have an image'? I wonder if you see. You understand? Meet me, let's talk, move.

Is the observer who says, 'I have the image', and says, 'How am I to get rid of it?' is that observer different from the thing he has observed? You follow? Obviously not. Right? So the observer is the image-maker. I wonder if you see that. Right? Do you meet this?

So what is the observer? Who is this observer that is making the image, and then separating himself from the image, and then saying, 'What am I to do about it?' You understand? That is the way we live, that's the pattern of our action, and that's our conditioning to which we are so accustomed, so naturally accept. So we are saying something entirely different, which is, the observer is the observed. Let me go into it a little more. I observe the tree but I am not the tree - thank god! That would be too stupid to say, I am the tree, or I have identified myself with the tree, and so on and so on. All this process of identification is still the observer trying to be something, or become something. So we have to enquire into what is the observer, who is the observer. The observer is the result of all the past knowledge. Right? His experiences, his knowledge, his memories, his fears, his anxieties, the past. So the observer is always living in the past. If you have

noticed you know what he looks like. And he is modifying himself all the time meeting the present, but still rooted in the past. Right? So there is this movement of time, which is the past, modifying itself in the present, going off into the future. This is the momentum or the movement of time. I won't go into that now for the moment.

So when we observe we are observing through the image which we have created about that thing, or that person. Can we observe that thing without the word, and can we observe the person without the image? That means can the observer be absent in observation. Right? Do you get the point? Are you working with me? When you look at a person - of course, if it is a stranger you have no picture, or you say, oh, he is a foreigner, throw him out - but when you look at somebody whom you know very intimately, the more intimately you know them the more the image, can you look at that person without the image? Which means, can you look at that person without the observer? You get it? I wonder. That is pure observation.

So does this awareness lead to analysis? Obviously not. You understand the question? That is, what do we mean by analysis? That is to analyze. Who is analyzing? You understand? I am analyzing myself - right, I'll go into it. I am analyzing myself, or the analyst is analyzing me. When I analyze myself, who is the analyzer? You are following this? Is the analyzer different from the thing who is analyzing me, is the analyzer different from me? Oh, come on sirs. Obviously not. You see as in our talks and in these answers and questions we are eliminating the very structure of conflict - you understand - between human beings. The structure of

conflict exists as long as there is division. The division in myself which creates the division outside. There is a division in myself because I say I am a Hindu, and identification with that image of being a Hindu gives me security so I hold on to that. Which is nonsense, there is no security in an image. And the other fellow does the same, he is a Muslim, or an Arab, or a Jew, he does the same, so we are at each other's throats. So the analyzer is the analyzed. You understand? So what happens then? If, when the observer psychologically is the observed, and therefore no conflict, you understand, because there is no division. If you see this clearly, that is our minds have been trained, educated to have this division. I and the thing are different. I, with my anger, with my jealousy - jealousy is different from me, therefore I must do something about it: control it, suppress it, go beyond it. I am acting upon it. But when jealousy, anxiety, is me, what has happened? You understand my question? There is the elimination of conflict. Then what happens? Go on sir. I don't want to. Go on, what happens? If you are actually doing this as we are talking, when you end the division between the two what happens? When anxiety is me, I am anxiety. Obviously. Then what takes place? Don't wait for me to answer it.

First of all, may I go on? First of all the pattern has been broken. Right? The pattern which is the conditioning of my mind, that pattern has been broken. Right? Which means what? The ending of something is the beginning of something else. I wonder if you capture this. If I break the pattern - if the pattern is broken, the ending of the struggle, what then takes place? A new momentum takes place, you follow, a new movement takes place. Right sir? Don't be sceptical. If you do this you will find out. If you

apply your mind, your energy, go into this, you can observe the tree and the word 'tree' interferes, the moment you see that you say, tree, a butterfly, a deer, the mountain, the river - you follow, immediate reaction. That reaction can be observed and perhaps put aside and just to observe the tree, the beauty, the line of it, you follow, the grace of it, the quality of it.

Now to do the same with the person with whom you have lived, with whom you have been intimate, not to have a single image about that person. Then relationship is something extraordinary, isn't it? I wonder if you see. No? You don't do this, that's why you don't find out. We are so anchored in our own past, in our own conditioning, in our own pattern, god only knows how you are going to break it. Right? It has to be broken. It is like a man living in an illusion and calling that reality.

Q: Sir, if the observer is the observed how can you ever go beyond that? I mean you can't make yourself step out of that. When you see it, you are still in it.

K: Sir, just a minute sir. Are you actually, not you personally, I am not being personal - is one aware of the fact of this, fact, not the idea? The fact that the observer has the image about the person whom he is observing, his wife. Is he aware of that fact of this division? And is he aware that this division is created by the image which he has made about him or her? Right? Are you aware of this fact? Or am I telling you of the fact and therefore you accept it? Therefore it is not actual, it is just an idea. But if you say, yes, this fact is so. That is, there is the image about her or him, I am aware of that image, that picture, that idea, then the next is: is the picture, the image, the actual person that is living with you? Obviously not.

So who is creating this image? You follow? If you go sequentially the answer is very simple. You understand?

So, sir, first observe the tree, whether you can see it without the word: when you see that thing called rose, can you look at that flower without naming it? Test it out. Then find out if you have an image about a person. Now wait a minute. You have an image about me, haven't you? Because the papers write about it, or some silly book. You follow? You have an image about me. So are you listening through the image, through the picture, through the articles you have read, or the books? Or are you listening directly without the image? You understand? Oh, come on.

Q: Sir, what happens when the other person behaves to confirm your image?

K: Suppose one's wife has no image about the husband, what is the relationship then between the husband and the wife who has no image? You understand the question? That's what you are asking. You understand sir? You are violent and the other person is not violent, then what is the relationship? Have you any relationship, except perhaps sensory, sexual, have you any relationship? Obviously not. But you are living in the same house. So what will you do? Sir, you are not facing it, moving with the facts, you see that's why you are living with ideas, that's the difficulty in this matter.

All right, sir, let's go into it. My wife has no image about me. First of all, that's the most extraordinary way of living. You understand? In that perhaps there may be real profound love. She has no image about me but I have an image, pictures, ideas, all that in me piling up, and we are living in the same house. What takes

place? She is free, I am not. And I create the conflict, not she. Right? I want her to have an image about me because I am used to that, so I begin. A most destructive relationship goes on. Right? Until she says, enough. Does she divorce me? Go on sirs, this is your job, face it. Leave me? Or her having no image of me has brought about a totally different atmosphere in the house. You understand sir? You have never done this, do test it out sirs. There is a totally different - I am beginning to be aware because she is immovable, you understand, and I am moving all around. So I begin to see when I meet something that is immovable something happens to me. Isn't it happening to you now? Oh, come on sirs!

Sir, a man goes from one religion to another, one guru to another, one philosophy - you know, plays around, around, around, and another man says, I have been through all that, out, finished. He is immovable. You understand? So what happens? Test it out.

Q: How to eliminate the image?

K: How to eliminate the image. You see, you haven't understood. You can't eliminate the image because you are the image maker. Right? Do you see that? You have to eliminate yourself. (Laughter) Which is, your thought which has built up the image about yourself. I won't enter into the whole movement of thought because there are too many questions, we will go into it when we talk.

3rd QUESTION: Doesn't thought originate as a defence against pain? The infant begins to think in order to separate itself from physical pain. Which comes first: is thought, which is psychological knowledge the result of pain, or is pain the result of thought? How does one go beyond the defences developed in

childhood?

You have understood the question? What is the time, sir?

Q: Five thirty.

K: Oh lord! You see sir how long one question, or two questions, take. You know really there is only one question. If you consider all these questions there is only one real question. What is that? Ask it, sir. Please, a sort of angel comes along and says you can ask only one question, and it must be the real question, not how am I to get rich, who am I to marry - you follow. The real deep fundamental question.

Q: How to eliminate thought.

K: Who is the entity who says, how am I?

Q: Who am I?

K: I won't answer that question because you haven't come to it. You'll find out.

Q: Why don't you ask the question?

K: I have asked it. Oh, you are not quick enough. Sir, the question is: does thought create the pain, or pain creates the thought? You understand? You put a pin into this leg, it is communicated to the brain, then the pain, then the anxiety to end that pain. The whole of that is a momentum of thinking, isn't it? The nervous reaction, the identification with that reaction, and the identification saying, I hope it will end and I mustn't have it in the future. All that is part of the whole momentum, of the whole movement, isn't it? Why do you separate the two: does thinking come first, or the pain comes first? You understand? Who laid the egg business, you know. Does the chicken come first, or the egg comes first? You are missing the whole point, sir.

It's not the time to go into this. Fear, which is part of pain, is fear the result of thought? You understand? Is there fear without thought?

Q: Is there an image without thought?

K: Sir, the me is put together by thought, obviously. Successive incidents, successive ideas, and genetic heritage, and so on and so on, the me is the result of thought: I am a Hindu, I am a Catholic, I am this, I am that, I am an American, I am successful, I am a doctor, I am - all that is a bundle put together by thought.

I am asking, sir, most of us have had pain. Have you ever experimented to dissociate thought from pain? Haven't you? Of course you have done it. To watch the pain, not identify and say, 'I have pain'. You understand? Sit in the dentist's chair for some time and watch the thing going on, so your mind observes without identifying. You can do this, sir. I sat in the dentist's chair for four hours - I can tell you about it. Never a single thought came into my mind. I discovered that after I had sat for four hours.

How does one go beyond the defences cultivated in childhood? Would you go to a psychoanalyst? Would you? No, wait, don't say, no. That's how they exist. Perhaps they are the modern priests. Now would you go to a psychologist, psychotherapist, psychoanalyst and so on, there are so many varieties of these medicine men. Sorry, I am not being rude to them, I am just asking, would you go to them? That's the easiest way, isn't it? And we think they will answer all the childhood problems. They can't. They may slightly modify it. They themselves say so. So what will you do? There is nobody you can go to. Right? Sir, do you face that? There is nobody, your guru, god, priest, psychoanalyst,

including Krishnamurti, nobody you can go to, what will you do? Have you ever faced that, that fact that you cannot. You can go to a doctor, if you have cancer, that's a different matter. The psychological knowledge that you have developed from childhood which becomes neurotic - most people are neurotic somehow. And there is nobody on earth you can go to, or in heaven, what will you do? How would you find out that you are neurotic? Not somebody telling you you are neurotic, because most people are neurotic. Somebody tells me I am neurotic, it is the pot calling the kettle black. Right? So how shall I find out I am neurotic? Do I want to find out? If I do, how shall I know, how shall I see it? Have I really eliminated from my thought, from my mind, the idea somebody is going to help me? You understand, sir? See what I have done. You understand? The very going to somebody to help me may be the essence of neuroticism. I wonder if you see this? It doesn't matter.

So what am I to do? How am I to know in a world that is almost neurotic, all my friends, my relations, they are all slightly imbalanced. And probably I am also imbalanced. So what shall I do, knowing there is nobody I can go to? No confession, all that business, nobody, so what shall I do? See what has happened, sir, to me? You are not meeting this. As I cannot go to anybody, then what is taking place in my mind when I have depended on others? On books, on psychologists, on authority, what has happened to my mind?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Go on sir, what has happened to your mind if you actually realize that you cannot possibly go to anybody?

Q: You have to do it yourself.

K: No, watch it, sir. What happens to your mind? Is neuroticism the result of dependence? I depend on my wife, I depend on the doctor, I depend on god, I depend on psychologists. You follow? I have established a series of dependents around me, hoping that in that dependence I will be secure. Right? And I discover as I cannot depend on anybody, what happens? Oh, come on sirs, what happens when you don't depend?

Q: You become...

K: Do it, sir. Do it. You understand, sir? We are bringing about a tremendous revolution, psychological revolution. Right? And you are unwilling to face it. I depend on my wife. She encourages me to be dependent on her, or I, etc., both ways. So you tell me that is part of your neurosis. I don't throw it out, I examine it. I say, you are quite right. I see this. So can I be free of not depending on my wife, psychologically, of course. Will you do it? No, sir, you won't, because you are frightened, you want something from her, sex, or this, or that, or she encourages you with your ideas, helps you to be dominant, helps you to be ambitious. You follow? Says, you are a marvellous philosopher. So to see that the very state of dependence on another may be the deep psychological neurosis. And when you break that pattern what happens? You are sane. When you are free of the church, the priests, the popes - you follow - the whole works of it all. You understand what happens to you, what is the state of your mind. Sir, you must have such a mind to find out what truth is.

Dependence has been, from childhood, has been a factor against pain, against hurt, for comfort, for emotional sustenance, for encouragement, and all that has been built in you, you are part of

that. If you say, no more authority, religious authority, do you know what happens?

Q: What did Christ say?

K: Oh, sir. You see, it is impossible to discuss with you. Sir, before Christ there was the Buddha, 500 BC, before him there was somebody else, so it isn't there was just this one person who has suddenly discovered. That's your conditioning of two thousand years, as in India they are conditioned by three thousand years. This conditioned mind can never find out what truth is. You may worship your images, enjoy them, but it is not truth. Don't throw bombs!

So, sir, not to depend on anything means you are alone. Do you know what that word 'alone' means, all one. Yes, sir. That is sanity. Sanity breeds rationality, clarity, integrity.

Sorry, sir, not to answer all the other questions.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 8TH MAY 1980

I am sorry you are not having better weather.

In answering these questions - and there have been over a hundred questions and it would take perhaps two months or more to answer all of them, and you wouldn't be here and the speaker wouldn't be here, so we have to answer those that are somewhat representative of all the questions - in answering these questions the speaker is not trying to tell you anything, he is not trying to convince you of anything, or transmitting some ideas which he has, or some concepts, or beliefs which you accept and then try to examine those beliefs, ideas and concepts. I think that we must be quite clear about that matter. In answering these questions both of us are investigating the question. It isn't the speaker is investigating and then tells you about it and then you accept it, but rather together we are going into it, so that it is not one person understanding and then telling you about it. I hope that's clear.

1st QUESTION: There is a prevalent assumption these days that everything is relative and a matter of personal opinion; that there is no such thing as truth or fact independent of personal perception. What is an intelligence response to this belief?

Right? Is it that we are all so terribly personal? What I see, what you see, is the only truth? My opinion and your opinion are the only facts we have? That's what the question implies. That everything is relative; goodness is relative, evil is relative, love is relative. And as everything is relative, that is, not whole, complete, truth, then our actions, our affections of personal relationship are

relative, and can be ended whenever we like, whenever it doesn't please us and so on. That is the implication of this question. Right?

Now is there - we are both of us investigating, please, I am not telling you - is there such a thing as truth, apart from belief, apart from personal opinion, belief, personal belief, perception, is there such thing as truth? This question has been asked by the ancient Greeks, by the Hindus in the ancient days, and by the Buddhists. It is one of the strange facts in the eastern religions that doubt was encouraged. To doubt, to question. And in the west it is rather put down, it is called heresy if you doubt. So one must find out for oneself apart from personal opinions, perceptions, experiences, which are always relative, whether there is a perception, a seeing, which is absolute truth, not relative. You understand? You understand my question? Now how are you going to find out? If we say that personal opinion, perception is relative, and therefore there is no such thing as truth, absolute, it then is relative. And according to that our behaviour, our conduct, our way of life is relative, casual, not complete, not whole, therefore fragmentary. I hope we are following each other. And we are trying to find out if there is such a thing as truth which is not relative, personal opinion, perception. Right? So how do you set about it?

How would you, if this question is put to you, how would you find out if there is such a thing as truth which is absolute, which is not relative, which is complete, which is never changing under climate, personal opinions, and so on, how will you find out? How does your mind, the intellect find out, or thought find out? May we go on with this? Does it interest you, all this? I wonder why. Because when you are enquiring into something that demands a

great deal of investigation, action in daily life, a sense of putting aside which is false. That's the only way to proceed. Right? That is, if we have an illusion, a fantasy, an image, a romantic concept of truth, or love and all the rest of it, those are the very barriers that prevent moving further.

Can one honestly investigate what is an illusion? Does the mind live in illusion? Or do we have illusions about people, about nations, about god, about religion, about everything? You follow? How do illusions come into being? I don't know if you follow? How does one have an illusion, what is the root of it? What do we mean by the word 'illusion'? It comes from the Latin and so on, ludere, which means to play. The root meaning of that word is to play, ludere. Which means playing with something which is not actual. You understand? The actual is what is happening, whether it is what may be called good, bad, or indifferent, what is actually taking place. And when one is incapable of facing what is actually taking place in oneself then to escape from that is to create illusion. Right?

Please don't agree, I am just exploring this, we are exploring together. The word illusion implies to play with something that is not actual, ludere. I won't go into all the Greek and Latin meaning of it. And also in Sanskrit the very same words are used.

So if one is unwilling or afraid, or wants to avoid what is actually going on, that very avoidance creates the illusion, a fantasy, a romantic movement away from 'what is'. If we accept that as the meaning of that word illusion, moving away from 'what is'. Right? Can we go on from there? No, please don't agree with me, see this as a fact. Then can we avoid this movement, this

escape from actuality? So then we ask, what is the actual? Right? You are following? The actual is that which is happening, which is the responses, the ideas, actually, the actual belief you have, the actual opinion you have, and to face that is not to create illusion. Right? In our investigation have we gone that far? Right? Because otherwise you can't go further.

So as long as there are illusions, opinions, perceptions, based on the avoidance of 'what is', then that must be relative. Right? Right, sir? Shall we go on? Relativeness, which is - I won't go into the word relative. This can only take place when there is a movement away from the fact, from what is happening, 'what is'. In understanding 'what is' it is not your personal opinion that judges 'what is', it is not your personal perception but actual observation of 'what is'. One cannot observe what is actually going on if you say, my belief dictates the observation, my conditioning dictates the observation, then it is avoidance of the understanding of 'what is'. I wonder if you've got it? Right? Are we doing this? Actually do it: see, perceive what is actual, your actual belief, your actual sense of dependency, your actual competitiveness, and not move away from it, observe it. That observation is not personal. Right? But if you make it personal, that is, I must, I must not, I must be better than that, then it becomes personal and therefore it becomes relative. Whereas if we could look at what is actually taking place, then there is complete avoidance of any form of illusion. Right? Can we do this? You may agree to this verbally, but can we actually perceive our dependency, either dependency on a person, on a belief, on an ideal, or on some experience which has given you a great deal of excitement and all the rest of it and therefore

depend on those, that dependence will inevitably create illusion. So can we observe the fact that we are dependent and observe it?

Right?

So in the same way we are going to find out if there is such a thing as absolute truth. If you are interested in this, because this has been asked not only by some casual questioner, but by monks who have given their life to this, you understand. By philosophers, by every religious person who is not institutionalized, deeply concerned with life, with reality and truth. So if you are really concerned about what is the truth one has to go into it very, very deeply.

First of all one has to understand what is reality. Right? What is reality? That which you perceive, that which you touch, that which you taste, when you have pain and so on. So reality is the sensation and the reaction to that sensation, the response to the sensation as an idea, and that idea created by thought. So thought has created reality: the marvellous architecture, the great cathedrals of the world, the temples, the mosques, and the idols that are put in them, the images, all created by thought. And we say, that is reality, because you can touch it, you can taste it, you can smell it.

Q: What about hallucinations? This can be a disturbance in the physiological brain.

K: Yes, sir. The brain may be diseased, or affected, wounded, or bruised, and out of that you have illusions, hallucinations.

Q: Physiologically if you have say a high fever...

K: Of course sir, may I request - questions are to be answered, if you ask questions from the audience you interrupt the flow of the enquiry - so may I request, most politely, that unless you write it

down, please don't. I hope you don't mind my asking this.

Hallucinations, illusions, delusions, take place when the brain is damaged, when there is an avoidance or an escape from 'what is'. All these words illusions, hallucination, delusions, are all of that category.

So we are saying all the things that thought has created - you understand - the knowledge, the acquisition of knowledge through science, through mathematics and so on and so on, is reality. But nature is not created by thought. Right? You are following this? That tree, the mountains, the rivers, the waters, the deer, the snake, is not created by thought, it is there. But out of the tree we make a chair, that's created by thought. Right? So thought has created the actual world in which we live, and nature, including the environment, that is not created by thought. Obviously.

Then we ask, is truth reality? You understand? You are following this? One perceives that thought has created the world in which we live, but thought has not created the universe. But thought can enquire into the universe. The cosmology, astrophysicists, that is they are proceeding the enquiry with thought, and they will come to certain conclusions, certain hypotheses, try to prove those hypotheses, always in the path of thought. I don't know if you are following all this? So thought is relative and therefore whatever it creates, in whatever direction it moves it must be relative, it must be limited. You are following all this? Please, this is not a lecture, I am not a professor, thank god! We are just enquiring as two human beings wanting to find out what actual truth is, if there is such a thing as that. So the mind is no longer in illusion, that is the first thing, has no hypothesis, has

no hallucinations, delusions, it doesn't want to grasp something, or create an experience which it calls truth - which most people do.

So the mind has now brought order into it. Right? Right, sirs? It has order, there is no confusion about illusions, about delusions, hallucinations, experiences. So the mind, the brain has lost its capacity to create illusions. Right? Then what is truth? That is, sir, what is the relationship between reality - you understand reality, we explained what is reality - and that which is not created by thought? Is there such a thing which is not the product of thought? Do you understand? Can we go on with this?

That is, is your mind, our minds now, sitting here in a rather depressed climate, under trees, rather cool, are our minds free from every form of illusion? Right? Otherwise you cannot possibly find out the other. Which means is your mind completely free of any confusion? Therefore it is absolute order. You follow? Is it? You understand my question? How can a confused mind, a disorderly mind, a mind that is in a turmoil, ever find what truth is? It can invent, it can say, there is truth, or there is no truth, but for a mind that has a sense of absolute order, a mind that is completely free from every form of illusion, then it can proceed to find out. You understand? Otherwise you can't, obviously.

That is, sir, there is something rather interesting, if you are interested in it. The astrophysicist scientists are using thought to find out, going out. You understand? They are doing this. They are investigating the world around them, matter, and going beyond the astrophysics, beyond, but always moving outward. Right? But if you start inward, the meaning is also matter - thought is matter - so if you can go inwards then you are moving from fact to fact. Right?

I wonder if you see all this. Therefore that which is beyond matter you begin to discover. That's up to you.

Sirs, this is a very serious affair, it is not just a morning, a Thursday morning, an hour to discuss this. One has to give one's - you understand - you have to give one's life to this, not away from life. You understand? Life is my struggles, my anxiety, my fears, my boredom, my loneliness, my sorrow, you follow, my misfortunes, all the regrets - all that is my life. That I must understand and go through that, not away from it. Then there is such thing as absolute truth, if you have gone through it.

2nd QUESTION: How can we take responsibility for what is happening in the world while continuing to function in our daily life? What is right action with regard to violence, and when faced with violence?

How can we take responsibility for what is happening in the world while continuing to function in our daily life? First of all, sir, is the world, that which is happening outside, is it different from what is happening inside? You understand my question? The world, what is happening in the world is violence, what is happening in the world is this extraordinary turmoil that is going on, crisis after crisis, wars, division of nationalities, religious differences, racial, communal differences, one set of systemized concepts against another, this battle that is going on, is that different from what is going on in us? Right? Please, do investigate. Is it different? Because we are also violent, we are also full of vanity, so terribly dishonest, put on different masks for different occasions. Right? So is it one movement - you understand - like the tide going out and the tide coming in? You follow? It's

one movement. Not, how am I to be responsible to that.

So if the world is me - right - because we human beings created that, that cannot possibly be changed unless we human beings change. That is the truth of it. You understand sirs. We want to do something there, in the world - better institutions, better governments, better economics, etc., etc., etc. - but we never say, we have created that, and unless we, I, you, change that cannot be changed. We won't take the responsibility for that, but we'll take responsibility for that. You understand the difference? Do we meet each other in this?

So I am the world. Right? Right sir? I am the world. It is not an idea, it is not a belief, it is not a concept, it is an actuality. After ten million years, or whatever million years we have lived, we are just the same. You follow? We haven't changed fundamentally. And so we have created such havoc in the world. So the fact is I am the world, not an idea but an actuality. Do you see the difference? As the idea and the actuality. The idea is you have heard this, that you are the world, you make an abstraction of it into an idea, and discuss about the idea, whether it is true, false, against it, for it, and you've lost it. You understand? But the fact is, you are, it is so.

So you are responsible for changing this. That means you are responsible completely how you live your daily life. Please, this is not preaching, or advocating, nothing, we are investigating together. So our responsibility is not to the chaos that is going on, and try to modify it, change it, decorate it, or join this group or that group, or that institution and so on, but as a human being who is the world, and that human being has to go through radical transformation otherwise you will have no good society. And most

of us find it awfully difficult to change. Right? Even to give up smoking. You understand? You have got institutions that will help you not to smoke. You see how we depend on institutions. You follow sirs? So can we find out why we don't change? Why we see something to be wrong - wrong in quotes - and end it immediately? Is it that we feel that somebody else will bring order in the world, and then we just slip into it? You understand? Is it that we are indolent psychologically, lazy, ineffectual? You understand sir? How many years one spends to acquire a certain technique, to go through school, high school, college, university, to become a doctor - ten years, more - and we won't spend a day - you understand?

So our responsibility is to bring about a radical change in ourselves because we are the rest of humanity.

And the next question is: what is right action with regard to violence and when faced with violence? What is right action with regard to violence. What is violence? Go on sirs, what is violence? Anger? Hatred? I am just going into it please. Anger, hatred, conformity, imitation, obedience? Or the denial of all that, the opposite of all that? You understand my question? And violence is part of our life, inherited probably from the animal and so on. And is it possible to be free of it? Not relatively, but completely free of it. You understand what it means? To be free of anger, which means not only to be free of anger but to have no anger in the mind. You understand? I wonder if you meet all this?

Say for instance, conformity, not outward conformity, but the sense of conformity through comparison. You follow what I mean? We are always comparing, aren't we? Psychologically: I was, I will

be, or I am, which is comparative. You are following all this, sirs? So I am asking, this mind, which is always comparing, judging, aggressive, and its aggressiveness is to compare - right? I don't think you see this - so can the mind be free of absolutely all violence? If it is, then suppose it meets violence, what is its response? First of all if the mind is free of imitation, conformity, comparison and so on, from that there is right action. Right? I don't know if you follow that. And if one meets violence face to face, what is the action that takes place? Can you judge what you are going to do when you meet it? You follow my question? I wonder if you do?

Look sir, I don't want to go too deeply into this. The brain, as I was saying, please, I am not an expert on the brain, I have not studied neurology and all the rest of it, but you can watch it in yourself if you are sensitive, alert, that the brain when it faces violence undergoes a chemical change, because it reacts much quicker than the blow. I don't know if you are following all that. Right? And it has the capacity to heal itself. I won't go further into it.

So the brain knows what is violence, can react to that violence, but for the brain itself to be conscious of the freedom of violence. You understand? It is probably as clear as mud!

Sir, let's make it very simple. When you know somebody is angry, your whole body reacts. The chemical response takes place and there is immediate response, you may not hit back, but the very presence of anger or hatred there is an action. Right? Now in the presence of violence, not to have this response. I wonder if you understand? Right, am I explaining it? Try it some time. I hope you

never face violence but I am sure you will face anger. And in the presence of a person who is angry, see what takes place, be aware of it and not to react. You follow? That is, the moment you are aware of the other person's anger and you do not yourself respond there is quite a different response. I wonder if you understand this. Don't call it love and all that kind of stuff. This response, which is our instinct to respond to hate by hate, to anger by anger, but in the presence of anger there is this wheeling up which creates in the system nervous reactions and so on, chemically, but to quieten all this in the presence of anger, and then there is a different action taking place when you are confronted with violence. Have I made this clear? Or is it still muddy? No? Is it clear, at least verbally?

3rd QUESTION: The hope that tomorrow will solve our problems prevents our seeing the absolute urgency of change. How does one deal with this?

Is that the reason that we don't change, that tomorrow, the hope of it, that the future, tomorrow, the next day and so on, the future - because our minds are conditioned to the future, the questioner asks, is that the reason why we don't change? Now if you go into it - we will go into this question.

What do you mean by the future? What is future? You understand my question? If one is desperately ill, tomorrow has meaning. You understand? Because I may be healed by tomorrow. And so we must ask, what is this sense of future? What is future? You understand my question? What is future? Because we know the past, you understand, and because we live in the past, which is a fact, the opposite movement, that is the past going through the present, modifying itself moves to that which we call the future.

Right? Are you following this sir? First of all do we know, are we aware that we live in the past? Right? We live in the past, don't we? And that past is always modifying itself, adjusting itself, expanding itself, contracting, but it is still the past - past experience, past knowledge, past understanding, past delight, the pleasure which has become the past, and so on and so on. So the future modified is the past. Right? I said the future is the modification of the past. Right? So the future is the past, modified. I wonder if you see this?

So my hope of the future is still the past moving to what I consider the future. Right? Right, sir? I must talk to somebody! So the mind has never moved out of the past. That's all I want to get at. Right? The future is still the past, so the mind is always acting, living, thinking in the past. And so can the past end, not the seeing of the absolute necessity of change? Do you understand my question?

What is the past? Let's look at that for a while. What is the past? My racial inheritance, my conditioning as this or that, as a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, Catholic, American and so on; the past is the education I have received, the past is the experiences which I have had, the hurts, the delights, the remembrances and so on; that is the past. Right sir? That is my consciousness, that's our consciousness; it is not my consciousness, it is our consciousness. So can that consciousness with all its content, which is my belief, my dogmas, my hopes, my fears, my longings, my illusions and so on, can all that end? Sir, you don't know what this is.

Look! Can you end this morning completely your dependence on another? Because that is part of your consciousness. Because

the moment you end, something new begins. Obviously. But we never end anything completely. The non-ending is the hope. Right? Are you following this sir? So can you end and see the consequences of dependence, psychologically, I don't mean outwardly - I depend on the postman, telephone, this, that and the other - but psychologically, inwardly, see what it means to depend, and immediate action taking place, the ending of it.

Now the point is, is the content of our consciousness to be done bit by bit? You understand? That is, get rid of anger, get rid of jealousy, bit by bit by bit. That would take too long, wouldn't it? Or can the whole thing be done instantly, immediately? You understand my question, sirs? That is, taking the content of our consciousness one by one and ending them will take all one's life, or perhaps many days, many years; but is it possible to see the whole content and end it? You understand my question? To see the whole content, the whole of it, which is fairly simple if you do it, but our minds are so conditioned that we allow time as a factor to change it.

I hope we are answering these questions.

4th QUESTION: Are there any psychological needs which we human beings are responsible for meeting in our daily relationship with others? Is there such a thing as true psychological need?

That's the real question: is there such a thing as a true psychological need? You have answered the question yourself, haven't you? Need I answer it? Need I answer the question? Oh, I do need to answer it? No, thank god!

5th QUESTION: What does it mean to see the totality of something? Is it ever possible to perceive the totality of something

which is moving?

You understand the question? A good question? Shall we do it together?

As we said in the previous question in going into it, to perceive the totality of our consciousness, that consciousness is centred as the 'me', the self, the egotistic activity, self-centred movement, which is the totality of our consciousness. Right? Now can we see that completely? Of course we can. Right? Is that difficult? That is, one's consciousness is made up of all its content. Right? Is that clear? That is, my jealousy, my nationality, my beliefs, my experiences and so on and so on and so on, that is the content of this thing called consciousness. The core of that is me, the self. Right? To see this thing entirely now. Right? Right, sir? Can you do it? Of course you can. Which means giving complete attention to it. Right? Again we rarely give complete attention to anything. Now we are asking each other: give complete attention to this content which is at the very core of the self. The self, the 'me', is the essence of that, and give attention to it, and you see the whole, don't you?

Now the questioner says also, which is interesting, which is, is it ever possible to perceive the totality of something which is moving? Is the self moving? Is the content of your consciousness moving? It is moving within the limits of itself. Right sir? Are you following all this? Am I talking to myself?

Sir, look, what is moving in consciousness? Attachment, the fear of not being attached, the fear of what might happen if I am not attached? Which is what? Moving within its own radius, within its own limited area. That you can observe. So you can observe that

which is limited. I want to go into this a little bit, don't be shocked. Is our consciousness with its content living? You understand my question? Are my ideas living? Your belief living? So what is living? Are you following this? One has an experience, pleasant, unpleasant, noble, ignoble, so-called enlightened - you cannot have experience of truth, of enlightenment - that's irrelevant. So is the experience that you have had living? Or the remembrance of that experience is living? Right? The remembrance, not the fact. The fact has gone. But the movement of remembrance is called what is living. You follow? Come on, sirs, move. So the experience, which has gone, of course, that is remembered, that remembrance is called living. Right? That you can watch, but not that which is gone. I wonder if you see this?

So what we call living is that which has happened and gone. See, sir, what you are doing. That which has gone and dead, our minds are so dead, and the remembrance of all that is called living. That is the tragedy of our life. I remember the friends we have had, they have gone, the brothers, the sisters, the wives that are dead, the mothers, I remember. The remembrance is identified with the photograph and the constant looking at it, remembering it, is the living. You understand, sir? And that is what we call living.

What time is it, sir? I think we had better stop. May I stop? I was told I must stop at exactly an hour because of the tape!

This is a rather interesting question.

6th QUESTION: Is there a state which has no opposite and may we know and communicate with it?

Let's be very simple about this. Is there an opposite, except man, woman, darkness, light, tall, short, fair hair, dark hair, the

tree, differences, night and day. And is there an opposite to goodness? If it has an opposite it is not good. Right? I wonder if you see that. Goodness, if it has an opposite, then that goodness must be born out of the opposite. Do you follow this? Am I too quick? All right, let me go slowly.

You see, I don't think about all this, it is forced out of me. Goodness: what is an opposite? We have cultivated opposites, haven't we: good, bad. And we say, goodness is the opposite of bad - bad in quotes, both in quotes. Now if they have a relationship with each other, or the outcome of each other then this is not good, good is still rooted in the bad. Are you following all this? So is there opposite at all? You understand? I am violent - there is violence, thought has created non-violence, which is non-fact, because violence, the ending of violence is quite a different state from non-violence. Right? So the mind has created the opposite in order either to escape from action, or in order to get over violence, or suppress violence. All this activity is part of violence. Are you meeting all this?

So if you are only concerned with the fact, facts have no opposites. Right? I wonder if you see that? I am concerned - say for instance, if I hate, I hope I don't, suppose I hate, my mind, my thought, society will say, 'Don't hate'. Right? Which is the opposite. The opposite is born out of its own opposite. Right? Do you follow that? So there is only hate, not its opposite. If I observe that fact, and all the responses to that fact, why should I have an opposite? You understand? The opposite has been created by thought and therefore there is constant struggle between hate and non-hate: how am I to get over my hate? But if only that fact

remains, and not its opposite, you have the energy to look at it.
Right? You have the energy to do - no, not do anything about it -
the very fact is dissolved when you observe it. Have you got it?

That's enough sir.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 10TH MAY 1980

May we continue where we left off last Sunday. Perhaps some of you were not here, so we'll have to go over again a little bit, briefly, what we were saying.

We have been saying for many years that society cannot possibly be changed, society which is in great turmoil, which is corrupt, where there is war, a great deal of struggle between human beings, that society cannot possibly be changed unless human beings, who have created it, bring about a radical change in themselves. This is what we've said. And we must explain a little more about it.

But please, this is not a gathering for entertainment. This is not a meeting of people together, to be mentally, intellectually or romantically, stimulated. We are here, I hope, to face this problem, which is this enormous confusion, mischief, great danger, which human beings are facing. To go into it very deeply we must think together about the problem.

We cannot possibly think together if we have contradictory opinions. If we are anchored in our own particular conclusion or belief, or hold onto some fantastic or romantic experience. Because this problem faces all mankind. Wherever you go, if you have travelled, not as a tourist, but wherever you go you'll find the same problem, man against man, confusion, fear, lack of integrity. And the scientist, the psychologist, somehow don't seem to be able to resolve this problem, nor the politicians, nor the Institutions, whether they are religious or political or social.

So it behoves us, if we are at all serious or concerned, that we

human beings who have created the society - and we have - and we are responsible for all the things that are happening in the world, the appalling cruelty, to animals, to human beings, the religious tortures in the past, and so on. We have created them. And to understand that, not merely intellectually, but to really face it.

I hope we can think together about the problem. That is, if one has a particular point of view and another holds his opinions, then it's impossible to think together. If you are prejudiced and the speaker has a particular point of view, then we cannot possibly think together. Thinking together does not mean agreeing, but rather together, human beings, as two human beings, not Americans, Hindus, and all that business, but two human beings who are confronted with this problem: the problem that human beings have created this society which is so terrifying. And as human beings we have to radically change ourselves. And is that possible? Is it possible for a human mind, which has evolved through time, millennia upon millennia, to pass through a great many experiences, sufferings, many conflicting incidents, wars, this mind of the human being, this brain, which is not yours or mine, but the brain that has evolved, five, ten million years, it's the human brain, not a particular brain. But we have reduced it as a particular brain, mine and yours, but if you examine it very carefully you will find this brain, which has evolved through time, is the brain of mankind. Please don't reject it or accept it, examine it, look at it. Because this brain of ours suffers, is anxious, lonely, frightened, pursuing constant pleasure. And this brain has lived in a particular pattern, and this pattern is repeated over and over again, all over the world, whether they are Buddhists, Hindus,

Communists, Catholics or whatever you will.

So it is not your brain or a particular individual's brain, it's the brain of mankind. And that brain has functioned in various patterns - pattern of fear, pattern of pleasure, reward or punishment. That's the pattern, through all these millennia, it has developed. And is it possible to bring about, not another series of pleasurable patterns or patterns of fear, beliefs and so on, but to go beyond all these patterns, otherwise there is no radical change, there is no psychological revolution. I think this is important to understand.

Again, please, you're not listening to a talk by some strange person. We are together thinking, enquiring into the problem. So you're not, if you will kindly follow it, you're not accepting any authority, we're not doing any propaganda or trying to convince you of anything. But seeing the problem, which is very complex, and looking at that problem, facing that problem, and enquiring together into that problem. The enquiry into the problem is not analysis, the cause, effect. Enquiry is not argument, opposing one opinion against another opinion, one prejudice against another. Enquiry implies observation. Where there is observation there is no analysis. When you observe, that is when you observe without fear, without your own particular prejudice, or idiosyncrasy, then in that observation analysis ends. I hope we are doing this together.

That is, when you observe a tree, that thing, the very observation is through words, the moment you see it you call it a tree. Please do this as we are talking. To look at that thing without the word, which is to observe actually what it is. That's fairly clear. But to do that psychologically is much more complex. To observe without any motive, to observe what actually is going on - your

fear, your anxiety, your loneliness, one's own sense of lacking, depression, whatever is actually going on. To observe it without analysis, without judging, without evaluating, just to observe. I hope this is becoming clear. Can we do this, together? Our minds have been trained to analyse, to see the cause and discover the effect, and in the very process of discovering the effect, the effect becomes the cause. It is a chain. You're following all this?

I think it's one of our calamities that we have during these probably hundred years, we have Communism and psychoanalysis, because they now prevent your being actually responsible for yourself. If there is any trouble, turmoil in yourself, you go to an analyst or some institution or some group, and so on. You, as a human being, you are now becoming, not free, but depending on others - depending on the church, depending on politics, depending on your gurus, or whatever it is, you are always depending on somebody to change, to bring about order in yourself. So we are merely losing our freedom to be responsible for ourselves. That's why Communism makes one irresponsible, like psychoanalysis it reduces you, or makes you depend on somebody to solve your problem.

So what we're saying is that as human beings, we are responsible for the disorder that exists in the world. And this disorder is created by thought. That's where we ended up last week, last Sunday. We said that thought has created, not only the marvellous architecture, the marvellous cathedrals and the temples, and the mosques, it has created the technological world, beneficial and destructive, war and the instruments of war. Thought has created, has brought about the division between human beings,

nationalistic, class, political, economic, spiritual, religious divisions. If you examine it closely, you will see that is a fact. Thought has been responsible for all this, not only what is inside the temples, the churches, but also what is outside in the world. So unless we understand very deeply the nature of thought, there is no possibility of bringing about a radical change. Right? Are we together in this, so far?

Thought has created the technological world. Right? Thought also has created the images about oneself, about the various national divisions, thought has created the Arab, the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim, and so on. Thought has also created the marvellous architecture and the churches, the cathedrals and the images in all those cathedrals, temples and mosques - there are no images in the Islamic world, but they have the scripture, the writing, which is also a form of image.

But thought has not created nature, the tree, the river, the sky, the stars, those lovely mountains, the birds. But thought is using them, destroying them, destroying the earth, polluting the air and so on. So if we want to resolve this problem of conflicts, struggle, turmoil, confusion in the human mind and so in the human society, we must go into this question of what is thinking. Right? Are we meeting together? Please, shall we? No, Sir, not only you but all of us together.

We are asking: what is thought, what is thinking? Why has thought made all this? Why has thought brought about marvellous medicine and also why has thought created wars and destroyed human beings? Why has thought made god and why has thought made the image of god? We have, thought has made the image of

god. And also thought has brought such enormous conflict between human beings, between you and your intimate friend, intimate person, wife, husband, boy and so on. Are you interested in all this? Or have you come here to enjoy a rather cool morning, sitting under the trees? If you are really interested, not in what is being said, but rather interested to find out, interested to find out for yourself why has thought done this, what is the nature of thought. That means, together we are looking into it. That means you must exercise your observation, you must go into it as alertly, keenly, passionately as the speaker is doing. Not just sit there and casually listen and go away. This is not an entertainment, this is a very serious affair.

So we are enquiring, talking over together, as two friends. You can't talk together with so many people, but two people, you and the speaker, trying to find out why thought has made this confusion, this turmoil. So thought is matter. Thought is the response of memory. Right? If you had no memory you wouldn't be able to think, if you had no remembrance of things past, thought wouldn't operate. So thought is the response of memory, memory is the outcome of various experiences, multiple incidents, accidents, which have been accumulated as knowledge - follow all this, sirs - stored up in the brain. And that experience, that knowledge, which is memory, and the reaction of that memory is thinking. Right? It's not what I'm saying - you can discover it for yourself. Right? Is that clear? Can we go on from there? That is, through millennia we have acquired different kinds of knowledge, literary, scientific, personal, experiences. Those experiences have become knowledge, both scientific and personal. That knowledge is stored in the brain.

So that brain is not your knowledge, it is the human knowledge. I know we like to think that it's my brain and your brain.

So this knowledge, experience stored in the brain as memory must always be limited, because knowledge is never complete. Right? Can never be complete, in any field. So with knowledge goes ignorance. Therefore thought is always limited, partial, it can never be complete. Right? Don't agree with me, sirs, examine it. So thought has created this world of confusion, because in itself it's limited. Right? Thought, as we said, is matter. That thought can only create matter. Right? It can create illusions, it can create marvellous ideas, Utopias, marvellous systems, theories, but that very theory, that very ideal, that very concept by the theologians, or by the historians, is always limited. Right? So our actions are always limited. Therefore our actions are fragmented. Right? Our action can never be complete if it is based on thought. If own realizes that, not as an idea, but as an actuality - you understand the difference? The idea and the actual. You hear this statement that thought can never be complete, whatever it creates must be incomplete. You hear that statement and instinctively you make an abstraction of it into an idea. You're following all this. Are we together in this? An abstraction, away from the fact. So then the idea becomes all-important. And then you think, how am I to carry out that idea. So there is again division between action and idea. Are we going too fast? It's up to you.

So observation without abstraction, observation without analysis, observation without any form of conclusion, just to observe the nature of thinking. That is, who is the observer who is observing the nature of thinking? I wonder if you see this. You

understand sir? Somebody I must talk to. Right? Can I pick on somebody, sir? Right, sir, let's put it this way. One is very greedy, self-centred. That's a fact. Is greed different from you? You understand my question? You are greed, but we have unfortunately created an illusion, that is, greed and I will act, do something about that greed. Right? So there is a division between greed and the actor, who will act upon greed. Right? So is that a fact. Or is it a pattern which we have developed to escape from the fact? Right? I wonder if you meet all this. That is, I am greedy, I don't quite know how to resolve this whole problem of greed, so I created its opposite, non-greed, and work with non-greed, which is non-fact. You're following all this? So we are saying, the observer is the observed. Right? Right, sir? So there is no division. Sir, look - there is a division between the Jew and the Arab, right? Created by thought: by racial prejudices, by religious conditioning because they are living on the same earth, but they are all fighting each other.

Now if you observe very carefully, the human mind is conditioned as a Hindu, as a Muslim, Arab, Jew, Christian, non-Christian. You follow? It has been conditioned. And that conditioning says, I'm different from you. Right? And these differences of conditioning by thought, encouraged by various people for political, religious reasons, and we hold onto that division. So where there is division there must be struggle, there must be conflict. So when one realizes that greed is not separate from me, I am greed, then there is totally a different movement taking place. You're following this, sir? Are we meeting each other in this point? Gosh, it seems so difficult. Is it very complex, what

we're talking about? Yes, sir? Look at it, sir.

How will you meet violence? Human beings are violent. Right? We have cultivated the opposite. Right? The non-violence, don't be violent, be kind, be just, be all the rest of it. But basically we are violent, it still goes on, after a million years. Is that violence different from you? It's not, obviously. You are violence. Now can you observe that fact without making any kind of ideal about the fact? Then what takes place? You're following all this? I'm violent. As a human being I'm violent. And I have lived with that violence for a million years, my brain has formed a pattern of not being violent and yet violence. And the pursuit of not being violent is an escape from the fact. And if I observe the fact, is the fact of being violent different from me, my nature, my way of looking? I am that. Right? Do we agree?

Then the conflict which existed before ends. Doesn't it? I wonder if you see this. The conflict of division between violence and not being violent, that's a conflict, but when there is the realization, I am conflict, not I am different from conflict, then that conflict ends. And a totally different action takes place.

So, sir, our question is: thought is the movement in time. Right? Thought is based on memory, which is the past, the past, with all its conclusions, ideas, beliefs, images, from that past the present, the past meets the present and the future. Right? There's a constant modification going on. That is time. Right? There is not only chronological time, by the watch, by the day, night, night and day, but also there is psychological time. Right? I will be. When you say, 'I will be' that's time. I must become something - that's time. I am not good but I will be good. That's time. And time is also

thought. Right? Time as day and night, time when you have to go and catch the bus, time to acquire knowledge, to learn a language, time to acquire any kind of technological knowledge to act skilfully to earn a livelihood - all that is time, requires time.

Psychologically, inwardly, we also have this idea of time. Right? I am not but I will be. I am confused, I'll go to the analyst, he will help me. Time. So psychologically we have cultivated this idea of time. Right?

So time is a movement from here to there. Psychologically also it's a movement from here to there. So thought is time. Right? This is important to understand because our brain is the essence of time and we function psychologically in that pattern. I will have pleasure. I remember being happy, having a marvellous experience, this or that, and I must have more. This constant becoming is time. Now we're asking, is that an actuality or a fiction or an illusion, psychologically? Right, sir, are you getting tired? This is too much probably, all this.

We're saying, time is necessary in the acquisition of knowledge, of various kinds, many kinds. Now is time necessary to end something, psychologically? You're following? That is, psychologically, I have fear, most human beings have fear. And they have had this fear psychologically from the very beginning of time, from the very beginning of psychological time. Right? And we haven't resolved it, not only are we frightened of physical pain and so on, but psychologically also we have great fears of getting hurt, getting bruised, wounded, psychologically, because from childhood we have been hurt, and so on. So our brain functions in time. And so it has never resolved any of the problems. I wonder if

you meet this. If I say to myself, I will get over my fear, actually what takes place is, I'm still frightened at the end of it. I exercise will, control it, escape from it and so on. And so I never - human beings have never resolved this problem of fear. And we are saying, as long as we think in patterns of time, psychologically, fear will continue. Is this clear?

So we are saying, can this thing called fear be ended immediately? Now let me take another - fear is rather a complex problem which we'll go into perhaps tomorrow, in another talk. Take for instance dependence, psychological dependence. Human beings have cultivated this, because they are afraid to be alone, they are afraid to be lonely, they want comfort, they feel sustained if they depend on somebody. Because in themselves they are insufficient, psychologically, therefore clinging to somebody: a religious image, or a personal image and so on, clinging to somebody.

Now that has been the pattern of the human mind, cultivated through time. The consequences of dependence is fear, anxiety, jealousy, hatred, antagonism, all that follows. In that pattern we have lived. Right? Now to end that pattern immediately, is the question, because the moment you admit time, I will end it, you have admitted moving away from the fact. Right? The fact is, one is dependent. Now without admitting time, you understand - "I will get over it" - end it, immediately - you have broken the pattern of time. You are following this? Are you working as hard as I am working for you? That is, sir, observe how you are dependent on another, psychologically. All the remembrance, all the pictures, the images and so on - dependent. And our brain has been used to the

pattern of time, because it has grown with time. So it has exercised an act of will, 'I will' and that means avoiding the fact. Now when one understands, not intellectually, or verbally, but actually sees the fact, how the brain works in time and therefore never resolves, and you see the urgency of not depending, it's ended. When you end something, a new thing begins. Right?

Are we thinking together or are you merely listening to the talk of a speaker and then saying, yes, I don't quite understand what he's talking about. He talks about this and that? Which means, you really are not thinking about the problem, which is your problem, the problem of humanity, the problem which is to bring about a totally different kind of society.

So is it possible to end your antagonism, your hatred, your jealousy - you understand - immediately, so that the brain has broken the pattern and can think and can act and look and observe totally differently. I wonder if you get this. Sir, this is meditation. You understand? Not all the phoney stuff that has been talked about. To meditate, which means to observe how your mind operates, not how the psychologists have told you your mind works, Freud and all the rest of it, but to observe for yourself because you are responsible for yourself, for your body, for your mind, for your thoughts. So can you observe the whole content of your consciousness? You understand? Am I making this too difficult, sirs? Would you tell me a little bit? Am I making this too difficult? Your consciousness is full of the things that thought has created. Right? Your anxieties, your beliefs, your gods, your saviours, you Krishna's - you follow? All that has been created by thought. So your consciousness is the essence of time. By gosh, do

you get it? And we are living, functioning, acting in that. And therefore there is never a radical, psychological change. And therefore society can never be good. Goodness is not the opposite of bad. Right? If it is, it is not good. Love is not the opposite of hate. Right? If it is, it is still hate. Right?

So, sir we had better stop here - we'll continue tomorrow, if you all want to come.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 11TH MAY 1980

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying, weren't we, that our brain, the whole of our mind also, has lived through many, many experiences, many accidents, every form of experience, and has accumulated a great deal of knowledge. And that knowledge has formed a pattern according to which we live. And that pattern has been created through time; not only time necessary to learn a language, to learn any kind of technique, skill, but also that very knowledge has created a whole structure of our existence, psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin, as it were. And apparently after many, many million years we have hardly psychologically changed at all. We have become more modified, more cunning, capable of arguing intelligently, or semi-intelligently. And this pattern, which has been created through time, and unless that pattern is completely broken, as we went into it yesterday, we will not be able to create a new society. The society in which we live, with its wars, immorality, with its violence, terror, with its constant uncertainty, has been created by human beings, whether we live here, in the Far East, the Near East, it has been structured, put together by human beings. And unless the human beings psychologically radically, profoundly change, society cannot be changed. They have experimented, as the communists have done, change the environment hoping thereby to change man. Of course, this never can be done. Man overcomes the environment, and so on and so on.

So if one is at all serious, concerned with world events, with all the confusion and misery in which we all live, it becomes

absolutely necessary to bring about a psychological revolution in ourselves. We said thought has created this mad, insane world. Thought thinks that it is rational, capable; in certain fields, in the technological field, in the world of commerce and so on, there it is fairly rational, but psychologically it is totally irrational. Thought, as we said yesterday, is the outcome of memory, experience, knowledge. And we also said yesterday that thought is matter, and whatever it creates must belong to that. And can that thought, which is limited, as knowledge is always limited, can that thought bring about a radical change in itself? That's what we were talking about yesterday. And we should go much further into the problem.

Also please bear in mind that we are talking over together, it is not the speaker talking and you listening, but rather both of us exercising our brain, our capacities, our intellect, if we are rational, think over this problem together. Which does not mean you accept what the speaker is saying, but rather together you and he go into the matter. You know, it is an extraordinary thing in Eastern religions doubt is encouraged, to doubt. In the Westerns religious world doubt is substituted, faith is substituted for doubt. Do you understand what I am saying? So our minds are rather more inclined to accept rather than to examine. Our brain refuses to see something new because it is caught in the same old pattern. And we are going to examine that pattern because we are not advocating any faith, on the contrary. We are not saying that you must believe or not believe, we are not doing any kind of propaganda, which is all too silly in these matters.

So we are going together to examine the whole issue that is involved in our human existence. If I may suggest, please don't

take notes one can't pay attention while you are taking notes. Sorry! And please don't take photographs and tape recorders and all that kind of thing because it disturbs others. So kindly refrain from doing all that kind of thing. I hope you don't mind. It's not a matter of copyright, or anything of that kind, it is merely for the convenience and the distraction that takes place when you are taking photographs and so on. What we are trying to do together is to examine what is going on now, not only in the world but also in ourselves, as we did in the last few talks.

So we are asking whether this pattern of existence in which the brain has established itself, seeking security, because that is the primary need for the brain, to be completely secure; whether that security is in an illusion, or in some fanciful idea, or some romantic concept, or in an image, spiritual, religious, and all that kind of thing, or the image that you have about your wife, or husband, or girl friend, or boy friend, and all that business. So the brain is always trying to find security because it is only then that it can function somewhat skilfully. This pattern has been put together by desire; first by thought, by desire, through attachment, through greed, and though it is caught in fear it seems incapable of escaping from that, or overcoming that, or being free from it. If you will kindly examine these three things together; that is, desire, though we examined together yesterday and in the previous talks, the whole movement of thought; desire, greed, attachment, fear. That's the pattern in which we are caught. And is it possible to break this pattern? Please enquire together with the speaker. That is, let's think over the matter together. Not that I am explaining and you are accepting, or you are rejecting and so on, but that is the

problem that confronts us.

Desire has created so many problems, both sexual, various forms of objects to which desire drives, and desire to achieve success, desire to be better than somebody and so on and so on. This whole competitive existence of human beings. Perhaps competition is destroying the world - super powers, and so on, the importance given to success, to fulfilment, to achievement and so on. So we have to examine together the nature of desire. We are not saying you must suppress or fulfil desire, or evade, or overcome, but we are examining the whole momentum, the movement of desire. We are following each other?

Religions, that is the institutionalized acceptance of some dogmas, rituals, images and so on, those religions have said, desire must be suppressed, in order to serve god you must come without any desire. I don't know if you have gone into it. We needn't go into that matter now. But we are not saying we must do that, we are examining. If we can understand the nature and the structure of desire, not verbally or intellectually, but actually, factually, then perhaps desire has its proper place. But now desire is so consuming - instant fulfilment of desire, whether it is in meditation, whether it is in taking coffee, or whether going somewhere or other it must be fulfilled, it must be acted upon instantly. Restraint is looked down upon, is even denied. But we are saying before we do anything about desire, whether it is right or wrong, whether it is noble or ignoble, whether it has a proper place in society and so on and so on, we must understand the nature of it. Right, sirs? Are we following each other? Good!

What is desire? What is the root of it, not merely the objects of

desire which vary according to our age, according to our circumstances, environment, pressure and so on, what is the root of desire, how does desire come into being and why does desire play such an extraordinary part in one's life? Right? Please, sirs, as we said, we are talking over together, seeing the nature of desire, not according to the speaker. As he pointed out earlier, we must have doubt. Doubt is a very cleansing thing. But also doubt must be kept on a leash, as a dog is kept on a leash, you must let the dog go sometimes, run. But also we must keep it on a leash, occasionally. So in the same way doubt is an extraordinary quality of cleansing the mind, but also it must be kept on a leash.

So we are saying together let us talk over the nature of desire, and find out its proper place. What is desire? How does it come into being with all of us; with the most highly sophisticated, educated, intellectuals, with the ordinary person, and also with all those monks and saints who are consumed by desire? You may take a vow of celibacy, like the monks do, all over the world, but desire is burning in them. So we must carefully examine this thing. Right sirs?

How do you approach this problem? You understand? How do you, when you want to examine the nature of desire, how do you look at it? You understand my question? How do you consider, or observe the movement of desire? If you are conditioned, your approach will naturally be partial. If you are enormously consumed by desire, then it will also be very limited. But to examine the nature of it one must have somewhat a free mind. Right, sirs? So let's do it together.

There is not only visual seeing; that is, you see something very

beautiful, and the perception of it, the seeing of it, creates a sensation. Right? There is sensation, contact - right - the seeing, the sensation, the contact, then what takes place after that? You understand my question, what I am saying? You see something, a woman, a man, a car, a picture; the seeing creates the sensation. Then the touching of it. Then what takes place? You are following this? Please follow it otherwise I will be talking and you will merely be listening, which will get us nowhere.

So where does desire begin? Seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought creates the image and when thought has created the image through that seeing, sensation, contact, then thought creates the image, you, thought makes the desire to possess or not to possess. Right? I wonder if you are following this. You see a shirt, or a suit, or a dress, a car, or a beautiful woman, a man, whatever it is. There is the sensation, contact, then thought creates the image, you in that shirt, in that dress, or in the car, at that moment desire is born. You are following all this? It is not what I am telling you; you are discovering this for yourselves. Right? Are we going together?

So desire is born when thought creates the image; when there is seeing, contact, sensation, then thought with its image sitting in the car, driving the car, wanting, you follow, the whole momentum takes place. Then arises the question, if you are interested in it, is it possible to see something - the sensation is natural, the contact is natural - but to see when thought arises with its image, desire creates all kinds of complications. Right? I wonder if you are following all this. So the question is: is it possible for thought not to create the image at all? You understand? That is, seeing the car, the sensation, thought creating the image of you driving in that car

- the power, the position, you know all the fun of it - but before thought creates the image not to have that image formed. I wonder if you see. Have you understood something at all? Are we moving together?

So we are saying, discipline is not conformity - right - but the very observation of the whole movement of desire creates its own order. Are you following all this? You do it now as you are sitting there, watch your desire. You must have desire for something, even for heaven, for illumination, for beauty, for goodness, whatever it is. Observe how this desire comes into being. And the moment when thought creates the image then there is the whole of that energy directed. You follow? I wonder, are you capturing something? So desire then does not make disorder, as it is doing now. That is, then in the understanding of the nature of desire that very understanding is order, in which there is no suppression, no conformity, no contact. Have you understood any of this? Have some of you - not understood - see how desire works for yourself? Then you will see that every form of controlling desire, suppressing desire, overcoming desire, ends. Because you see how desire comes into being, and before it arises you are aware of the whole nature of the movement of desire. Understand it, sir? I must talk to someone!

So greed is a form of desire. Greed is encouraged by all the industrialists, by the commercial and all that business, it is encouraged. And that is becoming an immense problem in this world. Materialism is part of this greed.

Then from that we can move to the question of attachment. Most of us are attached to something or other; it may be a piece of

property, old furniture, or a picture, or an idea, or a belief, experience. Watch yourself, please. You know you are attached to something, or to a person, to some experience that one has had. Where there is attachment - please listen, just observe the consequence of attachment. We are not saying you mustn't be attached, just observe the nature of attachment, and then out of that observation comes right action with regard to attachment. If you are attached to a belief, what is the nature of that belief, who has created the belief? You understand? You are attached to a religious concept, a religious image, or to a person. What is implied in that attachment? First, please just listen. Just listen, then we can move together. You know you are attached to something, why? Is it that you are lonely? Is it by being attached to something you feel sufficient in yourself? Is it that if you are not attached to anything you feel completely isolated, empty? Is it being attached to a person gives you comfort, security, a sense of identification? The consequence of all that is the loss of it, the fear of losing it, jealousy, anxiety, hatred, a sense of being deeply wounded. So attachment will inevitably lead to all this. Right?

Now when the speaker explains all this, is it an idea or an actuality? You understand what I am saying? Have you formed an idea of attachment, or you actually see for yourself that you are attached? And see for yourself the consequences of it? And so it is not an idea which you accept, but you are observing the movement of attachment. Right? Now what will you do about it? You understand my question? When you have observed the nature of attachment, how thought creates the image about a person, and is attached to that image. Right? And to the person, the image is far

more important than the person. I wonder if you are following all this? So can attachment, with all the consequences which brings great conflict, misery, confusion, antagonism, can all that end? Then what takes place when you end attachment? You are following? Please, sir. You understand my question? You are attached, you know, you have intellectually or actually observed the consequences of attachment, with its conflict, fear and so on. Is it an action of will, to say, I will end attachment? Or you have an insight into attachment? If you have an insight into attachment because you see the whole movement of it, then there is an ending of it. Not that you are attached to something else. You understand? One may be attached to that person or to that idea, and letting that attachment go and be attached to another person, another idea. We are talking of the ending of all attachment, which brings enormous psychological conflict. Have you the insight into it, and therefore end it?

Then what takes place? When you end something - you understand - when you stop drinking, if you do, or when you stop smoking, any of those things, both physically and psychologically, what happens? Sirs! Do you want me to tell you? You see, that is the danger. That's how you create authority, dependence on another. Whereas if you discover for yourself when you end an attachment completely, what is the state of the mind that has been caught in the pattern, and in the movement of that attachment. What happens to the mind? Something totally new takes place, doesn't it? You have broken the pattern of attachment, therefore naturally something other than this pattern comes into being. Are you doing this? You see you are all so frightened. That is the root

of it.

So we have to examine what is fear. You are interested in all this? Yes? Not casually, sitting under the trees on a lovely morning, and looking at the leaves, the light on the leaves, and so on, enjoying it, and those mountains behind. We are saying something very, very serious, you can't play with this kind of thing. Because if we radically transform our way of living, and if you don't want to be radically transformed don't listen to all this. Probably you are not anyhow. But if you are serious you may be listening. So we are not entertaining you, intellectually, emotionally, or romantically. This is a very, very serious matter of life.

So we have said desire, greed, attachment, is part of our life, daily struggling, conflict, occasionally happy, life. And now, let's examine together, and I mean together, what is fear, why we are so frightened. And this problem of fear has not been solved at all though we have lived a million years, we still carry on in the same old pattern of fear. So what is fear? Isn't one afraid of letting go of attachment? Whether the attachment to a person, belief, a concept; the communist have created a concept, and if you talk to a communist, a card-carrying communist, he is afraid to let that pattern go, he won't think of anything anew. Right? Or talk to a very practising Catholic, or a Protestant, or any Hindu, Buddhist, it is the same thing. They are afraid. Because in the pattern, in a conclusion, in a belief, there is security, there is a sense of stability, strength. Whether that idea, that image, that concept be an illusion, that very illusion gives you security. In attachment there is a certain sense of well-being, safe. Right sirs?

We are not analysing, we are merely observing the movement of fear, which is totally different from analysis. I know there are a great many analysts here; they think I don't understand, I am a bit peculiar in this matter, rather conditioned, peculiar, rather crazy. I have met many of them, I know that. So we are not analysing, I want to make this perfectly clear. Because analysis implies the exercise of thought. Thought is partial, limited, because all knowledge is limited, and always living within the shadow of ignorance. And analysis is a process of exercising knowledge that has been acquired, and operating from that knowledge. We are saying quite the contrary: observation is entirely different from analysis. Just to observe the nature of fear. So it becomes very important to understand what is observation - observation which is not, let me repeat it a thousand times, which is not analysis.

So what is observation, to observe? To observe that thing without naming that thing, because the moment you have named that thing as a tree, you are observing it with a word, with a concept, with an image. Go into it with me for a moment. But to observe that thing without the word - if you can do it. And that is comparatively easy. But to observe psychologically your reactions, all that goes on inwardly, just to observe it without saying it is good, or bad, this is hate, this wrong, this is right - without any movement of thought, just to observe. Right? So we are observing the reaction which we call fear. Fear that comes into being when you feel that it is necessary not to be attached, whatever it is. Then the immediate reaction is fear. Because in attachment you have found security, safety, a sense of protection, and with the ending of that there is the quivering of what is going to happen. Can I tell my

wife, or husband, or boy, or whatever it is, I am not attached? What will she do, or he do? You understand what I am saying?

So we are now examining together the nature - observing, sorry - we are observing the nature and the movement of fear. That means your mind is free from all analytical conditioning. Right? Is it free? Or you hold that back, the analytical process, and you say, well, I'll observe without analysis. That can't be done. That's only playing games. To observe, the whole sense of analytical conditioning must end, otherwise you cannot observe properly, accurately. Because all our education, all our conditioning is to analyse, to see the cause, see the effect, try to change the effect and so on and so on. Only analysis is much more complex than that but I am putting it very briefly, rather insufficiently. But to observe is much more arduous than analysis. To observe your wife or your husband, or your boy, or whatever it is, without the image that you have created about that person. You understand my question? Each one of us has an image about the person with whom we live. And in that image there is security. But that image is not the actual person. How that image is created, whether that image can end, is a different problem. Which is, that image is created by thought, by constant interaction, and with that image we live. And so the image and the actuality are two different things. Right? And so there is conflict, obviously. The struggle between two people, man, woman, or wife, and so on and so on, constant struggle, conflict between two people because they live on images. When there is no image perhaps there will be love, compassion, affection, care.

So let us together observe the nature of fear. Why after millions and millions of years we have not resolved that problem. You

understand my question, sir? Why? We have resolved many problems outwardly in the world, in the environment and so on, but fear is not out there but in us. It is a psychological reaction, and why haven't we with all our cunning, with all our knowledge, with all our experience, resolved this problem of fear completely? Is it we have never looked at ourselves but always relied on others to tell us what we are? You understand? We have never looked at ourselves actually what we are. Not according to philosophers, psychologists, and the experts, because they themselves have never looked at themselves. They have ideas about themselves. Is it that we have never observed ourselves as we observe ourselves in a mirror? The mirror, if it is a clean mirror, then it doesn't distort, it shows exactly what you are, what your face is like. But to so observe ourselves without any distortion, demands that you look without any motive, without any desire, without any pressure, just to watch, just to observe. So similarly, we are going to observe the movement of fear.

Most of us are afraid, we are not talking about physical fears, that is also involved - but losing a job, you know all that, not having employment, not having enough money, having had pain, physical pain, fear of having the pain again. So there are all the physical fears. And it is much more important to understand first the psychological fears, because then perhaps we can do something about physical fears most sanely, rationally. Right? May we proceed? We are doing it together, you are not listening to me. We are together observing this extraordinary thing called fear which man has carried for a million years. And the speaker says it can be ended completely psychologically, all fear, if you have the capacity

to observe this fear, not direct it, not say I mustn't have it, or I must have it, I must - you know, all that.

What is fear? Is fear time? You understand? Time being that which has happened yesterday, and that which might happen tomorrow. You understand? Which is time, is that the cause of fear? Go into it slowly, let's go into it slowly, because when we have finished observing fear this morning it must end so completely that you have no psychological fears at all. Then you are a rational, sane human being. Because at present we are irrational. Is fear time? That is, having had knowledge of fear - right - the knowledge of fear, that is, you have lost somebody, or somebody has given you the feeling of insecurity, not being able to understand, to grasp, all that. You follow? Is knowledge part of fear? You are following? You are attached to somebody, and that attachment has given you safety, security, a sense of communion, talking over. And the ending of it creates a sense of insecurity. Right? Does that insecurity create fear? Obviously. Which is what? The knowledge of ending something might bring about more pain, or more uncertainty. Right? So there is fear. That is, does knowledge of a past experience create fear? You have understood?

So isn't knowledge time? You need to have time to learn a language, learn a technique, that requires time. And the psychological accumulation of knowledge is also time. So I am asking - we are asking each other, does this accumulated knowledge, psychologically, is that one of the factors, or it may be the central factor of fear? Are you understanding all this? Oh, come on sirs! Look, when you are attached to somebody, it is not only to the person, but to the idea, you follow, the whole structure and nature

of that person, with your image of that person. In that there is great security. Now if you lose that security there is fear. That is, the previous knowledge of being secure in attachment, that knowledge, letting that knowledge go creates fear. Right? So knowledge, is psychological knowledge one of the causes of fear? All right? Please sirs, bear in mind at the end of the talk, talking over together, walk out without a single shadow of fear psychologically, otherwise this talking over together means nothing.

Is fear a movement of thought? You understand? That is, there has been fear in the past, there is the memory of that, the remembrance of that, and the remembrance is a movement of thought. Right? Which again is the movement of knowledge. Right? And this knowledge is stored up in the brain, and this knowledge is me. Right? When I say I am attached to you, I am attached to you because you are the audience and I derive great pleasure from it, because I can talk to you, fulfil myself, all that nonsense. And that gives me a great sense of fulfilling. So thought has experienced this sense of power, that thought then says, if I let this go I am frightened, I am nothing. Right? So is fear the cause of me, I? Go into it, sirs. This is a very serious thing we are saying. As long as there is this central entity with its self-centred activity, which is desire, attachment, greed, you will always have fear. Right?

So when you understand all this, not words, not ideas, not through the intellect - the intellect has its place - this understanding is to see totally this whole fabric. That means to have immediate insight into the nature of fear. Then perhaps only there will be love. Fear and love cannot go together. You see what we have done? We

know that very well, consciously, or even unconsciously, we know that. But as we haven't resolved that problem between human beings we say, let's love god. You understand sirs, how you have transferred that which should, must, exist between human beings, and that can only exist when there is no fear, we have transferred that love to some object created by thought, and we are satisfied with that. Because it is very convenient that, we can keep ourselves individual, self-centred, anxious, frightened, greedy, attached, and talk about love of god, which is sheer irrational nonsense.

So at the end of our talking together this morning, as two friends, who are involved with this problem, who are concerned with the social order, which is disorder, and seeing that there must be a transformation in oneself before society can be changed, they are talking over together this problem of desire, greed, attachment and fear. That's the pattern in which we have lived, in that pattern we have found great security. And in that pattern there is fear. And seeing that totally is to have an insight into it. And when you have an insight the whole problem is completely changed, broken. Can we say that to ourself, honestly, that we have broken the pattern of fear? When you walk out of this place, to be free of this thing. Then you will become a rational, sane, human being. Unfortunately we are not that now.

What time is it, sir?

Q: Twenty to one.

K: Twenty to one? Sorry to keep you so long.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 13TH MAY 1980

There have been many, many questions, but we can't answer all of them. In answering these questions, or rather in enquiring into these questions, we are both involved in it. Not just the speaker answering questions, but both you and the speaker are sharing in the question. So don't just please merely listen to what the speaker is saying but rather join in with the speaker in answering the questions.

1st QUESTION: What is true creativity? And how is it different from that which is celebrated in popular culture?

What is generally called creativity is mostly man-made: painting, music, literature, both romantic and factual, all the architecture, the marvellous technology, and all those who are involved in all this, the painters, the writers, the poets, the philosophical writers, probably consider themselves as creative. And we all seem to agree with them. That's the popular idea of what is a creative person. Do you agree to that? I think we all see that, that all man-made things most beautiful, the great cathedrals, temples and Islamic mosques, some of them are extraordinarily beautiful. I don't know if you have seen them, and if you have, they are really marvellous. And the people who built these were anonymous, we don't know who built them. They were only concerned with building, writing, the bible, and all that. Nobody knows who wrote them. But now, with us, anonymity is almost gone. And perhaps in anonymity, there is a different kind of creativity. It is not based on success, money, and twenty eight

million books sold in ten years, and so on and so on. The speaker himself at one time tried anonymity because the speaker doesn't like all this fuss and nonsense. He tried to talk behind a curtain! And it became rather absurd.

So anonymity has great importance. In that there is a different quality, different - this personal motive doesn't exist, the personal attitudes and personal opinions, it is a feeling of freedom from which you are acting. But most creativity, as we call it, is man-made. That is, this creation takes from the known. Right? You know the great musicians, Beethoven, Bach and so on, it is from the known they act. And the writers, philosophers and so on, also have read, accumulated, developed their own style and so on, always moving, acting or writing from that which has been accumulated, known. And this we call, generally, creativity.

Now is that really creative? Please, let's talk about it. Or is there a different kind of creativity which is born out of the freedom from the known? You understand my question? Because when we paint, write, create a marvellous structure out of stone, it is the accumulative knowledge, whether in the scientific field or in the world of art, human art, there is always this sense of carrying from the past to the present. Or imagination, romantic, factual, moral and so on. Is there creativity that is something totally different from this activity that we call generally creativity? You are following?

We are asking, and I think it is rather an important question to go into, if you are willing, whether there is an action, there is a living, there is a movement, which is not from the known. That is, is there a creation from a mind that is not burdened from all the

turmoils of life, from all the social pressures, economic and so on, is there a creation out of a mind that has freed itself from the known? And it can then use memory. You understand?

Knowledge. But we start with knowledge and that we call creative. But we are suggesting that there is a creativity which is not born out of the known. When that creative impulse, or movement takes place, it can then use the known. But not the other way round. I don't know if you are following what I am saying.

If you don't mind some time, try, or find out whether the mind can ever be free from the known - the known being all the accumulative experience, remembrance, the knowledge that one has acquired, the impressions and so on, if the mind can be free from all that. And in that very state of mind creation as we know it may not be necessary. You understand? A man who has a talent for writing feels he must express himself, he develops his own style, the way he writes, Keats, and so on and the others, they have this impulse to fulfil, create. Perhaps their own lives are not all that beautiful - like Michelangelo, Raphael and all those people. Sorry to quote these names, I am not learned but I have visited many museums when I was young, I was pushed into it and all that, and the remnants of all that remains. And I have talked to a great many artists, writers, friends and so on.

It seems to me that all our creation in the scientific world, knowledge, human art, it always from a point, from a talent, from a gift, and that gift is exploited to its fullest extent. Like a musician who has a gift, a protege, he becomes tremendously important. And we common people admire all that and wish we had some of that. As we haven't got it we run after them, we almost worship

them - the conductors, you know the game that goes on.

And when you begin to question what is creativity, as the questioner is asking, is it something totally different, which I think we all can have. Not the specialists, not the professionals, not the talented, gifted, I think we can all have this extraordinary mind that is really free from all the burden which man has imposed upon himself, created for himself. And then out of that sane, rational, healthy life, something totally different comes. And that may not necessarily be expressed as in painting, architecture; why should it? You follow? If you have gone into this fairly deeply, and I hope you will, you will find out that there is a state of mind which actually has no experience whatsoever. Because experience implies a mind that is still groping, asking, seeking, and therefore struggling in darkness, and wanting to go beyond it. But a mind that is very clear, not confused, has no conflict, has no problem. You understand? Has no problem. You try it. Such a mind has no need to express, talk - I am talking, sorry! The speaker is talking not because he wants to impress you, or anything of that kind, which is too silly, or persuade you to certain attitudes, opinions and judgements, it is a kind of friendly communication with two people who are concerned with all this enormous complex life, who haven't found a complete total answer to all this. And there is a complete and total answer if we apply our minds, our hearts to this.

So there is a creativity which is not man-made. Don't please say, that is god-made, that has no meaning either, because if our own minds are extraordinarily clear, without a shadow of conflict then that mind is really in a state of creation, which needs no expression, no fulfilment, all that publicity and nonsense.

2nd QUESTION: You have said that in the very seeing there is action. Is this action the same as the expression of action? If not, is there a connection between the two, and how do they possibly relate to suppression?

What the speaker said was, if he remembers rightly, that in observation, the very observation is action. There is an observation of greed, observation, which is to observe without any distortion, without motive, without saying, I must go beyond it and all that, just to observe this greed movement. And that very observation sees the whole movement, not just one particular form of greed, but the whole movement of greed, that perception, that seeing, that observation, ends the movement. That is what he calls action.

There is no interval - forgive me if I go into it a little bit more - there is no interval in seeing and acting. One must be careful here. It is not impulsive action, it is not saying, I feel like it and I'll act. That's what we are all doing. But what we are saying is that in observing greed - I am taking that as an example, in observing greed, hatred, violence, whatever it is, when that observation is completely non-directive then there is no interval between the seeing and the acting. Whereas we have intervals: seeing, concluding, abstracting an idea and then carrying out that idea, which is the interval between the creation of an idea and the acting of that idea. I don't know if you are following this. If you observe yourself this is what goes on. This time interval, in which all other kinds of problems arise, whereas the seeing is the very movement of ending greed.

Now the questioner says, is this action the same as the expression of action? Have you understood? Is this the same as the

expression of action? That is, you see a cobra, a snake; there is instant expression of self-preservation, self-protection, which is natural, healthy and so on - unless you are some kind of peculiar person, then you play with these things. But the self-possessive instinct is immediate; to run away, or do something about it. There the seeing has expressed itself in action, physical action. Right? We are talking of not only physical observation but also the observation with the whole of your mind, not partial observation, which we do, but to be so attentive that it is the whole of the mind, if you can do this. I don't know if you have tried all these things. That is, to give complete attention. Right? That means attention implies there is no centre from which you are attending. I don't know if you follow this. Must I go into all this? All right.

When you concentrate it is from a centre, from a point to a point. I don't know if you understand this. Therefore it is limited, restricted, narrow. Whereas attention has no centre, you attend. I don't know if you follow this. If you now - forgive me for pointing out - if you are really attending now you will see you are not attending from a point. Right? So find out for yourself, if you are willing - I am not persuading you, or anything of that kind, it is not group therapy and all that business - if you are willing just see if you can completely attend. That is you hear, you see, you feel, everything in your mind is alive, attending. Then you will find out that there is no point from which you are attending, no point to point. In that attention there is no border. Whereas concentration has a border.

If not, is there a connection between the two, and how do they possibly relate to suppression? I am not quite sure I understand the

question. Is there a connection between the two, that is, the physical action, which is when you see a danger, you move away immediately, and the action, the perception, the observation which ends a particular reaction, that is called greed, ending totally, not partially. The questioner asks, is there a connection between these two, and how do they possibly relate to suppression. There is no suppression.

Look sir, all right, let's take greed, as we did the day before yesterday. Greed we all know how it arises, what its responses are and so on. In observing greed, if there is a division between the observer and the observed, that is, there is greed and I say, 'I am greedy', which means I am separate from that thing called greed. Right? You are following? So this separation, in this separation there is either conflict, suppression, overcoming it and so on, all the travail that comes about in this division. But this division actually doesn't exist if you go into it. Greed is me, is the observer. Right? I wonder if you understand. May I go on? Greed is not separate from the person who is observing as though he were different from the observer. We are saying the observer is the observed, which doesn't mean I observe the tree, I am the tree. I would end up in an asylum. But we are saying when there is this reaction, which is named as greed, that greed is not different from the me that is observing it, so we eliminate altogether the division. In that there is no suppression, you are that. If you come to that point - you understand, when you say, 'Yes, I am that', not as an idea but as an actuality, then there is a totally different movement takes place. I don't know if you have tried it after these weeks of talking, you must have tried one of these things. If you have, you

must have found out. Test it.

That is, the total absence of conflict, which is an extraordinary thing because you have broken the pattern of this division which creates conflict.

3rd QUESTION: For the making of images to end must thought also end? Is one necessarily implied in the other? Is the end of image-making merely a foundation upon which we can begin to discover what love and truth are? Or is that ending the very essence of truth and love?

We talked about, the other day, how images are made. We will go into it again. We live by images, not only actual image created by the hand but by the images created by the mind, by thought. These images are continuously added and taken away. This is the movement that we go through. I don't know if you are watching your own images that you have. You have your own image about yourself; if you are a writer you have an image, if you are a poet you have an image, if you are a wife, husband and all the rest of it, each one has created for himself an image about himself. This begins from childhood through comparison, through suggestion, by saying you must be as good as the other chap, or you must not do, or you must, so gradually this accumulated process begins. And in our relationships, personal and otherwise, there is always this image, man, woman and all the rest of it. And as long as this image exists you are either wounded, bruised, hurt or this image prevents having actual relationship with another. We explained and have gone into this..

Now the questioner says, can this ever end, or is it something with which we have to live everlastingly, and in the very ending of

the image does thought end? And he asks also, are they interrelated, image and thought? And when the image-making machinery comes to an end, is that the very essence of love and truth? That is more or less what he means. Have you ever actually ended an image? Voluntarily, easily, without any compulsion, without any motive, without saying, I must end my image, I won't be hurt, and all the rest of it. Just voluntarily, pleasantly, easily, happily, end the image you have: the image of god, the image of - you know all that. Take one image and go into it. In going into it you discover the whole movement of making images. You understand what I am saying? That is, if one has an image, let's say a belief, which is an image, go into it. That image you begin to discover in the very ending of it there is fear, there is anxiety, there is a sense of isolation, and so you see the image-making involves all this. And if you are frightened you carry on, you say, it is much better to keep something I know rather than something I don't know. Right? Whereas if you go into it fairly seriously and deeply, who is the maker of this image? Not one particular image but the image-making machinery, the whole of it. Is it thought? Is it the natural response, natural reaction to protect oneself? Wait a minute, don't agree yet, don't agree. The natural reaction to protect, protect physically, and protect psychologically. One can understand the natural response of protecting physically: to have food, to have shelter, clothes, not to be run over by buses and so on, not to jump down a precipice. That is a natural, healthy, intelligent response. In that there is no image. I don't know if you follow this. When you see a precipice, you move away. It is not the image that is moving away, it is the physical danger you see it and

the physical danger and the self-protective reaction makes you move. In that there is no image. I don't know if you see that.

But psychologically, inwardly, we have created this image. And this image is the outcome of a series of incidents, accidents, hurts, irritations, which is after all the state of a mind which is inattentive. I don't know if you follow this. May I go on? You are following this? Does it interest you, all this? Don't agree, do it for yourself. Please, I don't care if you flatter me or agree with it, it is nothing to me. You follow? Unless you want to do it, don't do it. If you want to do it, do it. This psychological image-making, is it the movement of thought? You understand? We know thought, perhaps very, very infinitely enters in self-protective action, physically, but the psychological image-making must be the outcome of constant inattention, which is the very essence of thought. I wonder if you get it. You understand, sir, just now. Thought in itself is inattentive. Please, I carefully explained previously that attention has no centre, it has no point from which to go to another point, which is concentration. When there is complete attention there is no movement of thought. It's only the state of mind that is inattentive, and thought then, which is always partial and therefore not completely attentive, it creates the image.

Have you followed a little bit? I am inattentive, I am doing something else, you know inattentive. My wife or friend or somebody tells me, 'You are silly ', and immediately I have formed an image, or somebody says, 'What a marvellous person you are', I have formed an image. Which is, the state of inattention, lacking attention creates the image by thought, which in itself is inattentive. Got it? I have discovered something new. Right?

Because - please look at it carefully for yourself, thought which is matter, thought which is the outcome of memory, the outcome of memory, experience, knowledge, and that must always be limited, partial. Memory, knowledge, can never be complete. Right? Can never be complete, therefore it is partial, therefore it is inattentive, thought is inattentive in itself. I wonder if you see this.

So when there is attention there is no image-making. You get it? It is not a conflict. You see the fact. When you insult me or flatter me, I am completely attentive, it doesn't mean a thing. But the moment I am not paying attention my thought takes over, which is inattentive in itself and creates the image. Got it?

Now the questioner says, is the ending of image-making the beginning, the essence of love and truth? Not quite. Sorry to put it, not quite! One must go into it very, very deeply. This may not the time or the occasion. I was going to talk about it, the speaker was going to talk about it on Saturday and Sunday. But it doesn't matter, we will go into it now briefly and we will then talk about it.

Is desire love? Is pleasure love? What do you say? I know all of our life, most of our life, is directed towards pleasure, different forms of pleasure. And in that movement of pleasure, sex, etc., etc., takes place and that we call love. Right? Am I saying something not true? So we are asking is love desire, pleasure? And can there be love when there is conflict? When the mind is crippled with problems - problems of heaven, problems of meditation, problems between man and woman, problems. You follow? When the mind is living in problems, which most minds are, can there be love? And when there is a great deal of suffering, physical as well as psychological, can there be love?

So I am not answering these questions, it is for you to find out.

And is truth a matter of conclusion, a matter of opinion, of philosophers, of theologians, of those who believe so deeply about dogma, rituals, you know, which are all man-made, can such a mind know what truth is? Or truth can only be when the mind is totally free of all this jumble? So philosophers and others never look at their own lives, and go off into some metaphysical psychological world, which they begin to publish and become famous.

So truth is something, sir, that demands extraordinary clarity of mind, that has no problem whatsoever, physical or psychological. A mind that has not known even conflict. You understand what I am saying? The memory of conflict must end. You are following all this? Because we have a great many pleasant and unpleasant memories, remembrances that are delightful and remembrances that are most painful. With that mind, with that burden, we are trying to find truth. You understand? It is impossible.

So a mind that is astonishingly free from all man-made psychological - you follow - all that, then truth is something that is when there is love and compassion. You cannot have love and compassion when you are in violence, when you are clinging to some attachment, when attachment becomes all important.

Sirs, and ladies, if we may, we are not being personal, these are not words to me. If it was not something actual I wouldn't speak. You understand what I am saying? I wouldn't be dishonest to myself. If it is not a fact I would be such a terrible hypocrite. I wouldn't ever sit on a platform or talk to anybody. You understand what I am saying? This requires tremendous integrity.

4th QUESTION: Would you please make a definite statement about the non-existence of reincarnation, since increasing 'scientific evidence' is now being accumulated to prove reincarnation as a fact. I am concerned because I see a large number of people beginning to use this evidence to further strengthen a belief system they already have, which enables them to escape facing the problems of living and dying. Isn't it your responsibility to be clear, direct and unequivocal on this matter instead of hedging round the issue?

We will be very definite. Sir, this idea of reincarnation has existed long before Christianity. Right? The Hindus, the ancient Hindus talked about it. I must tell you a lovely story. And it is prevalent and almost actual in India, and probably in the Asiatic world. They believe in reincarnation. Now what is it that incarnates? You understand? Not only now, incarnating now, but reincarnating. You follow? That is one point.

Second: this idea of reincarnation being proved scientifically as evidence so that people can escape through that, the question implies, and the questioner also says, I am concerned because people are escaping. Right? Are you really concerned because people are escaping? They escape through football, they escape through going to basket-ball, and may I also add escape by going to church - another form of entertainment. And let's put all that aside, being concerned what other people do, because we are concerned with the fact, with the truth of reincarnation. Right. And you want a definite answer from the speaker.

What is it that incarnates? To incarnate is to be born. Right? What is it at the moment now, living now, sitting there, what is it

that is living? You understand? Reincarnation means in a future life. Right? I am asking, what is it that is taking place now, which is incarnation? You understand my question? Right? What is it? Go on, sir, examine it. As we are sitting here, nothing is happening. It is fairly simple, you are listening to some talk, or some idiocy, or some rubbish, or you like what you are hearing, or you don't like what you are hearing. But in our daily life, when you go away from here, what is it that is actually taking place, which is the very movement of incarnation, what is it? You know it. Your struggles, your appetites, your greeds, your envies, your attachments, your - you follow, all that. Is that what is going to reincarnate next life? You understand what I am saying? Go on, sir think it out.

Now those who believe in reincarnation, that is to be born with all the things which I have now, all the thing which we have, to be born next life, modified, perhaps, and carry on life after life. That's the idea. If you really believe in reincarnation, really, it is something that is alive, a belief - belief is never alive, but suppose it is tremendously alive, then how you are now matters much more than what you will be next. You understand what I am saying? Are you following? That is sir, it is called in the Asiatic world, Karma - I won't go into all that. Which means action, not all the stuff but action. If I live a life now, in this period, with all my misery, confusion, anger, jealousy, hatred, violence, it may be modified, but it will go on next life. Right? This is obvious. If you go into all that. So there is evidence of that. The evidence of violence, evidence of remembrance of things past, you follow all this. It may be remembrance of things past of a past life. Right? That remembrance, that accumulated me - this accumulation is the me,

the I, the ego, the personality - that bundle, modified, chastened, polished a little bit goes on next life. Right? This has evidence. Right, are you following all this?

So the question is not whether there is incarnation. You follow? I am very clear on this matter, please I am very definite, not that there is reincarnation, but what is far more important than reincarnation is the ending of this mess, this conflict, now. You follow? Then there is something totally different goes on. I wonder if you get all this. It is like my being unhappy, miserable, sorrow-ridden and I say, 'I hope next life I will be better'. Right? That hope of next life is the postponement of facing the fact now. The speaker has talked a great deal to all those believers and so on who have lectured, written, talked about reincarnation endlessly. It is part of their game. And I say, all right, sir, you believe in all that; what about, if you believe, what you do now matters. Right? Right, sirs. But they are not interested in that, they are interested in the future. You follow? They don't say, look, I believe, but I will alter my life so completely there is no future. You follow?

Don't say at the end of answering this particular question, you are evading it. I am not. The present life is all important. If you understand, and go into that present life, with all the turmoil of it, the complexity of it, and end it - you follow - end it, not carry on with it, then you enter into a totally different world. To end it you must apply, you follow sir, give attention, you must go after it, not just say, 'Well I believe in it, reincarnation, I hope in the future something will take place.' I think this is clear, isn't it? I am not hedging.

You might ask me, do I believe in reincarnation, right? That is

the question implied too. I don't believe in anything. This is not an evasion. I have no beliefs, which doesn't mean I am an atheist, I am ungodly and all that nonsense, to have no belief. Go into it, sir, see what it means. It means that the mind is free from all entanglements of belief.

Q: What about the story?

K: Oh, you have heard of the Upanishads in India, the literature of ancient India. There is a story there about death which is reincarnation and all the rest of it. The son of Brahman, you know what a Brahmana is, the father is sacrificing, giving up, he has accumulated so much and one of the ancient customs and rules was that after collecting, at the end of five years you must give up everything and begin again. Would you do all that? So he had a son, and the son says to him, 'You are giving all this away to various people, to whom are you going to give me away to? To whom are you sending me?' The father said, 'Go away, I am not interested'. So the boy comes back several times, and the father gets angry and says, 'I am going to send you to death'. Being a Brahmana he must keep his word. So he sends him to death. And on his way to death the boy goes to various teachers and says, 'Some say there is incarnation, others say there is not.' So he goes on searching and he comes to the house of death. When he arrives death is absent. You know it is a marvellous story if you go into it. Death is absent. He waits for three days. On the third or the fourth day death appears and apologises. He apologises because the boy was a Brahmin and he says, 'I am sorry to have kept you waiting. And in my regret I will offer three whatever you may wish. You can be the greatest king, have the greatest wealth, and you can have

immortality.' He promises anything. And the boy says, 'I have been to all these teachers and they all say different things, what do you say about death and what happens afterwards?' So death says, 'I wish I had pupils like you'. You understand? Who is not concerned about anything except that. So he begins to talk, and tells him about truth, about a state of life in which there is no time and so on and so on. That's the story.

5th QUESTION: If you are the world, and one feels it, sees it, what does it mean to step out of the stream? Who steps out of it?

The questioner has probably read some books of the speaker. What time is it, sir? Sir this is a very important question because - this will be the last question, if you don't mind, I am sorry to keep you waiting so long, in spite of the tape!

I wonder if one realizes, not as an idea, not as something romantically appealing but as an actual fact that we are the world, psychologically, not physically, colour and hair and all that stuff, but psychologically, inwardly we are the world. Go to India, they have the same problems as here - suffering, loneliness, death, anxiety, sorrow, as we have in the west. Wherever you go this is the common factor of humanity, the factor of all human beings. So psychologically, inwardly, we are the world. Right? Is that an idea or a fact? You understand? When you hear this statement, do you make of it into an idea, or actually realize it, as you realize when a pin is put into your thigh, or in your arm, the actual pain of it? Not the pain of the realization, the pain when an injection is made, that is an actuality, you have no idea about it, it is so, there is pain. Now do we actually realize this immense fact? Or is it just a lot of words, you say, I see it, I know it and I feel it? But something

biting, something that is so tremendously actual, then the psychological fact of that affects the mind. You understand? The mind is not your mind, your brain is not your American little family brain. It is the human brain. And when one realizes that it brings a sense of great, you know, not only responsibility - responsibility implies generally guilt in it, if you are really responsible you feel slightly guilty about it. I am using the word responsibility without any sense of guilt. A sense of tremendous human responsibility for all things connected with human beings: how you educate your children, how you behave, you follow. When you actually realize this immensity - it is immense - then the particular entity as me seems so insignificant. You understand? With all my little worries, you know, it becomes so shoddy. And when you see this fact, in your heart and in your mind you feel this, you cover the earth, you understand. Cover the earth, nature, ecology, and all that, you follow, you want to protect everything you can. Because you are responsible for all this.

And when there is this, the questioner asks, what does it mean to step out of this stream? And who does step out? The stream is this constant human struggle, misery - right - of all human beings, whether communist, socialist, imperialists in China, technicians, it is the common ground on which we all stand. And to be free of that - you follow - to be free of all that is not who steps out of it, the mind has become something totally different. You understand? Am I making this point clear? It's not 'I step out of it; the mind is no longer in it. Sirs, look, if you are attached and you end attachment, something totally different takes place, not you are free from attachment. So there is a different quality, a different tone to your

whole life when one realizes this enormous fact that we are
humanity. Right sir?

I think that is enough, isn't it?

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 15TH MAY 1980

In talking over together these questions we are sharing not only the question but also with the answers, with the exploration of the answer. So it is not just I answer and you listen and you all agree or disagree, but together we are trying to find the right answer to these questions.

1st QUESTION: I am not asking how fear arises, that you have already explained, rather what is the actual substance of fear? What is fear itself? Is it a pattern of physiologic reactions and sensations, tightening of muscles, surge of adrenalin and so forth? Or is it something more? What am I to look at when I look at fear itself? Can this looking take place when fear is not immediately present?

It is rather a long question. The questioner, as far as I can make out from this question, wants to know what is the substance of fear, what is actual fear, and how can one observe fear present or past. That's the question. Do we understand the question?

What is fear itself, apart from the physiologic reactions, tightening and so on, what is the actual moment of fear? What is the nature, the inward structure of fear, the substance? Right? Can we go on with that? Have we all understood this rather long question?

What is fear itself? We are generally afraid of something. Right? Or a remembrance of something that has happened, or a projection of the reaction into the future. But that is not what the questioner asks only; he asks also what is the actual nature of fear. I think we don't know, we had better find out.

When one is afraid, both physiologically as well as psychologically it is, is it not, something that one has, the feeling of danger, the feeling of total isolation, called loneliness, deep abiding lasting loneliness. Those are all reactions to something: one is afraid of snakes, or one has had pain and is afraid of that pain and so on. So it is either a remembrance and therefore something that has happened in the past, and recalled when that dangerous moment arises, the remembrance of the past identifying and say, that is fear. The questioners says, and I think there is something which we have to go into together, which is, apart from all this, physical, psychological reactions which we know as fear, apart from it is there fear in itself, not fear of? You understand? Am I making it clear? Is there fear per se? Or we only know fear in relation to something else. If it is not in relation to something else, is it fear? We only know fear in relation to something, from something or towards something. But if you eliminate all that, is there actual fear, which you can examine. You understand my question? Or is fear, deep rooted fear, in the mind, which has always wanted total security and not finding it it's afraid? You understand?

Please we are examining it together, you are not just playing games with me, the ball is not in your court or in my court. We are looking at it together. The mind, the brain needs complete security to function well, healthily, sanely; not finding it in anything, in a relationship, in an idea, in a belief, in an image, an intelligent mind rejects all that. But yet it must have complete security. And lacking that fear comes into being. Right? That is, is there something totally, completely secure, certain? Not the certainty of belief,

dogma, rituals and ideas, which can be abolished and new ideas, dogmas, theories can replace them, but if you put aside all that, is the mind, the brain seeking a security that is imperishable? And not finding it, it has deep rooted fear. Are we meeting together?

So I am asking, one is asking oneself apart from the ordinary kind of fears, is the mind, brain creating the fear itself? You follow? Because there is nothing valid, nothing that is whole, and is that the substance of fear? Can the brain - and the mind includes the brain reactions and all that - can that total mind have complete security, certainty, not about something - you understand - not for god, belief, all that, but in itself completely whole? Right? Am I conveying something?

Can the mind in itself have no fear? Am I conveying something, are we meeting each other? Thought which is part of the mind and brain has created - desire and security has created various illusions, philosophical and so on, theological, and not finding it there it either creates something beyond itself in which it can find total security, or the mind is so totally complete it has no need for fear. Are we? This is rather difficult.

We are not talking of getting rid of fear, or suppressing fear, what is the cause of fear - we went into all that the other day - but we are asking something totally different, which is, can the mind in itself have no cause or substance or reaction which brings fear? Sir, please this is rather a difficult question, to find this out, that is, can the mind, can it ever be in a state - again that word 'state' implies static, I don't mean that - can it ever be in a quality, in a state, where it has no movement reaching out or going - completely whole in itself?

You see this implies understanding what is meditation, if you are interested in it. Meditation isn't all this nonsense that is going on, but to be free from fear. You follow? Both physiological as well psychological, be free from it. Otherwise one can't love, there is no love, there is no compassion, as long as there is fear the other cannot exist. And to meditate, not to reach something, to understand the nature of fear, and to go beyond it, which is to find out whether the mind has no memory or remembrance of something which has caused fear, so that it is completely whole.

I think I have more or less answered that question; except, can this looking take place when this fear is not immediately present? One can record fear, can't one? And the recording of that fear can be observed, can't it? You are sitting here quietly, probably you have no fear now. But you have had fear in the past, and you can summon it, but it is not actually the same. Right? Because at the moment - no, fear exists a moment after, not at the actual moment. I don't know if you see. You have given it a name, a reaction and so on, and that you call fear. But at the actual moment of great danger, the moment of facing something that may cause fear, at that second there is no fear, there is nothing. Then there is a recollection of the past and then the naming of it and you say, 'By Jove, I am afraid'. The tightening of the muscles, the adrenalin and so on and so on. So one can, I think, recall the past fears and look at them. The observing of that fear is important because either you put it outside of you, or you say, 'I am that fear' - there is not you observing that fear, you are that reaction. Then when there is no division as you and fear, but only the state of that reaction something - I don't know if you have noticed it - something entirely

new takes place. Right?

2nd QUESTION: When one sees in the world about us no demonstrable universal principle of justice I feel no compelling reason to change myself, or the chaotic society outside. I see no rational criteria by which to measure the consequences of action and their accountability. Can you share your perceptions on this matter with us?

I don't like that word 'demonstrable' - one cannot demonstrate universal principles of justice.

Is there justice in the world? This has been a question which all the philosophers have gone into, spinning a lot of words about it. Now is there justice in the world, rational, sane, justice? You are clever, I am not. Right? You have money, I have not. You have capacity and another has not. You have talent, you can enjoy all that, another is born poor. One has crippling disease and the other has not. The criminal, what we call criminals, he is judged and sent to prison, or whatever takes place. So we consider that there must be justice. Right? Seeing all this we say, there must be somewhere justice. So we move from lack of justice to an idea of justice. I don't if you are following it? God is just and so on. But the fact remains that there is terrible injustice in the world. Right? And the questioner wants to know if there is no justice why should I change? You understand? There is no point in it. Why should I change this chaotic world where the dictators are so supreme, their very life is injustice, terrorizing millions of people. And seeing all that there is no rational cause for me to change. I think that is a rather irrational question - if I may say so. Do you change for some cause, because you are under pressure? Or you are rewarded? You

follow? Is change brought about by reward and punishment? Or you see human beings are so irrational right through the world and all the things they have made are also irrational, and you as a human being, you as a human is the rest of humanity. I don't know if you see that - we went into it the other day. And if you are the rest of mankind you are responsible, not because you find you are rewarded, or you see so much injustice in the world, how the crooks get away with everything - they build marvellous churches, a lot of money, and there are millions and millions starving.

So change is not brought about through compulsion, through reward or punishment. The mind itself sees the absurdity of all this and says - you follow? It's per se, it sees the necessity of changing itself, not because you tell me to change, or god or the priest or somebody tells me to change. I see the chaos around me and that chaos has been created by human beings and I am that human being, and I have to act, it is my responsibility, a global responsibility.

3rd QUESTION: Can we die psychologically to the self? To find out is a process of choiceless awareness - I wish you wouldn't quote me. However in order to observe choicelessly it seems we must have ended, or died to the ego, me. So my question is, how can I observe in my current state of fragmentation? Is it like the 'I' trying to see the 'I'? As you have said, we must be free of fear in order to observe fear. It is an impossible paradox. It is driving me mad. Please clarify this issue.

I will clarify the issue: don't quote me. Or anybody, because then it is not yours, you become secondhand human beings, which we are. So please that is the first thing, because that distorts our

thinking. You understand? We are the result of a million years of pressure of other people's thinking, propaganda, all that. And if one is not free of all that you can never find out the origin of all things.

So the question is: how can I observe in my current state of fragmentation? You cannot. Right? But you can observe your fragmentation. I don't know if you follow this. I am observing myself; in observing I discover that I am looking at myself with certain prejudice, so I forget looking at myself, I go into the question of prejudice. I am aware, I become aware of my prejudice, and can I look at it without any sense of distortion, without choice, and all the rest of it, just to observe the prejudice I have. Let the story of prejudice tell me, not I tell the story about prejudice, but let prejudice unroll itself. You understand what I am saying? What is the cause of prejudice? The image, conclusions, opinions.

So I begin to discover, one begins to discover in looking at fear I realize that I am fragmented, that fragmentation is brought about by thought, naturally, and therefore I begin to be aware of the movement of thought. So what is important is not to observe fear, when my mind itself is clouded, confused, so I enquire into my confusion: why are human beings confused? Why are you all confused? If you are very clear you wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be here - thank god! Because we are confused our question is, what is this confusion, who has created this confusion in us and outside of us? Right? So in enquiring, or observing confusion the movement is to be aware of the movement of thought, the contradictory nature of thought. You follow? The whole thing unrolls itself if you watch. The story is there, but we don't read the story. We are telling the book what it should say. You understand?

We are not saying there is the history of myself - the history of mankind is myself - so in enquiring into, reading that book I read the book, chapter by chapter, or I understand the whole book instantly. That implies one has to have a deep insight - I don't want to enter into all that. I don't know if you want me to go on into that.

Sir, look: there is confusion in all of us, and if we say, 'I am not confused', that would be too silly. Or, 'I have perfect relationship with another', that is equally silly. So one is confused. Now either you analyze it, the cause of it - you understand? Please follow this a little bit. The cause of it, which is thought, thought in its very nature is contradictory, thought in its movement is divisive, as national, divisive, thought in itself must be limited because it is based on knowledge and knowledge can never be complete. Right? So that is the way we go into it, analytically or let thought move in a particular direction to examine, which means the remembrance, the memory, the experience is observing. Right? You are following all this? No? All right.

When you observe somebody, your friend or whoever it is, you are observing what? Not the face, not the figure, not how she looks, or he looks, long hair, short hair, you are observing the image you have built about her, or him. So we are saying all that is a movement of thought, based on remembrances, conclusions, ideas. All that is a movement of thought. I mean this is an obvious fact, you don't have to prove it to anybody, that thought in itself is divisive, fragmentary, partial, it can never be complete, therefore it must create confusion.

Now, I have explained it. Now can we look at this sense of confusion in oneself - please follow this a little bit - without going

through all that process? You understand? Without explanation, without remembrance, just to look at it and see, to have an insight into it, then you can explain it. Have I explained it?

Have I explained this? Insight, by the very word means to have sight in the thing - insight. But you cannot have insight if it is merely the response of memory. Look sir, organized religion is not religion, with all the nonsense that goes on with it, rituals, dogmas, theories, theologians spinning out new theories about - and so on and so on. That is not religion. Now what makes you say, that is not religion? Is it merely a thoughtful examination of all the religions, their dogmas, their superstitions, their ignorance, their rituals and saying at the end of it, 'This is nonsense'? Or you see immediately that any form of propaganda, pressure, and so on, that is never religion? Either you see it immediately and therefore you are out of it. I don't know if you see. But if you are merely examining various religions and then coming to a conclusion, then that conclusion will be limited, can be broken down by argument, by superior knowledge and so on. But if you get an insight into the nature of this religious structure which man has invented, the mind is immediately free of it. I don't know if you are following this? It's like if you understand the tyranny of one guru, tyranny - they are tyrants because they want power, position and all the rest of it, they know, others don't know - so if you see the tyranny of one guru you have seen the tyranny of all gurus. You understand? So you don't go from one guru to another. I am afraid you are doing that.

4th QUESTION: In observation without the observer is there a transformation from staying with the fact that leads to an increase of attention? Does the energy created have a direction? (Good lord!

I don't know what this is all about.) What is the relationship of attention to thought, to the centre, the self? Is there a gap between attention and thought that leads to freedom?

Look sir, these questions unfortunately don't relate to your actual life. Right? I am not saying you should not put these questions, I am only asking you most respectfully, all these questions actually have not touched the actual daily living life. You understand? Right? Is that so, or not? So all these questions become theoretical, something abstract, something you have heard and you then say, who is the observer, and the observer is the observed and so on. But if you say, look, my life is this, let us find out why I live this way. You understand, sirs? Why I am worried, why my mind is eternally chattering, why I have no right relationship with another, why am I cruel. You understand? Why is my mind so narrow? Why am I neurotic? A neurotic person never says, 'I am neurotic'. But one can observe the person who is neurotic, it may be my wife, or my husband who is neurotic, but we never apparently deal with questions that affect our daily existence. I wonder why. You understand my question?

All these questions - I think there are about two hundred and fifty questions, we went through them, please I am not scolding, or impatient, or preaching, but I am just asking myself after reading all these questions, why isn't there one question that affects psychologically the inward - you understand? Why I am unhappy, why am I in conflict with my neighbour, with my husband? You follow? So why is this happening? I will answer these questions, if I must, but why are we so timid, or so enclosed, or we are afraid to expose ourselves to another, which doesn't mean that you must

expose. If we asked really a genuine - a question that affects deeply our life it has much more vitality than this. Right?

So I'll ask the question: why do we, each one of us, live the way we are doing? Taking drugs, pot, drinking, smoking, pursuing pleasure and aggression, why? You understand? Why? Why are we like this? Please sir, go into it a little. Why are we aggressive? The whole society in which we live, this society in the west, aggression is one of the most important things, and competition, they both go together. Why? You can see in the animals how aggressive they are, in mating, at a certain season, they don't compete, do they? A lion has killed a zebra, other lions share it. You have seen this on television and so on. But apparently with us aggression is a most deep rooted thing, and competition, why are we like this? Is it the fault of the society? Our education? But the society is what we have made of it. So don't say, society, blame the society for this, or some education, but apparently we are deeply aggressive, and competitive. And if you are not competitive, if you are not aggressive, in this society you are trodden down. Right? You are discarded, you are looked down upon. Why are we aggressive? Go on sirs, examine it. Is it that this emphasis on the individual freedom, you understand, individual freedom, and that freedom demands that you must express yourself at any cost? Is that it? Especially in this country, in the west, this sense of freedom, you know. If you have an instinct to do something, if you want to do something, do it, you don't restrain, don't examine it, it doesn't matter, if you have the skill act.

Q: What is the difference between aggression and competition?

K: I wouldn't bother about that. Please either you write the

questions and I'll answer, or let me talk a little.

You can see what aggression does. You are aggressive and I am aggressive for the same job, the same this, that, the other. And so we are fighting each other all along the way. Right? Both psychologically and physically. And we carry on. That's part of our pattern, part of our social education, and to break that pattern we say we must exercise our will. Right? Which is another aggression. I don't know if you follow this? Right? Are you following this, sir? When I exercise my will, will is another form of 'I must'. That's another form of aggression. So can you have an insight into aggression? You have understood my question, or is it too difficult? You understand my question sir? That is, I am aggressive - thank god I am not, I have never been, I don't want to be - suppose I am aggressive and that's the pattern from childhood, that is the education, the mother, the father, the society, the boys around me, they are all aggressive, and I see, I like that, it gives me a pleasure. And I accept it and I also become aggressive. Then as I grow up somebody shows me the nature of aggression, what it does in society, how competition is destroying human beings. It is not only the speaker that is saying this, scientists are beginning to say this - so perhaps you will accept the scientist. So you explain it very carefully, the reason, the cause, and the destructive nature of competition, which is to compare, always comparing. You understand?

Now a mind that doesn't compare at all, you understand, is a totally different kind of mind. It has got much more vitality. So one explains all this, and yet we go on being aggressive, competitive, comparing ourselves with somebody, always with something much

greater not with the poorer, always something greater. So there is this pattern established, this framework, and in which the mind is caught. And listening to it you say, 'I must get out of it, I must do something about it', which is what? Another form of aggression. You understand? I wonder if you see that. So can you, can we have an insight into aggression? You follow? Not explanations, not the remembrance of all the implications of it and so on and so on, which is constant examination, then coming to a conclusion, and acting according to that conclusion. That's not insight. Whereas if you have immediate insight into it, you understand, then you have broken the whole pattern of aggression.

That is, sir, we compare, don't we, both physically, you have long hair, I wish I could look as nice as you do, or psychologically there is constant comparison. Which means what? I don't know if you have gone into this. To compare oneself with somebody else, greater, more intelligent, bright, and so on, is to what? Deny what you are and change what you are. I wonder if you understand this. Am I making this clear? Look, I compare myself with you and I say you are awfully clever, all that, and in that comparison I say, by Jove, I realize I am very dull. Right? You are following this? But if I have no comparison, am I dull? I begin then to discover the things 'as is'. I wonder if you see.

So what we shall do with the way we are living? Sorry to bring it home. What shall we do? You will attend meetings, other forms of other kinds of meetings, discussions, philosophers explaining their philosophy, the latest psychologist, non-Freudian, non-this, and non-that, but the latest, they will explain to you. You understand? We are doing this all the time, moving from one thing

to another, and that's called an open mind. But we never say, I am like this, let me find out why am I like this. Why I have wounds, psychological bruises, why. Why do I live with them? I don't know if you are following all this. But reading somebody, books, like attending Krishnamurti's talks, and then quoting it back, it is so... I know all this by heart! I have been like this for sixty years and more, so you don't have to quote to me. But if you don't quote, and find out for yourself, you understand, sir, it has greater energy, it is more fun, more alive, you become much more alive.

5th QUESTION: What is the relationship of attention to thought? Is there a gap between attention and thought?

This is a good question because it affects us. That is, what is attention, what is the relationship of thought to attention, is there in attention freedom? Right? Is this a question that affects us? That is, we know what concentration is. Right? Most of us do from childhood we are trained to concentrate, and the implications of that concentration is narrowing down all energy to a particular point, and holding to that point. Right? A boy in a school is looking out of the window, looking at the birds and the trees and the movement of the leaves, or the squirrel climbing up the tree, and the educator says, 'Look, you are not paying attention, concentrate on the book.' Right? 'Listen to what I am saying', and so on and so on. Which is what? Go into it, sir. Which is what? You are making concentration far more important than attention. That is, the boy is looking out of the window watching that squirrel, I would help him to watch - if I am the educator - I would help him to watch that squirrel completely. You follow? Watch it. Watch the movement of the tail, and also how its claws are,

everything, watch it. Then if he learns to watch that attentively he will pay attention to the beastly book! You follow what I am saying? So there is no contradiction.

So attention is a state of mind in which there is no contradiction. Right? There is no entity, or a centre, or a point, which says, I must attend. In that state there is no wastage of energy. Whereas in concentration there is always the controlling process going on: I want to concentrate on that page but thought wanders off, and then you pull it back, a constant battle going on. Whereas in attention, if you go into it, it is very simple really, when somebody says, 'I love you', and he means it, you are attending, you don't say, do you love me because I look nice, or I have money, or sexual, or this or that - you follow what I am saying? So attention is something totally different from concentration.

And this attention, the questioner asks, what is the relationship of this attention to thought? Right? None, obviously. I don't know if you follow this. Concentration has a relationship to thought because thought directs: I must learn, I must concentrate in order to control myself. Right? Thought then gives a direction from one point to another point. Whereas in attention thought has no place, you attend.

And is there a gap between attention and thought? Sir, as we explained the other day, if you once understand, if one once has a grasp of the whole movement of thought you wouldn't put this question. I'll answer it, but first one has to understand what thought is. You understand? Not somebody tell you what thought is. But to see what thought is, how it comes into being. And we will do it again, we will go into it.

There can be no thought if there is total amnesia. Right? But fortunately, or unfortunately we are not in a state of amnesia. And one wants to find out what thought is, what place it has in life. You understand? So one begins to examine thinking. So what is thinking? Thinking takes place as a reaction to memory. Obviously. Memory responds to a challenge, to a question, to an action, or responds in relation to something, or to an idea, to a person. Right? You see all this in life. So what is thinking, what is thought, how does thought exist in the human mind? So one asks then, what is memory? You understand? What is memory? Memory is you have trodden on some insect that has bitten you, that memory, that pain is registered and stored in the brain, that pain, which becomes a memory, it is not actual pain. That pain is over but the memory remains. So next time you are careful. So there is experience as pain, which has become knowledge, and that knowledge, experience is memory, that memory responds as thought. Right? Memory is thought. And knowledge, however wide, however deep, however extensive, must always be limited. Right? There is no complete knowledge. I don't know if you are following all this.

So thought is always partial, limited, divisive because in itself it isn't complete, in itself it can never be complete; it can think about completeness. You understand? It can think about totality, whole, but thought itself is not whole. So whatever it creates philosophically, religiously, it is still partial, limited, fragmentary, because knowledge is part of ignorance. You understand, sir? I don't know if you understand this. As knowledge can never be complete it must always go hand in hand with ignorance. Right?

That's logical, rational. And if one understands the nature of thought, and understands what concentration is, then thought cannot attend because attention is giving all energy - you understand - without any restraint. I wonder if you understand this. If you are listening now, I hope you are, if you are listening and attending, what takes place? There is no 'you' attending. Right? There is no centre that says, 'I must attend'. You are attending because it is your life, your interest. If you are not interested, lying down in the sun, saying, well I'll listen partly, that's a different matter. But if you are serious and giving attention you will soon find out all your problems, all that is gone - at least for the moment.

So to resolve problems is to attend. I wonder if you have got it? Do you understand this? It's not a trick!

What time is it sir?

Q: Seventeen minutes to one.

K: I am so sorry, it is seventeen minutes to one.

Sorry these questions are of the same kind. As this is the last question and answer meeting we shall perhaps some of us meet again on Saturday and Sunday and after that we close the shop!

So all these questions, two hundred and fifty questions or more, are always somehow not dealing with the facts of oneself. You understand sir? Why is my mind chattering, so restless? You follow? You don't ask such a question. Have you ever asked that question of yourself, why are you so restless, specially in this country, the mind so chattering, restless, moving, going from one thing to another, constant entertainment. Why is your mind chattering? And what will you do about it? Right? Your immediate

response is to control it. Right? Say, I must not chatter, which means what? The very controller is chattering. I don't know if you see that. Do you see? There is a controller who says, 'I mustn't chatter', he is in himself part of chattering. See the beauty of it? So what will you do? Go on sirs.

If you observe it, if you say, look, my mind is chattering and I can examine the causes of chattering because chattering is part of the mind being occupied. Right? I don't know if you have noticed, the mind, the whole structure of the brain must be occupied with something. Right? With sex, with problems, with television, with going to football, going to church, it must be occupied. Right? Why? Why must it be occupied? If it is not occupied, aren't you rather uncertain, won't you fear not being occupied? You feel empty, don't you? No? You feel lost, you feel - then you begin to realize what you are, that there is tremendous loneliness inside. Right? And so to avoid that deep loneliness with all its agony the mind chatters, is occupied about everything else except that. And then that becomes the occupation. You follow? If I am not occupied with all the outward things, like cooking, washing up, cleaning the house, and so on, then it says, I am lonely, that's my concern. You follow? How am I to get over it, let me talk about it, how miserable I am - back to chattering. But if you say, why is the mind chattering? Ask the question, go on, sir. Why is your mind chattering? Never a moment when it is quiet, never a moment when there is complete freedom from any problem. Right?

So again is that occupation the result of our education, of the social nature of our life? Those are all excuses obviously. But when one realizes, if one does, your mind is chattering and look at

it, work with it, stay with it - I don't know if I am explaining. My mind is chattering. All right I'll watch it, I say, 'All right, chatter'. I am attending to it. You follow? I wonder if you understand this. I am attending, which means I am not trying not to chatter, I am not saying, I must not suppress it, I am just attending to chattering. If you do you will see what happens. Then your mind is so clear, free of all this. And probably that is the state of a normal healthy human being. Right? That's enough.

OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH MAY 1980

May we go on with what we were talking about last Saturday and Sunday? If I may point out, this is not an entertainment, to be amused, or intellectually, or emotionally stimulated. Please don't take notes because you can't pay attention to both. I hope you don't mind.

Human beings right throughout the world have been tyrannized over by institutions, organizations, by priests, by gurus, by every form of authoritarian aggressive assertions, either by the philosophers or by the theologians, or by one's own idiosyncrasies, greed and anxiety. And we have been saying during these talks - tomorrow will be the last one - and the questions and answers that it becomes more and more imperative that human beings, whether they live in far away Asia, or in the Western world, or here, should bring about in themselves a radical transformation, a mutation. And that is necessary because society as it is, organized, upheld, has become extraordinary complex, corrupt, immoral; and such a society is very destructive, leading to war, oppression, every form of dishonest action. And to bring about a change there, in the society, it is necessary that human beings change themselves. And most of us are unwilling to do that. Most of us rely either on an institution, organization to change society, or some leader - and these leaders generally become tyrannical. We look to others to bring about the necessary change in society. And we human beings are responsible for it, we have created it, we have put it together. We, those in America, Europe or wherever they live, we have made this society.

And we seem to not realize the central fact that we, each one of us, are responsible for what is going on in the world. The terror, violence, wars, and all the rest of it. And to bring about that change in ourselves we have to look at ourselves, we have to see exactly what we are; and not depend on anyone, including the speaker. We have all been led by others, and that is one of the great calamities, so we become utterly irresponsible: irresponsible for our own acts, for our own behaviour, for our own vulgarity, and so on.

Many of us, and most people, at least thoughtful people, are aware that they are conditioned by society, by education, by all the various pressures, or incidents, and accidents and ideas, we are conditioned. By religious beliefs, by philosophers with their theories, whether communism or other kinds of ideas spun out by philosophers. The word 'philosophy' means actually the love of life, the love of truth; not love of ideas, not love of theological concepts; but the actual understanding of life and the loving that takes place when one understands the deep meaning of living. That is the real meaning of a philosopher.

And we have been conditioned by our own beliefs and the beliefs imposed on us; and the desire to be certain, the desire to have no fear; all that has brought about our conditioning - the American, the Russian, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Arab, the Jew and so on. We are conditioned. And as most of us are aware that we are conditioned, we say, we cannot possibly change it, it is impossible for the mind, for the brain, to uncondition itself. So put up with it, modify it and carry on. If you observe yourself, that is what we are doing. We never like - if the speaker may point out, that we are not doing any kind of propaganda, we are not

instituting one belief against another belief, one dependence against another dependence. There is nothing to prove because we are, both of us, are thinking over together. All of us, if you are serious here, are giving our attention to this fact: that we are conditioned and out of this conditioning we are creating more and more havoc in the world, more and more misery, confusion. And we are asking, talking over together, thinking together, whether it is possible that this conditioning can be totally freed, eradicated, broken down, changed, mutated and so on. So we are thinking over together. You are not, if I may point out, listening to the speaker and agreeing or disagreeing. There is nothing to disagree, or agree. We are thinking together and seeing the necessity of bringing about a radical change in society, and that change can only be brought about completely, wholly, when we, human beings, transform ourselves. That's a fact, not a concept.

A concept is merely a conclusion, opposing one opinion against another opinion, one belief against another belief, and wrangling, or quarrelling about those concepts and ideas and ideals. Here we are merely investigating, looking, observing our conditioning.

Our consciousness is made up of its content. That again is a fact. Our anxieties, our beliefs, our ideals, by our experiences - the content, the suffering, the pain, the remembrances of things that are past; all that, the doubt, the faith, the uncertainty, the confusion, all that makes our consciousness. Please as we are talking look, observe, if we will, our own consciousness: the beauty of the trees, the mountains, the lovely skies, if there is no smog, all that is part of our consciousness; the hatred, the disappointments, the success, the travail that one goes through life, all that makes up our

consciousness. Your belief in god, or disbelief in god, your acceptance of a guru, or non-acceptance of a guru, and so on and so on, all that is the content that makes our consciousness. You can expand that consciousness, limit it, but it is still part of that consciousness, its content.

And we are asking, as we have said during the past talks, whether it is possible for a human being to be totally psychologically free of fear. Last Saturday, or Sunday, we went into that very carefully. And if one may briefly repeat it: is fear, of which all of us know, of various kinds, is fear of things with regard to that, or is fear the very structure of the mind; or thought has put fear there? Please, I am not asserting, we are talking over together. The mind, which is all the movement of the brain, the reactions, the responses of our nerves and all that, that mind in itself, has it fear? Or thought, which is part of the mind, has brought about fear? Right? We are asking this question. And we said, to find that out you must examine the nature of thought, our whole process of thinking, which is born as a reaction out of knowledge, experience, stored up in the brain. As knowledge is always incomplete, whether scientific knowledge, or the knowledge that one has acquired through experience, or the knowledge through books, study, research, must always be incomplete. That's a fact. And thought therefore is incomplete, fragmented, broken up, divisive. And we are asking has thought put, introduced the fact of fear?

We said thought is time, because thought is movement, and time is movement. That is from here physically to go there, to cover the distance. And that same movement has been introduced into the psychological world - I am this, I shall be that, or I want to

be that. So there is not only physical time, but also psychological time. And that is the pattern in which we live, that is part of our conditioning. And we are asking, talking over together, thinking over together, whether thought is the factor of fear? And if so, can that thought observe itself bringing about fear, and so find out, for the mind to discover that the mind itself has no fear - which we went into, which we can go into again if necessary.

So that is, time, achievement, this million years and more of our brain being conditioned, evolved. And that brain, that mind - the mind is part of that - is conditioned. And we are saying, asking each other, thinking together, whether such a mutation can take place. And that mutation can only take place psychologically when one can look at oneself very carefully, without any distortion, because that is the central fact. Without any distortion - is that possible? It is only possible when there is no motive to become something, to change something and so on. To observe without distortion, actually what we are, not what we should be, or what we have been, but what is going on now.

And distortion takes place when there is any fear in our observation. Which we went into the other day. And if there is any form of pleasure. This is one of the central factors one has to understand, look at. Pleasure is one of our driving forces: pleasure of possession, pleasure of knowledge, pleasure of achievement, pleasure of power, pleasure of status; and the pleasure of sex, the pleasure of following somebody, and the pleasure of achieving enlightenment - whatever that may be. That's one of our central activities, like fear. They go together, unfortunately. I hope we are observing ourselves as we are, observing these two factors in life.

It's not that the speaker is telling you, you know all about this. And we say, as long as there is fear, with all its anxiety, hatred, antagonism, and so on and so on, comparison, conformity, imitation, and the tremendous drive to have more and more pleasure and the pursuit of it, is a distorting factor in the observation of what is actually going on.

If we observe according to some psychologist, some philosopher, some guru, some priest, some authority, then we are not observing. We are observing according to their knowledge, according to their investigation. And our minds have become so accustomed to accept other's research, investigation and conclusion, and with that knowledge in our mind we try to look at ourselves. Therefore we are not looking at ourselves; we are looking through the eyes of another. And this has been the tyranny with which human beings have put up for a million years and more.

We are not saying you must suppress pleasure, or transform pleasure, or run away from pleasure. That's what the priests have done. That pattern, that idea of suppression, escape through identifying with some idol, person, or concept, that hasn't solved the problem. So we have to go together, investigate, think together, what is the nature of pleasure.

As we said, this is not an entertainment, this is very serious. If you are not serious, if you want to have a sun bath, or sit under a beautiful tree, do so, but you are not paying attention to what is being said, and this is a serious matter that affects our whole life.

So as we went over the other day the nature and the structure of fear, together again let us observe the nature of pleasure. Why

human beings all over the world are condemned to this thing, why human beings everlastingly follow it, in different ways. Right? So what is pleasure? Why sex has become important? In this country volumes and volumes are written about it. Is it a reaction to the Victorian era? It is as though for the first time one has discovered it. And here, without any restraint, without any modesty - we are not condemning, we are observing - it is going on, sex in different forms. That's part of pleasure. The remembrance, the picture, the desire and so on. We went into the question the other day, the nature of desire. I won't go into it now because we have limited time.

And it is always the remembrance, remembering the pleasure, an incident, which has passed, that incident has left a mark on the brain, from that mark, which is the remembrance of that incident which has gone, and that incident has given at that moment, at that second, great delight. Then the remembrance of it and the pursuing of it. So our brain, our mind, is a bundle of past remembrances. And these remembrances of various kinds have brought about this desire, this pursuit of pleasure. So if you want to go very deeply into it, which we shall, just now, the mind, including the brain - we are using the word 'mind', please bear in mind, if I may explain, the mind is the brain, with all its convolutions, and all its experience, stored up as knowledge, the mind is the reaction, physical sensations, all that; the totality of all that is the mind. The mind is part of this consciousness with all its content.

So can thought, which is the factor of remembrance, remembrance is the recording of an incident that for a second, for a minute, has given you sensation, which has been transformed as

pleasure, can the mind not record? You understand what we are saying? You haven't gone into it probably, and we are going into it now. Our brain is a recording machine, recording all the past experiences, pleasures, pain, anxiety, the wounds, the bruises psychologically one has received, all that is put together by thought. That is, the remembrance, and acting, pursuing according to that remembrance. We are saying, can the brain, can the whole totality of the mind not continue in registration? That is, if you have an incident, over, finished, not record it. I'll go into it a little bit.

We record from childhood the wounds, psychological wounds that we have received, the pain that has been imposed by our parents, by education through comparison, that is, you must be like your brother, or you must achieve certain position and so on. So human beings psychologically are wounded. And if you are questioned now about the way you live, your beliefs, your confusions, your desire for power, questioned, you will get hurt - why you follow anybody, you get hurt. Now to listen to what is being said, asked, and not to register. I wonder if you follow all this. This is quite difficult. No, no, don't say so easily.

Not to register flattery that you receive, or the wound, the insult. And that registration is almost instantaneous. If somebody tells you, what a marvellous person you are, there is immediate registration. Oh, what a marvellous speech you made the other day! That is registered, and from that registration there is pleasure; or, that was rather a stupid talk, immediately that is registered, that becomes the wound, and you carry it for the rest of your life, psychologically. We are saying, asking, looking at the mirror

which is being presented, in that mirror we see ourselves without any distortion. That is, to be so attentive at the moment of flattery, at the moment of insult, at the second when somebody says a cruel word, or points out your neurotic activities, to see it as fact and not register it; that requires attention at that moment. Attention implies that in that attention there is no centre from which you are attending. I won't go into all that because we did the other day.

So we see the nature of pleasure. I can't go more into it, briefly that is enough. Because we have a lot of things to talk over together.

So fear and pleasure, and we are asking further: is love pleasure? Go into it, sirs, and ladies. Is love desire? Is love something you remember? An image you have created about the other person? And you love that image? Is that love? Can there be love when there is conflict, ambition, the drive for success? Please enquire into all this, look at it in your own lives. We know the love of nature, the love of books, the love of poetry, love of this and that, but we are talking psychologically, which is far more important because that distorts our lives and so distorts our activities and our actions. And without love there is nothing.

So if we are serious, concerned about this fact that human beings have created this society, and that human beings unless they bring about a radical transformation psychologically in themselves, they will go on century after century suffering, creating misery for others, and pursuing this everlasting illusion called god and all the rest of it.

So to find out, or to come upon that strange flower which is called love, which cannot come about through institutions, through

organizations, through belief. And is love pleasure, desire, jealousy? If it is not, then is it possible to wipe out all that, effortlessly, naturally, easily? That is, can hatred, violence, which certainly is not love, end? Not at some future time, not tomorrow, end, as you are listening, end it. And we went into the question that attachment is not love. Because attachment breeds every form of antagonism, dependency, fear and so on. You all see that, you all know that, you are all fully aware of all this. And seeing is the ending of it, not merely logically, analytically see it, but to see the fact, the total consequences of attachment. It is very clear. But for most of us seeing is intellectually analyse it, verbally explain it, and being satisfied with explanations. To see what attachment implies actually - the pain of it, the jealousy, the antagonism, you know, the whole sequence of that movement. The very seeing, in the sense not only visual seeing, optical observation but also the art of listening to this movement. And when you listen to it completely it is the ending of it.

So the ending of the content of our consciousness, which is the very essence of the 'me', the self, the 'I', because that is that, the 'I'. The ancient Hindus in India said, the 'I', the centre, the very essence is there, reality, god, truth, is there, and round that there are many layers of ignorance; and to free the mind of these various layers you must have many lives. You know, reincarnation, and all that stuff. We are not saying that. We are saying, as you see danger, hear danger, observe danger, there is instant response. When you see the danger of a bus coming towards you, you move away instantly, unless you are neurotic - perhaps most of us are! But we don't see the danger, the tremendous danger of attachment,

of nationalism, of our separate beliefs, our separate ideas, ideals and so on. We don't see the great danger of that, because it divides man against man, one guru against another guru, one part of religious organization against another religious organization. This is happening right through this country and all over the world. When you see danger you act. But unfortunately we don't see the psychological dangers: the danger of comparison, the danger of attachment, the danger of isolated individual demands - because we are not individuals. If you observe, we are not; the word 'individual' means, indivisible, not broken up, not fragmented. Because our minds, our brains, if you observe it carefully, which has evolved through millennia upon millennia, millions and millions of years old, our brain is not your brain; it is the brain of mankind, the brain of humanity. Psychologically you suffer, you are anxious, you are uncertain, confused, seeking security. That's exactly what they do in India, in Asia, all over the world. So psychologically we are one, one unitary movement. And through our education, through all our personal, our desires and so on, we have narrowed all this vast, immense mind to our petty little quarrels and jealousies and anxieties.

And also, if time allows us, we have to go into the question of death, suffering, pain. I do not know if you want to go into all this, because it is part of life. You can't say, well, I am not interested in death, I am not interested in suffering. That would be lopsided, unrealistic, and such a mind which refuses is an infantile mind. We have to investigate the whole complex problem of life. Either one understands it immediately, the whole structure; or you take part by part, and hope thereby to understand the whole.

So we have to also consider, talk over together, what is suffering, why human beings throughout the world go through this torture. If you are sensitive, if you are alert, watchful, one suffers a great deal, not only in your own little backyard but you suffer for human beings who have no opportunity, who have no food, who have no education, who will never ride in a car, who only have one piece of cloth. And the suffering man has imposed on animals. All that, this immense global suffering, through wars, the tyranny imposed by the dictators, the tyranny, the sorrow imposed by various doctrines and so on. So what is this, why has mankind, human beings, you and everyone, why are we not completely free of that thing?

Where there is suffering there is no love. How can you? So where there is desire, pleasure, fear, conflict, suffering, there can be no love. So it becomes very important to understand why human beings go through this year after year, century after century. Don't let's reduce it to some kind of romantic nonsense. It is an actual fact. When you lose somebody whom you think you love, what agonies you go through; when you have failed in something: all that is a tremendous weight carried by human beings which they have not put off.

Is suffering to end by an act of will? Do you understand? You can't say, I will not suffer. That very act of will is also part of suffering. You cannot run away from it; you do run away to church. Every form of escape we have from this tremendous burden. In the Christian world you have escaped through your own image. The Hindus, being a little more clever at this kind of game, they say, suffering comes because of your past life, for your

misdeeds and so on and so on. First of all, why have we not resolved it? Why human beings, very clever in things technological, in killing each other, why we have not solved this question. First thing is, never to escape from this. You understand? Never to escape from suffering, psychologically. We have pain physically you do something about it, take a pill, doctor and so on and so on. But psychologically when you lose somebody, when there is deep attachment to something or other, person, and when that attachment is broken, there are tears, anxieties, fear, sorrow. And when there is sorrow the natural - or unnatural response is to seek comfort; comfort in drink, in drugs, in some ritualistic religious activity. They are all escapes, because we have not solved it.

So psychologically, when there is the loss of someone, and so on, never escape from it; look at it. That is, to observe without distortion - is that possible? In that sense of agony, the sense of great sorrow, tears, shock, at that moment it is not possible, you are in a state of shock. Don't you know all this? But as you come out of it, it may last a day, it may last a few hours - and I hope it won't last more than a couple of days - when you come out of it the immediate response is to find the cause of this suffering, analyse it, which is another form of escape, because you are running away from this central fact of looking at it, being with it. And when you come out of that shock thought begins: the remembrance of what we did together, what we didn't do, the remorse, the pain of the past, the loneliness which is now asserting itself, it's coming out; all that. To look at it without any movement of thought, because thought is the central factor of fear; thought is also that factor of

pleasure and this sorrow, which mankind has carried for a million years, it is part of this whole structure of the 'me', the 'I'.

And we are saying carefully, advisedly, that there is an ending to sorrow, completely. And it is only then there is the passion of compassion, love.

And have we time this morning to go into the question of death? What time is it, sir?

Q: Twenty five to one.

K: Twenty five to one. You see we have the last talk tomorrow. We have to talk about death, which is a very complex business, and the nature of meditation, which is part of life. Not the meditation of five minutes every morning, and afternoon and evening; but meditation as the whole movement of life, not separate from action, from our daily action. So we have to investigate the nature of death, action and meditation.

You know, sirs, and ladies, you may listen to all this, be stimulated by the speaker, or be antagonistic to him because he is disturbing you, breaking down one's own vanities, showing one's own rather shoddy little pleasures, seeing yourself in the mirror which the speaker is putting before you: but all that has no meaning unless you act. But action is very, very complex; it isn't just, I will do what I feel like. That's what you have come to now: instant response to your desires, instant meditation, instant illumination. What nonsense all that is! That's what some of the psychologists, others are trying, saying: do what you want. And what you want, what you have done is brought about this terrible society in which we live. That is the beginning of degeneration. With this lovely climate, beautiful country, there is rapid

degeneration going on, of which few of us are aware. We haven't even matured before we degenerate, we haven't even come to that.

So all these talks and discussions and questions and answers have very little meaning unless one learns the art of listening, listening to oneself without any quiver, without any distortion, without any false response, just to listen to yourself. And also the art of seeing, observing yourself. You cannot observe yourself with your past experience; you have to observe yourself as you are, moving. Then there is an art of learning, which is not the accumulation of knowledge and information. This whole business of living is so complex one has to observe the whole movement of it. Perhaps we shall go into death and action and meditation tomorrow.

OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH MAY 1980

I hope one realizes that this is not a Sunday morning gathering for amusement, or entertainment, or some kind of so-called spiritual uplift. We are rather serious and we have talked mostly during these talks and question and answer meetings, of the whole complex problem of living. And together, with the speaker, we are trying to resolve all our problems; not only the problem of fear, greed, attachment; and the question which we talked about yesterday also, that love is not desire, love is not the continuous expression of love, of pleasure.

And we would like this morning as this is the last talk, to go into the question of what is action, what is the significance of death, and also a much abused word, meditation. Because this concerns most of our life. We are not trying to prove anything, convert you to a new set of beliefs, ideals, doing any kind of propaganda. The speaker particularly has a horror of all that. But together with the speaker, if you will, if you are serious, go into all these questions.

Though probably most of you have been here during the last two weeks, we now will have to go and consider what is action. Because most of our life is action: all our relationship is action, our attitudes, our behaviour, our particular idiosyncratic expression, our restraints, our freedom to express what we like, or don't like; we are violent, aggressive, obeying, believing and so on; all that is action. Not just going to the office every day for the next fifty years - I don't know how you tolerate it. Or doing some particular job, over and over and over again, for the rest of one's life. All that

is also action. And these actions are based not only on past knowledge, modified by the present and continued into the future.

Please, as we said, we are talking over together. We are not trying to convey or say something which is not clear. Together, you and the speaker, must go into this whole question of action: try to find out if there is an action which is complete, which has no regrets, which has no sense of incomplete partial action, and therefore that action breeds conflict, such actions are divisive, and so on.

So what we are going into this morning, if you are at all serious, on a lovely day, if you want to go into this as we have gone into other problems of life. We are dealing with life, that is, we are dealing with everyday living: our conflicts, our confusion, our jealousies, our aggression, our attachments, our beliefs, our constant struggle with pain and sorrow. That's our life. And to escape from that turmoil we go into various kinds of philosophies, psychoanalytical issues, hoping to solve our own daily conflicts and miseries and confusions. We apparently never face those. We have very carefully cultivated various forms of escapes, a whole network, both religious, sensational, vulgar and so on.

So this morning, as on the previous mornings, we are going to consider together; the speaker is not telling you what action is; together we are going to understand the nature of action, and whether there is an action which is so complete, whole, that it leaves no mark on our daily life so as to bring about conflict. What is action, the doing? For most of us it is based on accumulated knowledge, experience, and from that act. Right? We are following, I hope. That is, through many years study, practise, and

acquire a great deal of knowledge, and act from that, either skilfully or not. That's what we are doing all the time. A carpenters, a scientists, or astrophysicist are the same in their movement, in their acquisition of knowledge, and adding more knowledge, modifying it, changing it, but the basis is acquiring knowledge and acting from that knowledge. The other thing is to act and then learn from that action. Do something that pleases you immediately, learn from that, acquire knowledge in doing. So both are the same. I hope we understand this. That is, the acquisition of knowledge either by study, gradually learning, through experience, and from that knowledge act. The other is, act, and through action learn, and therefore acquire more knowledge. So both are the same. So our action is based on knowledge, and on a great deal of information, and from that skill. Right? And as we were saying, knowledge is always incomplete. I think, one must very clearly understand this. There can never be complete knowledge, either with the astrophysicists, scientists, painters, music, piano players, the carpenter, the plumber, there can never, never be complete knowledge. And so knowledge goes always with ignorance. So our action, when based on knowledge must be incomplete. One must see this very clearly.

And in daily life, in our relationship with each other, whether intimate or not, action is based on previous memories, images that we have built about each other, and act from that. Please see all this clearly. Because the next question will be rather difficult if you don't understand this question carefully. Which is, action based on knowledge, on image, in our relationship with each other, must be divisive; that is, divided, conflicting, partial. And in this

relationship with each other, either there are no images at all and therefore actual relationship; or if there is an image, that image is the outcome of knowledge, and acting from that image. So our relationship, intimate or otherwise, is partial, fragmented, broken up, and so there can never be in that relationship love. Right? Love is not a remembrance - Father's Day, Mother's Day, and all that business. That's a commercial business.

So is there an action which is not born out of time? I am going to explain this carefully. Acquiring knowledge in any field requires time. To get to know each other requires time, if they are more intimate, that also requires time. So all our action is the outcome of knowledge and time. Right? Time being not only by the watch, by the sun rise and sun set, but also psychologically. That is, I am, I shall be; I have not, but I will have; or, I am greedy, angry, violent, but time will help me to resolve it. So our mind is put together by thought and time, and knowledge. So our action is born out of that. If you examine it very carefully, all our action is based on that, and therefore knowledge being incomplete, thought being incomplete, there must be strife between two people, man, woman, and so on, man and man, the whole business of relationship. And if one understands this, or intellectually is aware of it, to be intellectually aware of it is partial, because that is only part of our life, to be emotionally aware of it is also partial, but to be aware of it completely, the whole implication of that. Right? Are we following each other, I hope.

So then the next question is: is there an action - go carefully, please - is there an action which is not the outcome of knowledge? You are following? That is a question: we are not saying there is,

or there is not. To acquire language, technology, to be skilled in technology, in computers and so on, you must have skill based on knowledge. There it is necessary. Right? We are asking something entirely different: which is, we act psychologically out of knowledge: I have known you for some years, I have built an image about you, and from that knowledge I act with regard to you. Right? We are enquiring into the psychological memory from which action takes place. Right? We are following each other? Please, we are going into something very, very subtle and difficult, if you don't, I can't help it. It is very simple if you apply your mind to it, if you listen to it carefully, not only to what the speaker is saying, but also listen to your own mind working - if you are not asleep, or taking a sun bath here, or eating some kind of food. You have to give some kind of attention to this.

Psychologically we have built a great deal of knowledge from which we are acting. That is, our knowledge is self-centred. Right? I want, I don't want, I am greedy, I must fulfil, there must be sex, and so on and so on. So psychologically we have built an image about ourselves and others. That image, that symbol, that word is the knowledge. Right? So this self-centred knowledge, from which we act, is essentially selfish. Right? And when action takes place from the self-centred state, such action must be either harmful, hurting, violent, isolating. Right? I don't know if you have not noticed, if you have studied your own life, that most of us are so egotistic, so rooted in our self-centred vanity, that we build a wall around ourselves. Right? If I am aggressive, I have already built a wall round myself, and in that state I want to act. Right? See all this, sir, in yourself. You are actually observing yourself, if you

will, in the mirror which the speaker is presenting. It is your mirror, not my mirror. That we, as human beings, right throughout the world, move, act, from this centre. Right? And as long as we act from this centre there must be conflict. And as we pointed out from the beginning of these talks, our concern is to eliminate conflict, not only national, economic, social conflict, wars, the conflict between various religions, the various doctrines, beliefs, superstitions, rituals - which are part of superstition - as long as there is this divisive element in the mind there must be conflict. And this divisive element exists as long as our action is self-centred. Right? And this self-centred state is the accumulation of knowledge and experience stored in the brain, and in that state there is this constant pursual of the me and my expression. Right?

So our next question is: is it possible to act, to live, without this self-centre? Therefore it is a very serious question, it isn't a Sunday morning evangelistic nonsense; it is something that we have to go into very, very carefully. Because human beings, from the very beginning of time have lived with conflict. And we are still living in that state after millions and millions of years. Therefore there is something radically wrong: in spite of all the philosophies, religions, beliefs, we are still animalistic, we still have this terrible destructive centre from which we act. I hope we are not merely listening to a lot of words, but you are observing your own mind, aware of your own mind working, looking, asking; asking if there is a totally different way of living. Not be caught in the same pattern of a million years. Right? Please put this question to yourself most seriously, because we are destroying ourselves, we are destroying the earth, the air, and we are destroying human

beings.

So our responsibility is tremendous. I am using that word 'responsibility' without any sense of guilt. If you feel responsible you act. But if you don't act don't feel guilty, you are simply not responsible.

So what is this centre? Right? How has it come into being? And we said we would talk about death also. When death takes place the centre of this action ends. You follow? I'll explain, I'll go into it carefully. First, we are asking: can the centre come to an end, and yet live in this life, not go off into some monastery, identified with some ideology, or utopia, and say, I have lost the centre - which would be nonsense. Because you have merely identified the centre with something else. Right? I don't know if you see that. That is, this egotistic activity with its pleasures, fears, anxieties and so on, that centre, that ego, believes in something, and identifies in something - in the image, in a doctrine and so on, or takes a new name - but that centre still remains. You are following this? Good!

So our question is: is it possible to die to that, and yet be alive, active, work, carry on? Which is to carry on without conflict. You follow? So we must enquire, what is this centre to which the mind, the brain, the form, the name cling to? You understand? I don't know if you are following all this? We are asking: what is the nature and structure of the self? Right? What are you? You can only find out if you don't assume anything. Right? If you say, well I must be what I am, then you are not finding out what you are. Or, I believe I am some spiritual entity - again, you can't find out; or if you approach with your prejudice, you can't. So in enquiring into this you must be free to observe. Right? Because observation is not

analysis. You must understand also this carefully. Our whole mind and brain is trained to analyse. That has been our pattern of life. And when one sees that pattern of living has not brought about the ending of conflict, you must enquire in other directions. Right? The other direction is observation. Observation without direction, which means no analysis. Sorry, if there are other analysts here, forgive me! If you don't agree it is all right, but go into it with me, with the speaker.

When you observe, when thought interferes with that observation you are giving it a direction; from your memory, from your motive, from your desire. Right? Then there is no observation. Your desire, your motive, your pleasure directs the observation. Right? So to observe actually what you are, one must approach it freely. And that's our difficulty because our minds are conditioned. And being conditioned, our approach is always limited. Right? So can you, sitting there this morning, talking this over together, be free of that? Free of your prejudice, of your analysis, of your aggression in your analysis, and all that. Just to observe, as you observe your face in the mirror when you comb, or shave your face. Right?

Then what is this I, this ego, this self, that we give such tremendous importance? Because one has to find that out because if that is something actual, not an illusion, something that you can touch, feel, look, and not some illusion that one has created, then one has to find out what is the nature of this me. Because we are going to discuss together, not only what we have talked over in the past, but also what death is. Please, it is related. Surely the 'me' is put together through education, through comparison, through so-

called culture, the so-called idea of individuality, all that is the movement of thought, which has created the 'me'. You understand? Which is so; the me that is aggressive, the me that strongly believes in some fantastic idea, that is romantic, that is terribly lonely, and escaping from that loneliness into all kinds of idiotic nonsense. So all that is me, put there by thought. Right? When you say, soul and all that business, it is still thought. And we are saying from that, action takes place. Right?

Is there an action which is not self-centred? Right? To put it very simply. Which is not egotistically motivated, directed? Because that has brought havoc in the world. Right? Not only in personal relationship but with out neighbours whether they are near or far. Now can this self-centred existence come to an end? And yet be alive in this world, act, think, feel? That is, psychologically we have built a great deal of knowledge about us, can one die to all that psychological knowledge? Right? And is that death? You are following this?

You know we are so afraid of death. We have never enquired into a mind that has not only not fear, which we talked about the other day, but also what is death. Right? You see our mind clings to a continuity. Right? In continuity there is security: I was, I am, I will be. That concept, that idea, gives tremendous strength. Right? I feel secure, safe. And death denies all that. Right? My security, my attachment to all the things I have held together. And we are afraid of that. That is, to enter into something unknown. Right? Because we have always lived with the known. You are following all this? Please do, it is your life: your calamities, your miseries, your depressions, your loneliness, it is your life. You have to face

it one day or the other. That is if you want to understand and live differently without one single problem, without a shadow of conflict, with a great deal of affection and love. That's if you want to do it. But if you don't, carry on, continue in the old pattern, bringing a great deal of misery to yourself and to others, war, and all the misery that goes on in the world. It's up to you.

So our living, our daily living, as we know it, as we are aware of it, is a series of continuous constant struggle, conflict with each other, however intimate you are, confusion about all this, one politician says that, the other says the other, one economist highly placed denies the other economist, one scientist - you know the game that goes on. This constant struggle with each other, within ourselves. That's our living. Right? That's an actuality, not a theory, not something that somebody has imposed upon you, you are that.

So is that what we are frightened of, losing all that? You understand what I am saying? Let me take perhaps a good example, which is attachment - sorry to repeat it again, those who have heard it. One sees the nature and the structure of attachment, the consequences of that attachment: pain, jealousy, anxiety, hatred, pleasure, and a thin line of love, so-called. Going to the office, or the factory, being a secretary, taking some shorthand, you follow, day after day, constantly for the next fifty years. What a tragic way you live. Or you escape from all that into some other idiocy. There too is there conflict, there too is this aggression, pleasure, in a different form, but the same pattern is repeated. And this is what we call living.

And there are all those preachers, priests, so-called religious

authorities, hierarchies, they say, you can't have heaven here, it is up there, you must have faith - right - to understand it, to escape from it, you must have faith. I wonder if you have noticed that religions are based on books. Right? Here Christianity is the Bible, and the Islamic world is the Koran, in the Buddhist and the Hindu world there are many, many books, there is no one book that says, do this. So those religions which are based on books deny doubt. Go into it with me. Right? If you doubt, the whole religious structure comes to an end in the Western world; and it does also in the Buddhist world, and the Hindu world. So faith has taken the place of doubt. I do not know if you have gone into this question of doubt. What an extraordinary cleansing effect it has on the mind. Of course if you doubt everything you end up in a lunatic asylum! But one must know when to doubt. That means you must know when: when you have a dog when you have it on a leash, but you let it go when necessary, when you want it to be free, you can't keep it all the time on a leash, poor dog! So doubt must be held on the leash, and sometimes let go. Which means you start with uncertainty - you understand - not with certainty - please follow this. Books give you certainty. Right? The Bible, this and the other. You have to believe in that. So you start with certainty, and you begin to examine, it ends up in uncertainty. Whereas if you start with uncertainty you may end up with something beyond certainty, beyond everything else. Now we are going to go into that presently.

So can we, in living, intimately or not, be free of attachment immediately, which is death? You understand what I am saying? Do you understand? Death will not argue with you. Death, you

can't say, give me some more time, please wait. But if you know what death is, which is the ending. Right? The ending while you are living; the ending of attachment. You follow now? Which is what death is going to say to you: you must leave everything behind you. But such an ending is frightening. Right? So you believe in reincarnation, you want hope, and all the rest of it; or in heaven, resurrected and all that. Now you see, while we are living can you end something? Not smoking and all that silly stuff, but much more deeply, psychologically; end to your greed, end to your aggression, end to your dogmatic beliefs and experiences, you follow, end it. When you end something there is a totally new beginning. I wonder if you see this? But when you end it through analysis, through will, you are not ending it. Right? This is difficult. All right, I'll explain it.

If there is a motive for ending, then that motive is put together by thought, by desire, and when you analyse and therefore end it, it is still the process of thought - tight - which continues in other forms but you have ended it in a particular direction. Right? Have you understood this? Right?

So we are saying, observe without direction, attachment, or aggression, or your violence. Observe it without any motive, direction, desire, just to observe it, and in that very observation there is an ending of it. And therefore you are inviting death while living. You follow? I wonder if you understand this? Not commit suicide, that's another thing. But the mind that lives in conflict, pain, suffering, without any sense of affection, love, because it is self-centred, and one of the many facets of this self-centre is this aggression, competition, greed; end one of those, or many of those,

immediately, easily, then you are living quite a different kind of life in this world.

So death is while living. You understand? Do you understand this? Not at the end of life when you are old, gaga and diseased, unconscious, go through all that misery, you understand. But to end the things that the mind has collected, easily, with certain grace, so that there is a different quality of the mind. You understand? Such a mind has not this continuity and constancy.

And also we ought to talk over together as two friends, a very, very complex problem - all life is a complex problem, unfortunately - also about religion, meditation, if there is something beyond all matter. You understand my questions?

Religions, or rather man has always enquired if there is something more than material existence: the daily routine, the work, this loneliness, the incessant pain and sorrow, man from the ageless time has asked if there is something beyond. He has always been seeking it; and the priests and the minds that want to make an institution of that, the searching, the asking, those have made it into a religion. Right? Made it into an organization, an institution. So the man who is seeking is caught in that. I don't know if you see. So one has to find out if you are caught in that. Or your enquiry; not believing, not faith, but enquiry, observing, asking. Right? That is, asking if there is something more than this existence, this material welfare, whether there is something far beyond man's limited existence. Right? We are going to go into that, together; not me go into it and you listen. That's very easy; when you leave you forget all this, what you have listened to, but if it is your life, your everyday concern, then it's yours.

How do you - not how - in what manner do you enquire into this? You understand? Our minds, our brains, are the result of time. A million years, and many more million years, it has evolved, grown, accumulated all kinds of knowledge, through experience, through pain; our brain is that. Always seeking security, both physically and psychologically, its very essence is, give me security. Because when the brain and the mind are completely secure then there is quite a different state of mind. But unfortunately our brain and our minds and our reactions and so on have not found security, either in the physical world, or in the inner world, in the world of psychology, in the psyche; neither there nor here. After a million years we are still groping after this. And not finding it thought invents god, saviours, masters - you follow? They will give us security. That's why the gurus and all the priesthood grow like mushrooms, offering you all kinds of things, including the clever psychologists, and the philosophers.

So first, is there security? You understand? Please ask yourselves. Is there security in your relationship with another? To bring it down to earth! Obviously not, you would like to have it. And that security means constancy, right, a continuity. Have you that in your relationship? If you are honest, obviously not. But the mind is seeking this. If it can't find it, it invents an illusion and hopes in that illusion to have security. Right? You understand? So the mind, thought, which is part of the mind and brain, thought is seeking this constant movement of security. Right? And not finding it there it must inevitably invent something which becomes an illusion. That also is a reality. Right? Illusion is a reality.

So the mind must be free to understand, to investigate, if there

is something beyond matter. The mind must be free of any kind of illusion. Right? Illusion is belief; illusion is faith; illusion is dependence. You follow? So can the mind be free of any form of illusion, otherwise it can't go further? Not you, the brain, the mind cannot move further. That is to be aware that you have illusions, and end it, not keep in the background and try to investigate, then you are playing games. So can the mind be free of the desire to create illusions? Right? That's part of meditation, not just sitting in a place and for ten minutes be silent, morning, afternoon, evening, whenever you do it, and the rest of the day be mischievous, egocentric. Right?

So scientists, astrophysicists, are always asking this question, if they are serious, not merely inventive and business scientists: is there something beyond matter? You understand? Is there something beyond thought? Because thought is matter. Right? Because it is held in the brain cells, the memory, experience, knowledge, held in the brain cells, therefore it is still matter. And thought is matter. You are following? You may not accept it, go into it, examine it. So is there something beyond matter? How will you find out? Scientists and others, astrophysicists and so on, are looking out there. Right? Outside of themselves. Right? We are saying, when you know how to look at yourself, which is also matter - understanding yourself, looking at yourself, there it is much more real than the other, this you can test - you understand. From your daily actions you can test it - that becomes merely a theory. I don't know if you are following all this? Are you, sir? I hope you are enjoying this sunny weather; if you are not interested in this, look at the trees, the beauty of the trees, the sun through the

leaves and the distant mountains and their light, the beauty of the sky. But if you are sensitive to that then you will be sensitive to what is being said.

So what is the state of the mind, consciousness, that can discover - I am using the word 'know' in a rather wide sense. You know the word 'know' is very limited, isn't it? You can say to your wife, "I know you", but do you actually know your wife, or your husband, boy friend, you don't. You only know according to the image that you have built about her or him. So here the word 'know' becomes - when you say "I know something beyond", you have destroyed it. You understand what I am saying?

So meditation is not something you practise. It is the understanding of the whole movement of life. Right? The sorrow, the pain, the anxiety, the aggression, the loneliness, otherwise if the mind isn't free of all that your meditation is worthless. You understand? You know these gurus that have come from India have brought over their many, many forms of systems, superstitions, and concepts. There are the Tibetan meditation, the Zen meditation, the meditation to awaken - I am just using their phraseology, don't jump on me - meditation to awaken their kundalini, various forms of yoga. Yoga, the real meaning of that word, is to join. Right? That is to join, according to them, to join the lower material existence to the highest. The practices of yoga, you know, you breathe, take various postures and all that, was invented about the 18th or the 17th century by a man, or a group of people who wanted occult powers. Which is through control, through forcing - you follow - through direction, they said this might awaken extra sensory perception - I am putting it into modern words! And they

have been practising it. But there is only one yoga, which is called Raja yoga, in which there is no practice, no artificial exercises; walking, swimming, natural, and a tremendously moral life in which there is integrity. You follow? That is real yoga, not all this thing that you play along with.

And when you understand the nature of a system in meditation you understand all the systems. Right? Whether it is the Tibetan, Zen, or your own particular kind of native guru, not the imported gurus but your own native ones; if you understand one systems of theirs you have understood all the systems with regard to meditation. Which is, they are based essentially on control, concentration, practice. Right? Do this and that everyday. That is, including Zen, to make the mind more and more dull, which is to repeat, repeat, repeat. You understand? I hope you understand all this.

And these gurus also come along and give you what they call mantra. You have heard about all this. I am sorry you are burdened by all this business. The word 'mantra' means, the root of it, 'man', 'tra', two different words. The first word, 'man', means meditate - listen to it carefully - meditate, or ponder over not becoming. You understand? Not to become something: 'tra' means - I am bored with all this stuff! 'Tra' means put away all self-centred activity. You understand? Mantra means meditate, or ponder over, be concerned with not becoming. You understand? You understand that, sir? Don't become anything. You may become something in the material world, but don't become inwardly anything. And if you have any self-centred activity, put away that. That is the real meaning of that. And look what they have reduced it to!

So system, whether Tibetan, Burmese, Zen, or the Hindu, or the Christian, when there is a repetition, which means you repeat hoping to achieve something, and that system is invented by your guru, or your super guru and so on, and you merely follow. Right? That is, follow some authority. Therefore your mind becomes infantile, narrow, mechanical, without any substance behind it. So when you understand one system, finished. You understand? You don't have to go to Japan to understand the Zen Buddhism, or go to India, or all the rest of it. The word Zen comes from the word, Sanskrit word Ch'an. It went first after the Buddhist period, or during the Buddhist period to China, a monk carried it there. And as the Chinese and the Japanese cannot probably pronounce Ch'an, they turned it into Zen. And that has become almost sacred!

So meditation is the ending, the ending of your greed, the ending of your attachment. Right? Because then only the mind is free; then only the mind has no problems. It is only such a mind that can go beyond. That is, the mind with its consciousness - the consciousness is made up of all the content, you understand, the content makes consciousness; your greed, your envy, your anxiety, your loneliness, your beliefs, your attachments, your pursuit of safety, you follow, all that is the content of our consciousness. And to go beyond to find out - or rather to see, to observe if there is something beyond all this, the mind must be completely free of all its content. This is rational, this is not illogical. You understand? Then the mind is empty. Emptiness is full of energy. They are also saying that, the scientists. Right? When the mind is empty there is nothing; nothing which means not a thing created by thought. Such a mind being empty, that mind is full of energy. Right? You don't

know about it, don't go into it unless you have done all the other things it is just a lot of words.

Then is there something beyond energy, what is the origin of energy? Not god, all that has been set aside completely. Is there something beyond this energy, the origin of this energy? There is if a mind is totally empty, knows compassion and love, such a mind will come upon it.

What time is it sir?

Q: Five minutes to one.

K: Oh, I am so sorry, it is five minutes to one. Sorry to have kept you so long.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 6TH JULY 1980

We are going to have seven talks and several question and answer meetings so we will go very slowly and quietly into the whole problem of human existence. Please don't be impatient if I repeat some things which have already been said. And we are going to deal with meditation, love, compassion, fear and all the travail of human life - the sorrows, the terrors, the violence - we are going to go into all these matters quietly, logically, and perhaps sanely.

It is becoming more and more evident that it is not the environment that matters, not the starvation, not the poverty, not the injustice, not all the things that exist around us; what is becoming more and more evident is that human beings are themselves becoming the terror of this world. Human beings themselves are destroying each other, human beings are dividing themselves into tribes, into nationalities, into classes, into every kind of destructive, divisive process. The Communists and the Socialists and all the politicians will never transform the world; nor the scientists. The astrophysicists who are exploring the universe outside of themselves, they are not going to find the solution either. And so human beings, that is we, you and another, we are bringing about great chaos in the world, we are bringing great terror, we are becoming a danger to each other. Our religions, the organized beliefs, dogmas, rituals and all that absurd nonsense without much meaning are dividing the people - wars, preparations for wars, nuclear bombs, you know the whole terror of this world. And some of us are trying to escape from all this, going off into little communes, joining monasteries, or following some Asiatic gurus

away from this monstrous world, but they also cannot possibly solve the problems. You cannot escape from what is. Neither have ideologies helped man: on the contrary the Communist ideologies, the ideologies of the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Christians, they are again dividing man, destroying man. And human beings, because there is so much confusion, want or desire to commit themselves to something, to some group, to some idea, to some activity. And this commitment to something, to some philosophy, to some outrageous nonsensical gurus, is the desire of human beings to depend, to rely, to commit themselves to some beliefs, ideas, concepts.

And during these talks we hope that we can think about all these matters sanely, not antagonistically, not meeting each other with arguments, opinion against opinion, a conclusion against another conclusion, but rather together, you and I, the speaker, be concerned with all these matters. And if it is possible to think together, not agreeing together, not opposing each other, not contending against ideas, opinions, but rather together, each one of us, think about these matters. One cannot possibly think clearly and so together if we are committed to one experience and hold on to that experience. Or if you are very learned, have read a lot of books, steeped in philosophies, theories and ideas, whether it is Marxist or the Christian theologians, or the Hindu pundits, we cannot then think together. That is obvious.

That is, if you are very learned, if you are clinging to a certain belief or to a certain experience which you yourselves have had, and hold on to those, how is it possible to think together? Those experiences, conclusions, beliefs will prevent you from exchange.

So, if you will kindly put aside all those, if you can, then we can meet each other, because the speaker has no beliefs, no values, doesn't belong to any group or religion, he is not trying to do any kind of propaganda, to persuade you to think in a particular direction, or to convince you of what he is talking about. We must be very clear on this matter from the very beginning. There is no belief demanded or asked, there are no followers, there are no cults, there is no persuasion of any kind, in any direction, and therefore only then we can meet on the same platform, on the same ground, at the same level. Then we can together observe the extraordinary phenomena of human existence. And I hope that is very clear.

First of all I would like to ask, if I may, why human beings who have lived on this earth for five, ten million years, why are they after such a lengthy period of time, experience and sorrow, why are they still carrying on the same pattern? What is wrong? What has happened to man's brain and heart after these millions of years? I do not know if you have asked such a question: why through a million years and more of evolution, time, gathering immense knowledge, experience, the travails of everyday life for millions and millions of years, why we are still like that? Do you understand my question? Why after such a lengthy period of time we are still suffering, we are still hating each other, we are still living in some kind of peculiar personal illusions? Why we are tribal, committed to tribalism? Do you understand my question? Why? What is the cause of all this? There have been thousands of philosophers, the leftists and the rightists and the centralists, there have been every kind of religious teachers, some so-called saints

who are really not saints at all, they are probably neurotic people, why the theologians of the past in the Christian world - perhaps for a much longer period in the Asiatic world, the pundit, the scholars, all this vast accumulation of knowledge has apparently not solved any of our problems. You understand? This is a very serious question: why human beings, you and another and perhaps oneself, why we go on in this way? What is the cause of it?

From the very beginning of time man has lived in conflict, not only with his environment but also with his neighbour, with his wife, with the woman he caught or dragged into the cave, it has been a constant battle, constant strife, endless misery, suffering for generation upon generation. We are not exaggerating, these are facts. We study history, which is really the story of man - his violence, his wars, his gathering of the land for himself and his family. Man has always apparently been destructive. And religions have tried to tame him, make him a little more peaceful, a little more gentle, a little more considerate. But apparently they too have not succeeded, whether in the Christian world - and perhaps the Christian world has destroyed more human beings than any other race. They talk about peace and love and they are responsible for murdering millions and millions and millions of people. The Asiatic world with their superstitions, with their innumerable gods, but they have not been so violent: their religion says, "Don't kill", but when circumstances force them they kill, they are as destructive as the West.

So, observing all this, which everyone must have seen, thought about, why is it after a million years and many many million years, what has gone wrong with the human mind? The brain has evolved

through time, your brain is the result of thousands and thousands of years. It is not your particular brain, though we think it is our brain, the individual brain. If you examine it very carefully it is the human brain, genetically, racially, this brain has grown and evolved through time, which is obvious. And it has followed certain patterns of living, always trying to seek security, both physically as well as psychologically. Its pre-eminent demand has been to find, at any price, security. And is that the cause of this present chaos and misery and confusion and terror? You understand? Is that the cause, this eternal demand for personal security? Though the brain, your brain and mine, each individual brain is the result of great evolution, it is not your brain, it is the human brain. You can talk about it, you can ask questions about it later. But even the scientists are beginning to discover - at least some of them - that this brain is not yours or mine, it has grown through time, evolved. So it is the human brain. And that brain has sought security, inwardly, outwardly. And is that the cause of this terrible chaos in the world? You know if there is a cause for anything there is an end to the cause - right? Do you see this? If there is a cause for physical pain there is an end to the physical pain, they can find it. If there is a cause for psychological disturbance, chaos, misery, the cause can be found and ended. So where there is a cause, a beginning, there is also an ending. And is our present degeneration, the danger, is that the result after all these millenia? Is the cause separateness, individuality? You are following all this, please. I am not laying down the law. We are together thinking about all this. So you must exercise your brain as the speaker is doing, not merely listen, but if you do listen with

care, with attention, then perhaps we will meet each other. But if you are merely casually listening and thinking about other things then we shall not meet each other, there is no communication.

We are asking, this is a very serious matter, we are trying to find out together whether there is a cause for all this misery, for all this terrible chaos, uncertainty, terror, wars - a root cause? And if one can discover it, not somebody tell you the cause and you agree with it, but if you, yourself, discover or come upon it through observation, you yourself will then be free of the cause and therefore of the effect.

So we are asking: is this confusion, misery, the result of the human brain seeking, at all levels of life, security? Is that the cause? Though one must have security physically - clothes, food, a roof over one's head - one must have that. But psychologically, inwardly, is there security at all? One may seek it - we will go into this matter more deeply presently. And is this chaos the cause of this idea, a concept that each one of us is a separate entity? Because we have never gone into the question that the brain of each one of us is the common brain of humanity. We are enquiring into that. And this desire for security may have brought about this concept of the individual - me and you. We as a group against another group. Is that the cause? Or is there also another cause, which is: ideas, ideals, that is, the very substance of knowledge? This is rather difficult. You understand what we are talking about? Are we going together so far? Please I am not talking to myself. You have taken the trouble to come here in this unpleasant weather, uncomfortable and so please kindly pay attention - if you also desire.

Because knowledge has become all important in the world. Technological knowledge - if you want to be a good carpenter you must spend many, many years learning, accumulating knowledge about the wood, the tools, the design, and acquiring great knowledge as a carpenter then that knowledge is used skilfully and so on. And if you are a scholar you acquire a great deal of knowledge, read a great many books, storing up in the brain as memory and giving importance to knowledge, and assuming that knowledge will gradually through time, through accumulation of more and more knowledge that you will ascend to heaven. And knowledge as a surgeon, as a philosopher, not only of outward things but also the psychological structure of man, structure of the mind, is that knowledge the cause of this present misery? Do you understand? I hope you are following all this. We are not talking to please you, to entertain you; there are cinemas, football, tennis courts, every form of entertainment outside exists. So this is not an intellectual or, if one may use an ugly word, spiritual entertainment, or romantic, emotional froth! Because this is a very serious matter into which we are going: why human beings, with all the immense accumulated knowledge, why through all these years and millenia they are still the same, a little more sophisticated, a little more polished but the same psychological brutality, cruelty, not only to each other but to animals, to the world around them; why? What has happened to us? You understand my question sirs?

As we said, where there is a cause there is an ending of that cause. If we can understand that principle: if you have a toothache there is a cause for it, and there is an ending of that pain. Similarly

where there is a psychological cause there is an ending of that cause, you understand? Please meet me on this. A war, there is a cause to war, economic, national, prestige, power, and so on. There is a cause to war, it is a division of nationalities, division of ideologies, the totalitarian and the non-totalitarian, the democratic, so-called democratic and the autocratic. And when one sees the wars are a result of all this, there is a cause to war and therefore war can be ended, but nobody seems to want to end it. So if we can understand the principle, the truth that where there is a cause, that cause can be ended. You understand this?

So we are trying to find out, trying to observe together what is the cause of the extraordinary things that are going on in our life. What is the essence of that cause? Is it that the very beginning of man and also woman - don't get het up when I don't mention woman - when man and woman began, is it that they took a wrong turn? Look at it please, go into it. Why should we suffer? If man is the creation of god, god must be a rather horrible entity, a monstrous entity that is making human beings go through hell - right? He must be total disorder because we live in disorder, if he created us. If he created us and we are killing each other through terror, bombs, kidnapping - you know all the terrible things that are happening in the world, if you are created in his image, that image must be monstrous. Obviously it is quite evident that man is responsible. Nobody outside of us, no gods, no angels, no Brahman or Higher - none of that is responsible for this, we are responsible. And what is the cause of this? Do you understand now? Is the cause selfishness? Is the cause the accumulated knowledge - please listen carefully - we are not against knowledge, knowledge is

necessary, to drive a car, to learn a language, to operate an electronic, and so on and so on, knowledge is necessary. But the psychological knowledge that one has accumulated, generation after generation, is that the cause? Is it that the knowledge has been translated psychologically into concepts, into your belief and my belief - you are following all this? Please sirs don't go to sleep! If you are really deeply concerned about this, which everyone must be, why we live this way, so-called civilized human beings, with cars, marvellous surgeries, excellent communication, transport and all the rest of it, but psychologically inwardly, inside the skin, we have become terrors, we have become the most dangerous people on earth. Right? We may be occasionally kind, occasionally loving, unselfish, but this separate individual unselfishness and so on has not solved the problem. It is not poverty, starvation, disease that is the problem, it is us, our consciousness.

So how shall we find out what is the cause of this degeneracy, this great cruelty, bestiality, indifference, you know? How will you find out? By the speaker telling you? I know you want that. That would be the easiest thing, wouldn't it, because our minds are always seeking the easiest way. But the speaker cannot tell you, and will not tell you. Then where are you? You follow? Please face this because it is your responsibility to find out. To find the cause of this state of the world.

You know, if you love, if there is the sense of great compassion in your heart, this question still remains. You may follow somebody, the more Asiatic they are the more romantic and more nonsensical. None of them have asked this question, or have ever actually answered it. They have theories, the Hindus have gone

into this and invented a theory, and the Christians say the original sin - that is a very convenient theory, then you can have Saviours and all the rest follows.

So how will you, as a human being, feeling responsible, because your brain, your whole psychological structure is the result of many many, many million years, that structure is not yours, every human being in the world is of that structure. Because they suffer in China, in the Far East and in the Middle East and here, in the West, they are cruel, there is no sense of affection, care, there is divorce, there is every kind of brutality going on. And each one of us is part of that. And if you feel tremendously responsible for all this, as you must if you are at all awake and aware of what is happening in the world, how will you enquire, how will you find out? Do you understand my question? Are you sufficiently earnest to give your time and your heart, your mind to find out? Not how to meditate, that comes much later. Not what is yoga and all that business. We can talk about that too, later. But this is far more important than all that because if you can find the cause there is an ending to that cause. If there is a discovery of what is the cause of sorrow of every human being in the world, then that sorrow can be ended.

Why is there such conflict between human beings, what is the cause of it? When you discover the cause it can be ended. Not through time, that is to say, "I will take time to find out the cause, I will spend a week meditating about it, thinking about it, pondering about it, discussing it". That is again allowing time to discover the cause. Our brains - please follow all this - our brains are the result of time - right? Which is evolution, from the small micro cell to

this enormous complex human being, to arrive at this stage has taken thousands of years, which is time. And we think in terms of time. That is, how can I found out the cause? You understand my question? And we are now going to spend time discussing it. You have understood what I am saying? Or can you be free of time and observe? You understand what I am saying? Would you admit that your brain is the result of time? Right? Though it is born, when it is born as a baby it is small, but as it grows older it gathers strength, vitality, more blood to the brain and the more it grows. And this is the process of man and so this process is common to all of us, and this process is not yours, your petty little brain. It is the brain of all humanity, which suffers, which designs, which calculates, which creates images, which creates gods - you follow? - the whole thing is common to all of us.

And time is the pattern in which the brain lives - right? - pursues. Observe your own brain, how it acts, how it thinks. The speaker is not a specialist in brains, though he has discussed it with specialists who agree, some of them, some of them don't agree. Some of them go very far with the speaker, some of them say it is all nonsense. Listen to all this: which is, the scientists are investigating matter and through the investigation of matter they want to find out the ultimate. You follow all this? That is, through matter they are trying to find out the ultimate. We are the matter. You understand? You are matter, your brain is matter; and they go outside and investigate, they don't begin with themselves. You understand what I am saying? And if they went into themselves they would come upon something most fantastically original, creative, beyond all time. But that requires tremendous observation

of oneself, tremendous energy to give to this. But nobody wants to do that because that is not popular. That brings you nothing, no money, no position, no power, no status. But it is only through oneself which is matter, it is only through oneself that you can come upon that thing which is the beginning of all things.

So we are asking: what is the way, the manner, how is one to find out the cause of all this? Or there are several causes? Cause 'A' may be that man in conquering the environment at the beginning of time, gradually built himself the idea that he is separate, he is an individual against other individuals. 'B' may be this sense of continuous idea, concept of individuality is the cause. Or it may be another, 'C' may be this tremendous psychological knowledge. This is difficult. Please go into it carefully.

You have gathered knowledge within the last twenty, thirty, fifty, sixty years as a separate individual - my experience, my belief, my consciousness. And this belief, this concept, this experience, which is after all knowledge, psychological knowledge which we have gathered, is that the cause? Or it is none of these? Do you understand my question? Is this becoming too difficult, too abstract? No, it is not abstract, it is not something that you read in a book and put it aside, not something that some philosopher invents and then you read and you agree or disagree. It is something actual, you are facing it now. This is not then a concept, an idea, we are dealing with actualities of our daily life, which is so enormously complex. Or the cause may be - I am not telling you, you have to go into it yourself, for god's sake move - when I use the words "For god's sake" it is just"... Or is it the beginning of thought? Please go into it carefully. Is this spreading complex cruelty of man, his

behaviour, his vanity, his terrible cruelty to everything, is the cause of that thought? You understand?

Thought and knowledge go together. Knowledge is always compounded in ignorance - right? That is, knowledge can never be complete, whole, and therefore it is always within the shadow of ignorance - right? Of course. This is logical. There is no complete knowledge about anything, even about the computers, or about your wife, or your husband, or girl or whatever it is. So knowledge is always within the shadow of ignorance, so knowledge is always incomplete. And is thought, which is the child of knowledge, is that the cause? Are you following all this? You have to exercise thought when you drive a car. You have to exercise thought when you do your business, in the office, or in the factory or in the home, when you cook, when you wash dishes, whatever one does, physically, one must have knowledge. Psychologically is knowledge necessary at all? You follow what I am saying? Please go into it carefully. And is the origin, cause, of all this existence with all its chaos, misery, confusion, uncertainty, etc. etc. is thought the cause of all this? And if thought is the cause of it then thought can be ended. You follow? Where there is a cause there is an end. Where there is a beginning there is an ending. If you are addicted, or if you are a smoker, there was a cause and you can end it. So similarly, if thought is the cause of this state of the world then that can be ended. And with the ending there is a new beginning, totally different from that which thought has put together. You are following all this? So is thought the origin of all this?

Would you like the speaker to go into all this? Not for you to

follow, I am not your guru. Thank god! I am not your leader. I am not your philosopher. But the speaker has gone into this matter very, very deeply, all his life he has done this. And has come to a point where he has found for himself, found, realized the cause of all this. And meditation is only when you have discovered the cause and the ending of the cause, then meditation begins.

Meditation isn't what you are all doing. Forgive me pointing it out. Trying to concentrate, trying to follow methods, systems, and all that, that is not meditation. Meditation comes naturally, uninvited when you have finished with all the cause - right? So the function of the speaker, without any vanity, without any sense of doing propaganda, he says, let us walk together and find out. Let us walk together on the same road, on the same path, not your path or my path, the path of intelligence, which is not your intelligence or the speaker's. That intelligence is to discover the cause. When there is the discovery of the cause there is that supreme intelligence, which in its very nature is compassionate love.

So we are asking one question, perhaps there is no other cause but this one cause, thought. You see man has never gone into this question of thought. They are just beginning, scientists are beginning to enquire. The Hindus have gone into it up to a certain point, the ancient Hindus, and stopped somewhere else. But we, the common people, ordinary people with our daily problems and anxieties, our attachments, and our griefs and our pains, we are asking this question: is all this the result of thought? Thought includes feeling, sensation, the perils, the fears, all that is part of thought. And if thought has created this world in which we live, some of it is great beauty: the marvellous cathedrals, the mosques,

the temples, the poems, the literature; but what is inside the cathedrals, the mosques, the temples is put there by thought. The speaker once some years ago, in India, was speaking all over India and he happened to be behind Mr. Gandhi. And Mr. Gandhi, Mahatma Gandhi whatever you like to call him, was saying that everybody could enter the temples. At that time only the Brahmans could enter into the temples. And he was saying "Gods are in the temple, anybody can enter". So the speaker was following him, next week he came to the same town, and so they asked him, to catch him out because he was a Brahmana, they said, "What do you say, should non-Brahmans enter temples?" And it was a very simple answer: god doesn't exist in temples! If he exists at all it is somewhere else, totally outside of man's thought - right? But they didn't like that!

So I am asking you if thought is the result of this chaos? And if thought is the cause of this chaos thought can end and something totally new can begin. And it is your responsibility as a human being, not as an individual, as a human being, a human being who is in China, in India, in the Asiatic world, in the Arabic and in the Middle East, the West, that human being is asking this question. Is that the cause? And if it is the cause then how that cause can be dissipated and therefore the ending of it? Therefore from the ending of it a new beginning, a totally new beginning, which is the real revolution, not the Communist, not the Terrorist, and so on. What is your responsibility and what is your answer to that question? You understand? The ball is in your court! You understand that term? When they are playing tennis the ball is in the opposite court. So how will you answer this question? Together

during all these talks and question and answer meetings we will help each other to find this out - right? For you to find it out so that you are not a follower, so that you have no authority over you to tell you what to think and what to do, then you are a complete human being.

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 8TH JULY 1980

May we go on with what we were talking about on Sunday? We were saying that human beings have evolved for millions of years. Evolution implies time, not only physical time but psychological, inward, time. Man has grown from the very beginning of time, of his existence, through various experiences, calamities, accidents, fears, anxieties and so on. Our brain has evolved in that direction. And I think no one can dispute that point. And so it has formed a pattern, a pattern, a mould according to which it lives. This pattern, this mould is the process of time, which is called evolution. And so the brain and the mind, both are the same, can never be free. I hope you are thinking this over together, this is not propaganda, or persuading you to think in any particular direction. We are thinking together, trying to find out the causes why human beings live the way we are living, though we have had a million years of experiences, sorrow, fear, pleasure and so on. We were asking yesterday, or the day before, why, what is the cause of all this terror, misery, confusion, uncertainty? And we were saying that one of the causes may be that from the very beginning man has sought security, not only in the environment, but also inward security. That may be one of the causes of this present calamity.

And also we said it may be that during all this evolutionary time man has cultivated the idea of individuality - the me and the you. The me separate, struggling, fighting against you to survive. And that may be one of the causes of this present misery, confusion, terror. And also we said one of the major causes may be thought itself. And we pointed out, where there is a cause there can also be

an end to that cause. I think this we must clearly understand right from the beginning. A cause, a beginning, a motive, which has its own effect and that causation can continue all the time. And that cause can be ended. I think this is obvious if you go into it for yourself.

As we said on Sunday, if you have physical pain there is a cause for that pain. And that cause, that pain can be ended. Similarly, psychologically there may be a cause for our suffering, for our fears, anxieties, and so on. And that cause, if there is a cause, can be ended. This is a law, this is so.

And we were asking on Sunday, what is the basic cause of all this confusion? Is there one cause? Or several causes? I do not know if you have gone into it and thought over it, or merely passed it by and have not given your attention to it to find out for yourself, but as we go along perhaps we shall be able to find out the one cause, or several causes. If there are several causes for our misery, is it possible to analyse these causes? Please go very carefully with me, we are thinking together, I am not telling you what to think. We are not doing any kind of propaganda. The speaker is not persuading you in any direction. Because we must be free to observe and find out, and therefore there is no authority, there is no group, or sect, or person, who will tell you. You have to be so alert to find out for yourselves.

So we are saying: are there many causes for this? Or there is only one supreme cause, which includes all other causes? You are following? We said, one of the causes may be this constant desire for security, to be safe, to be protected, to feel that one is stable, without any uncertainty. And we said also there may be a cause,

which is that man has always thought of himself as an individual, separate from the whole of humanity, and therefore he has built a wall of division between himself and the rest, and that may be one of the causes. And the other causes may be thought itself.

So man and his brain and mind have been moulded through time, through what is called evolution, millions and millions of years. And time has not given him freedom. He may be free outwardly. He can go about from country to country, from job to job, from one business to another, certainly not in the totalitarian countries but in the democratic, so-called democratic society there is a certain amount of freedom physically. But psychologically, inwardly, the mind which includes the brain, has been moulded through time, and therefore it is never, never free. And it may be one of the causes that man has made himself a prisoner psychologically and therefore there is no freedom for him to flower. Right? I hope we are meeting each other. Please, if I may ask, we are thinking together. You have to exercise your mind, your brain, your heart to find this out because if we don't we are going to destroy each other. That is what is happening in the world. One nation becoming more important than the other, one tribe more important than the other, building up armaments - you know all the rest of it. Four hundred thousand million dollars in war every year. You understand the craziness of this?

So the brain, the mind, which are one, has never been free. And without freedom man cannot flower. He cannot possibly go beyond himself. And that may be one of the major causes of our confusion because inwardly we are not free. We have been moulded through time to certain patterns. If you have observed your own mind, your

own brain in operation you can find out very easily that we have repeated a certain pattern, walked along a certain path for a million years. We have been brainwashed by the priests for two thousand years in the West, brainwashed in the East for perhaps three, four, five thousand years and more. So our brains are conditioned. Our brains are moulded according to a certain edict, sanctions - sanctions by the teachers, by the philosophers, by the priests. The priests acting between you and that. They are the saviours. Perhaps that was good at a certain time, in Ancient Egypt, Ancient Eastern civilizations, but now that kind of thing has become rather infantile.

So what is the cause of all this? Man technologically, intellectually, scientifically, in all those directions has evolved enormously. He has become extraordinarily clever, erudite, capable, not only to kill each other but to heal each other - medicine, surgery and so on. And as we pointed out the other day, science is trying to find through matter the ultimate. If you have talked with scientists it is so. That is, through matter, outside, and investigate, investigate, investigate, accumulate a great deal of knowledge about the outer, and hoping to find out through that the original, the origin of all this. The scientists are doing that.

The religious people say there is god. And that god has created this world. That god must be rather a miserable god, rather confused, rather corrupt god to make this world as it is. Or you have your own particular pet theory as to the origin of all this. Intellectually conceived, intellectually comprehending the many philosophers, the theologians, the theoreticians, the Communists as well as the Christian theologians, and so on, you might have

certain conclusions, opinions, judgements. But if you want to find out the origin of all this you must set aside everything of all that, obviously. And that demands not only a certain quality of strength, of perception, but it requires very careful observation, not analysis. Again analysis is the pattern of time. We have analysed, analysed, analysed, not only the world outside of us but also philosophers, psychologists, psychotherapists have analysed our minds and have come to certain conclusions, certain concepts and so on. And we are conditioned by these people. And to find out what is the original cause of all this one must be free of all that, otherwise there is no freedom. Freedom is not to go from this village to that village, or freedom of choice in a job, freedom of speech, freedom of this and that, but real freedom lies when the mind and the brain, when the whole organism of psychological structure is free from all the patterns, from all the moulds, from all the impositions of others on our minds and heart.

So if you are serious, and I hope you are, and you must be coming and sitting here in spite of this awful weather, I hope you are serious enough to go into all this. It is not just this morning or the day before yesterday, but it will be a continuous enquiry, observation. Don't please say, "I have heard him. I have understood", or "He is talking nonsense", and walk out. One must have a great deal of patience. Impatience is time. Patience is not time. Patience means observation, close careful, critical, step by step observation. That is real patience. In that observation there is no time. But if you are impatient to get on then you are running ahead without understanding the beginning.

So what is the cause of this misery? Is it the demand for

security? Is it this illusion that we are separate? That our brain is totally different from another brain? Our minds, our behaviour is different from you and another? Or is it thought? There is no Western thought or Eastern thought. Thought is thought whether you live in Asia, Far East or Middle East or in the West, it is still thought. Maybe thinking in a particular way, or in a particular direction, in a certain pattern, but that is still thought. Whether that thought is employed, exercised in the East or in the West, it is still thought. Perhaps conditioned by the environment in the West or in the East, but it is still thinking. So is that the cause of all this? Because if you have observed historically man has gone on in this way of living: fighting each other, strife, conflict, unhappiness, anxiety, a sense of constant abiding fear, and the pursuit of pleasure, suffering, and a flash of love, translated as sex, and the idea of compassion - which is merely an idea but not something living.

So we are going together - please we are walking on the same road together, I am not leading you, I am not telling you, I am not assuming any authority though I sit on a platform. And I really mean all this. So we are walking together to find out, not through analysis. We must go into this question of analysis. When there is analysis there is division. The analyser and the analysed - right? The one assumes he knows and therefore he is able to analyse. Observe your own minds sirs, this is happening all the time when we are analysing. In the process of analysis time is necessary. "I may not be able to analyse clearly today but I am going to learn, acquire knowledge of how to analyse" - and that implies day after day or month after month, or week after week and gradually learn

the art of analysis. Analysis implies there is a division of the analyser and the analysed - right? So there is constant interpretation between the two, inter-relations between the two, one judging the other - you are following all this? - one imposing his dictum on the other. All that implies not only time but constant division between the two - right? Right? Are we going along together, please?

And this division has been one of our conditionings that the analyser is totally different from the analysed. But is that so? Is not the analyser the analysed? Are we going along together? When I analyse my anxiety, I, in analysing that thing called anxiety, how do I know that it is anxiety? You are following all this? Because I remember the previous experience of anxiety, I have remembered that, it is stored up in my brain, and the next time that a reaction takes place I recognize it and say that is anxiety. So there is always this division constantly maintained. But the fact is, if you observe, when you are angry you are not different from anger. Only later on you say, "I have been angry". I wonder if you are following all this? Please, right, can I go on? Encourage me. Don't encourage me! (Laughter).

So when one realizes analysis maintains this division constantly, the I, the observer, is different from the observed, psychologically I am talking about, not that I am different from the tree, I am different, but psychologically this division is the essence of conflict, the essence of trying to be something which you are not, and therefore struggle. That is the pattern in which the brain has lived - right? And we are saying: that a process of analysis doesn't bring about freedom at all. On the contrary, it maintains

constant conflict. And a mind, a brain, in constant conflict must wear itself out, it is never fresh, it is never flowering, but is in conflict along the same path. Are we together in this? Do we see this? I am afraid you won't because you may be analysts. It may be your profession. And when you are tied to something you have already entered the path of corruption. Right? You are following all this? Please don't be angry with me or upset. I am just pointing out the facts. Either you can look at the facts and act, or you say, "It is too much for me. As an analyst I depend on my wife, responsibility, my children, my position, my Cadillacs, my Rolls Royce, my - whatever car it is" - and carry on. But if you are serious in your enquiry into all this you must give your mind entirely to it.

So analysis prevents clear observation. To observe is much more important than to have an analytical mind. We have lost the power of observation, but we have cultivated the art of analysis. We never observe clearly what is going on in our minds and hearts without any distortion. And as our minds and hearts are so distorted, so corrupt, we think that corruption, that distortion can be straightened out through analysis. And therefore that analysis is never clearly seeing the importance of it, the insignificance of it because we are committed to it. It is like a man committed to a belief will never see himself how ridiculous it is.

So we are saying what is important is to observe the activity of our own minds and hearts. And that observation is prevented if there is any form of distortion, any form of direction, which means any motive. Therefore it requires an extraordinarily attentive mind. Right? Are we moving together? It may be something new, or

something you haven't heard before, or you have read it in some book or other. You know it would be marvellous if you had read no book. Personally I haven't. If you have read no book at all, heard no preacher, no priest, no philosopher, no guru, and you can then come to it fresh, come to it so that you can observe your whole complete structure. But unfortunately you are all very clever people, well read, or read sloppily, picking up a little bit here, a little bit there, and think that by adding it all up you have some knowledge. Whereas if you are observing - it is really marvellous if you can do it, because in that there is freedom to observe, and that is the essence of freedom. Without that you cannot possibly enter into all this.

I hope you are working as hard as the speaker is doing.

So we are saying: unless the cause is found there is no ending to the pattern - right? What is the cause of all this, of human misery? That is, you are humanity - please see this - you are humanity, your brain has grown through a million years, it is not your brain, it is the common brain of man. Therefore you are the world, and the world is you. You are not Swiss, German, and all that nonsense. You are actually a human being, like those human beings in the Far East, starving, unhappy, brutally butchered, you are those who suffer, anxious, you know, you are all that psychologically. So your mind, your heart, is humanity. You are not separate. If you can understand this.

So we are saying: our mind is a common mind, common brain which has grown through time, and that brain and mind has functioned along a certain direction all these years, for millenia. And we are going on in the same way, only more defined,

adjusting, withdrawing, shrinking, expanding but it is the same direction. And when you see all this, how man is destroying himself and the earth and the air, and nature, the animals, one feels tremendously responsible. And what is the origin of all this? What is the cause of all this? Right? Let's move.

Is it thought? Thought is the movement from knowledge. You understand? Experience, knowledge, memory, thought, it is one movement. It is not first acquiring experience then knowledge, then memory, then thought; it is one unitary movement all the time going on, in the same direction. Right? Right sirs? Is that the essence, the real cause, not the individual, not the desire for security, but the very movement of thought that has brought about this present chaos in the world? Please enquire with me, don't agree or disagree, because then we can't meet. There is no communication if you disagree or agree. But if you are observing, moving, living then it is something vital. Thought has created marvellous things: the great cathedrals, the marvellous architecture, the great songs, poems, music, the extraordinary technology, the bomb, the atom, it is all the result of thought. The enormous accumulation of armaments to destroy each other, is the result of thought. And all the knowledge accumulated by the scientists is the result of thought. That is, if you are not thinking you cannot go to your home, you cannot speak languages. So thought has an extraordinarily important place. But we are enquiring, observing, the cause of this misery of man, apart from the world of physical convenience, communication, telephone, and all the transportation - we are not talking about that, that is obvious. But is thought the essence of our misery? You

understand? If it is then can that end? You understand my question? Please join with me, don't go to sleep. Just please give your attention to this.

You know any man who is suffering physically will do anything, spend money, take a long journey, anything to get cured. But we don't seem to spend even half of that time, or a quarter of that time, to enquire into all this - why human beings go through such agony of life, why life has become so dangerous, so utterly meaningless, as we are living. So is thought the origin of all this? And is thought the centre of all our existence? You understand? Our love, our affections, our remembrances, the creating of images, all that is the movement of thought. And our relationship with each other is the movement of thought. And thought, as we said, is the child of knowledge. If we had no knowledge you wouldn't be able to think at all. And knowledge is always limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything. There is a complete understanding of something beyond all this when knowledge comes to an end. We will go into that presently, much later. We are not selling something now for you to wait and catch something later! But unless you follow this step by step it becomes very, very difficult to comprehend further. You understand? There is no complete knowledge about anything: about the universe, about astrophysicists, they can't find it, the scholars, the philosophers, all of them are based on knowledge. And that knowledge is incomplete. They may say, "I believe in god who is supreme, omnipotent" and all the rest of it, "and he alone knows complete knowledge, or the end of knowledge." But we are not talking such nonsense. We are pointing out that knowledge is

always limited because it is always within the shadow of ignorance. Right? Are we meeting each other? Please, come on sirs.

Even the greatest philosophers, the world specialists, the theoreticians, the people of the church and religion, they can never under any circumstances, unless they are foolish, claim complete knowledge. And so our thinking, which is born out of knowledge, is limited. Right? There is no complete thinking. So our actions then are limited. Our observations are limited as long as there is the functioning of thought. Right? If I observe you analytically, examining you analytically, then that analysis is the process of thought and therefore my observation and conclusion must be totally limited. Right? You are following this? It means a great sense of humility to observe. You understand sirs? Not "I know, I will observe", but humility, that is, freedom from this certainty to observe. I will go into that presently.

So if thought is the origin of all this mess, and it looks like it, don't accept what I am saying, our misery, our war, the division amongst people, the division of religions, the division of professions, the division of this whole becoming is the movement of thought. I do not know if you have observed how in the physical world the man becomes a clerk, or a priest, or a foreman, or a business man, and is climbing the ladder. He is all the time becoming something, physically. The parish priest becomes the bishop, the bishop becomes a cardinal, or archbishop, and the archbishop, the cardinal, who becomes the pope. It is the same pattern physically repeated. Psychologically, inwardly, we are doing the same, becoming something all the time: "I am not this

but I will be that. I am not good but I will be better." You understand? So this movement of becoming - please understand this - this feeling of becoming is the movement of thought in time - right? And that may be the origin of all this mess. Everyone is trying to become something. Understand, physically to become something - it is rather competitive, cruel, destructive, but one can see what is happening, and not go into that game. But to see it psychologically is quite a different matter. You hear this - please observe - you hear this, that is psychologically you are becoming something all the time - conflict, conflict, conflict, struggle, fight, push. And that may be the cause of this destructive world in which we live.

Now that becoming is the movement of thought. You are following this? I'll compare myself with you psychologically, I say, "How intelligent you are, how affectionate, how considerate" - how this and that and the other, and I am attempting to become that. Comparison is the movement of thought - right?

Sirs, look I have stated this: now what does the mind do when you hear this statement? It doesn't observe immediately what is happening in yourself, but hearing a statement of that kind the mind makes an abstraction of it, into an idea and then you dispute about that idea. Whereas the actuality is different from the idea. The word suffering is different from the actual suffering - right? Now if you listen kindly to what is said, that the mind and heart and the brain, they are all one really, have been conditioned through time, through culture, through religion, to become something, and in this becoming there is competition, struggle, ruthlessness, violence and so on, when you hear that is it an

actuality to you, or an idea? You follow this? Is it an idea? Or a fact? Because this is very important to understand. Because our minds are always functioning in ideas, not with facts, psychologically, I am talking. Psychologically the brain immediately makes an abstraction of a fact, which is called the ideal and so on and so on. Whereas if you observe, the fact is more important than the idea. And you can deal with the fact, you can do something about the fact, but you cannot possibly do something about an idea, except create more contention, different opinions about ideas and the ideologists and all the rest of it follows. But if you observe the fact, that is: the brain, the mind and the heart, it is all one, this mind is always trying to become something. That is a fact, not an idea.

Now just go slowly. Is the fact different from you who are observing the fact? You are understanding all this? The fact is each one of us in different ways is trying to become something, not only in the outer world but also psychologically primarily.

Psychologically, primarily, inwardly affects the outer completely, not the other way round, which the Communists try to assert. If you observe it is the other way round. They had marvellous theories, the Communists at one time, having no government, no army, everybody was equal - and look what has happened! So ideas are the most destructive, not facts. The fact is this: and we are saying is that the cause of all this misery of man? Which is, thought has built this structure, psychological structure, which is based on being something other than what is - right? Are you following this sirs?

So if that is the cause, then is it possible to live in this world

psychologically without becoming anything? Which doesn't mean that you are what you are. You understand? Because what are you? You are nothing but becoming. I wonder if you see that? I am tired, not tired, I am putting so much into this. Do you understand this sirs? That is, if you say I don't become anything, what am I? Then I might become a vegetable, do nothing. But have you ever enquired, gone into this question of not becoming anything? Which means the total ending of comparison, and imitation, conformity, psychologically - you follow? That is, if there is to be an end to the cause of this human global misery, and if that is the cause that each human being right throughout the world, whether he is living in a small little village, or on a most high, sophisticated thirtieth floor, they are still following the same pattern set through millenia. And if that is the cause it can be ended naturally. Then what is man? You follow? Is he just nothing? Follow this carefully. In becoming are you something? You are following all this? Psychologically becoming something you are nothing at the end of it. I wonder if you realize this. But we are afraid of that.

So if that is the cause, and a cause is always ending, and is this becoming the movement of thought? I want to know myself - self-knowledge. See the fallacy of this. Sorry! I want to know myself and I begin to analyse, I begin to observe, I begin to question. The very observation, the very questioning, the very movement inwardly as it were, is still the movement of becoming. You have understood? I wonder if you see all this because we are coming to some basic things. So any movement of the mind not to become or to become is the same. I wonder if you see this. Yes sirs? Right? To become is the movement of thought. And you say, "I see it and

I must end it and become something else," - it is still the movement of thought in a different direction - right? So can that movement of thought end? Is this all too abstract? No, no, I don't deal in abstractions personally. I have a horror of all that.

So the mind, the human mind, not my mind, or your mind, the mind has followed this direction for centuries upon centuries, encouraged by the priests, by the philosophers, by the learned people, to know more and more and more, not only about yourself but outside. And if when somebody comes and says, "Look what you are doing", then the idea that you must know yourself is to pursue that path, which is again to learn about yourself, so as to become something, or to become nothing. So it is the same movement in both directions.

So the question is: can that movement end? You understand sirs? Come with me. Because if thought is the cause of all this misery then can thought not move in any direction? I wonder if you are all following this? So we must go into this question: that is thinking? Because thinking has produced that noise (noise of train), but thinking has not produced the noise of that stream. Thinking has produced wars, thinking has produced division in our relationship, the division based on the image that you have built about each other, naturally - right? That image is the result of time. You may have a husband or a girl friend or boy friend, or whatever it is, immediately the brain has formed an image. The image is the factor of separation, which is thought operating. When you say, "I remember you", which is the recollection, the remembrance of the past which has been registered in the brain, and then I remember you. The image is formed, which is thought, a symbol. A symbol, a

myth is not actual. Right? When you cross yourself, all the symbols in the church aren't the actual, are not the truth.

So as we said, thinking is a movement in time because time is a factor of acquiring knowledge through experience, through incidents, through accidents, through communication and so on, which has acquired knowledge. That knowledge is the movement of thought - right? I have an experience of meeting you yesterday, which is registered in the brain, I remember it and I say, "You are that person". So it is very simple if you go into it. So thought is matter. Right? Oh, lord! I have discussed this with some scientists, some of them agree, some of them don't agree, but it doesn't matter, I am just telling you - you can agree or disagree, it doesn't matter. Knowledge, which is always incomplete, is stored in the brain. The brain is matter - right? The cells are matter, they contain the memories, therefore thought is matter. Now watch it. Scientists are trying to find out through matter outside what lies beyond, if there is. But they never go inside themselves, which is thought is matter. You are following all this? And enquiring through themselves if there is something far beyond all this. Not the imposition that there is god - that is too immature and too silly. But we are now trying to enquire through matter - you are following? I wonder if you follow all this? - through thought, which is matter, and whether through that matter to find out the source of all this. Right? You have understood?

You understand sirs? See what is happening if you go into it. The scientists and such people are trying to find out what lies beyond all this. If you have discussed with scientists they will agree to all this, even the astrophysicists who are looking into the

skies and heavens, still it is matter. And we are saying the scientists are operating through thought, but we are saying that thought itself is matter and that matter is me - I can enquire into myself which is much more factual, much more drastic, highly disciplined, it requires a certain quality of discipline, then it is possible to go infinitely further. And I will show you how to do this. Not show it, you have to work at it.

So if thought is matter and thought has built the whole psychological structure - right? - my anxieties, my fears, my despairs, depressions, my moods, my love, everything thought has built; my feelings, my romantic dreams, my day-dreams, everything is that. Which is difficult to admit for those people who are so-called religious because they start off that there is something spiritual in them right off - that they are souls, divine, this or that. But all that is thought - the higher consciousness, lower consciousness, according to the Hindus, the Atman, the Brahman, and all the rest, is still the movement of thought creating something outside. Like the Christians have done - the saviour and all that.

So if thought is the cause of all this misery, then what is the place of thought, which we have described, then has it no other place? You understand my question? We said thought has a place, otherwise we couldn't talk to each other, otherwise you couldn't go home, you couldn't catch a bus, couldn't do your job, and all the rest of it, which is based on knowledge, skill and so on. There it is necessary. Thought must function, more objectively, more impersonally, more clearly, more efficiently. But thought has no other place except there - right sirs? Because thought is building the psychological structure of me who wants to become, or not to

become.

So is it possible to live in a world without any movement of thought building a structure of becoming? You understand my question? Find out. Unless there is no psychological structure, unless it isn't there, you cannot go much further. You understand? That is natural, logical. As long as there is a centre which is accumulating and becoming, that very centre is the essence of thought. And a mind that is not free from the structure which thought has built psychologically, that mind cannot possibly go any further. It can play tricks, it can live in illusions.

So in our next talks we are going to go step by step into the freeing of the mind from all the conditioning, from all the accumulation of ages which has corrupted it.

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1980

May we go on talking about what we have been saying for the last two gatherings? I am not at all sure that we are not making all that has been said into a kind of intellectual concept, a series of ideas or conclusions and therefore they have become merely a series of ideas, a set of values, and something that one has to carry out in life, desirable, perhaps worthwhile and profitable. If we turn all these talks into that kind of thing I am afraid we shall be missing a great deal, because, as we were saying, man has lived for millenia upon millenia, living in constant struggle, conflict, not only with himself but with his environment, with his neighbour whether he is very near or very far. And we have followed that pattern for centuries. And when one observes what is happening in the world there must be an answer to all this, there must be a way out of all this, there must be a way where we can think globally, not as a group of individuals or sects or so on, but we are concerned with the whole of humanity. That humanity is you and me. We are not different from the humanity of India or China or Russia, or America or here. We all go through the same struggle, the same anxieties, the same conflict, the same kind of mischief and so on.

And, as we said, we try to find out for ourselves the root cause of all this and whether it is possible, having found the root cause, whether the mind is capable of dissolving the cause and therefore bringing about a different action in life. That is what we are concerned about.

And if one may point out, we are talking over together, thinking together. That is, if we can approach this problem not from your

point of view or from the point of view of the speaker, but to observe quite impersonally, without being tied to any particular belief, dogma or person, then perhaps it is possible that we can think together over these problems. The problem being: why human beings who have lived so long continue in the same pattern, perhaps modified, perhaps a little more knowledgeable, capable of meeting certain challenges, but basically he is what he has been for millenia. And we said the cause may be, the root cause of it, that every human being is trying to become something, not only in the physical world but also in the psychological realm where he is trying or making tremendous effort to be or to become something. And we are saying that may be the root cause of all these problems. You may agree or disagree with this cause, the original cause but if we can go into it together - not I tell you and you agree or disagree but together if we could go into this very, very seriously and act, not merely verbally exchange opinions and ideas, opposing each other but if we could go beyond the word and act. That is, is it not so - I am putting this question to you - that each one of us in different ways is trying to be other than what he is - what he is trying to achieve, to become, to change? If we are agreed on that, that it is the root cause of this great mischief that is going on in the world, bringing about great confusion and so on then we can think together over the problem - right?

As one observes, our action is based on ideas. Ideas are more important than action - right? I wonder if you see. Please, we are talking together, I am not just talking to myself. Ideas or ideals are the platform, the background from which we act - right? Whether those ideas are personal or evolved through a great many centuries,

or sanctioned by organized religions, we move, live with ideas - right? Ideas may be symbols, memories, experiences, conclusions. Ideas create values - right? Values which are satisfactory, desirable, worthwhile, have significance. And having established those values based on ideas - right? - we act according to those values. And those values are created by thought. Can we proceed? Right?

So our action is based on values. And these values are brought about by constant adjustment to circumstances, to one's character, to one's desire, to one's social environmental condition - right? So our actions are based on values which are the product of thought - right? Can we go on? Because we are going to point out presently that a mind that has values is very limited because those values are created by thought, by desire - right? And therefore our action is always limited - right? And if we examine our actions, we see that the whole of life is action. Our life is action, speaking, walking, thinking, acting from knowledge, responsibility, friendship, the whole of our existence is action, whether that action is directed by a value, or by an experience, or sanctioned by society or culture and religion - right? We are moving.

So we are asking: this has been the pattern of our existence, each person creating his own value, what is important, what is not important, what is worthwhile and not, what is comforting, what is desirable and so on. So we are asking: is there an action which is not based on value? You understand? So that is, as we said, our action is based either on past memories, on past values, or present values or future ideals - right? That which should be, that which has been and that which is. So our action is a continuous, constant

movement of the past through the present, modifying itself into the future. I wonder if we are meeting? Are we meeting each other? Yes sir? Good, at least somebody is.

So our actions are always based on the past. There is no spontaneous action. Can we move along? Please don't agree with me. Everybody is talking about more or less spontaneous action. There isn't such a thing. It is essentially based on past memories, past values, modifying itself constantly but essentially rooted in the past. And therefore there is no spontaneous action. And then one asks: what is correct action? If action is not based on the past, on values, because they limit action, because they are the outcome of thought which is the result of knowledge - right, we have been through that. So is there action which is correct under all circumstances, not based on values? Am I putting the question rightly? Are you meeting with me? Because it is very important to find out if there is freedom in action. Now we think there is freedom in action because we can do what we want. That is the prevalent fashion, to do each one what he likes without the father or the government on your back. And that freedom has led more or less to this present chaos, each one doing exactly what he wants.

So one must find for oneself what is right action, not based on concepts, ideals, values - right? Do you want to find out? No, sir this is not a game we are playing. It is not something that you do this morning and forget all about it. It touches our daily life and therefore it is very serious. And it is a very serious question to ask: is there an action which is not based on Marxism, or on Christianity, or on Hinduism and all the rest of it? Or on any human values, which are the product of thought? Right? Therefore

one must ask this question whether there is a right action under all circumstances?

So one must go into the question: what is right? One can say what I think is right, or I have a certain belief and according to that I act and that is right. Or I have experiences which have shaped my action and therefore they are correct - right? And we are pointing out, if one may, that all such expressions of action is prejudice, a prejudice which has something common with ideals - right? I wonder if you are following all this? Your prejudices form your ideas, whether those prejudices are carefully culturally cultivated or religiously adopted, such action is essentially based on values. And we are asking: is there an action which is not based on any of this - right? Because that is freedom, otherwise it is like being tied to something and therefore every action becomes corrupt. I wonder if you follow all this? If I am tied to a belief naturally my action will be according to that belief and therefore limited and therefore corrupt - right? You may not agree but please examine it first before you agree or disagree. We are using the word 'corrupt' which means rompere, the root meaning rompere to break, to fragment, to bring about fragmentation. That is the root meaning of that word 'corrupt'. So our actions are corrupt, never whole. And to find out what is correct action one must be actually free from all values - right? Please see the logic of it or the sense of it.

Now what is correct action? The word 'correct' means precise, actual, not distorted, which must be constant - right? That is the meaning of that word 'correct'. Not you give a meaning to that word 'correct' or the speaker gives it, the dictionary gives that meaning, which means an action which is constant, which never

varies under any circumstances, precise, not based on any romantic, sentimental imagination - right? Are you following this? Yes sir? And is there such correct action? Action being not based on some principle, not based on some ideal, not the result of personal or cultivated values otherwise it is corrupt action. We are going to find that out.

A mind that is tied to an idea, to a concept, to some value, or to a person, action springing from that must always be corrupt - right? That is, if I am attached to a person, that attachment is going to dictate my action, obviously. If I am attached, or tied to a belief my action will be according to that belief and therefore my action is corrupt. If I act according to my experience, knowledge, and knowledge being always limited, my action will be corrupt. You understand what we are saying? It is totally different from everything that has been said. And we are saying: is there an action which is incorruptible? And we say there is, which comes - please follow this - which comes when you observe, not analyse, when you observe the consequences of values, how the values are created, how when you are attached to an idea, a concept, a person, such action is invariably destructive, corrupt, limited. If this is so, by observing, not analysing, they come to an end. Am I making myself clear? That is, I am attached, suppose I am attached to a symbol, whether the symbol be in the church or I have created my own symbol through mythology and so on and so on, those symbols are created by thought, I am attached to a symbol and I act according to that symbol. The result is conflict, not only against your symbol, against your belief, but also conflict in my daily action - right? I wonder if you see this. I observe this. I see this

actual fact. Right? No?

Sirs, do we both of us see this fact that as long as you are tied to anything, a person, a belief, a concept, an idea, to your own knowledge and experience, the outcome of that action must invariably bring conflict. Do we see that?

All right, I will put it differently. I am a Jew, I hold on to that concept. The result is if you are a Muslim, an Arab, we are at war with each other - right? That is fairly simple, obvious, we observe it. But if you go much deeper inwardly and you cling to a person for various reasons, and the very attachment to that brings a great deal of conflict, fear, hate - right? And without analysing can I observe the fact? We will go into what we mean by observing.

Do you observe without any distortion yourself? Observe, not try to change what you see, not try to reason away what you see, or try to overcome what you see, or suppress what you see, but just to observe as you do in a mirror, what you actually are. That is, can I observe my reaction which is aggression? You understand? I am taking that as an example. I am aggressive - god forbid - I am aggressive. Can I observe that? The cause of it, without analysing, the expression in my face, in my voice, in my gesture, can I observe it without trying to justify it or give an excuse, or try to say "I am not", but just to observe. Can you do it? Are you doing it as we are talking? Take your own particular idiosyncrasy, your own particular character, your own particular attachment and observe it, which will become rather difficult because our minds are trained and educated to analyse. That is to find the cause through analysis and hope thereby to overcome the cause. Whereas we are saying that process of analysis will not free the cause. Whereas if you

merely observe without any emotional reaction, see exactly as it is, let the fact tell the story rather than you tell the story about the fact. Have I made that clear? We are always saying what to do about the fact - right? It must not be, it must be, we must go into it and so on. But we never allow the fact to unfold itself. That is what we are saying. Observation is the unfolding of what is going on. Are you doing this as we are talking?

You know most of us are attached to a person - right? To our husband, to our children, to something or other, to a priest, to a guru, to a system of meditation, or whatever it is. Can you observe your attachment? Please this is not a group therapy, this is not a confessional, and all that nonsense, it is too silly. But we are asking each other: can you observe your attachment? Of course you can. You become conscious of it. Then if you observe it carefully the immediate reaction is: why not? What is wrong with attachment? The consequences of attachment are fear, and therefore hate, jealousy and therefore lack of love. These are the consequences, aren't they? No? You are very silent. Probably you are sitting next to your wife or husband! (Laughter) But if you observe it very carefully without distorting what you actually see, that observation is the act of intelligence. I wonder if you get this? Right sirs?

May I go on? Because we are coming to a point if you are willing to, there is an action which is correct under all circumstances. And that is to observe the fact of what is actually happening without any distortion - right? I'll show you something. That is, when you observe, is the fact, that which is happening as attachment and the consequences of that attachment, when you observe, is the observer different from the thing he observes? You

have understood my question? When you are angry, at the moment of anger there is no division between the observer and the observed - right? Only a second later comes the division - right? I have been angry. You recognize the feeling of anger because you have had it before, so the division takes place the moment when the observer separates himself from the observed. I wonder if you see this.

Right? Please this is serious if you want to go into it because if you can see this you will eliminate conflict altogether, because conflict exists between the observer and the observed - right? Am I using words which you are not accustomed to and therefore you find it rather puzzling? Just a minute.

I am attached to a person, if I am. I am attached to a person. Is the attachment - please listen - is the attachment different from me? Or I am attachment? You understand sirs?

I am supplying you with energy. You see you really don't want to face this and therefore you find lots of excuses because where there is attachment to a problem, to an idea, to an ideal, to a person, to a dogma, to a ritual, to an organization, to certain institutions, there must be corruption. Right? And if I am attached to my wife, there is the absolute certainty of corruption, because corruption means fear. Fear brings hate, conflict, jealousy, antagonism, which are all the expression of corruption, not the act of love. So do we see this not analytically but factually. Now when you say "I see it", is the see-er different from what he has seen? Are you following this? That is sir, where there is division there must be conflict. That is a law. There is conflict between the Arab and the Jew, between the Communist and the Socialist, the Capitalist and so on and so on, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, you follow? Where there

is division there must be conflict. Conflict is corruption. And we have lived with this norm, with this pattern that the observer, the thinker is different from the thought. So the thinker is always trying to dominate thought. You are following? Right? But the thinker is thought.

So when we observe attachment towards somebody or something, a piece of furniture, is the person who is attached different from the attachment? You understand what I am saying? Obviously not. Therefore when there is no division and therefore no conflict, the whole process of attachment comes to an end. Please test it. Don't accept a thing anybody says, including myself. Test it. That is, see actually what you are attached to, tied to, to your name, to your family, to your brother, sister, father, wife, girl, boy, whatever it is, to the bishop, to the pope, or some other person. If you are, just observe it. But if you like to be attached, if you like all the consequences of attachment, you are perfectly welcome, nobody is going to stop you. But if you want to find out whether there is an action which is incorruptible, which is correct under all circumstances then you have to be free from all values, from all attachment. Because when you observe attachment it is intelligence which is seeing the whole process of it, not analysis.

So where there is intelligence there is correct action. Intelligence is not knowledge, is not accumulated information. Where there is insight into the attachment, that insight is intelligence and from that intelligence there is correct action. Right sirs? Don't look at me, it is not worth it, but look at yourself and find out. Because man has lived with corruption for a million years and all his actions must be corrupt, must bring chaos, conflict, and

his actions are based on ideals, on concepts, on values, which are all the product of thought. There is no divine absolute value, even though the priests may say that. When they do say it, it is the activity of their own thinking.

So there is an action which is completely whole, completely incorruptible, in daily life, not somewhere in heaven. That is, can a human being live in this world with that intelligence? That intelligence is born out of insight, for example, into attachment. Insight. Insight means having full comprehension of the whole process of attachment immediately. You understand what I am saying? You must have had an insight into something or other occasionally, where that insight is not memory, is not the process of value or a conclusion, it is a second of complete comprehension of that which you see totally. And that is the essence of intelligence. And that intelligence is not yours nor mine and therefore it is always acting correctly. Will you try it, do it? Do it as we are sitting here, not when you go home. As you are sitting here observe yourself, observe your action with regard to your wife, your husband, to your neighbour, to your politics, to your religion - whatever it is. And can you have without analysis a perception, a seeing the whole consequences and the cause of this attachment instantly, immediately? Because that implies the freedom from time.

As we said, the brain is the result of time, which nobody can deny. It has evolved through millions of years, from the most primitive cell to very, very complex cells. And that has taken time - right? Which means evolution. And the brain is functioning according to the pattern of time - right? Sir this is all very simple if

you give your mind and heart to this, your mind to this. It is really quite simple. The brain functions in the pattern of time, in the mould of time. That is, yesterday, today and tomorrow. The sunsets and sunrises. Time as, I will be, I hope to be, I want that - right? That is a movement of time. I look forward to meeting you tomorrow, which is time. Having hope is time - right? So the brain operates, functions because it has evolved through time, in the process of time. Clear?

Now we have lived with that pattern for millions of years. There is not only physical time which is yesterday, today and tomorrow, but also psychological time, inward time. We are talking about the inward time of the mind. So the brain which is part of the mind, the brain functions, acts and responds, thinks in time. And that pattern has been established for a million years and we are still pursuing that pattern. We live in that pattern. And if there is no end to time - you understand what I am saying - the pattern will be repeated over and over and over again. Do you understand something sirs?

Look: as we said the other day, I need time to become something. If I want to be a good chemist I need time. If I want to learn a language I need time. If I want to be a good driver, car driver, I must have time. Acquire knowledge, skill, action. There I need time, to learn a language and so on. And that same pattern, principle, is applied psychologically. You follow? I need time to be good. I need time to become unselfish. When you say "I must have time to become unselfish" - that is the very essence of selfishness. So our brain is operating always in time. And time is movement - right? - from here to there, physically. And also time is to become something, psychologically, and so it is a movement. I am not quite

good but I will be good. That is a movement from 'what is' to 'what should be'. Movement is thinking also - right? So time is thinking. I wonder if you see this? And that is the pattern in which we have lived. And that pattern has not changed man although he has lived for a million years and more. Therefore is there a possibility of breaking that pattern? You understand my question? No you don't. Yes? We say there is. If you follow this you will see it. Analysis is a process of time - right? Right sirs? Therefore I see, I have an insight into analysis and therefore it is the ending of analysis. Right? Insight is not of time. Can you see it? I have an insight into my desire, into my desire for something, and in the process of desire for that either it can be analysed, examined and come to a conclusion; but if I observe the whole movement of desire, that very observation is an insight which is not of time.

I'll put it differently. Look sirs: we all know we are attached to something or other - right? Can you end it immediately? If you end it instantly, immediately, that is the ending of time. But if you say, "I'll go into it, I will analyse it, I will see if it is right, it is wrong, it should be, it should not be", then you are repeating the pattern.

Right sirs? The ending of time is tremendously important because that is actual freedom from what has been. I wonder if you get it.

Am I forcing you to think in a particular direction? Because I happen to be energetic, vehement? Or we are both of us moving in the same direction? Because you see sirs this has been one of the problems of humanity. You may not have gone into it. Man has always asked whether there is an end to time. Time must have a stop. And we think time has a stop through some kind of meditation. They have gone into this a great deal, perhaps a little in

the Western world, but a great deal in the Eastern world. So they say time has a stop only when thought can be controlled. You understand? Because thought is a movement in time. Thought is time. Whereas we are saying: it can end when there is observation without distortion of what is actually going on, which is the actual reaction in yourself: reaction to attachment, why you are attached, what is the consequence. To see the whole of that immediately is the ending of time. I can't repeat it again. Is this somewhat clear? No, it must be clear, we are using common words. Either you are not exercising your own brain or you are merely persuaded, pushed around. But if you say, "Look, I want to find out, I want to observe if I am attached to anything", then you soon discover you are, and you see the consequences of that, fear, hatred, anxiety, jealousy, all the conflict that goes on. And if you say, "I am used to it. I don't mind putting up with it" - then you are just living in perpetual conflict, which is what every human being is doing. But if you want to end that conflict, that can be ended only immediately, which is to see it without any distortion.

SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH JULY 1980

May we continue with what we were talking about in the last three talks? Some of you may have come for the first time, or haven't been to the other talks, so we should, if you don't mind, repeat a little bit what has been said before.

Apparently man has lived for over five or six million years and during all this evolutionary period man has not been able, both outwardly and inwardly, to solve the great problem of conflict, conflict not only within himself but conflict and wars, slaughter outside. And that is the pattern through all these millenia, the brain has followed this course, this mould, this pattern. And we are still continuing constantly in the same stream of misery, confusion and great sorrow, both inwardly and outwardly. And if we are at all serious and are concerned with what is happening in the world, and also within ourselves, one must wonder, or discuss, or find out why the brain, the mind - because we are using the mind as sensation, all the emotions, the reactions, and the responses of thought, all that is the brain, the mind and the heart, the whole psychological structure of human beings, both biologically as well as psychologically - why we human beings, who are supposed to be educated, evolved, sophisticated, cultured, why we live in this world killing each other, being divided by religions, by nationalities, by all the destructive division that thought has created between human beings. And is it possible to bring about a change in the very structure of the brain. That is what we have been talking about for the last three talks.

And also we said that this is not a talk by the man who is sitting

on the platform talking about ideas. Any number of ideas have existed in the world, any number of ideologies, both the totalitarian, Marxist, Lenin, Mao, and the other type, ideologies of the Left, the Centre and the Right - the extremes of all these. And these ideologies have been very, very destructive, whether they are the religious ideologies or the political ideologies. And the brain, the mind, the whole psychological structure of man has lived in this pattern, has lived in this mode. And, as we said, this is not a talk by the speaker. We are together thinking over this problem - together. You are not just listening and agreeing, or disagreeing, going home having perhaps been a little interested, intellectually entertained - but I am afraid that is not the purpose of this Gathering. We are together taking the journey, thinking together. And one must, if you are kindly, give some attention to all this, because we are all human beings, whether we live in Russia, the East, or the West, South or North. We all go through a great deal of torture, misery, anxiety, the burden of fears, and sorrow. This is the common lot of man, the common lot of humanity. And the common lot is the human being sitting here in the tent, whether we are from the East, West, North or South, we are humanity. Our brains and our minds are not individual brains and individual minds, it is the mind of humanity. I know perhaps that many of you will disagree, but if you examine it impartially, objectively, scientifically you will find that the brain is not yours, nor mine, it is the brain of human beings which has evolved to the present condition in which we find ourselves.

And we have been asking, examining, observing, not analysing, why the human mind has lived with this despair, this depression.

Why human beings have not, during all these millenia, changed radically. That is the problem. That is what we have been talking over together. Talking over together, not listening to the speaker and saying he is theoretical, or nonsensical, oriental and all the rest of that nonsense. Thought is neither oriental nor occidental. I think this is the basic fact. You may in the West think along a particular line, scientific, industrial and so on; and in the East it may be different, but essentially it is thought, thinking, which is common to all of us. It is the lot of man to think. And thinking is not yours or mine, it is common. And this thought born of knowledge, experience, memory, this thought has created the industrial world, built extraordinary bridges, beautiful bridges, great scientific inventions, surgery, medicine; and also thought has created wars. Thought has created all the architecture, beautiful and ugly, all the great paintings, the statues, and music. Thought has also created all those things that are in the cathedrals, in the temples, in the mosques. And thought has divided the religious world into Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism and so on. These are all facts. It is not the speaker's invention. These are obvious, observable facts.

And we have lived that way, tribally. It has become glorified nationality. And is it possible for this brain, which has been moulded in a particular pattern, and has existed in a particular way, suffering, demanding, obeying, not obeying, conforming and revolting in its conformity - this has been the pattern. And any serious person must enquire whether it is possible to break down this pattern and live totally differently, without war, without antagonism, without anxiety, fear, sorrow. And if you are willing, and capable naturally, to think together you can find out for

yourselves whether it is possible or not. That is, more or less, what we have been talking about during the last three talks. Right?

As one observes one's own mind, not the speaker's mind, not the speaker's words, which are ordinary non-technological words - he is using non-technological words, jargon and so on, just ordinary, everyday English. And also, if one may point out, we are not trying to do any propaganda, we are not asking you to join any Community, or to follow any guru. All that is silly, grown up people don't do this kind of thing. Immature people do.

So our question is: why the brain, which has got such immense capacity, why it has not solved its own problems, why it lives in this way? And as we said the other day, and we will repeat it again if we may: thought is the core of this, is the centre of all this travail. Thought is born out of knowledge, experience, which becomes memory held in the brain cells. So thought is a material process. This we have discussed with several scientists who are brain specialists - some of them agree, some them don't, naturally! That is their game. Some agree, some don't, about everything. But thought has been the centre of all this human struggle, this human urge to go beyond itself, the urge to find god - if god exists - to find out what is illumination, if there is something beyond time, if there is something beyond man's thought which is eternal, and so on. And so thought has been exercised right from the very beginning. And thought has made the image that man must grow, evolve, become something. I hope you are following all this. Please you are not following the speaker, you are following yourself. There is no teacher, nor disciple. That is truth. There is no follower and the leader in the world of mind. There is only

learning, not learning what someone has to inform you of but learning in action. We will go into that presently.

So we are together examining, taking a journey into the very, very complex life of human beings, very complex. And to enter into this complexity the mind must be free from all attachments, not tied to anything, to your guru, to your conclusion, to your concepts, ideas and so on, because when you are tied to something, when you are committed to a particular religion, to a particular system of thought, to a particular method of meditation, to a particular method or belief and so on and so on, that very commitment brings corruption. Therefore a mind that is committed, taking sides, believing, cannot possibly enter, discover whether this mind can itself transform. Right? I know it is very difficult to accept this, because every human being wants to be committed to something, he feels safe in that commitment. One feels safe if you have a leader, if you have a guru, if you have a particular system. And if you are attached to any person obviously you can see corruption beginning because in that attachment there is fear, hate, anxiety. Similarly if you are attached to an idea, to a belief, to a concept, to a particular image or symbol of a religion, then corruption is inevitable. And one of the factors of this corruption is authority.

Are we meeting together? Or are you sitting separate over there and the speaker over here? We are physically, but is there any kind of communication between us? Is there any kind of observation of the common factor together? Do we both see, not only intellectually, verbally but actually as a fact - this microphone is a fact. Can we see the fact in ourselves that as long as you are

committed, attached tied to something, to a person, to a belief, to a concept, there must be corruption? Whether you are a Marxist, Leninist, Mao or some latest guru, or attached to any particular system, there must be corruption. Do we see that as a fact? If I am committed to the idea that I am a Hindu, see what takes place. Or if you are committed as a Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, or belonging to some sect, some theological or democratic concept, you are tied and therefore you are not free to examine. And there must be freedom. And authority, specially in the world of the mind, and of the heart, and of the brain, that is to follow somebody, to accept some theological or theoretical concepts, given by Marx and so on, or by some Asiatic or Indian mind, if you accept that and follow it mentally, in your actions and so on, that is the very basis of authority and corruption. Do we see this together? Not just intellectually see it, because one has carefully explained it, verbally it is very clear, but to do it, to see the consequences of this attachment, how it has divided the world into such chaos. And is it possible to be a light to oneself, not the light of another? Because our brain has been trained and evolved, and accepted authority. Not only the outward authority of law, which is necessary, but the authority, the psychological authority, the so-called spiritual authority. We have become slaves to that authority. So we are controlled, shaped, connived at by those who say "We know, we have attained, we will tell you what to do, follow us. We will lead you to heaven, save you from your sins" - and all that business that goes on in the world.

And such a mind, committed, can never be free. And without freedom you can never find out what truth is. So could we in

listening to this obvious fact, because we feel we can't stand by ourselves, we always want to lean on somebody, whether it is the husband or the wife, whether it is your girl friend or boy friend and another boy friend, we think by leaning, seeking comfort from another, our brains have depended on the authority of the spirit. Please do pay a little attention to this if you are serious. And so our brains have been conditioned to accept spiritual authority - the priest, the guru, the man who says, "I am enlightened, so I will lead you to that". A man who is enlightened, when he says he is enlightened he is not, because enlightenment is not a thing to be experienced; it is a state of mind and has gone beyond all thought. We will go into that when we talk later on, about meditation and so on.

So can the mind, your brain which has been trained to accept authority, and therefore its own particular discipline, can that brain immediately free itself from that authority, not the authority of law, not the authority of the policeman. You may disagree with the policeman but there is the common, or supposed to be common, protector and so on. The law that you must keep to the right in this country and in England keep to the left, and so on. Now can you in listening see the consequences of accepting authority outside: the authority of god - you understand? - the god who has been invented by thought, and the authority of the worldwide priesthood which says, "I will help you to attain, help you to reach." You are following all this? Because when you accept such authority you must invariably bring about disorder, not only disorder in yourself but also the disorder that brings about different authorities: the Islamic authorities, the Buddhist authorities and so on. They are all

at each other. As one very famous guru told me, "I began with two disciples, now I have got ten thousand disciples." You understand sirs, all this?

So when there is the acceptance of psychological, so-called spiritual - the authority of the spirit, the inwardness - then there must be disorder because it brings conflict in yourself. You may say "I accept that authority because it pleases me, it gives me help, it gives me a sense of protection." So you are depending on another and when you depend on another the consequence is fear, division and all the conflicts that go on between what you are and what you should be. Right? So the mind, including the brain, so the mind has lived in this pattern, which is in the pattern of disorder. Look at your own minds, I don't have to... look at your own mind, how disorderly it is. Disorder means conflict, conflict between what is going on, the reactions, the responses, the reflexes, and the authority, the sanctions, the so-called illuminatory dictatorship and the fact of what you are - the conflict, which is always the desire to become something. Right?

So the brain has lived in this disorder, going from one guru to another, if you can't find enlightenment here you go off to Japan or India and that is the latest racket. Sirs, truth is where you are, not in India, not in any other country, or any other people. It is where you are and where you are with all your troubles, worries, depressions, and the miseries. You have to finish with them and go beyond. Nobody on earth can give you that freedom from sorrow, freedom from anxiety. It is only you that can do it. So it is in vain and useless to go off to various countries seeking various spiritual authorities and living in their concentration camps, which are

called Ashrams - this is the game we have all played for millenia. This is not something new. For two thousand years the priests of the Western world have played this game. In India they have been much longer at this. So this is the cause of our conflict, because we are looking to another. And can you, as you are listening, as we are thinking together, taking the journey, walking over the same path, not my path, your path, the path of observation, can you see what your mind, your brain has become and end this sense of spiritual authority immediately, so that you, who are humanity - you are humanity, you are not an individual because you go through the same door of anxiety, misery, uncertainty, fear, pleasure, sorrow, as everybody in the world does, so you are humanity, you are the world and your brain is the world - if you see immediately the truth of this fact, that conflict in essence comes when you are accepting authority, spiritual authority from another: and this conflict arises not only from that but from being incapable of observing actually what is going on within yourself, without any distortion, without any judgement, just to watch it. Because we must live in order. Order is absolutely essential. There is no relative order. There is only order, or disorder. You understand what we have been saying? Either there is complete order, totally; or there is only disorder. It isn't something in between the two. What is in between the two is disorder.

So we must find out what is order. First of all to find out what is absolute order. There is such a thing as absolute order because the cosmos means order. The universe is in order. But we human beings live in disorder. Nature is in order but when man interferes with nature he brings disorder because in himself he is in disorder.

Right sirs?

So what is order? Is it the end of conflict? Go slowly. We will go into it very carefully, step by step. Please you are not following me, the speaker. You are observing your own structure of yourself. The word 'structure' there means movement. Movement of yourself, because you are a living entity. You can see something dead, but if you are a living thing it is a movement. And this movement of life is disorder. We may have occasionally some kind of peace, quietness, but the quietness, the peace and the silence that is cultivated by thought through so-called meditation, or by going off, doing all kinds of tricks, is not silence, peace.

So we are now thinking together - I mean thinking together. I am not telling you what order is, which means you must live this way, that way the other way. Thinking together to find out for ourselves whether there is an absolute order. Or must man everlastingly live in disorder? So disorder and order cannot go together. A disordered mind cannot find order. That is simple. So we must find out what brings about disorder in us. Right? Not try to find out what is order. It is like a blind, ignorant man trying to find out heaven. I mean blind man in the sense of an ignorant man. He must be free of ignorance first. So a disordered mind can never find what is absolute order. Now what causes disorder? As we said the other day, when there is a cause there must be an end to it. That is a law - right? I don't know if you see that. Where there is a beginning there must be an ending. If there is cause for a physical pain - right - it can be ended, either in death or there is a cure for it. If you have a bad toothache, the cause is infection and that infection which is causing pain can be ended - right? So there must

be a cause for disorder - you are following all this? Right? Are we together a little bit, please for a little while? Right?

We are saying there must be a cause for this disorder. What is the cause? Are there several causes for disorder in our life? Or there is only one factor that brings about disorder? You are understanding my question? Not my question, your question. First of all, are we aware that we live in disorder? I think that is fairly clear. We are. We may have patches of sunlight, but most of the day we live, as we are doing now, with rain and clouds. So we are not talking about patches of order which are really the forgetfulness of disorder. So what is the cause of it? Or are there several causes? There must be disorder when there is contradiction, not only in your action, which is, not only in your thought, in your behaviour, contradiction, saying one thing and doing another. Obviously. And there must be disorder as long as we are conforming - right? Conforming to an idea, to an ideal, to an image which has been created by another. All right? Which is: as long as there is contradiction in ourselves between action and the fact, between what we think and what we do - right? That is: as long as man, mind is trying to change 'what is' into 'what should be', there must be disorder. The totalitarian Communist world have their theoreticians according to Marx and Engles and Lenin and Stalin and that, and have created a concept, an ideological world and the people there in their authority, in their power are shaping man to conform to that. You are following? This is what all religions have done. There is not much difference - perhaps there is a certain difference - between the totalitarian world and the religious world and the fascists. They are all following the same path, perhaps

mildly, gently, forcefully, aggressively, frightening, but it is the same direction.

So is that the root of this cause of disorder? Please go slowly. Don't immediately say, "That is." Think it out. Or there must be disorder as long as thought dominates our actions. Because as we said, thought is the response of memory. That memory is the result of experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain, in the cells. So thought is always limited because knowledge is always limited, there can be no complete knowledge - right? Are you following all this? See what man has done. He knows probably deeply unconsciously that there can be no complete knowledge about anything, so he says, 'God' - whatever that is - 'is omnipotent, omniscience' and so on and so on. So look what he has done: knowing his limitation, his knowledge must always be limited, he creates something which is total knowledge, omniscient and struggles to reach that. You follow the game? You see what man is doing all the time. So we are asking: is thought responsible for disorder? Please this requires a great deal of thinking, don't just say, yes or no.

Thought has created the opposite, not the fact but the opposite. That is: I am unhappy but I have known happiness at some period and the remembrance of that is a contradiction to 'what is' - you are following this? Yes? I wonder. So thought has created the opposite which is non-fact. What is fact is what is going on, what is happening. The fact is human beings are violent. That is a fact. But thought has said I must achieve non-violence, which is the opposite of 'what is' - right? - so there is conflict. But if there is no opposite there is only this, then you can deal with this. You are following?

You can always deal with facts but not with non-facts. I wonder if you see this. Am I making this too complex? Too abstract? No, it is too practical I am afraid! (Laughter).

So is that the basic cause of our disorder? You follow? The cause is to become something, always trying to become. I am ignorant, I must know more. I don't know enlightenment, I must achieve enlightenment. My mind is in conflict, chattering, I must make it quiet. It is the same principle as the clerk becoming the executive, the parish priest becoming the bishop, and the bishop becoming the cardinal, and the cardinal becoming the pope. You understand? The same principle. Is that the cause of our disorder? You see we live in disorder, and then thought says, "I must live in order". So it creates a pattern of order, a pattern of values which are order, a pattern of behaviour - you understand? Being in disorder thought then creates what it thinks is order and the conflict begins. So is that the cause of our daily existence in disorder? If that is the cause it can be ended. Now just a minute. Follow it carefully. It can be ended. Your next question is: how? You are back again into the old principle of, "Tell me what to do." You are following all this? For god's sake, come on sirs. Right? One sees this fact that thought creates the opposite and the opposite then becomes important in order to relieve the fact, to go beyond the fact. That is, I am violent - suppose one is violent. It creates its opposite because it thinks by creating the opposite, through conflict it can be free of violence. But conflict itself is violence. I wonder if you understand all this - right? Can we go on?

So: can the mind, which has lived in the pattern of opposites, which is the pattern of non-facts, that is, when there is violence that

is a fact, the non-violence is non-fact, the ideal is non-fact. So can the mind live, look, observe only the fact, without moving away from the fact? I wonder if you have understood? That is, to move away means to suppress, to try to go beyond, to evade it, to analyse it, is moving away from this, from the fact of violence - right? Are you doing it as we are talking? Or are you just being carried away by the words? So the brain has lived in this pattern of fact and non-fact - right? And so created the conflict. When one sees the futility, the absurdity of this, then you are only left with fact - right? Then how do you observe the fact? Are you getting tired? Can we go on? How do you observe the fact? That is, the fact is violence. We said violence is a state of contradiction, a state of following somebody, spiritually, philosophically, ideationally, psychologically, following somebody and there is a division between you and that, the guru and you, and the clever guru says, "We are all one." You follow? That is the game they play! So we are saying: can you observe the fact without any movement away from it? Right? Can we go on? So we are saying: how do you observe the fact? Are you giving a direction to the fact? You understand what I mean? Are you looking at the fact with a motive, which is to direct it - right? Please all this requires tremendous attention.

We are saying: how do you look at the fact? There is only fact - right? Not its opposite. So the fact is all important: not how you translate the fact. Right? The translator of the fact, he is translating according to his previous knowledge - right? And therefore when he translates the fact he is moving away from the fact - right? Are you all asleep? So is there an observation without the translator, without the interpreter, without the observer? If there is a division

between the translator of the fact, obviously it creates conflict. You are following this? So to end conflict the translator is absent. Then there is only pure observation. When there is pure observation the fact is not. I wonder if you see that? You understand? As long as the translator is doing something he is creating the fact. But if the translator, the interpreter, the observer, the thinker is not, the fact is non-existent. I'll show you why. Are you interested in all this? Do it! Otherwise it has no value, then it becomes an intellectual game.

What is the fact? The fact is violence. I am taking that as an example. The fact is violence. What is violence? Imitation - right? Conformity, comparison, anger, hate - right? Jealousy, fear, sorrow. Those are all facts. Depression, elation, sorrow, all that is a fact. When you say it is a fact, what does that mean? Is it a fact because you have remembered that thing which is happening now in the past - you follow? You are following this? No, you are not. I am greedy now. The word 'greed', the word, is not the fact - right? But by using the word 'greed' I have identified it because I have used that word previously - right? The previous recognition of the fact of what is happening is what we call fact. Are you also working with me? So by naming it you have recognized it - right? And so you have placed it in the past. See what we have done.

Take a very simple example: one is angry. At the moment of anger there is no recognition as anger. There is only the reflex to it, to a hurt, to whatever it is. A reaction. At the moment of reaction there is no sense of "By Jove, I am angry". It only takes place a second or two later. Why? Because the mind, thought, has recognized the fact according to the past remembrance - right? So it is dealing with 'what is' in terms of the past - right? Which then

creates conflict. Are you following this? So is there an observation without the word? Without remembering this is violence? You understand? The moment the process of recognition, thought, begins it becomes non-fact. Right? Is this too difficult? It is fairly simple isn't it? I am angry - I have never been, but I am angry and at the moment of anger there is only this adrenalin active. Then a few seconds later thought says, "I have been angry", which is the recognition of that which has happened in terms of the past - right? Now therefore the past and the present are in conflict. So can you observe without the word? So can you observe without the translator, the thinker who says, "I remember that, it has happened again"? That which is happening has never happened again. I wonder if you see that? It is only the remembrance of that, and from that you say it has happened again. This is too much for you! (Laughter).

So the pattern which the mind, the brain and so the thought, has set, has lived in this conflict from time immemorial. And we are saying, the cause of it is this. And where there is a cause it can be ended. The cause is the division between the actual happening and what should not happen, the ideal. So the ideal is non-fact, always. Only what is actually happening. The actual happening is my anxiety, my fear, my desperate loneliness. And when there is observation of that loneliness, the word says, I know what it means to have been lonely because I have known it in the past. So the past is in conflict with the present. You understand this? So is there an observation without the past? Of course there can be. Then the fact is not. It is the translator, the thinker, the interpreter, the observer who is creating the fact. I wonder if you see this? You understand?

The fact is I am angry. The moment I smother it with a lot of words and ideas, I give it importance, I strengthen it. The moment I cease to give the past history to it, it withers away - you understand? Try it. Do it sirs.

So we are saying: the cause of disorder is this conflict between what is taking place, what is going on, and what should be. If there were no opposite, non-violence - you follow? - I then have to deal with it, the thing as is. I wonder if you see? You understand? So we are saying: man has lived in disorder, and he has looked for somebody else, an outside agency, to clear up this disorder, both politically, economically and religiously, so-called spiritually. The moment he does that he has created the division - right? Where there is division there must be conflict - the Jew and the Arab, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Christian and the non-Christian. So there is only fact and not non-fact.

We have got three more talks - Tuesday, Thursday and next Sunday. And we have to deal with a great many more things still. We have to go together, think together, to find out if man can ever be free of fear, completely free of fear, both the fear of the world and fear of what is happening, fear, inside. And also one has to go into the question of this very complex problem of pleasure. And the still more complex problem of death, and the ending of sorrow. And also we have to go into, talk over together, the meaning of meditation. So we have three more talks and we will go into all this with as much detail as possible.

SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH JULY 1980

I am sorry the weather is so foul. The cause of it, apparently, is St. Helen's eruption of the volcano in northern California - but I doubt it!

In the western world, in the religious community of the west, doubt has been discouraged, forbidden. If you doubted the whole structure of the religious institutions then you are either called a heretic, tortured, excommunicated, burnt and so on. In the eastern world doubt was encouraged; doubt your experiences, doubt your illusions, doubt the very structure of your thinking, doubt your beliefs so that the mind became free of all self-imposed or imposed illusions. And here, in the west, apparently illusions of many kinds exist, specially in the religious world, not in the technological world of business, or engineering - there you question, you have acquired knowledge by questioning and by doubting gradually have build up an enormous amount of knowledge about engineering, biology and so on, physics. But in the religious world doubt is a very dangerous thing. If you doubted the whole Christian structure you would pull down the nature of the church. And I think, if one may point out, doubt is essential. Doubt what the speaker is saying, question what he is saying, enquire, never accepting either the speaker's words or thoughts or feelings, or your own interpretation of what he is saying, so that your mind, your brain is active, it is not just accepting. If you questioned your gurus, if you have any, I hope you haven't, if you question your gurus, their self-styled illumination, their idea that they are great Buddhas, and all the rest of that - and there are people like that in

the east assuming all kinds of positions, beliefs - and if you question them, and they don't like to be questioned because they say, "You know nothing, we know, don't question", but if you question, go, penetrate into their inner heart, deep into their minds, then you are enquiring into your own minds. Then you are questioning your own concepts, your own values, your own ideals.

So the mind is always actively observing, enquiring and therefore digging very, very deeply. And, if you do not mind, if I may ask, please doubt, please have a mind that is questioning, never accepting, either your own experience or the experience of another, because we are going to enquire, observe, into the whole nature of man. The psychologists and the psychotherapists and all the philosophers both the religious theologians and the Communist theorists, if you accept any of them we shall become slaves to either one or to the other, and therefore we deny freedom to ourselves to enquire. I hope this is clear. You are not therefore, if I may point out, merely listening to what is being said, accepting or denying and just carrying on your own way of thinking, adhering to your own particular point of view, or accepting your own so-called spiritual experiences. Experience is something that happens, an event that takes place, either that event is emotional, romantic, illusory, or actual; actual in the sense that you may have certain emotional reaction, and if you don't question that emotional reaction you then become a slave to somebody else's concepts. I hope this is clear.

And so, if we may, we will go into this question, thinking together, into the structure of our being, into what we are, what your consciousness is. We mean by that word 'conscious', your

attitudes, your opinions, your judgement, your prejudices, your ideals, your fears, pleasures, the whole content of your existence, your suppositions, your illusions, your ideas - all that is our consciousness - right? You may invent a super-consciousness but it is still part of thought which has invented the super - right? And there have been volumes written all about consciousness and super-consciousness, and so on, but it is still the movement of thought and the things that thought has put together. So we are going to enquire, if we may, into all that.

First of all, why has man given such importance to pleasure? Please we are thinking together, there is no question of doubting here, we are thinking, you may question your very thinking but if you question your very thinking then you have to enquire into the nature of thought, which we have gone into, the nature of memory, knowledge, experience. Why man, throughout the world, has given this extraordinary importance to pleasure - why? Please we are thinking together. Why have you, or another, given this sense of continually pursuing everlastingly this pleasure? Pleasure not only sexually with all its images, past incidences, gathered there together as memory, the image-making and pursuing that image. And the pleasure of possession, whether worldly things or possession of certain values, experiences, knowledge. In that there is great pleasure. And there is pleasure in helping another. I do not know if you have gone into that: wanting to help people - you are following all this? And the pleasure of power, both physical and psychological. The power of so-called extrasensory perception, the power and the pleasure in dominating people, in guiding their lives. You know all this. And we are asking: why human beings since the

beginning of time have pursued this one particular aspect of life much more than others? Pleasure of search and finding, pleasure of seeking god - whatever that means, in quotes; pleasure of having tremendous control over one's body, or the mind. The constant restraint which brings also great pleasure. There are many, many forms of pleasure. Why does man, you and people, pursue this? Is there - please, we are enquiring, thinking together - is there an end to pleasure? Or pleasure when denied becomes violent, aggressive, takes different forms, from the very denial of what you want - right? May we go on with all this? May we? Please, I can go on, I have spent years on this, sixty or more years, so you have to maybe hear it for the first time, but you are also enquiring with the speaker, not just accepting and sitting back lazily. Your mind, your heart, your brain is actively enquiring.

What is the relationship between pleasure and desire? What is the relationship of desire, pleasure, will and love? You are following all this? Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Or is love something totally different? To us love has become pleasure - sexually and in many, many different ways. And we are asking: what is the relationship of pleasure to desire? Apparently they seem to go together. One desires a house, and the possession of a house, a woman, a man, title, knowledge, status, power - desire. You are following this? Apparently there is a relationship between the two: which is, desire as will and the action of will in the pursuit of pleasure. You see whatever experiences one has, personally I have doubted everything - possession, money, I haven't got it, fortunately, status and I haven't got any - personally I abhor all that kind of stuff, but one has to enquire very, very deeply if one wants

to find out if there is an ultimate truth, if there is an ultimate source of all this, the ultimate ground from which all life began and before. If one wants to go into that very deeply and see if there is such a thing then one must be free of every form of illusion. Illusion exists as long as there is the desire, pleasure, fear and sorrow - right?

So we are going to enquire into the nature of desire, which dominates our lives: desire for power, desire to understand, desire to find the ultimate happiness, all that, god - this burning inwardly which is called desire, this flame of discontent. And as long as that discontent is not understood, has not been unravelled, broken down so as to discover what lies behind discontent and desire, we must inevitably create illusions - illusions in our relationships with each other, illusions with regard to what is truth, if there is something beyond all time. So I hope we are going together in this. All right sirs?

What is desire? Why have human beings not been able to resolve that problem of constantly desiring, this constant urge, which is the desire to fulfil, the desire to identify and when that desire is not fulfilled the sense of antagonism, bitterness, anger and all the rest of the reactions that arise - right? So without suppressing, without identifying with something greater - you understand - which the monks all over the world do, that is, all the monks throughout the world have desire like every other human being, but the monks identify either themselves with Jesus, with Krishna, or Buddha, or whatever it is, and that desire is focussed on a symbol, an idea, a concept, but it is still desire. And there have been monks and priests throughout the world who have tried

different ways to suppress desire, to be free of desire, by torturing themselves physically, by fasting, through isolation, never looking at a woman, or a man, never looking at nature, the beauty of the hills, the streams and the waters, because all that provokes desire.

So have you not noticed some of the monks in the west when they are walking, they are reading the catechism? They never look at anybody. The same thing happened once in Kashmir, in India, I was walking behind a group of monks: it is a beautiful country, lovely hills, birds, flowers, rippling waters, and there was a flute playing in the distance. And these monks were only concentrating in repeating some mantra because the moment they released from that particular point desire might arise. You follow? So without suppressing, without evading, without any sense of direction, without motive, which is direction, let us go together to find out what is desire and its relationship to pleasure, and the action born of will - right? Is all this too much? Because our life is concerned with all this: we are not talking about anything ideological, outside of life, we are talking about life itself, our living, our daily tortuous, boring, lonely, desperate life. You may escape through social work, or going off to some country to help somebody, but we have to understand ourselves first before we can help another. That is why I don't want to help you in any way because you have to find out for yourself.

So desire, will, pleasure and action. Most of our actions, if you are aware of it, are directed by will - 'I will do this, I will become that, I will not do this, I should do that' - you understand? This action of will. "I will meditate," "I will follow, that person, not another" - will is part of our violence. And to understand that will

we must examine very closely desire because will is the essence of desire - right?

What is desire? How does desire come into being? And why does it play such an important part in our daily life? Whether to have a better house, better life outwardly, inwardly to become something different, this constant struggle. So let us go into it carefully, perhaps some of you may have heard the speaker explaining desire, but forget it. Forget what you have read, what he has explained yesterday or two years ago, or last year, and begin as though you knew nothing - right? Then it is fun, at least for me it is like that. If I kept on repeating what I said ten years ago it would be terribly boring.

So what is desire? Is there beauty in it? Is there something precious, something that the mind clings to to enrich it, giving meaning to life, helping the mind and the heart to flower? Not to become, to flower - you understand? I wonder if you understand that? There is a difference between the beauty of flowering and the striving to become something - you understand? Is there beauty in desire? Or is it always connected with striving, discontent, bitterness, anxiety? Are you waiting for me to tell you? Or are we working together? You understand the difference? Either you are waiting for the speaker to explain and therefore receiving, which puts me as your guru, somebody who is going to help you, which is not the speaker's intent at all. But if we are thinking, working together, moving together, walking together, then there is no teacher and the taught. You understand? Then there is only a movement which is called learning.

Learning as we know now is accumulating infinite knowledge

and acting from that knowledge. That is what we call learning, reading books, attending school, college, university, if you are lucky, or going out, acting and through action learn. Both are the same. You follow this? Go to school, college, university, study, study, study, accumulate information, knowledge and with that knowledge enter life as a lawyer, businessman, as a cook, as a carpenter, engineer, scientist, physicist and so on. Or go out without knowledge, act and through action learn; which is the same - right? Both result in the accumulation of knowledge, and this we call learning. Clear? That is our conditioning. Our brains are conditioned to that accumulation of knowledge and action.

And we are proposing something entirely different. There is a totally different kind of learning. You see your minds are never still, are they? May one ask? Occasionally. They are never still, still in the sense to observe so completely, not only the skies, the heavens, and the beauty of the earth, but also to observe silently without any movement of thought the whole structure of your own mind, your own being. Then when you so observe without any motive, without any direction, without any desire, then that very observation is an insight, which is not accumulation of knowledge but learning to act instantly, immediately from that which you have observed. Am I making myself clear of this? No.

You see sirs, our brain is accustomed, trained, conditioned to this knowledge. Knowledge becomes all important to act. That is all we know - right? And so our actions are always incomplete because our knowledge is always incomplete, obviously. So any action born from that knowledge must be partial - right? With regret, with sorrow, injury, compliance, conformity, imitation,

comparison - right? Are you following all this? Now is there an action which is not all that? An action which is not born out of remembrance? Can I go on sirs? We are asking. I say there is, the speaker says there is. That action is the instant, the immediate perception and acting. Be very careful here because most of us think we can act immediately - I am lost. I must go very carefully into this.

Do we first of all see that acting from knowledge is always limited - right? Because knowledge itself is limited and therefore thought is limited - right? Any action born from that must invariably be partial. That is obvious. Therefore one asks, you are asking, not me, I am not asking, you are: is there an action which is totally complete, without any regret, without looking back, without looking forward, without any strain - you understand? Totally, completely harmonious. There is, which is the art of observation, the art of seeing and that is possible only when there is no prejudice, when there is no direction, when there is no motive, only perceiving.

Can one be free of motive, to observe? Free of directing observation but just to observe. To observe the futility of accepting spiritual authority - I am taking that as an example. To observe it: what it has done to the human mind, what it has created in the world - the division, the hierarchical approach to life - you know the whole structure of it, to see it completely. It is not necessary to read books, to investigate Buddhism, Hinduism, and so on and so on, Christianity, and then come to a conclusion that they are all more or less the same. I do not mean that. I do not mean by analysing either. But to observe that the acceptance of spiritual

authority is destructive to freedom. And without freedom there is no observation. When you observe that way, in that moment of observation the whole nature of authority is explained, is shown because that means your mind is extraordinarily free and has the tremendous energy and capacity to observe. And in that observation there is freedom from authority, which is insight. And that insight is intelligence which is the essence of learning. Got it.

Have you understood sirs? I think you have. At least some of you. Now we are going to do exactly the same thing with regard to desire. We are not analysing desire. We are observing completely without any direction, motive to get rid of desire, or why shouldn't I have desire, what is wrong with desire and so on and so on and so on. Just to purely observe the movement of desire - right? Are we working together? That is, how does desire come into being? The objects of desire may vary - you may want a better house, somebody else wants a better wife, or a husband, or a position, or a new toy, a new guru, a new - I don't know, whatever. So the objects of desire vary all along, all the time. We are not talking about the objects of desire, but desire itself. We are observing, and therefore we are not telling what desire is, but that observation of desire is telling us its movement. You have got it? You understand sirs? Right? Are we together in this? Let's move on.

We are asking: what is the source, the nature of desire? It is obviously very simple. Seeing, touching, sensation - right? Right? Seeing the woman, or the house, or the car, or this or that, seeing, visual perception, contact, touching, sensation - right? Then thought creates the image of living in that house, being with that woman, or man, driving that car, sitting in a car, then desire begins

- right? Test it out for yourselves, don't accept what the speaker is saying. Seeing these corduroys, touching them, the sensation of them, then thought says, "How nice, what a nice colour that is, I wish I had those." There begins desire. That is, where there is sensation, the operation of the senses, then thought creates the image, and at that moment desire is born. Is this clear? It is not my explanation: see it for yourself. It is so obvious.

So why does - please go further - why does thought always create images? You understand? It is a very interesting point if you go into it. Why thought creates the image, or the imagination, the image of symbols, ideas, you know, the whole movement of images. The image that thought creates between two people, however intimate they are, between a man and a woman. The constant building and adding to the image. So the question is: why thought is always moving in the direction, in the process of constructing images? I see that - one sees that blue shirt or the robe, or whatever it is, in the window. It is a nice colour, well cut, well made. There up to that point it is all right - right? Then thought says, "I wish I had that shirt. It would look rather nice on me" and then the pursuit of that, acquiring the shirt and the pleasure of having it. You are following all this? This is very simple if you break it up.

Now the question is, this is where comes learning, not accumulating but learning, which is: seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought not entering into that. You are following what I am saying? No. I will explain. It is natural, sensible, sensitive, the reactions are alive, seeing something beautiful, touching it, the sensation. That is natural - right? If you haven't that there is

something wrong with your system, nervous system, your whole body is not sensitive, alert. Up to that point it is excellent. Then thought comes along, creates an image, then the movement of desire and the pursuit of it, the pleasure of it, the gathering of it - right? Now the question is: why does thought create the image, and can thought, which is also sensation, realize that when this movement takes place, which is desire, conflict begins? I wonder if you understand? Right? Sirs, don't look at me. It is not worth it but find out for yourself. Because you see it means never allowing thought - no, not never allowing - thought realizing the nature of the image, why it is creating the image, thought itself realizing that, then desire becomes something totally different. You understand what I am saying? Then there is no conflict in desire. Do you see this? Where there is desire, with its image created by thought, there must be the pursuit of pleasure - right? Do you see this? And when pleasure is thwarted either there is fear, or antagonism or violence. That is the root of violence.

So to understand, to go very deeply into the ending of violence and the understanding of pleasure and desire, if this process is understood, not intellectually but actually as a movement in one's life, then you will discover, if you go into it deeply that enjoyment is something entirely different from pleasure - you understand? When you look at the mountains, the hills and the snow and - not these days, unfortunately - but if you do observe it on a clear day, marvellously blue sky, the snow lines of the hills and the valleys and the waters, and the brightness and the brilliance of the day, that is enjoyment - right? What is wrong with that? It's perfect, lovely to feel that. But thought says: "I hope I shall have it when I come

back the next day" - you follow? The perception of that sense of enjoyment becomes a memory, then that memory becomes the pleasure, because it has created an image of that excellent morning, and the pursuit of that excellent morning as a remembrance - right? I wonder if you see all this.

So the question then is, to pursue it further: that beauty of a morning, why should it be registered at all? You understand my question? There is enjoyment of that morning, the stillness, the quietness, every leaf is alive and the trees are moving, you know the extraordinary sense of beauty of the morning. It has happened. Finished. But the brain has registered it as a memory, and then thought says, "I hope I will have the same feeling, the excitement and the beauty of it the next morning". You have understood up to that point? Right? We are asking: why should the brain register that event? It is finished. You have understood? The moment it has registered and said "I must have it the next morning", when the beauty of the next morning appears you haven't seen it for the first time. Am I explaining this?

So we are going into something much more difficult, which is: the enjoyment when it is registered, then that registration is the pursuit of pleasure. Right? And not the beauty of that instant. It is a remembrance, remembered beauty, which is not beauty. Do you understand what I am saying? So pleasure invariably goes with fear - right? No? It is so obvious, sirs. Shall we go on? Fear is very, very deeply rooted in human beings. And where there is fear there is darkness. You understand this? And the human mind, including the brain, has lived with fear: fear of loneliness, fear of not being successful, fear of losing, fear of not having security, fear of love,

fear of dependence, fear of attachment. We all know this. Every human being has this deep rooted fear. And the mind has lived with it. We accept it, as we accept terrorism in this present age, as we accept totalitarianism, as we accept wars, as we accept division - tribal divisions which are called nationalities, the religious divisions - we accept all these, because we daren't question anything. And if we do question there is fear - right? So we are born with fear and die with fear. And that is a tragedy. We have never asked ourselves whether fear can end completely, like pain, like a disease? You know what to do with a disease, unless it is incurable. But we have never said, asked, or demanded, enquired whether fear can end completely, totally. We are asking that now. Ask that question, put that question to yourself. That is how we are thinking together. I am not asking you to put that question, you are putting the question for yourself.

Is fear from something, or about something? Or, is fear something totally different from the object of fear? Is this becoming too difficult? You understand sirs? One is afraid of darkness. Afraid of losing one's job. Afraid of one's wife running away, or husband chasing another woman. Or afraid of being alone, by yourself. And so it is always fear of something, from something, or about something - right? We are asking the question: is there a fear in itself, per se? Or is it always about, from, to something - you understand? Please ask these questions.

Is fear innate, like blood, like the cells, like smell, the hearing, the seeing? Or the nature of fear is wanting; wanting security, wanting to run away from loneliness, wanting to be something? You understand? I wonder if you are meeting my point. Are we

going together? Or fear is something that is not wanting, groping, escaping from something, either the past, the present or the future, but it exists by itself as long as there is the movement of time and thought? I wonder if you are getting it? Say one is afraid of loneliness - most of us probably know that. Or losing a job or losing something. The loneliness. If you are married, if you have children, as long as they are together you never think about loneliness. It never is there. But as you grow older your children have gone, and all the rest of it, you suddenly find yourself old, lonely, unhappy - right? And that breeds fear - right? As one is afraid of death, something that will happen in the future, not immediately because you are all sitting here - unless the tent collapses. So there is the avoidance of death, which is perhaps at the end of some years, which is time - right? Right? And the thought that I might die. So is fear the result of time? Or of thought? Or time and thought are the same? One has done something in the past, and one is afraid of that, because it is not palatable, it is not nice, it is not pleasant. So one is afraid of that coming up again and being attacked. So the memory of that past incident, which was not pleasant, is the remembrance of something past - right? Which is the movement of thought. And the movement of thought is the movement of time - right? Right sirs? So is fear the movement of thought and time? I wonder if you understand this?

If I am to die now, immediately, there is no fear - right? It is finished. But I want to live another ten years, or another five years, and I hope nothing will happen in between that time - right? So fear is time. Do you realize this sirs? And thought. Right? No,

please see this. This is very, very important. If you once understand this, you have to understand time and thought so completely then fear ceases totally. That is why it is very important to understand the nature of time.

(Train noise with whistle). The train, that whistle is telling us to stop! It is very important to understand - we have got another ten minutes - time and thought. What is time, apart from yesterday, today and tomorrow, apart from time is necessary as a means of learning languages, subjects and so on, time as distance to cover from here to Lausanne, that is necessary, time is necessary to cover the distance? Time as sunrise, sunset, and the darkness, evening. That is a fact. Now is there time apart from that? Apparently there is. "I will be. I am going to be successful. I am not now, but I will be. I am angry, give me time and I will get over it". So there is physical time and psychological time. Right? And I am questioning, doubting whether there is psychological time at all. We have accepted psychological time. "I will become." - become the Minister, Governor, the politician - you know become something or other, which is hope - right? So we are questioning whether there is psychological time at all. We have accepted psychological time, which may be an illusion, though all the saints, all the religious people, all the philosophers say you must have time. Time is knowledge. Time is a means of achieving, psychologically - right? We are doubting that. We are questioning whether it is so. Apparently it is so. But is it actually so? You see? Right?

That is: "I am not and I will be" - right? This movement from 'what is' to 'what should be'. That is psychological time. And that

we have swallowed, lived with it, accepted it, and that is part of our nature, part of our mind, heart, brain. I question it and I don't accept it. That is: is there actually psychologically becoming something? You understand? Actually? That is: 'what is' and 'what should be'. Right? I am putting it very quickly. Can we move? 'What is', anger, jealousy or whatever it is, greed, loneliness, whatever it is, 'what is' and moving away from 'what is' to 'what might be', 'what should be', what is hoped for. That is time - right? But is 'what should be' actual, or only 'what is'? The 'what might be', might not be! But 'what is', is so. You understand? Come on sirs, right? It is so. If it is so why is the mind moving away from 'what is' to 'what might be'? Why is it incapable of living, understanding, observing 'what is'? Why is this movement away from 'what is'? I wonder if you get this? You understand my question? We are working together? Are you following this? Why is there always in us psychologically not living with 'what is', being with 'what is'? But moving away from 'what is', is time? So if there is no movement away from 'what is', there is no psychological time at all. Get it?

So can the mind remain, hold, observe only 'what is', and not move away in any direction, horizontally, vertically and so on, but purely observe 'what is'? In that observation there is no time at all. Do it sirs and you will see it. That is, psychological time, which we have accepted, and if we go into it very carefully without any reaction, without any motive, you will see what is of the greatest importance is not 'what should be', but 'what is', then in the observation of 'what is' there is the withering away of that which is, because when you move away from it the 'what is' still remains.

The moving away from it is wastage of energy. Whereas observation is total attention of 'what is', which is the observation of complete energy. Where there is complete energy there is complete attention, and where there is inattention there is the movement away from 'what is'. Have you got this? I don't know what I have said just now. You understand sirs?

This is great fun: one is jealous, that is 'what is'. Then we say, "Why shouldn't I be jealous?" - jealousy is justified, reasoned, analysed, which are all moving away from the actual central fact of being jealous. This movement of analysis, of moving away, of justifying it, is a wastage of energy, which doesn't solve the jealousy - right? But when there is total observation, pure observation, which means no motive to dissolve 'what is', so when there is complete perception, which is total attention, in that attention there is all your energy. So where there is complete attention there is no jealousy. Only when there is inattention jealousy begins. I wonder if you get it? Have you got this? May we stop now?

SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1980

As I said the last time that we met here, we would talk about death - sorry on such a nice morning - the ending of sorrow and what perhaps one can come upon, which is love and compassion. That is what we said we would talk over today. And on Sunday what is meditation - right?

We have talked a good deal about the various aspects of life, of our daily existence, how important it is to understand ourselves and to understand the structure and the nature of the brain and the mind. Perhaps some of you have listened and have gone into it fairly deeply, and some of you perhaps cursorily, superficially, and the others may say, "We all know this, we have read about it, we have been to Asia, India and other countries gathering a lot of information. And also we come here to find out what you have got to say". (Noise of aeroplane) - It is a clear day, therefore you are going to have a lot of noise!

We talked about the art of seeing, the art of listening, and the art of learning. (Noise of aeroplane) Shall I go on in spite of that? It is a lovely peaceful world! And if one may, I would like to talk about first the art of listening.

The word 'art' means to put everything in its proper place. That is the root meaning of that word. That means to have order, not only physical order, where one lives, in the room one lives, but also order within oneself. This order we talked about the other day too. But there is an order in listening. We not only hear with the hearing of the ear, but also we hear much more deeply, beyond the ear. That is, we understand the words if one is speaking English or

French or German or Italian, and the words are communicated to the brain and the meaning of those words are ascertained and either accepted or rejected, according to our conditioning. That is generally what we do. That is what we call hearing - hearing with your ears, transmitting what is said through the nerves and so on to the brain, and the interpretation of the usage of words and accepting or denying. But there is another art of listening, that is, not only to hear with the ears but also, if one may use the word, unconsciously, deeply. I do not know if you have ever tried that. That is, to listen to the words and to find out the truth of any statement that is made by the speaker, not only intellectually, not only with considerable doubt but also to listen without any resistance, which does not mean accepting. But to listen so profoundly, with great attention, that the very act of listening brings about a total breaking down of the pattern of the brain. I do not know if I am making myself clear on this point. Because our brain functions in patterns, whether it is a modern pattern or an ancient pattern, traditional, or non-traditional, in a particular groove, religious, political, economic, social, but they never come together. That is, to listen with complete attention, which in itself breaks down the pattern of the brain - you are following this?

Suppose one listens to a statement as: the past - please listen to this for a minute - the past is giving meaning to the present, and therefore the present has no meaning. The past is giving meaning to the present and therefore the present has no meaning at all. One hears that statement not only with your ears but also one listens to find out the truth of it, or the falseness of it, the significance of it, the depth of it. And this is not possible if you are merely

intellectually comprehending - right? If you are merely allowing the intellect to dominate so that it reasons logically or not logically and comes to a conclusion. But whereas if you are willing to listen to that statement which has just been made, you listen so completely so that either it rings a real bell inside you, as it were, the truth of that statement, or the intellect begins to interpret what has been said. Have I made it somewhat clear? That is the art of listening, which may be in itself the total response of the whole structure of the mind and the brain, the response totally, harmoniously, without any direction or interpretation, just the act of listening. Can we proceed from there?

First of all let us talk over together the question whether suffering can ever end? This has been a problem for man and not only the so-called personal suffering but the universal suffering of mankind. The suffering either of the so-called individual, or of mankind, is the same. Suffering is the same whether it is yours, mine or another's. We may interpret that suffering in a different way, we may have a cause for that suffering in another direction, but essentially suffering is common to all man. So it is not your suffering but human suffering. I wonder if we can tolerate that statement, because most of us are individualistic. That is training, our education, our culture, that we are individuals separate from another, not only biologically, physically, but also inwardly. Our worries are different from another's, our anxieties, our fears, our sorrows, our despairs are personal, ours, and nothing to do with another. And this individuality has been emphasized by the religions, individual souls being redeemed and so on, and in the Asiatic world the individual must strive apart from others to reach

Nirvana, Heaven, Moksha or whatever you like to call it. So there has been this conditioning through centuries that we are separate human beings.

Now is that so? And because we are separate individual human beings we think we are free to do what we want, to follow this path or that path, that guru, or another guru, follow certain ideals and so on and so on. So first we must question, doubt - as we pointed out the other day - whether you are really an individual. Or it is an illusion which has been sustained constantly by the idea, the education that you are essentially different from another. We are going to question, doubt that belief that we are individuals.

The word 'individual' means undivided, indivisible. But we are not indivisible, we are divisible, we are broken up, fragmented, constantly in conflict. And when you examine the psychological structure of every human being, it is a constant factor whether in the East, West, or whatever country one lives in, the common factor is that all human beings go through a terrible time, misery, confusion, anxiety, despair, depression - you know, all the rest of it - whether they live in India, America or in this country. That is the psychological common factor. Therefore your psychological structure is common to all humanity. Therefore you are not a separate psychological entity. This is very difficult for most people to see, or even to listen to it because they are so conditioned, their whole culture is based on this - individual salvation, being redeemed by a saviour, individual striving to become something in opposition to the rest, and so on and so on.

So if you see by listening to this either the truth of it, or either reject it - as probably most of you will do - or find out for yourself

through observation, not through analysis, but through observation your own conditioning and so thereby discover how psychologically it is one. So if you are exercising your capacity to observe without prejudice, without your conditioning, then we can go together, talk over together the suffering of mankind. Mankind is you. The world is you and you are the world. You may be physically differing, tall, short, dark haired, blonde and dark skin, black skin, white skin, you know, purple skin, yellow skin and all the rest of it.

So we are talking about sorrow, man's sorrow, the universal sorrow, the sorrow of every human being on this earth, no one seems to escape from it. Either that sorrow is brought through death of another, or the failure to achieve a result, to climb the ladder of success, whether in the religious spiritual world, so-called spiritual world, or in the physical world. Or losing a job, or fearing the danger of complete loneliness. All these factors contribute to sorrow - death, disease, old age, crippled - you know, all the rest of it - crippled both physically and psychologically, the neurotic and the saint. And generally the saints are neurotic. I know it is difficult for the Christian and the Asiatic world to accept such a statement, but if you examine it closely, without any prejudice, this constant pursuit to become something, either in the physical world or in the psychological world. To become something. The something is projected by the mind as an idea, a concept and striving to achieve that. But what is projected, what is the ideal is constructed, put together by thought, and thought in itself is everlastingly limited. And a man who is striving within the field of limitation is either idiotic, non-observant or some kind of unbalanced person. (Noise

of train) That is the first train, we are going to have three more!

So we are talking over together, if you will, this question of the sorrow of mankind, of which you are. And man has lived with this sorrow. There have been five thousand wars within the historical period, and you can imagine what tears, wounds, pain, anxiety, brutality, cruelty, during all these five thousand wars - and we are still going on. We are still going on with our tribal wars. And we also, during all these many millenia, have never been able to solve that problem, end it so completely that there is a new energy, totally different from the energy of thought, pain, suffering. So we are together, if you will, going to go into it.

What is suffering? And why has man put up with it? Can it be ended by will? Or is there a cause for it? If there is a cause it can be ended: what has a cause has an ending. We went into that in the previous talks. That is the law: if there is a cause it must end, there is an ending to it. So we are first asking, as human beings, not as individuals, asking: why mankind, you, you and another, live with this, as with fear, as with conflict, outwardly and inwardly, we live with it, we are never free of it? And if one is aware - aware in the sense to observe the actual sorrow that one has. Not invented sorrow, but the actual despair, the actual terrible loneliness, the sense of deprivation, the hopelessness of a life that has no meaning. You may invent the meanings but actually if you observe the life as it is lived has no meaning: going to the office, factory for the rest of one's life, an occasional holiday with bad weather, and this is the way of our existence.

What is sorrow? The word 'sorrow' comes also with the word 'passion'. They are together, these two words - passion, not lust, not

sexual demands but passion and suffering go together. When you suffer a great deal, in the sense that you have lost somebody whom you have loved - quotes 'loved' - and suddenly find yourself utterly lonely, unrelated, isolated because you have depended, attached to that person or to something else, and that sense of attachment to a person has come suddenly to an end. You have lived together, talked together, laughed together, walked the fields and the mountains, followed the rivers, and suddenly you are left. I am sure you all know this. Then the mind, incapable of understanding this suddenness, this deprivation, seeks comfort - you are following all this? - psychological comfort, goes to church, gurus, read books, attend football, you know, they are all similar, whether it is a religious ceremony or a football ceremony. I know you will all disagree, but they are all emotional excitement, and we escape from this central issue of our losing something which we have held dear.

And from that isolation one begins to withdraw - you are following all this? You are thinking together? Are we? Withdraw, become either bitter, lose one's mind if it is really a tremendous shock, or fall back on reincarnation, you know, all the rest of it. And the priests and the gurus are too willing to offer help. And you are caught in that and for ever lost. But you have not grappled or understood the root of sorrow. Right? Are we meeting each other? Are we? Right?

Is sorrow the concentration of all one's isolating activities in life? You understand what I am saying? You are following? All one's life, through various actions, desires and so on one has narrowed this enormous complex energy of life into a certain

narrow groove. Which is, this narrow groove is the me - my struggle, my happiness, my sorrow. And this tremendous energy of life has been narrowed down to a small little entity - you follow? Mr. Smith, and so on. And one is never aware of all that, the isolating process of daily life. Which is, through ambition, through aggression, acting for oneself, one's own pursuit of desires, that has brought this narrowness of this tremendous energy to this little point. And sorrow, is it an indication - please listen - that emphasizes this extraordinary sense of separation? You are following this? Is it too difficult? We are not talking an abstraction, in theories, either theological or theoretical. We are talking over together the practical way of ending this business, this enormous burden that man has carried. And sorrow may be the indication that dependence, attachment is corruption. And death is also a form of corruption. I wonder if you follow all this? No? No. Move sirs. Sorry!

We are uncovering slowly, bit by bit the cause of sorrow. First of all when another dies there is physical shock - right? And when that shock is over there is the mental, emotional, psychological sense of utter desperate loneliness. I am not inventing all this, this is one's life. And if we do not escape, avoid, and are totally with the fact of this sense of isolation, be with it, instead of running away from it, crying, despair - you follow? - all the things that happen, and be completely attentively with the fact that one has totally, through various activities brought about this isolation. (Noise of train) That is the second train.

So the ending of sorrow is not at the moment of losing somebody - you understand? - or not being able to fulfil in

something, or not trying to become something, climbing the ladder of success, either spiritual or mundane, it is not at the moment of death of someone you have liked or loved or been a companion, sorrow is not at that moment, it has begun long ago. You understand? You have understood what I am saying? It has begun long ago - long ago in the sense that all your acts have brought about this isolation, of which you are unconscious, which we take for granted. And sorrow may be the indication of what you have done - you follow sirs?

So can this isolating process comes to an end, not at the moment of death and understanding death and all the rest of it, the cause of this isolating movement? Is the cause of this isolating movement the idea that I am an individual, I am not the rest of mankind, I am separate, my salvation is through my own endeavour, through my own isolating enquiry, isolating activity, there is the beginning? Can that cause, which is the beginning, end there? I wonder if you understand all this? Are we going together? Not verbally, please, any person can see this verbally very clearly, but to go into the depth of it, put your heart and mind into it.

Can there be an action which is not isolating? You understand? Any action. That action can only take place when one understands the nature of love - you are following this? Not the love of a guru, or a god, or books, or your wife - love. Which is, in which there is no sense of jealousy - right? How can a man who is aggressive, or a woman, know what love is? Right? How can a man who is ambitious, concerned about himself, his progress, his unhappiness, his fears - concerned about himself, how can he love? And there is this Asiatic idea, and also it exists perhaps here and it does, which

is surrender yourself to god - you understand? Or surrender yourself to the guru, the vanity of the guru - you understand? You are following all this? Which means, truth is not so important as your surrendering yourself to an image that the mind has created. Your guru, whatever he calls himself, is a concept in your mind, an image which you have created of what a guru should be. Right? And he naturally plays up to that image. Oh, you are all so childish.

So is there an action which is not born out of desire? I went into that the other day, into the whole movement of desire, which means is love desire? No, don't say "No" - it is easy to say no. But to discover it, understand the nature of desire, with all its images and the ending of the images, that is to see that desire is not love. And pleasure, whether that pleasure be the pursuit of god, social service, or helping another and so on, basically, deeply, the pursuit of pleasure, that pleasure is not love. Right? Are you willing to follow so far? Or your sexual pleasure, the pleasure of being somebody in the world, the pleasure of being able to achieve something inwardly, holding on to some experience through drugs, through alcohol, through some kind of hypnotic presence of your guru, and having an experience and holding on to that experience, which gives you pleasure - all that, is that love? Will we go together into this? This is your problem. You sit there, listen, agree, see the logic of it, see the sanity of it, the reasonableness of it, the intellectual comprehension of it, but when you leave here, this tent, you are back again in the old game. So you are willing as a human being to carry on this burden of sorrow. Right? And a mind that lives in sorrow can never be free. You understand? And it is only a mind that is totally free from sorrow that can know what

compassion is.

The act of compassion is the act of intelligence. We mean by that word not the intellectual capacity of discernment, to distinguish, to reason, to judge, to weigh - all that is the capacity of the intellect. So intellect has its own intelligence. You are following this? But we are talking of a totally different kind of intelligence. The ordinary intellectual intelligence we all have, more or less, because we are supposed to be educated, read books, clever at argument, opposing one opinion against another, and so on. But where there is compassion the intellect has very little part. Where there is compassion, which comes into being without your inviting it, it comes into being when there is the ending of sorrow. The ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom and therefore intelligence. You understand all this? You don't do it! You are probably - I hope not - persuaded by the speaker, dominated by his presence, which is nonsense. But if you really go into this very deeply you will find your energy, which is being dissipated now in idealistic actions, in individual narrowing down of action, all that wastage of energy is making the mind shallow, not allowing the capacity which the brain has, immense capacity, psychologically, making that psychological structure become more and more narrow, shallow.

So compassion goes with intelligence and wisdom, which is the very nature of intelligence. When there is that intelligence you can argue, logically, sanely, but with a quality of compassion - you understand? No, you don't.

So love, compassion and the ending is death. Do you get this? No. You see your minds are not quick enough. You always want

explanations. We don't see immediately the beauty of that statement. We are going now to enquire into what is death? I don't know - one doesn't know if you are interested in this enquiry. Some people say "I hate death. I hate poverty" - the gurus say this. And we can now, when there is little noise in the air, we can now consider what is death, because all of us have to face it, whether you are old or young or crippled or living in great luxury, money and all the rest of it, the saints and the common man, and the pope and the little priest in the parish village, all have got to face this. Even Marx had to face it. The Communists have to face it. The psychologists have to face it. So being ordinary human beings, not professionals, because then those people who are professionals are already committed, professional gurus, professional priests, professional psychologists, professional - they are already committed, and therefore when you are committed, tied, you are already corrupt.

So we are going to enquire: what is death? That means, what is death, of which mankind from the beginning of time has been frightened? What is an ending? You understand my question? An ending. The ending of smoking, the ending of drug taking, the ending of drinking alcoholic stuff, the ending of something or other, the ending. You understand my question? Do we ever end anything? Or continue the pattern in different colours? I give up this pattern and take on another pattern. I give up this conditioning, take on another conditioning. I go from one psychologist to another psychologist. The latest psychologist with a new set of words. So is there ever an ending to anything in our life? Please enquire with me, don't just sit there and just listen, find out. Or there is a

constant continuity of the same thing in different directions? Do you end anything without any motive? You understand what I am asking? Without the action of will, saying "I will end". Enquire. Have you naturally given up, ended something which gives you delight? You understand my question? You will end something which is painful very easily, but will you end something which gives you great pleasure without any motive, without any action of will, without a projection and accepting that projection - you follow? The ending. And death is the ending.

Say for example you are attached to something, attached to your wife, to your girl-friend, to a boyfriend and so on and so on, to a belief, to a dogma, to a ritual, to a theory, to an experience - attached, holding on, clinging - will there be a natural, easy ending to that attachment? - without conflict, without asking "Why should I?", not rationalizing it, but just giving it up, letting it go. Will you do it? No. Of course not. If you told your wife, or your girl friend, "I am sorry I am no longer attached to you", she will tell you "To whom are you attached? Have you another girl?" - you follow?

So find out while living, so-called living with all the travail of life, whether you can end something happily, easily, without any conflict. If you don't naturally - and this is not a threat because that is absurd - naturally you will be afraid of death. And what is death? You follow my question? What is this death of which human beings are so frightened? Everybody is frightened about this thing - even Brezhnev, I am quite sure. Everybody wants to continue. The continuity is what has been - right - modified. But it is the same movement of constant continuity of that which has been modified. Right? That is our life - the jobs, the conflicts, the wars, the misery,

the confusion, that is our living. And we cling to that. Which is, to cling to our consciousness - you are following this? - this consciousness which each one of us thinks is totally different - right? You are following this? This consciousness is made up of its content - right? You are following all this. The content is your belief, your dogmas, your rituals, your culture, your knowledge, your despairs, depression, your uncertainty - which is common to all mankind. Right? You see your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind, psychologically. And the mind, or the brain, clings to that because in that there is security. It is afraid to let go because you don't know what is going to happen.

So you see one of the factors of the content of our consciousness, the human consciousness, is attachment. I am sorry to repeat that. Because that is our basic conflict. The Communist is attached to his Marxist ideals, the Catholic to his and all the rest of it. The idealists, the believers, the people who have experiences, holding on to that. That is the content of our consciousness, whether you are a scientist, psychologist, or a guru, or the latest pope.

And if you take one of the factors, one of the things, in this consciousness, which is attachment - or take anything which is acute and personal - then find out if it can be ended. Not struggle - you follow? - "I must end it in order to get something else", and all that stuff. End it. You can't argue with death, which is, the ending. There is a marvellous story in the Upanishads of India - I won't go into it because it is a very good story, we have only a little time. You want to go into it, that story? Of course, of course. Anything to divert us, move away from ourselves!

A Brahmana - you know what a Brahmana is? - in India, in the ancient days, he was giving away everything he had. It used to be an old tradition that when you have gathered some things for five years, through work, and all that, after five years you must give everything away - you understand? Do it! Which means, never gather anything - right? - so that you have nothing to give away. He had given away his cattle, his house, various things, and he has a son. The son comes to him and says, "Father you are giving away everything, and to whom are you going to give me?" And the father says, "Please go away, don't be childish, don't ask this question". But the boy comes back several times and ultimately he says, "Father tell me, to whom are you going to give me?" The father by now is very angry and says, "I am going to send you to death". And being a Brahmana he must keep his word. So he sends the boy away. So the boy goes from one teacher to another on the way to death. One guru, one teacher says, "You will live after death. Through many lives you will ultimately come to the highest principle". And he goes to another teacher and says, "I am going to the house of death what is there after?" "There is nothing after. This annihilation". So he goes on and ultimately arrives at the house of death. And when he arrives death is absent. You understand this? See the beauty of it sirs. You understand? Death is absent, so he waits for three days. So on the third day death comes and says, "As you are a Brahmana I apologize for keeping you waiting. And since you have come this long distance I give you, I offer anything you like. Women, palaces, wealth, anything you want". And the boy says, "I may have all those, but at the end of it I will meet you". Right? "You will always be there, whatever gifts

you give, you will always be there". And death says, "You are a marvellous person, to avoid all this and seeking truth". So he goes into the question - I have not read the story myself, people have told it to me - he goes into the question of time, self, and the ending of the self. You understand? That is the story. Sorry it peters out!

So we are asking: can we give away anything that we hold dear? And is there a continuity - please go with me a little while, you aren't too tired? - is there a continuity of me, the ego? You understand? The me. I die through disease, old age, accident, doctors, yoga teachers. At the end of it I die. And the Hindus have thought, the ancient people of India, say there is you who will continue, life after life, life after life, going through various stages of suffering, etc. Ultimately you will reach the highest principle - right? That is what is called reincarnation, to incarnate over and over again. But we are asking: what is this thing that will continue? You understand my question? What is this thing, you, what is the you? Is it an actuality? Or something put together - your name, your form, your culture, your character, your dependence, your sorrow, put together. That which has been put together can be undone. You understand? I wonder if you understand this? That which has been put together by thought - right? I am K. I have this. I am that. I am popular, etc.etc. Follow? All that is put together by thought. Right? The thought which has created the image of me. The me is the image, opposed to another image. Please follow logically, this is so.

So this thing that has been put together by thought, and when thought ends the thing that has been put together naturally

dissolves. So before I die, can I living dissolve this thing? You understand? You have understood? Not at the end, that is very cheap. That is common to all of us, death. Therefore that is very, very common, vulgus, common. But whereas this thing that has been put together by thought as culture, by thought as a name, by thought as a character, the image that thought has built for 80, 90, 50, 30, or 100 years, that image is the consciousness - right? You are following this? That consciousness with its content can be ended while I am living. Which means while I am living I am dying. I wonder if you see this? You understand sirs? One doesn't wait for death to come at the end of time, but to live with death, which is the ending. With the ending of that there is tremendous energy.

You see at the ending of that, the cause of sorrow, is this. And with the ending of it there is compassion, and with it comes intelligence. And if you want to go much further, not you, penetrate much further, which is the beginning of meditation, which we will go into on Sunday - right? May I get up and go?

SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1980

This is the last talk. There will be Question and Answer meetings for five days, from Wednesday to Sunday.

We have talked over together about the complications of our life. Our whole existence is so complex, with all its illusions, symbols and ideas and images, and our own personal ambitions, attachments of various kinds. And the world, of which we are, is becoming more and more confused, brutal, more and more divisive, destructive, without any sense of morality, and our society is very corrupt, as our religions are. And observing all this, as one must if one is serious, what is a human being to do? What are we, each one of us, to do in this mad world? Shall we go off into some exclusive club of religiosity? Become some kind of monk? Throw ourselves into some social reform? Join the Communist party, or other political activists? Or is there a way totally detached from all this, totally disassociated from all this, is there a way of living totally completely differently, yet living in this world? That is a great question and it demands a serious answer.

Can we, each of us who are human beings living in this world, human beings who are actually the whole global humanity, can we, without becoming committed to any political party, Left, Right, Centre, not belonging to any religions, organized religions, to any guru, to any commune committed to an ideal, to any system, method, because they have all become so corrupt, what shall we do? Perhaps some of us are serious, some of us half serious and the others casual. If we are at all serious in the sense of not being committed to anything because we have understood the nature of

being committed, being attached to your clothes, to a peculiar dress one wears after having been in India - and all that, not belonging to anything. Can we live in this world, earn our livelihood, be related to other human beings, be so totally free? Because only then perhaps we will know what love is. We have exercised our intellect, we have written books, given lectures, converted others, either to Communism or to other forms of religious quackery. And when we are disillusioned we move away from them and the others are caught in it. This is what is happening. And it seems to one that one must begin with uncertainty to find complete security, certainty.

As we said the other day, we are talking over together. You are not accepting anything the speaker is saying. You are beginning, I hope, to question, to doubt, not only what the speaker is saying, but also to doubt your own activities, your own form of drug - you may not take LSD and there are various other forms of drugs, alcohol and smoking and you know, all that, but also you may be drugged by belief, drugged by ideals, drugged by authority of someone who say, 'I know, you don't, I will help you. Or I will point the way'. Those are all various forms of drugs because they cripple the clarity of one's own perception.

So we are asking together: is it possible to live in this world without any motive? Because love has no motive. If I have a motive to love you because you are kindly attending this tent, or I derive some benefit psychologically in talking to you, then I am already corrupt, I am already lost. Out of that corruption one can create all kinds of illusions, all kinds of ideas, ideals. So can one be free from all this? Because we are going to discuss presently what

is meditation, what is religion, if there is anything sacred in life, which man throughout the ages has sought, something beyond thought, beyond time, beyond all the mischief the intellect has brought about? Is there something which is incorruptible, timeless, which is beyond all thought? This man has sought throughout immemorial days.

And if we are at all serious in our own life, we see how empty it is. You may put on all kinds of garbs, beguile yourself with daydreams, beguile yourself with imagination, images. And it becomes more important to find out why human minds have created images, not only out there, in the temples, in the churches and all the rest of it. In the Islamic world, the mosques are not filled with images but they have their own form of images, the script which goes from left to right. Beautiful script but that becomes the image, the symbol, the idea. So one must ask before we enter into this question of meditation: why we create images? You understand? Images of ideas, symbols, concepts, and according to symbols, images, concepts we live: why human beings have done this since time beyond measure?

I do not know if you have not observed that when you are related to some person, intimately or otherwise, the mind and thought has already created an image. Obviously you who are kind enough to come here, you have already created an image about the speaker - you can't help it. You have it, as you have an image about your wife, husband and so on. Why does the mind, thought, the brain, creates these images? Because it is very important to understand this, because that may be the reason, the cause why human beings do not love.

If you have observed yourself, the activity of your own thought and mind, and heart and brain, in your relationship you have an image about her or him - why? Please, as we said, put this question to yourself. I am not putting the question to you. You, who are living in this world, with all the divisions and mess, and utter misery and depression, degeneration, why you have an image? Having an image about anything, does that give security? You understand my question? One feels safe when you have an image about another, you feel safe. Because the other is moving, living, striving, pushing, and if you don't have an image about the person, then your mind and heart, everything has to be tremendously active. And most of our minds are lazy, befogged, clouded, without any subtlety, movement, quickness. So having an image about another gives one great security.

You who are kindly listening to the speaker, you have an image about him, bound to, otherwise you wouldn't be here. The reputation and all that nonsense. So having an image one feels one knows. You don't know me, the speaker, nor your wife, nor your husband, nor your friend, but having an image you think you know. So knowledge becomes, through the image, a sense of well being, safe, security and thereby gradual degeneration of the brain, the mind, because then you become lazy, you accept, you never question the image itself, you never doubt the image: the image that Christianity has imposed on people, the image that the Hindus, the Buddhists and so on have imposed - to have these images gives one a sense of security, a sense of well being. And so gradually the enormous vitality which the brain has, gradually it withers away and in that withering, which is unconscious, we feel safe, secure,

traditional, 'stay put'.

Please observe this in yourselves, not what the speaker is saying. Find out, if one may suggest, whether it is true or not. Not what the speaker is saying, but the image that you have, whether that image is not making your mind dull, whether that image is not preventing the extraordinary flowering of love. Because without that quality, that strange flower, one cannot possibly have order in one's life, and therefore order outwardly. Society is created by each one of us. It isn't the creation of some strange individuals in the far past, or some super human god, but the society in which we live is created by human beings - through their ambition, through their greed, through their competition, through their constant struggle, through their vanity, aggression, and so on. So the society is what we are. And this is important to understand: unless we radically bring about a transformation in ourselves we shall always live in a corrupt society. And therefore that corruption brings danger, terrorism, Communism, all the divisive elements in society. Please do pay attention to all this. It is your life.

So we are asking: whether you can live in this life without a single image? Which means: is there security beyond the image? You understand my question? Is there a sense of well being, a sense of not being hurt psychologically, wounded? Is there such a state so completely secure, not the security brought about by thought, through the image, through the symbol, through various forms of conclusions, ideals and so on, which do not give security, but it gives the illusion of being secure? You are following all this? Oh, for god's sake, we are moving together? It is very difficult to talk or to have a serious meeting with so many people, because we

are all thinking so many different things. Each one is concerned with his own problems, with his own desires, with his own pursuits, you are committed to this guru or to that idea, so you just come and listen, agree or disagree and casually carry on. But if you are serious, and life demands that one be serious, not only in the present state of the world, what people have done in the present and the people who are doing it, if you are not aware of all that, which is in ourselves, then we live and bring about corruption, degeneration.

So is it possible for the mind and heart, and therefore the brain, the whole human psychological structure of which you are, this whole consciousness, to be radically changed? Our consciousness is made up of its content - right? You are following this? Our consciousness is our beliefs, our desires, our anxieties, fears, pleasures, hypocrisy, vanity, our gods, our beliefs - all that is our consciousness. And we live and function within that consciousness. I am not saying anything very strange. It may sound strange to you because perhaps you are hearing it for the first time, or you have thought a little bit about it but have not gone into it sufficiently deeply. You can doubt what is being said, but what is being said is what you are. If you doubt what you are, which is your consciousness, and the consciousness is the content of it, if you doubt that, begin to question that, then perhaps the mind can go beyond that consciousness. You understand what I am saying? We are talking to each other. We are not laying down a law. We are pointing out the law of natural consequences, the law that where there is a cause there is an ending. That is a law. You can doubt it as much as you like but you can investigate it, go into it, doubt it,

enquire, question and you will find it is a fact. Not because the speaker is saying it, but in itself. Either you listen with such great attention you capture the meaning and the significance, and the consequences immediately. Or you want explanations. And when you are dependent on explanations - see what is happening in your own minds, please listen to this - when you are satisfied with explanations you are merely satisfied with words, which is mere acceptance of the intellectual movement. Whereas if you begin to examine the nature of your own consciousness, which is the consciousness of humanity - please understand this thing.

It is not your consciousness because when you go abroad to India, Asia, to all the gurus of the world, the priests, you will find they all have the common ground of this consciousness - they suffer, their pretensions, their vanities, the sense of everlastingly climbing the ladder, the ladder of heaven or the ladder of physical success. So this consciousness is the common consciousness of all humanity. You understand sirs? It is so. You may doubt it. Doubt it, question it, go into it. Don't say, "I doubt it" and just reject it. That would be rather puerile. But if you say, "Is this so? Do all human beings go through similar anxieties, similar pursuits, similar depressions" - they may vary, but depression is depression, anxiety is anxiety, it may be western anxiety or eastern anxiety but it is still the sense of being anxious, uncertain, despair, it is common to all mankind. And when you realize that it is common to all mankind, actually realize it not just as an idea, as a concept, as an image, but when you actually realize inwardly that you are like every other human being - you may have a different face, a different education, different outward culture, you may worship in one form or another,

but there it is inside you like a burning flame.

And we are asking whether that content can be totally emptied? If it is not emptied then you are caught in the old pattern of existence, with its travail, with its cruelties, with its vanities, with its impossible dangers. So if you want to go into it seriously let's talk it over together. This is meditation, not sitting cross legged, which you have acquired from India. I really don't know why you go to India at all. It is the most dangerous country. I really mean it. It is the most dangerous country for westerners to go there. It is full of romanticism, in your minds, full of something mysterious, full of some miracles taking place there, full of gurus who have - you know - reached the upper ladder, and in their presence you feel "Oh my god, I have achieved something". You understand all this? Romance, sentimentality, vanity - all that is encouraged.

You know there is a story in India which is: a boy at the age fifteen, sixteen... (Noise of aeroplane followed by noise of train - laughter) You can't go to any place where it is quiet any more. It used to be very quiet here at one time, twenty years ago, very quiet, no aeroplanes, no lorries, the road was rough. Now we have become very civilized and therefore very noisy.

So there was a boy who was sixteen or so, and his family was very religious - in the orthodox sense of that word in India. He was a Brahmin boy. And so he said to his father and Mother, "I am leaving you because I want to find truth. You have talked about it. You have told me about it. Your books tell me about it, but I want to find out". So he goes from one guru to another, one teacher to another, and he wanders all over India for fifty years. And he doesn't find it. He puts on different robes, different coloured

garments, and at last he says, "I haven't found it, so I had better go home". So he returns. And as he opens the door there it is! You understand? It has always been there, not because he has wandered all over the earth, but it is there, only we don't know how to look. Because we human beings are the history of mankind - you understand? We are the story of mankind, in each of us is the history of mankind, the historia. But we don't know how to read that book, so we say, "Please tell me all about it". We ask everybody in this journey of waste how to read, 'how to' - tell me. You understand what I am saying? It is there. That is why self knowing is very important, not according to any psychotherapist, not according to various philosophers, because then you are looking at yourself with their eyes, and therefore you are never capable of reading your own book, which is the book of humanity. You understand all this sirs?

So to know without any shadow of doubt, without any illusion, without any sense of holding back, to know, to observe this whole movement of consciousness, which is oneself. One can do it very easily. You don't have to move away from where you are - either to go North, East, West, South, it is where you are. But where we are is not very pleasant. It is not very encouraging. We are rather bored. But over there, across the river, it is more beautiful, more romantic, more colourful and therefore we build a bridge over there. When you are there still you are there - you understand? It is still you over there. So don't cross the bridge, if I may point out.

So it is possible to read oneself, read about oneself to the last chapter and to the last word. That requires attention, observation, not analysis. Just to observe what is going on without giving any

direction to your observation. This constant alertness to your reactions, to your reflexes, to your vanity, to your aggression - just, you know, play with it. In playing, watching yourself, humourously with play, you learn far more, you observe far more than striving after it, saying "I must know myself". And it is necessary for the mind, and therefore the brain and the heart, to be free of all illusions before you begin to meditate - right? That is obvious. If you sit cross legged and try to concentrate, focus your mind, follow a system, day after day, your mind may be, or still is, in illusion, and therefore your systems, your breathing, your yoga, all this encourages the illusions in which you are caught. You understand all this?

Sirs, I have seen a man in New Delhi, in India, I used to walk in the gardens there, a man came every day on a bicycle, every day, from his office. He was a poor man. He used to sit under a tree, putting the cycle against the tree, and sit down very quietly repeating a certain mantra - you know what a mantra is, I will explain it presently. And mesmerize himself into a state. You understand? And being in that state you could see his weariness of the office, the family, the daily misery - from his face it began to vanish. You understand? And so the face became very quiet because he was repeating, mesmerizing, relaxing in this mesmerism of his desire of his own conclusions, he was completely happy. You understand what I am saying? This used to happen day after day. I was there for several months at one time and I used to watch this man - every day, Sunday, Saturday. That was his drug.

So when one meditates there must be complete freedom. I know

you prefer the other kind of meditation, much easier, utterly meaningless but it is very comforting.

Now the word 'mantra', which people have been given perhaps for fifty dollars or three hundred dollars, or whatever the sum is, and that has become a terrible racket. The word 'mantra' means - if you are interested in it - in Sanskrit, it means ponder, recollect, observe, watch, in not becoming. You understand? And also - I won't go into the details - it means if there is any self-centred activity, such action is destructive. That is the meaning of the whole word, 'mantra'. In other words... (Noise of train)... I was just going to say, "Let's go to the Himalayas!" There too they are beggars. Much better stay here and face the noise! Sorry. (Laughter).

So we are saying: the mind must be completely free of all illusion, having no image, having no motive - you understand? No image, no motive, no illusion. An illusion, motive, direction comes with desire - desire to find heaven, desire to find illumination, desire to achieve, desire to have experiences. You understand? I do not know why human beings want experiences. You understand my question? You have experiences of every kind now: terror, sex, violence, oppression, dictatorship, whether it is Right or Left or Centre, whether it is the Communist, Fascist, or the religious, they are all the same. Right? I know you won't accept all this. Doubt it, what I am saying. They are all the same. They all want to shape your mind. They all want to course you into a certain pattern of thinking. And if you refuse either it is the concentration camp. shot, or you are put in a psychiatric ward. This is what is happening.

So the mind must be totally and completely free. And till that comes about don't meditate. You understand what I am saying? Because it is meaningless. I remember - I am sorry, I mustn't go into anecdotes, must I? Just this one. (Laughter). We were watching from a window in Benares. A beggar dressed in saffron robes - that is the sannyasi robes in India, I don't know if you understand the word 'sannyasi', what that means. I'll tell you presently what it means. He was dressed like that and he was a poor ordinary man, not very learned from his looks, from his talk. He sat under a tree and began to chant, sing, shout. The passers-by looked at him and went away. Within a week, I assure you I am not exaggerating, within a week he had garlands round his head, people stood round him saluting him, giving him food, almost bending their knees and saying, "What a great man you are". You understand? Within a week all this took place. We are so gullible - right?

So we are saying: a mind that is free from all this, then comes meditation. Now what is meditation? Unfortunately the eastern people, or eastern so-called gurus have brought this word to this western world, with all their nonsense behind it, with their systems, the Tibetan form of meditation, the Zen form of meditation, the Buddhist form of meditation, the Hindu form of meditation - right? You are following all this? Right? And we who are rather gullible and wanting to get somewhere because we are bored with our own lives, so we say, "All right, tell me how to meditate". And they are too eager to tell you at a certain price, or without price. So if you shun all that, all systems - systems means practising, day after day, which means your mind becomes mechanical. When you are

committed to a system your mind becomes already corrupt. Again doubt it, question it, find out the truth of it.

So there must be freedom from all this. Now where there is freedom what takes place? Are you following all this? Where there is freedom from all commitment, from all authority, from all illusions, images, conclusions, what is the state of your mind? You understand what I am saying? Find out sirs. Don't look at me. Find out. It is your daily life. You see we are so afraid to be nothing. Our culture, our education, everything says, "Be something" - either in the business world or in the religious world, or in the entertainment world, on the football field - "Be something". And when consciousness with all its content is empty - if that is possible, doubt that, that is yourself, doubt your vanity, why you are vain, why you are stuck in a belief, holding on to some past experience, past remembrances - and when the mind is free, which is, when all your travail is not - you understand? - what is there? You are following all this? Come on sirs. You understand sirs? When you give up smoking, without going off into some other form of smoking, when you end smoking, or when you end a certain pleasurable habit, when you end attachment, what is there? You understand my question? Is that what we are afraid of? I am attached to you. If I end it, what am I? So if I end my vanity, my conclusion, my belief, my gods, my - you know, longing, longing, longing, if I end all that, what happens? You are following all this? Do it please. End your particular attachment now - don't bother about your wife and your husband and girl. Say, "All right for the moment at least I'll be free of attachment" - what takes place there in the mind? There is a certain freedom, isn't there? And a sense of

nothingness - right?

Now not a thing. Nothingness means not a thing. Thing means - the word 'thing' comes from res, I won't go into all that - which is, thought which has put there - you understand? Thing is the movement of thought. Thought is a material process - we have been into all that. A material process because thought is the response of memory, memory which is experience, knowledge. This experience, knowledge, memory is stored in the cells of the brain. And therefore it is matter. It is a process of matter. We won't go into matter for the moment - I have discussed this question with the scientists, so I won't enter into that for the moment. So when there is not a thing - you understand? - it means the movement of thought has come to an end. You have understood? That is, sirs, if you can do it now, sitting here in this tent, knowing that you are attached, to a guru, or whatever you are attached to, end it. Not say, "Well, why should I end it?" I have explained all that. You should end it because the consequences of attachment are fear, anxiety, jealousy, hatred, being wounded, psychologically, building a wall round yourself, isolating yourself and so on and so on and so on. That is a fact. You don't have to doubt it. Don't take time to doubt it. It is not worth it. It is there. And if you end it, which means, thought has no other movement than ending itself.

Now: the ending of thought is the ending of time - right? Because thought is a movement. Time is a movement - from here to there physically - right? It takes time to go from here to your house, or chalet, to your tent, or whatever it is. To cover that distance needs time. And thought is a movement. Any movement is capable of being measured. Right? Come on sirs. Right? So what is

measured, that which can be measured, is the thing created by thought and by time. Now look: it takes one from here to go to one's home perhaps two hours, ten minutes and so on, which can be measured - right? By the distance, mileage, time. And also thought can be measured - right? Have you noticed that? It can be measured - right? Need I explain it? Oh, for god's sake, come on sirs, explain it to yourself. I don't have to explain it. You all look so dazed.

Look sirs: you can measure thought when you are saying, "I will become" - right? "I will become" - which is I am not what I should be, but I will become that. That is projected by thought. The ideal, whatever it is, projected by thought. So to arrive at that is the movement of thought from 'what is' to 'what should be'. That is measure. Now the word 'meditation' means also not only to ponder, to think over, to enquire profoundly, but also it has a meaning from the Sanskrit, to measure - you understand what I am saying? To measure. And in meditation measurement must come to an end - you understand? Oh, for god's sake! Which means, no measurement, which is comparison - you understand? "I was before I came to you..." - your guru - "You have given me the system and I am practising. Where am I today, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow?" - you follow? How childish it all is.

So measurement, which means comparison, inwardly comparing oneself with the past or with the future, with an example - no measurement, see. No illusion, no image and the absolute cessation of will. You follow what strict demands it requires to meditate? You understand what I am saying? It isn't something that is so easy, you sit like that and go off into some

kind of nonsense. This demands tremendous attention, great depth of enquiry into yourself. Therefore you have that tremendous sense of order, which means no conflict whatsoever.

Then if you have come to that - and I hope some of you will and you must - then we can go into what is meditation. You understand sirs? That is, when there is freedom and therefore the absence of all that, there is love, which is not pleasure, which is not desire. We went into that the other day. Without that love, without that compassion and because there is freedom there is intelligence, without that don't meditate. Then you are playing with something dangerous which is not worth it. You understand all this?

I used to know a man - this is not an anecdote - I used to know a man, I was younger then, he was seventy five. White beard, long hair, he was a real sannyasi. I will explain what that word means. And he said to me one day after hearing some of the talks - he came to see the speaker and he said, "I left home fifty years ago. I was a judge. One morning I realized that I was passing out judgement on people, on robbers, murderers, criminals, deceptive businessmen - you know all that". And he woke up one morning and said, "What am I passing judgement about. I don't know what truth is. So I cannot pass judgement". So he called his family and said, "I am retiring. You can have all my money and all the rest of it. I am going off by myself, into some corner of the earth and meditate to find out what truth is". After twenty five years and more he said, "I have come to find out to you and I realize that I have been mesmerizing myself" - you understand sirs? At the age of seventy five to say that he has been mesmerizing himself after fifty years - you understand what strife that requires? And so we

talked.

And I am saying the same thing - we are saying the same thing, don't have any form of desire, will, ideals, illusions or images and so on. The mind must be totally free. Then comes love which is imperishable, incorruptible. Because love is not attachment - you understand? Then you can begin to meditate. Then meditation is the most simple form of observation. Pure, unadulterated observation, which is: the mind can only observe when it is completely still - right? (Noise of train) If you listen to that noise, the train passing by, with complete silence - do it now - that noise doesn't enter into the quality of silence. I wonder if you get it. Sirs, you haven't done any of these things so it is just words, theories.

So to observe so purely, the mind, the body, the whole sense of organism and the structure of the psyche must be completely still, not controlled. The moment you control there is conflict - right? So obvious all these things are. So conflict must end. Which means - please this is a dangerous statement to make, but I will make it but see the nature of it - no control whatsoever. Personally, if I may for a second or two talk about the speaker, he has never controlled. Don't look at me wide eyed. You may think I am crazy. Probably I am. But see the importance: when there is control there are two entities, the one who is controlling, controlling that which he himself has created. You have understood? That is, I control my desire: controlling desire means, one who is controlling the thing called desire, and therefore there is a division between the controller and the controlled - right? So there must be conflict where there is a division. You say, "Today I lost my control, but tomorrow it will be better", and you will see to it. "I will exercise

my will, my suppression, everything."

So to live without any sense of conflict. Therefore no sense of control. Just see the beauty of it for god's sake. Do it sirs. Then the mind is absolutely still. The variety of stillnesses vary. When the train has passed by there is a certain silence. There is silence when thought says, "I must be quiet". That is another form of silence. There is silence between two noises, after all music is the silence between two noises. Right? Right? And there is the silence of the forest: in the forest when there is some dangerous animal moving, a tiger and so on, the whole forest becomes paralysed and silent. Have you ever been in a forest like that? I was chasing a tiger once, literally. I won't go into that, forget it!

So this silence is not brought about by thought - right? It is absolute silence, not relative. And if the mind has come to that point then is there anything in life sacred? I am asking. I am not talking about the silence. I am asking: is there anything sacred in our life, holy? Not created by thought - you understand? The bible and all the things in the bible, the images, the crosses, the incense, the altar, the wafer - all put together by thought. I hope there are no priests here! And is that sacred? Question that, doubt it, find out, because man has always tried to find something beyond time and thought. And enquiring into it he gets caught - you understand? There are too many traps and temptations. One goes out wanting to find out the beauty of life, or the sacredness of life, if there is something so absolute, love that is incorruptible, one asks. And then some person comes along and says, "Follow this. You will find it" and I am caught in it. And I get disillusioned, write about it - you follow? - and go off to something else.

So I am saying, asking you: is there anything sacred at all, holy?
- not in the temples, churches, that is not holy, that is all put
together by thought, obviously. And thought is not holy. My god, I
wish it were, then we would behave scrupulously.

So we are asking whether the mind which is free from all this
and therefore this immense quality of compassion, which goes with
intelligence, is there anything sacred? Now if the speaker says
there is, then there is not. Have you understood this? You see?
Good, I am glad some of you see this. When the speaker says there
is, then that very word, the very essence of that great love and
beauty and truth is not. So meditation, which is the absolute silence
of the mind, heart and all that, being completely free, you will find
out for yourself, such freedom will disclose through your pure
observation whether there is that which is immortal, depthless,
beyond all time and space. You will find out. It is there for the
mind that is capable to come to it. Finished.

SAANEN 1ST QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 23RD JULY 1980

About nearly two hundred questions have been put. I think to answer them all would take about two months. And I don't think you will be here, nor will I!

The word question comes from the Latin, to seek. And when one puts a question one is actually seeking the answer in the question itself. I hope we are understanding that statement. We ask a question and then wait for somebody to answer it. If you were in ancient Greece you went to the Delphic Oracle; and if you were in India you went to some special rather unbalanced guru. If you were here, in the west, you went to the psychologist with your problems, or to the priest to confess. But here we are asking questions and trying to find an answer, but the answer is in the question itself. If we know how to put the right question we will find invariably for ourselves the right answer. And it is very difficult to put a right question: it implies that one has thought a great deal about the problem and followed the problem in sequence and to see if there is an answer to the problem in the problem itself. I hope this is clear.

Now we have here many questions. We have chosen them carefully, not according to what one likes but according to the seriousness of the question. And in answering, in questioning, which is seeking, we are both of us involved. It is not you ask a question of the speaker and he answers it, and you either accept it or reject it according to one's romantic state, or some peculiar idiosyncrasy, or according to one's own fanciful imagination, or an

answer which will be comforting. But I am afraid it will be none of those things. If we could, as we are going to answer several of these questions this morning, please bear in mind that the speaker is not answering the question, that we are together investigating the question, which becomes much more fascinating, much more agreeable, and therefore there is no authority. We are together investigating, looking into the question itself, together. I hope this is clear: that you are not waiting for an answer from the speaker but since you have put the question either you seek an answer from another, or seek an answer in the problem. That is, investigating the problem you find the answer, which is much more fun! I am glad we have a nice day at last. And I hope it won't be too hot.

1st QUESTION: Without the operation of desire and will how does one move in the direction of self knowledge? Is not the very urgency of change a part of the movement of desire? If so, what is the nature of the first step?

That is, the questioner is asking: is desire and will necessary or required to understand the depth of self knowledge? Is not desire itself a movement towards self knowing? That is the question.

First of all to understand this question, not only superficially but also at depth, we must understand the nature of desire and will, and the structure and the nature of self knowledge, knowing - you understand? First desire, will and what does it mean if there is no desire, the movement of self knowledge? If one has not the urge, which is part of desire and will, how can this flowering take place in knowing oneself? Right? That is the question.

As we went into the question the other day: what is desire? And what is the relationship of desire to will? I'll go into it very

carefully, you have probably heard it ten times, but please don't get bored with it, but look at it. How does desire come into being? One can see actually perception, visual seeing, contact, touching, sensation - right? Then thought comes, creates an image out of that sensation and desire is born - right? I'm not an oracle. Delphi has gone long ago. But you can see this for yourself. You can see for yourself when you watch through a window a dress, or a shirt, specially a blue shirt, and the seeing, entering into the shop, touching it, the material, then the sensation, then thought comes along and says, "How nice it would be if I had that shirt" - or that dress, it creates the image - right? You having the blue shirt and putting it on, or the dress, and at that moment desire arises. Is this somewhat clear? No, please clear to yourself, not understanding the explanation. This is the movement of perception, of contact, sensation. That is natural, healthy. Then thought creates the image, you sitting in the car and driving it. When thought takes possession of sensation, creates the image, then desire is born - right? And will is the summation of desire, the strengthening of desire, the stability of desire, the urge to achieve, the urge to express one's desire and acquire, which is the operation of desire but strengthened as will - right?

So desire and will go together - right? And the questioner asks, if there is no desire or will, why should one seek self knowledge?

What is self knowledge? Let's examine that first. What is self knowledge? That is, the ancient Greeks, and the ancient Hindus talked about knowing yourself. It is as old as the hills - Socrates and others in Greece and in India talked about knowing yourself. What does it mean to know yourself? Can you ever know yourself?

Please we are exploring together, we are doing this together. What is the self? And you must know about it. You understand my question? What is the self that apparently it is necessary to know it? Now what do we mean by the word 'know'? Sorry to be so careful about this, otherwise we shall be misleading each other if we do not understand the words. What do we mean by 'know'? I know Gstaad because I have been there for twenty two years. I know you because I have seen you here for twenty years or more. I don't know why, but you are there and I am here. And when we say "I know", we mean by that not only recognition but also the remembrance of the face, the name - right? Which means recognition, remembrance and association. Or rather association, remembrance, which is I met you yesterday, I have recognised you today, that is the memory operating. So when I say, "I know", it is the past expressing itself in the present. I hope you are following all this. Does it interest you, all this? So the past is the movement of knowledge - right? I study, go to college, one goes to school, college, university, acquire a great deal of information. Then I say I am a chemist, or a physicist and so on and so on. So when we say one must know oneself, do you come to that knowledge about the self afresh, or do you approach it already having knowledge about it? You see the difference? You understand my question? Oh, for goodness sake. Am I making it difficult? No.

That is, I want to know myself. Do I approach myself through the knowledge I have acquired, which is, I have studied psychology, I have been to psychotherapists, and I have read a great deal, and I approach the understanding of the self through the knowledge I have acquired? Right? Or, do I come to it without all

the previous accumulation, knowledge about oneself? Right? You understand the question? We have explained what is desire, what is will, and when we say, "I must know about myself", I am already acquainted with myself. And so this acquaintance, this knowledge, dictates how I observe myself - right? This is very important if you want to go into this carefully. So having previous knowledge about myself I use that knowledge to understand myself, which becomes silly - right? It is absurd. Which is, I have understood about myself from the knowledge of others - Freud, Jung and all the rest of it, the modern psychologists and so on.

So can I - please listen - can I put aside all that knowledge because I am looking at myself through other people's eyes? Therefore can I put all that aside and look at myself afresh, anew? You have understood my question?

Now the questioner asks: is desire, will necessary in observing myself? Right? Now see what happens. I have acquired knowledge about myself through others, and the actual fact of what I am. You see the difference? The knowledge I have acquired through study about myself, and the fact of myself, what it actually is - right? So there is a contradiction between 'what is' and 'what I have acquired'. To overcome this contradiction you exercise will. Got it. You have understood this? How marvellous that is. You have understood that?

One has studied - I have not, I have not studied any of these things, thank god - one has studied, let us say, the latest psychologist, the latest - what do they call them? - psycho-therapists. And one went to him, talked with him, discussed, and he gives me certain knowledge about me, about myself and I acquire

that knowledge, take it home and discover that knowledge is different from me. And then begins the conflict: to adjust 'what is' to 'what I have been told'. Then in that conflict, to suppress it, to overcome it, to accept it the desire and will comes into being.

Good. Come sirs. Is this clear?

So that is the question. Now we are saying: is will and desire necessary at all? It only comes into being when I have to adjust myself to a pattern, to a pattern of good and all that stuff. And then the struggle, the conflict, to overcome, to control, all that begins. Right?

I am a seeker - you understand? I am a seeker, which is, I am questioning; therefore in my questioning I reject all that. I reject completely what others have told me about myself. Will you do it? You won't do it because it is much safer to accept authority, then you are secure. Whereas if you reject completely all that - authority of everyone, you don't become a follower, you don't become a disciple, you are absolutely out of that field altogether, then how do you observe the self? You understand? The movement of the self. The self is not static, it is moving, living, acting. Now how do you observe something that is tremendously moving, active - urges, desires, ambitions, greed, romanticism, all that - how do you observe? You follow all this? Which means, can I observe this movement of the self, the me, the desires, the fears, you know, all that, can I observe it without any knowledge acquired from others, or the previous knowledge which I have had in examining myself? You understand what I am saying? I will show you sirs.

One of the activities of the self is greed - right? Or comparison, comparing myself with another. That is the activity of the self.

Now when I use the word 'greed', I have already associated that reaction, or that reflex with a memory which I have had of that reaction previously. You understand what I am saying? I am greedy. I use the word 'greed' to identify that sensation. The identification of that is, I have already known it. So I use that word to identify it - right? So can I look at that reaction without the word, and therefore without the previous acquaintance with it? You are following this? Am I making this clear? Can I look at that reaction without a single movement of recognition? The moment that recognition takes place I have already strengthened that reaction because I recognise it and take it back into my memory. You are following?

Now can I observe myself without any direction, without any comparison, which is, "I have had this before" - you follow? - just to observe without direction and therefore without motive. That is learning about yourself afresh each time. Not that you have accumulated knowledge about yourself and you know about yourself. If you go very, very seriously into this question you will find that it is not little by little by little, first step, second step, third step, first initiation, second initiation - but to see the truth of this instantly - you understand? To see the truth that the moment recognition takes place you are not knowing yourself at all. Is that clear? That requires a great deal of attention. And most of us are so slack, so lazy, we have got all kinds of ideas, that we must be this, we must be that, we must not be this. So we come to it with a tremendous burden. And so we never know ourselves.

That is, to put it differently: as we said the other day, we are the rest of mankind - mankind whether they live in Asia, here, in

America, suffer, go through a great deal of anxiety, uncertainty, sorrow. So we go through it, each one of us. So we are essentially the common human kind, psychologically; you may be tall, you may be short, dark, I am not talking about that. Psychologically we are like the rest of humanity, so we are humanity. And what is there to know about myself? You understand my question? I am all that. That is a fact.

Then the problem arises: can that content of my consciousness be wiped away? That is the learning about oneself, which is not yourself but the consciousness of mankind. I wonder if you are meeting all this? No. You see we are so trained, we are so conditioned to an individuality - I am psychologically different from another, which is not a fact. So we are so trained, conditioned, we accept it. And so when we say, "I must know myself", we are saying "I must know my little cell". And when you investigate that little cell there is nothing. But when the actual truth is that we are mankind. We are the rest of humanity. And to enquire into this enormous complex human mind is to read the story of yourself. You are history - you understand? Historia. And there, if you know how to read the book, it is finished. But we come to the book with knowledge. We don't say, "I know nothing, let's read the book". Then you learn vastly, not accumulate knowledge - you understand what I am saying? So you begin to find out the nature of yourself which is mankind, and the nature of this consciousness which is the consciousness of all human beings, and enquire into that.

So we are saying, that the answer to the question is in the question itself. You see that?

2nd QUESTION: Is not a right way of life a ground of austerity, sensitivity, integrity, necessary before total transformation can take place?

The questioner says is not austerity necessary? Sensitivity, integrity - these three. Austerity, sensitivity, and integrity necessary before transformation in the consciousness can take place. The word 'austere' means ash, the root meaning of that word is ash. You know what ash is? What remains after you have burnt a piece of wood. The ash. See the meaning of it. That is, those who practise austerity, practise, end up in ash.

So let's go into that question. Throughout the world monks have practised austerity. In India there is a monk who is called sannyasi, he renounces the world, sex, drink, drugs, he becomes a mendicant, not organized mendicant - you understand this? He becomes a mendicant, he has one meal a day, and he can never stay in the same place twice, he has no home. I won't go into the whole nature of sannyasi, the meaning of that word means. Let's leave it at that. That is, a monk, specially in India, who lives on one meal, begging, mendicant, and never staying in the same place twice, and has abandoned the world, the world being the senses, which is sex and all that. And naturally he goes around from village to village, town to town, and preaches, talks about what it means to live a good life, and so on. Right? The monks in the western world have it carefully organized. They belong to a monastery with an Abbot, authority.

So first of all the expression of this austerity is an outward sign. You understand? Putting on a robe, that you have really renounced the world. There are all kinds of phoney sannyasis now, here too.

But they are not sannyasis. That is a very, very serious affair. And austerity is not the practising or the denial or the acceptance of sex and all that. It is austerity, which is a form of high discipline, according to a pattern laid down by the Abbots and so on and so on, in India laid down by the Brahmanas from the ancient of days. There is a pattern set. And you conform to that pattern, denying everything in yourself, your desires, your ambitions, your greed and all that. And that is called generally austerity. That is, look what happens: you start with certainty - right? Certainty that you have given up the world, the senses, sex and so on. You start with that. When you start with certainty you end up in uncertainty. I wonder if you understand all this? If I start accepting everything, all the religious edicts, sanctions and I begin to enquire into them, if I ever do, I end up saying, "My goodness, this is nothing, I don't believe in anything". You understand? When one starts with certainty you end up in uncertainty - if you are at all intelligent that is.

So austerity has quite a different meaning - may I go into it? You are interested in it? Never deny anything, but observe very carefully, intensely, and that very observation frees the mind from the worldly affairs. That is real austerity. I wonder if you understand this.

Look: I observe I am violent, that is part of human structure, human nature, derived from the ancient animals and so on and so on - if you accept evolution. Or if you are one of those who start with creation suddenly, then you have your own way. One is violent. The ordinary person who wants to be austere struggles with violence - right? He won't kill, he won't do this, he won't do

that, he won't even take part in society, he won't join the army, he is a pacifist and so on. He is constantly denying 'what is' by saying "I won't" - you follow all this? I say that is not austerity, that is only a form of suppression. But when one recognizes in oneself violence, that is, violence is anger, hate, envy, comparison, imitation, conformity are all patterns of violence. To observe that in oneself without wanting to go beyond it, without wanting to suppress it, without wanting to escape from it. See the fact and remain with the fact. You understand? Remain with it without any movement away from it. That is the depth of austerity.

We are trained to control: control your desires, control your anger, suppress it and give all that energy to Jesus, to Krishna, whatever it is. But we are saying the depth of austerity is not in sacrifice, is not in conformity, in training yourself to accept an ideal but to see completely the nature of this violence. And to see it completely don't move, thought mustn't interfere. Don't let thought carry away in any direction. Just observe it. And you will see, if you do, the real depth of understanding comes and with it intelligence. And when there is that intelligence you don't have to struggle, it is finished.

And the other thing is sensitivity. Most of us are sensitive about our own feelings, our own ambitions, our own struggles. But we are not sensitive to others because we are so concerned about ourselves, our little cell. And when there is tremendous concentration on oneself, what one is doing, how one looks, why shouldn't I do this - you follow? - this everlasting concern about oneself - how can you be sensitive about another? Not about - how can you be sensitive? How can a man be sensitive who is

ambitious? So physically one has to be sensitive first - right? There is no school, or college or university that is going to teach you how to be sensitive - right? You go off to India to learn to be sensitive - think of the ridiculousness of it!

So are your nervous reactions, alertness of the mind, are they alive? Or have you drugged them? You understand? Drugged them through belief, drugged them through acceptance of some authority, drugged your physical system as well as psychological structure by constant struggle, battling, battling, battling. I am romantic, I know I am romantic but it pleases me to be romantic which is contrary to seeing clearly, but I like it. So that drugs me so that I become insensitive - you are following this?

Integrity means to be whole, the word, integral, means whole. Which means no contradiction in oneself. We are examining the question itself, the meaning of the words. That is, austerity, sensitivity and integrity. Which is, never say a thing that you don't mean. And what you mean may be doubtful - you understand? I say something and I think that is what I feel, think, act but what I think, feel and act may be the result of some conditioning, of some desire, of some motive, therefore it is not integral. I feel like doing something - you know, that is the latest craze - I must express myself immediately. What does that mean? That is, there is no depth of understanding of that urge, the meaning of it, the content of it, why it arose, but just act because you want to - and you think that is having integrity. The word integrity means to be whole. And we human beings are broken up, divided, antagonistic, dualistic, and we accept all this and try to be integrated, to have integrity, which is impossible. So one must go into this question: what it is to

be whole.

First of all any image that thought creates about being whole is not whole - right? Because thought in itself is fragmented, limited. Therefore whatever it projects as the whole is not. So then can the mind discover for itself what it means to be whole, integral, have this sense of tremendous integrity? First of all you cannot have this sense of integrity if you follow anybody - right? Yes. If you are a disciple of anybody, then you are merely conforming to what somebody has laid down. Then you are merely romantically playing tricks upon yourself. Which means to have integrity is to have no ideals, no beliefs, no sense of the past and the future. Sirs, this is tremendously difficult, you can't play with all this, because the past is dictating, is translating which is the present - right? And the past is modifying itself through the present and going, but it is still the past. How can a mind, your heart, be whole, integral, have absolute integrity if it is living in the past? Past experience, past memories, romantic - you know, all that stuff.

So austerity, sensitivity and integrity are not the first step. The first step is the first step. You understand? Are you all asleep?

If you are going north and think that is the right direction, somebody comes along and tells you, "Look, what you are doing" - explains the whole business and you say to him, "What is the first step?" He says, "Stop!" Then he says, "After having stopped turn south". You understand this?

Two questions have been answered in nearly an hour. So we will do one more. I haven't seen these questions, I went through them but I haven't looked again.

3rd QUESTION: There are so many gurus today, both in the

east and in the west, each one pointing his own way to enlightenment. How is one to know if they are speaking the truth?

When a guru says he knows, he doesn't - right? You understand what I am saying? When a guru, or a man in the west or in the east says "I have attained enlightenment" - enlightenment is not to be achieved. It isn't something that you go step by step by step, climb, the ladder. That is the first thing to understand: that enlightenment isn't in the hands of time. You understand? That is, I am ignorant but I will have, if I do these things, I will come to enlightenment - whatever that word may mean - right? Because what is time? Time is necessary to go from here physically to another place. Psychologically is time necessary at all? We have accepted it, it is part of our tradition, training - I am this but I will be that. What you will be, will never take place because you haven't understood 'what is'. The understanding of 'what is' is immediate. You don't have to analyze, go through tortures - oh, for god's sake it all becomes so childish.

So enlightenment - I don't like to use that word myself because it is loaded with the meaning of all these gurus. They don't know what they are talking about. Not that I know, they don't know, that would be silly on my part, but I see what is involved when they are talking about achieving enlightenment, step by step, practising, so your mind becomes dull, mechanical, stupid.

So the first thing sirs, whether they are eastern gurus or western gurus, is to doubt what they are saying, including the speaker; much more so because I am very clear about all these matters. It doesn't mean I am the only person, which is equally silly, but the mind must be free from all the authority, followers, disciples,

patterns, you understand?

So how does one know that these gurus are speaking the truth? How do you know the local priests and the bishops and the archbishops and the popes, and all that, how do you know they are speaking the truth? Instead of going off to India, accepting new gurus, how do you know that they are speaking the truth? Please sirs, this is very important. Either they are all engaged in some kind of guile and blood, which means money, position, authority, giving you initiations and all the rest of it. And if you question them and say, "What do you mean by that? Why have you put yourself in authority?" - you follow? Question them, doubt everything they say and you will soon find out, they will throw you out.

It once happened to the speaker that a very famous guru came to see me. I am saying this en passant. And he said, "You are the guru of gurus. You live what is right. What you are speaking is truth, you live it" - he touched my - you know. And he said, "I am a guru with lots of followers. I began with one and now I have a thousand and more, both in the west and in the east, especially in the west. And I can't withdraw from them. They are part of me and I am part of them. They have built me and I have built them" - you follow? Listen to it carefully. The disciples build the guru, the guru builds the disciples. "And I can't let them go". And so gradually authority in the spiritual world is established. You understand the danger of it. Where there is authority in the field of the mind and the heart there is no love. There is spurious love, there is no sense of that depth of affection, love, care.

And so to find out who is speaking the truth, don't seek truth but question. Because truth isn't something you come by. Truth comes

only when the mind is totally, completely free from all this.

Because then you have compassion, love, not to your guru, not to your family, not to your ideals or your saviour or your guru - love, without any motive and therefore when it acts it acts through intelligence. And truth is not something you buy from another!

Sirs, they all say, both the eastern and the western gurus, the old saying that you must be a light to yourself. It is a very famous saying in India, old, ancient. And they repeat it, "But you can't be a light unto yourself unless I give it to you". Right? You are all so gullible, that is what is wrong with you. You want something, the young and the old. Young people: the world is too cruel for them, too appalling, what the old generations have made of the world. They have no place in it, they are lost, so they take to drugs, drink, all kinds of things are going on in the world with the young - communes, sexual orgies, chasing off to India to find somebody who will tell them what to do, so that they can trust them. And they go there, young, fresh, not knowing, and the gurus give them the feeling that they are being looked after, protected, guided, that is all they want. They can't get it from their parents, from their priest, from their local psychologists and so on, because the local priests, the psychologists and the psychotherapists are equally confused; so they go off to this dangerous country, which is India, and they are caught in that, by the thousands. And they are seeking: they are seeking comfort, somebody to say, "I am looking after you. I will be responsible for you. Do this. Do that". And it is a very happy, pleasant state. And also they say you can do what you like, sex, drink, go on.

And the older generation are equally in the same position, only

they put it much more sophisticated. They are both the same, the young and the old. You see this all the time taking place in the world. So nobody can give guidance, light to another, only you yourself. The light cannot be given to you, you have to stand tremendously alone. And that is what is frightening for the old and for the young. Because if you belong to anything, follow anybody you are already entering into corruption. If you understand that very deeply, with tears in your eyes - you understand? - then there is no guru, no teacher, no disciple, there is only you as a human being living in this world, the world, the society, which you have created. And if you don't do something in yourself the society is not going to help you. On the contrary society wants you to be what you are. Do you understand all this? So don't belong to anything, no institution, no organization, don't follow anybody, you are not a disciple of anybody, but you are a human being living in this terrible world. And there is you as a human being who is the world, and the world is you. You have to live there, understand it and go beyond yourself.

SAANEN 2ND QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 24TH JULY 1980

May I remind you, if I may, that these questions are really put to oneself, not to the speaker, though he will try to answer them, but they are really put to oneself. And, as we have said, the answers to these questions lie in the questions themselves, not outside, beyond the question. And that we are, both of us, you and the speaker, exploring the question, and thereby together find the answer. Not that the speaker will give you the answers, but together we will go into them. And I hope that is clear from the beginning, because if we look to another we are lost. And I really mean it. Because these are our problems, our daily, tiring, boring, tortuous life which we have every day, with all the uncertainties and miseries, and if we try to find an answer outside somewhere - in India or here, or your present guru, or myself, the speaker himself, then we will create an authority and thereby destroy ourselves.

1st QUESTION: I work as a teacher and I am in constant conflict with the system of the school, and the pattern of society. Must I give up all work? What is the right way to earn a living? Is there a way of living that does not perpetuate conflict?

This is a rather complex question and we will go into it step by step, if we may.

What is a teacher? Not only in a school, college and university, the master, the pupil, the professor and so on, what is a teacher? Either a teacher gives information about history, physics, biology and so on; or he is learning not only with the pupil, with the student, but also learning about himself. This is a whole process of

learning, teaching and understanding the whole movement of life. So we are asking: what is a teacher? Is there apart from technological subjects, like physics, chemistry, architecture and so on, apart from that what is a teacher? You understand my question? Is there such a person as a psychological teacher? If I am a teacher, not of biology or physics, but psychologically inform you, then will you understand the teacher or will my pointing out help you to understand yourself? You follow my question?

So we must be very careful and clear what we mean by a teacher. Is there a psychological teacher at all? Or only factual teachers, like a professor of chemistry, science, neurology and so on? Is there a teacher who will help you to understand yourself? You understand my question? So when the questioner says: I am a teacher. I have to struggle not only with the established system of schools and education, but also my own life is a constant battle with myself. And must I give up all this? And then what shall I do if I give up all that? So he is asking not only what is a right teacher but also he wants to find out what is right living. Clear?

What do you think is right living? As society exists now there is no right living - right? You have to earn a livelihood, you have to earn money, you have a family, you have children, you become responsible for them and so you accept if you have been through university and so on, you become an engineer, professor, an electromagnetic teacher and so on and so on and so on. As the society exists now can one have a right living? You understand my question? Or to search out a right living becomes merely an Utopia, a wish for something more? So I am asking myself and you are asking yourself, I hope, what is right living? What is one to do

in a society which is corrupt, which has such contradictions in itself, in which there is so much injustice - all that, that is the society in which we live? And I am not only a teacher in a school, or in college or university, and I am asking myself: what shall I do? You understand? Are you asking this too, or are you just waiting for the speaker to tell you? What is one to do in a society so deteriorating, degenerating, conflict, wars, violence and terror, what is one to do? What is the right livelihood?

Or, would you ask a question: is it possible to live in this society, not only having a right livelihood, but also to live without conflict? That is what the questioner also asks. Is that possible, to earn a livelihood righteously and also end all conflict within oneself? Right? Now are these two separate things: earning a living rightly and not having conflict in oneself, or with society? Are these two separate, watertight compartments? Are we moving together? Or they go together? If I know how to, or are aware, or live a life without any conflict, which requires a great deal of understanding of oneself and therefore an enormous sense of intelligence, not the clever intelligence of the intellect, but the capacity to observe, to see objectively what is happening, both outwardly and inwardly, and knowing there is no difference between the outer and the inner - you are following all this? It is like a tide that goes out and comes in. The society which we have created, and can I live in this society without any conflict in myself and at the same time have a right livelihood? You understand?

Now on which shall I lay emphasis? You understand? Right livelihood, right living? Or find out how to live a life without a single conflict? Now what would you do when this question is put

to you and you have to answer it - you are following this? - what will you do? Which comes first? The bread or the other? You understand what I am saying? Please don't look so - join me! We are together exploring this problem, not I alone. You are also exploring it. So we must both join together, not let me talk and you listen, agree or disagree, say "It is not practical" - it is not this, it is not that - because it is your problem. So we are asking each other: is there a way of living which will naturally bring about a right livelihood and at the same time to live a constant life without a single shadow of conflict? Is that possible? Is it possible for one to have a life without a single movement of struggle? Do you understand my question?

People have said you cannot live that way except in a monastery, or become a religious monk because then society looks after you - right? You are following all this? Society looks after you because you have renounced the world and all the misery of the world, and you are committed to the service of god, in quotes - right? So since you have given your life over to something, or an idea, or a person, or an image, or a symbol, because you are so deeply committed to that you may ask society to look after you, which is what happens in a monastery - right? Are you following all this? May we go on?

Nobody believes any more in monasteries - thank god. Nobody says, "I will surrender myself to something" - right? If you do surrender yourself it will be surrendering yourself to the image you have created about another, or the image which you have projected. You understand all this? No. Come on.

So what shall we do? Can I, can you live a life without a single

shadow of conflict? I say it is possible only when you have understood the significance of living. That is, living is action, living is relationship - right? Relationship and action. That is life. Therefore one has to ask: what is right action, under all circumstances? You are following all this? Please join me. What is right action? Is there such a thing? Is there a right action which is absolute, not relative? So one has to go into the question of what is action? You are all interested in this? What is action, what do you mean by action, which is living? Right? Talking, acquiring knowledge, a relationship however intimate with another and so on and so on. Life is action, movement. And life is also relationship with another, however shallow, however deep, however superficial. So we have to find both whether there is a right action and a right relationship - if you want to answer this question deeply.

What is our present relationship with another? Not romantic, imaginative, flowery and all that superficial thing that disappears in a few minutes, but actually what is our relationship with another? What is your relationship with a particular person, perhaps intimate, it involves sex, it involves a dependence on each other, comforting each other, encouraging each other, possessing each other and therefore jealousy, antagonism, and all the rest of it? And the man or the woman goes off to the office, or to some kind of physical work and there he is ambitious, greedy, competitive, aggressive to succeed and comes back home and becomes a tame, friendly, perhaps affectionate husband or wife and so on. Right? That is the actual daily relationship. Nobody can deny that. And we are asking: is that right relationship? We say no, certainly not, it

would be absurd to say that is right relationship. So we say that but continue in our own way. We say this is wrong, it is absurd to live that way but we don't seem to be able to understand what is relationship, but accept the pattern set by society, by ourselves - right? So we are going to find out for ourselves what is right relationship, is there such a thing? We may want it, we may wish it, we may long for it but longing, wishing doesn't bring it about. So what one has to do is to go into it seriously to find out.

Relationship is generally sensory, sensuous. Begin with that. Then from sensuality there is a companionship, a sense of dependence on each other, which means creating a family which is dependent on each other. And when there is uncertainty in that dependence the pot boils over. So we are saying, to find what is right relationship one has to enquire into the great dependence on each other. Why do we depend on each other? We depend on the postman, the railway and so on - we are not talking about that. Psychologically in our relationship with each other why are we so dependent? Is it that we are desperately lonely? You are following all this? And is it that we don't trust anybody, even one's own husband, wife - you follow? So we hope to trust somebody, maybe my wife, my husband, but even that is rather suspicious. And also dependence gives a sense of security, a protection against this vast world of terror. And also we say, "I love you". In that love there is always the sense of being possessed and to possess - you are following all this? And when there is that situation then arises all the conflict. Now that is our present relationship with each other, intimate or otherwise. We create an image about each other and cling to that image. No? Are we on the right track?

And so one realizes the moment you are tied to another person, tied to an idea, tied to a concept, corruption has begun. That is the thing to realize and we don't want to realize that. You understand this? If I am tied to you, an audience, friends and so on, I am then dependent on you to give me encouragement, to fulfil myself talking to you, there by encouraging vanity, all that follows, which is corruption. So can I, can we live together without being tied? Without being dependent on each other psychologically? So unless you find this out you will always live in conflict because life is relationship - right? So can we objectively, without any motive, observe the consequences of attachment and let it go immediately? Attachment is not the opposite of detachment. You understand? Please give your mind to it, let your brain work. I am attached and I struggle to be detached and therefore I create the opposite. But there is no opposite. There is only what I have, which is attachment. I don't know if you follow all this. The moment I have created the opposite, conflict comes into being. But there is only the fact of attachment, not pursue detachment. Only the fact that I am attached and I see the whole consequences of that attachment in which actually there is no love. And can that attachment end? Not pursue detachment. You have understood me? So please follow this further. The mind has been trained, educated to create the opposite. The brain has been conditioned, educated, trained to observe 'what is' and to create its opposite: "I am violent but I must not be violent" - and therefore there is conflict. Right? Do you see this? But when I observe only violence, the nature of it, how it arises and so on and so on, observe, not analyse, observe, then there is only that and not the other. Right? So you totally eliminate

conflict of the opposite.

We are talking about living a life without conflict. We are pointing out it can be done, should be done if one wants to live that way. Only deal with 'what is', everything else is not. You understand this? I am angry. Don't say, "I should not be". Remain, understand the nature of anger - or the nature of greed and so on and so on. So you eliminate totally the quarrel, the struggle between the opposites.

And when one lives that way, and it is possible to live that way, so completely to remain with 'what is' - not try to suppress it, go beyond it, escape from it - then 'what is' withers away. You experiment with it. You understand what I am saying? Oh, no.

Look sirs: my son is dead. My son is dead. I am attached to that son. I have put all my hope in that son. I want to fulfil through the son. And unfortunately some accident takes place, he is gone. And I shed tears, loneliness, despair, the shock of it. Then I run away from it - right? I go to a church, read, escape. But whereas if I remain completely with the fact that he is gone and I am lonely because I have depended on him, I have never understood this sense of isolation. I have escaped from it all my life. So when I remain with 'what is' then I can go into it fully, completely and go beyond it. You understand what I am saying? Please sirs, do it!

As we said the other day, this is a serious talk, serious gathering, not for casual visitors, casual curiosity, casual criticism. One must criticize, one must doubt - not what the speaker is saying but begin to doubt all that you are clinging to. And then doubt what the speaker is saying; don't begin by doubting what the speaker says. What he is saying is pointing out to yourself.

So when there is the freedom in relationship, which doesn't mean to do what you like, that is obviously what everybody is doing. If I don't like the present woman I go off with another woman - and the agony of divorce and all that business. Whereas if I really understood the nature of relationship, which can only exist when there is no attachment, when there is no image about each other, then there is real communion with each other.

And also: what is right action? You follow? That is what he says. Life is relationship and action. You can't escape from these two. What is right action? - which must be right under all circumstances, whether in the western culture or the eastern culture, in the Communist world - there it is more difficult because you daren't speak, you daren't act: you act according to the edicts of the dictator and his group, so there is no sense of freedom there. So we are asking: what is right action? To find that out we must enquire into what is our action now. Right? What is our action based on - either on an ideal - right? - on a principle, or on certain values? Or "I do what I want to do". Please enquire into all this. Either it is a projected ideal, concepts, experiences, or values, or do what you please, the moment you want to do something, do it, which is the latest cry of the psychologists. Don't have any inhibitions, do what you want. That is what is actually going on in the world, and is that right action? What does action mean? The doing - right? The doing now. That is action. Is that action based on your past experience? If it is you are acting according to the past memory of an experience, so the past is dictating your action in the present - right? I wonder if you follow all this? Are you interested in all this? Do you really want to find out what is right

action? You may temporarily but it demands tremendous enquiry into all this - not accept some authoritarian assertions.

So we are saying: our actions are based on memories, the past experience, or a projected concept, either according to Marx, or to the Church, or some idealistic, romantic business brought over from India. Which means you are always acting according to the past, or the enticing future - right? This is a fact. And is that action? We have accepted that as action, that is our norm, that is our pattern. Our brain is conditioned, our mind and so on and our heart according to that. We are questioning that. We are doubting that. We are saying that is not action. Action can only be when there is complete freedom from the past and the future. And when we use the word 'right' it means precise, accurate, action which is not based on motive, action which is not directed, committed. The understanding of all this, what is right action, right action, right relationship, the understanding of it brings about intelligence. You understand? Not the intelligence of the intellect but that profound intelligence which is not yours or mine, and that intelligence will dictate what you will do to earn a livelihood. You have understood? Without that intelligence your livelihood will be dictated by circumstances. When there is that intelligence you may be a gardener, a cook, or something, it doesn't matter. You see now our minds are trained to accept status, position, and when one has understood all that, in the very understanding of all that is intelligence which will show what is a right livelihood - right?

Now you have all heard this for forty-five minutes, one question, will you do something about it? No. Or carry on with your usual ways? That is why it demands a great deal of enquiry,

denying every form of experience in that enquiry. So there is a way of living in which there is no conflict and because there is no conflict there is intelligence which will show the way of right living.

2nd QUESTION: Is it possible to be so completely awake at the moment of perception that the mind does not recall the event?

You have understood the question? No? Do you want me to read it again? Is it possible to be so completely awake at the moment of perception that the mind does not recall the event?

We are enquiring into the question, in the question is the answer. We are going to show it, we are going to enquire into it, the question. He says, is it possible not to record at all, your hurts, one's failures, despairs, anxiety, experience - you follow? All the things that are going on inside and outside, not to record it so the mind is always free. That is the question.

Now, let's start examining it. Which is, the brain, evolving in time, its process is to record. Someone says to me, "You are an idiot". That has been said to me often! Politely and impolitely. And the brain instantly records it. You have accused me of being an idiot. I don't like it because I have an image about myself that I am not an idiot and when you call me an idiot I am hurt. That is recording. The hurt exists as long as I have an image about myself. And everybody will tread on that image - right? And there is hurt, I have recorded it. The mind, the brain has recorded it. And the recording is to build a wall round myself, not to be hurt any more. I am afraid so I shrink within myself, build a wall of resistance and I feel safe. Now the questioner asks: is it possible not to record that hurt as at the moment when I am called an idiot? You understand?

Not to record that incident, the verbal usage, the insight, the implications and the image which I have about myself. Is it possible not to record at all, not only the hurt but the flattery - and I have had plenty of that too. You understand? One has had both. So is it possible not to record either? Right? And the brain has been trained to record because then in that recording there is safety, there is security, there is strength, a vitality, and therefore in that recording the mind creates the image about oneself. Right? And that image will constantly get hurt. So is it possible to live without a single image? Go into it sirs. Don't please go to sleep. Single image about yourself, about your husband, wife, children, friend and so on, about the politicians, about the priests, about the ideal, not a single shadow of an image? We are saying it is possible, it must be, otherwise you will always be getting hurt, always living in a pattern. In that there is no freedom. And when you call me an idiot, to be so attentive at that moment - right? When you give complete attention there is no recording. It is only when there is not attention, inattention you record. I wonder if you capture this? is it getting too difficult? Too abstract?

That is, you flatter me. I like it. The liking at that moment is inattention. In that moment there is no attention. Therefore recording takes place. But when you flatter me, instead of calling me an idiot now you have gone to the other extreme, to listen to it so completely, without any reaction, then there is no centre which records. That is, you have to go into the question of what is attention.

Most of us know what is concentration; from one point to another point - right? From one desire, one hope to another. I

concentrate about my job, concentrate in order to control my mind, concentrate in order to achieve a certain result. In that concentration there must be conflict because as you are concentrating thoughts come pouring in and so you try to push them off - you know all this, don't you? And this constant struggle to concentrate and the thought going off. Whereas attention is: there is no point from which you are attending. I wonder if you see that? Do you follow all this?

One wonders if you have ever given attention to anything. Are you now attending to what is being said? That is, attending, giving your attention, which means there is no other thought, no other movement, no interpretation, motive, just listening so completely. So there is a difference between concentration, which is from point to point, and therefore resistance; whereas attention there is no centre from which you are attending, and therefore that attention is all inclusive, there is no border to it. You understand? Not what the speaker is saying, just see the truth of it. That concentration inevitably brings about resistance: shut yourself up, avoid noises, avoid interruptions and so on and so on, your whole brain is centred on a point, the point may be excellent and so on. So what is taking place there? There is division, the controller and the controlled - right? The controller is the thought which says, "I have understood, I must control that". I wonder if you see that? The controller is the controlled. We can put it differently. The thinker is the thought. There is no separation from thought and the thinker - do you see this sirs? Right? So you eliminate altogether the division when one realizes the thinker is the thought. In concentration the controller is the controlled. When one actually

sees the truth of it then there comes attention in which there may be concentration, I may have to concentrate on doing something but it comes from attention. Have you understood?

3rd QUESTION: In your talks you have said death is total annihilation and also you have said there is immortality, a state of timeless existence. Can one live in that state?

That is the question. First of all I said - please listen - I did not use the word annihilation. I have said death is an ending - right? - like ending attachment. When you end something, like attachment, something totally new begins - right? This is obvious. When I have been accustomed to anger all my life, or greed, aggression, I end it, there is something totally new happens - right? If you have done it. I have followed my guru, with all the gadgets he has given me and I realize the absurdity of it, I end it. See what happens. There is a sense of freedom. The burden which I have been carrying uselessly. I said death is like ending an attachment.

And also we said: what is it that has continued through life? You understand my question? We put death in opposition to living. Right? Is it so? We have put it. We say death is at the end, that end may be ten years or fifty years, or the day after tomorrow. I hope it will be ten years, but this is our illusion, this is our desire, and this is our momentum. It is like asking how to face death. You follow what I am saying? I say you cannot understand that, how to face death without understanding or facing living. Death is not the opposite of living. I wonder if you understand all this? Shall we go into this? Do you want me to go into all this? You aren't tired? I am surprised!

I think a much more important question is not how to face

death, what is immortality, whether that immortality is a state in which one can live: but much more important is how to face life, how to understand this terrible thing called living. If we don't understand that, not verbally, not intellectually, but living it, finding out what it means to live it, because to us living as we are is meaningless. Whether you are a disciple with all the jewels and all the rest of it, it has no meaning. Going to the office from day to day for the next fifty years, slaving away, going to church, you know, all these things, what is the meaning of all this? You may give meaning to life, as people do, say life is this, life must be that. But without all these romantic, illusory, idealistic nonsenses, life is this, our daily sorrow, competition, despair, depression, agony - with shadows of occasional flash of beauty, love. That is our life. Can we face that, understand it so completely that we have no conflict in life? That is, to die to everything that thought has built. I wonder if you understand this? Thought has built my vanity. Thought has said, "You must be this". Thought has said, "You are much cleverer than the other". Thought has said, "Achieve, become somebody, struggle, compete," - like the Olympics. That is what thought has put together, which is my existence, your existence. Our gods, our churches, our gurus, our rituals, our changing names into Indian names, all that is the activity of thought. And thought, as we said, is a movement of memory, experience, knowledge. Which is, experience brings certain knowledge stored up in the brain as memory, and responding, that memory is the movement of thought. This is so, if you observe it. So thought is a material process - right? So thought has made this, my life is that. I am different from you. I must achieve - you follow?

And when thought predominates our life, as it does, then thought denies love. Right? Love is not a remembrance. Love is not an experience. Love is not desire or pleasure. You will agree with this but that is our life. And living that way you have separated that thing called death which is an ending, and you are frightened of that. If we deny everything in oneself that thought has created, end it - do you understand what I am saying? This requires tremendous grit, not all the nonsensical romance. Your attachments, your hopes, your vanities, your sense of importance, all that is to become. When that becoming completely ends what have you? You are with death, aren't you? So living is dying, and so renewal. Oh, you don't understand all this. Do it and you will find out. But we are trained to be individuals - me and you, my ego and your ego. Is that a fact? Or we are the entire humanity, because we go through what every human being goes through, sexual appetites, indulgence, sorrow, great hope, fear, anxiety, and an immense sense of loneliness, that is what each one of us has, that is our life. So we are the entire humanity, we are not individuals. We like to think we are, we are not. You may be clever at writing a book, but that doesn't make you an individual. You have a gift, but when you have a gift to write or sing or dance, whatever it is, that gift is translated as 'my gift'. And when you accept that as 'my gift' vanity - you know, all the circus round it begins.

So there is a life in which there is no centre as me, and therefore life is walking hand and hand with death; and therefore out of that sense of ending totally time has come to an end. Time is movement, movement means thought, thought is time. And when you say: "Do I live in that eternity?" - then you don't understand.

You see what we have done? "I want to live in eternity. I want to understand immortality" - which means I must be part of that. But what are you? A name, a form, and all the things that thought has put together. That is what we actually are. And we cling to that. And when death comes, through, disease, accident, old age, how scared we are. And there is always the priest around the corner telling you that you will go to heaven. Or if you don't do what he tells you, you go to hell. It is not only the priest round the corner but the guru round the corner. They are all the same.

So can one live a life so completely without a centre, and therefore no conflict and then only that state of mind which is timeless comes into being.

SAANEN 3RD QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 25TH JULY 1980

May I repeat again what we said the other day about questions?

The word derived from the Latin which means to seek. Not find an answer but to seek; to seek the answer in the question itself, not away from it. And in answering these questions we are seeking or exploring together. The speaker may explain but together we are entering into these questions, together we are seeking to find out the truth in the question, not away from it. So we are sharing the question together and trying to find a true correct answer.

1st QUESTION: I am dissatisfied with everything. I have read and thought a great deal but my discontent with the whole universe is still there. What you talk about makes me more discontented, more disturbed, more troubled. I now feel frustrated, antagonistic to you. What is wrong with what you are saying? Or is something wrong with me?

I think the more one observes the world, what is happening, over population, pollution, corruption, violence, and observing all that practically in every country in the world, one is trying to find an answer to all this. That is one part of the question.

And the other is: the questioner says "I am discontented, not only with what you are saying but with everything around me. With my job, with my wife, with my husband, with my girl-friend, or boy, or whatever it is. I am discontented". And that is the common lot for most of us. Either it becomes a consuming flame, or it is dampened down by seeking some kind of satisfaction in various activities of life. And discontent, instead of allowing it to

become a consuming flame, most of us almost destroy it. We are so easily satisfied, we are so gullible, we are so ready to accept, and so gradually our discontent withers away and we become the normal mediocre human beings without any vitality, without any energy, without any urge to do anything.

But the questioner says I have been through all that, I have read a great deal and thought about life a great deal, probably have been all over the world, and I have not found an answer to this discontent. And people who are thoughtful, aware what is happening around them and in themselves, aware that politics, science, religion has not answered any of our deep human problems. They have technologically evolved, developed and so on, but inwardly I am discontent. And listening to you as the speaker, I am more disturbed, more discontented and antagonistic to what you are. What is wrong with you and what you are saying? Or there is something wrong with me?

First of all let us be very clear that when there is discontent, is that discontent per se - you understand? - per se, in itself, or you are discontented with something? You understand? I may be discontented with the world, with the philosophies, with the various instructions of various religions. But that discontent is with something, towards something or in something. It is not the discontent which has no cause, and therefore can be ended. As we said the other day, where there is a cause there is an end. Has this discontent a cause, and therefore it can be resolved, ended? Or this discontent has no cause? Please go with the speaker, we are sharing this question together. As we said, one can be discontented with so many things, as human beings are, better house, better this and

better that - you understand? The moment there is a measure there must be discontent. You have understood this? I wonder. I'll go on.

I am glad you are antagonistic to what is being said. Instead of accepting and sitting quietly and saying, yes, but I am antagonistic to you. Don't accept. You are causing me much more disturbance, I feel frustrated, therefore I am urged towards this sense of antagonistic attitude. So we must be very clear whether this discontent has a cause and if it has a cause then that discontent is seeking contentment, satisfaction, gratification. So this discontent creates the opposite, to be contented, to be satisfied, to be completely bourgeois, like the Communists are. And if that is this search, desire, if that is what you want when you are deeply discontented, to find something with which you can be completely contented, never to be disturbed, then that discontent will find a way to gather satisfaction, and therefore that discontent is withered, gone.

Perhaps that is what most of us are doing - probably all of you, if I may point out, you are discontented. You have been to this, to that, to that talk, to that person and so on and so on, and you perhaps come here wanting some kind of satisfaction, some kind of certainty, some kind of assurance, some gratifying truth. And if that is so then you will find satisfaction very easily, which most of us do - in the kitchen, in some aspect of religion, or enter politics - Left, Right, Centre or Extreme Left, Extreme Right - and carry on. This is what generally happens with all of us. And so you gradually, inevitably narrow down the mind, make the mind small. And the capacity of the brain is so immense, you have reduced it to mere satisfaction. You understand?

And if you are not satisfied with anything, if you are discontented with the whole universe, as the questioner put it, not be dissatisfied because you haven't got a house, or you haven't got money - you know, at that level. So this discontent, has it no cause and therefore it is a discontent in itself, not because of something? Is that clear? Am I making this clear? Are we getting together and making this clear? That is, I am discontent if I am seeking contentment. That is very simple and very easy. But if I am totally completely dissatisfied with everything, with the government, with the religion, with science, with politics, everything. And such people are rare, such people have this flame of discontent. And perhaps such a person comes here, listens, reads, hears, and that discontent increases, it becomes all consuming. So what shall we do? You understand the question clearly? What shall we do with a human being who is totally and completely dissatisfied with all the structure of thought?

As I said, such a person is a very rare human being. Such a person one can meet because he is - please listen carefully - he is in an immovable state - right? He is not seeking, he is not wanting, he is not pursuing something or other - he is aflame with this thing. And the speaker is also immovable - right? You understand what I am saying? What he says is so, not because he is dogmatic, superstitious, romantic, or self-assertive. He says that if you know, comprehend your consciousness with its content and the freeing of that consciousness from its content there is a totally different dimension. He has said this for sixty years, not because he has invented it; it is so. He has discussed with scientists, philosophers, great scholars and so on. And they have acknowledged, some of

them, that it is so. Scientists seek that which is beyond through matter. And the speaker says human beings with their brain and heart and mind are matter, and instead of looking at matter outside of you, enquire into this matter who you are, and you can go much further, and more he has said. The ending of sorrow is the ending of fear and so on. And there are these two entities, one - are you following all this? - one completely discontented, nothing satisfies him, words, books, ideas, leaders, politics, nothing and so he is in a state of immobility. And the other is equally is immovable, he will not budge, he will not yield. Are you following all this? What happens?

When two human beings, one completely from his depth of mind and heart is dissatisfied, and the other from his depth of his mind and the depth of his heart and so on says "It is so". These two entities meet. You understand what I am saying? This is not romantic, it is not something invented, something out of imagination. This is so. One feels antagonistic to the other, which means he has already moved. I don't know if you follow it? He has not remained completely dissatisfied. The moment he says, "I am antagonistic to you and your talk and all that", he has moved away from what is burning. Therefore he has already softened. I wonder if you understand this? And the other has no antagonism. He says, "It is so". When this person meets the other without antagonism, without wanting something from the speaker, then he is alright. Have you understood this? No, I see you don't understand this.

If this discontent develops antagonism, it is no longer discontent. Right? And so he is aflame with what he calls discontent. It is a flame. And the other too is a flame. You

understand? Then both are the same. Fire is a fire. It is not your fire, and my fire, it is fire. When the fire is dampened, then the two are different. You understand?

So if the speaker may ask: are you, as a human being, living in this terrible world, and if you have followed what they are saying that the earth will be almost uninhabitable, what is your condition of discontent? Is it merely puerile, childish, immature? Or if you are a human being totally aflame with discontent, never developing a reaction against that - being frustrated, being antagonistic, but let that flame be alive, then both are the same.

2nd QUESTION: One realizes deeply the importance of awareness, of one's inner and outer actions, yet one slips into inattention so easily. Must there be a Krishnamurti, the books, the cassettes, to keep us alert? Why? Why this gap between understanding and immediate action?

You have understood the question? Why is inattention so easy, so common? It is taking place all the time. And to be aware of what is happening inside the skin, and what is happening outside the skin. Sorry to use that word. And must there be somebody to remind you of it? Right? That is the question.

Clothes don't make a man - right? By putting on good clothes you don't become a man. By putting on robes, monks', you don't become a saint. Let's be very careful here. Either the clothes remind you that you must be constantly aware, then you depend on the clothes, whether the clothes be some kind of... it is unimportant. Or without this outward garment, can one be aware without slipping into inattention? And why is there a gap between understanding, realizing, comprehending, and immediate action?

That is the question - right?

What is it to be aware? Is this awareness, whatever it is, we will go into it presently, is it to be cultivated, developed, through practice, say, "I must be aware" and meditate on that awareness, and have some kind of thing to remind you of it constantly - whether a picture, a shirt which is most uncomfortable, a robe that irritates you so that you are constantly reminded to be aware. So let's find out what it means to be aware. We can't know everything that is happening in the world - right? What the politicians are doing, what the Secret Service is doing, what the army is doing, what the scientists who are helping the army, the government, are doing - we don't know what your neighbour is doing, nor what your wife or husband is doing inwardly. So we can't know everything. But we can know, or become aware of this movement inwardly. Now is that movement different from the outer movement? We must be very clear on this point. Is that which is outside, the pollution, the corruption, the chicanery, the deception, the hypocrisy, the violence, is that very different from us, from each one of us? Or it is a movement out and a movement in? Right? It is a constant movement, like the tide going in and out. Can one - please listen - can one be aware of this movement? Aware being know, recognize, see, observe. Or in the very process of observation of this flow, this unitary movement, take choice in it, make choice in this movement? "I like this, I don't like that. I am a subject of Britain and I like to be British" - or a Swiss citizen. It gives you a passport and you can travel all over the world. So in this movement, is the awareness based on choice, the observation? You are following all this sirs? Watch it sirs, as you are sitting

there, if I may suggest, would you watch it, aware. And if you are, your reactions are so quick, you say, "I had better have that, and not that". Right?

So can you observe this movement, which is you and the world, and the world is you, this movement, can you observe without any choice? That observation is awareness, which you don't have to cultivate, which you don't have to have somebody to remind you of, books, tapes and all the rest of the business. Once you see for yourself the truth of this, that this movement out there and the movement in here are essentially similar. They may vary a little bit here and there but it is the same movement that has created the world, the society, the army, the navy, the scientists, the politician, that movement is you. And can you seriously not deceive yourself, it is no fun then, if you want to deceive yourself you are welcome, but it doesn't lead anywhere; but if you want to go into it very, very deeply, awareness without choice and the observation of this movement without any direction. That requires not compulsive, lopsided, neurotic awareness, saying "I am aware, I am fully aware" - and you know jolly well he is not because you see by his actions, by his attitude, by his values, that he already lives in the illusion that he is aware. One has to be extremely watchful.

And naturally that attention, awareness cannot be constant, cannot. But to know it is not constant - you are following this? - to be aware that it is not constant, is to be aware of inattention. I wonder if you understand sirs? You understand - I don't know what I have said but I will come back to it.

It is, to be aware of inattention is attention - right? And as one cannot reasonably, sanely say "I am going to be alert from the

moment I wake up until the moment I go to sleep" - you can't, unless you are a neurotic, unless you practise, practise and say, "Yes, I am going to be aware, I am going to be aware" - then it becomes words and it has no meaning. But if you see that this attention, awareness cannot be maintained all the time, which is a fact, then inattention, not being attentive, has its values, has its meaning. You understand? Because in attention you discover that you are not attentive. Have you got it? Good.

And the questioner says, why is there a gap between understanding and immediate action? What do we mean by understanding? I understand that the Communist world, Russia, has entered Afghanistan. I understand that. I understand the terrible thing they have done - not only Russia but all countries have done this. And the present state in Afghanistan is terrible. I understand it. What has been the cause, the desire to expand, dominate and so on. I understand it. Somebody explains the nature and the structure of the atom, I listen carefully, I say, "Yes, I understand what you are saying". I listen to some philosopher and I say, "Yes, I understand the structure of your words and theories". That is, all that is intellectual discernment - right? And that is the function of the intellect, to discern, to evaluate, to analyse. And at that level you say, "I understand". And the questioner asks: why is there a gap between understanding of that kind and immediate action? The word is not the thing - right? K is not the word, or you are not the word. So that is the first thing one has to deeply understand, never is the word the thing, never is the explanation the actuality - right? Now understanding takes place not merely intellectually, only when the mind is quiet. You are telling me something, something

serious, philosophic, it doesn't matter what it is, you are telling me something serious. And if my mind is chattering, wandering away, I can't fully comprehend what you are saying. So I must listen to you, not translate what you are saying, or interpret what you are saying, or listen partially because I am frightened of what you might say. Then the mind is disturbed, moving, changing, is volatile, whereas if I really want to listen to what you are saying, the mind must be naturally quiet. I hope it is now. Then there is a depth of understanding which is not merely intellectual, verbal.

When there is that profound perception of what has been said, false or true, one can discover the truth in the false - all right? Then in that state of silent observation action is naturally immediate, there is no gap between the two.

Look sirs, when you are standing on a precipice, you don't argue, your intellect doesn't say let's discern, think about it, you jump away from the danger - right? There is immediate action which is a form of self protection, which is healthy, natural, normal. You don't stand in front of a bus which is running you down, or stand looking at a dangerous snake, or animal. It is a natural, instinctive response to save yourself - unless you are drugged and say, "I am going to stop the tiger" - then of course jump out of the window and show you how strong I am against gravity and so on. But if perception is complete - you understand? - which can only take place when the mind is quietly listening, not accepting, not denying but listening, then that perception and action are the same. It is not perception and I'll wait for action. Right? May I move to the next question?

3rd QUESTION: I have understood the things we have talked

over during these meetings, even if only intellectually. I feel they are true in a deep sense. Now when I go back to my country shall I talk about your teachings with friends, etc? Or since I am still a fragmented human being will I not produce more confusion and mischief?

This is really a very good question, we will go into it. You understand it?

I have understood the things that you have talked about - the things. You know the word thing comes from Latin, res, which is thought. Go into it. The thing, the statue, the painting, the books, the edicts, the sanctions of the church and so on, all of it are things. And thing is the movement of thought, which created the things, the statue, the painting, the symbols, the cross - you know, a dozen things. Now has one understood, not the thing, but the nature of thought, how it arises, and what is its activity? If that is fully deeply comprehended then the questioner says: when I go back to my home shall I talk about the teachings, your work, since I am still fragmented will I not create more mischief and confusion?

You know this is really a very good question. All the religious talk, the priests, the gurus, the whole works, are promulgated by fragmented human beings - right? Though they say "We are high up", they are still fragmented human beings. Right? And we are spreading all that, I don't know if you realize it. I may say I am a complete human being. I know heaven, I know illumination, I know all the rest of it - you understand? The moment you have said "I have attained", you are a fragmented human being. Right? The priests have said it, only, moderately. And we are spreading what they are telling us because we are fragmented human beings like

them, therefore we accept another fragment. I wonder if you see this?

And the questioner says: I have understood what you have said somewhat, partially, not completely, I am not a transformed human being. I understand. And I want to tell others what I have understood - what I have understood. I don't say I have understood the whole works, I have understood a part. I know it is fragmented, I know it is not complete, I am not interpreting the teachings, or the work, I am just informing you what I have understood. What is wrong with that? But if you say, "I have grasped the whole damn thing and I am telling you" - then it becomes the authority, the interpreter, the chairman of the committee and such a person becomes a danger, he corrupts other people. But if I have seen something which is true, I am not deceived by it, true. I feel in that there is a certain affection, love, compassion, I feel that very strongly. Naturally I can't help but go out, it would be silly to say I won't. But I warn my friends, I say, "Look, be careful, don't put me on a pedestal". You haven't put me on a pedestal. This pedestal is only for convenience, which doesn't give the speaker authority whatsoever. But as the world is so corrupt and human beings who are tied to something or other - to a belief, to a person, to an idea, to an illusion, to a dogma, they are corrupt. And that corruption speaks. And we also are somewhat corrupt so we join the crowd.

If you see the beauty of these hills, the river, the extraordinary tranquillity of a fresh morning, the shape of the mountains, the valleys, the shadows, how extraordinary everything is in proportion, not made by the painter, seeing that won't you write to your friend? You say, "Come over here, look at this". Then you are

not concerned about yourself but about the beauty of the mountain.
You understand?

4th QUESTION: What do you mean when you ask us to think together? Do you intend that everybody who listens to you should think with you at the same time? Don't you think that this is acting as a guru, leading people to follow your ideas, thoughts and conclusions?

This is rather a bore! I wish you had never heard the word 'guru'. That is a discredited word. You don't know what it means. I believe the true meaning is one who dispels ignorance. Not adds the guru's ignorance to you - you understand? - but one who dispels ignorance. Not the ignorance of books, but the man who is unknowing himself acts. That is the meaning of the word 'guru'. It has got other meanings too, which we won't go into. And there have always been western gurus from the ancient times. You understand? The priests, acting between you and whatever he calls god, the saviour. This has also existed in India. And the questioner says, when the speaker asks us to think together, are you not setting up yourself as a guru? So let us examine what it means to think together, when the speaker says think together.

He very carefully explained each time that it is not accepting what the speaker is saying. It is not agreeing. It is not to accept the ideas, the conclusions which he may have. The speaker in fact has no conclusions. But he says think together in the sense, let's both of us observe together. Observe and let's find out what it means to observe. That doesn't give him any authority. You can make him into an authority, which would be unfortunate, but he doesn't accept any authority, or rather have any authority, or denies any

kind of following, disciples. If he is accepting conclusions, ideals and so on and is accepting disciples then he is in a state of corruption, whoever it is. And for the last sixty years I have been saying this.

So please don't make me into a guru and I won't accept you as a disciple because the disciple destroys the guru, the guru destroys the pupil. Swallow that pill!

So there is no sense of authority in this. And when he says think together, it is very simple: if I am prejudiced, if I have all kinds of nauseating, compulsive, neurotic conclusions and I say let's think, which means I want to force it on you. But he says constantly, together, which means share together what we are observing, out there and in here. That is all.

And this desire, this longing for somebody to tell us. That is the root of it. Somebody to tell us how to live, how to love, how to think. That is, education has been how to think. You must think this way. And most of us unfortunately, young and old, long for some shelter - the more romantic, the more pleasurable, the more satisfying, the better it is. Apparently you seem to be incapable of standing alone. You know that word 'alone' means all one. When you are really alone, not contaminated, not corrupt because you aren't attached to something. When you are alone because being free you are that whole human entity, human world, but we are frightened to be alone. We always want to be with somebody, either with a person or with an idea, an image. You know what it means to be alone? It is not solitude, which is necessary, it has its own beauty, to walk alone in the woods, to walk alone along the river, not hand in hand with somebody or other, but to be alone,

solitude, which is different from aloneness. If you are walking by yourself, you are watching the sky, the trees, the birds, the flowers and all the beauty of the earth, and also perhaps you are also watching yourself as you casually watch the woods and the trees and the flowers, you are also casually watching yourself as you are walking along. Not having a dialogue with yourself, not carrying your burdens with you, you have left those at your home.

So solitude reveals your loneliness, your vanity, your sense of depression and so on and so on. And when you have finished with solitude there is the other, which is not a conclusion, which is not a belief, which is not doing propaganda, telling you what it means to look. That is not propaganda, that is not pushing you in any direction. Because when you are directed, when you are guided, then you become a slave and therefore you lose totally freedom from the very beginning. Freedom isn't at the end, it is at the beginning, contrary to what the Communists say. But freedom can only be given to the disciplined who know how to live and so on - they are the dictators to tell us how to live! As the gurus and so on do, so we become their slaves. And where there is no freedom there is no love and truth.

Shall we go on with one more question? You aren't tired?

5th QUESTION: Why does sex play such an important part in each one's life in the world?

Why do you ask me? (Laughter) Don't laugh it off. Why does it play such an important part in your life?

You know there is a particular philosophy, especially in India, called Tantra, part of Tantra, which encourages sex. They say through sex you reach Nirvana. It is encouraged. I won't go into all

the horrible details of it - so that you go beyond it, and you never do. And sex used to be taboo, keep it quiet, for god's sake don't talk about it, but now... I remember hearing on the television - 'Sex at any time, at any place, but be careful what you eat'!

Why has sex become so important in our life? All the ads, of naked ladies, half dressed ladies and so on and so on. Why has society, not only in the present period, but also always, why has sex been so deeply embedded in man? - apart from producing children, I am not talking of that. Why? Probably it is the greatest pleasure a human being has. And in demanding that pleasure there are all kinds of complications and volumes have been written about the complications, the explanations and the psychological etcetera, etcetera. But they have never gone into this question - I have not been told, they may have - they have never asked this question why human beings have made this thing so colossally important in their life. Why? You could answer it probably as I can.

Let's go into it, shall we? I am not telling you about it, you know better, we are looking, observing, asking. As we said, it may be one of the greatest pleasures and freedom in that pleasure. Right? Our life is in a turmoil. Our life is a constant struggle, nothing original, nothing creative - I am using that word very carefully. The painter, the architect, the wood carver, he may say it is creative. The woman who bakes bread in the kitchen, kneading it - they say this is creative also. And sex is also creative, they say. So what is creation, what is it to be creative? You understand? The painters, the musicians, Beethoven, Mozart, Bach and the Indian singers with their devotion, they say that is the act of creation. Is it? You have accepted it - we have accepted Picasso as a great

painter, great creator, putting one nose on three faces, or whatever it is. I am not denying it or being derogatory, I am just pointing out. This is what is called creation. But if you enquire, doubt, question, is that creativeness? Or creativeness is something totally different. That is, you are seeing the expression of creativeness - right? In the painting, in a poem, in the prose, in a statue, in music, that is expressed. Expressed according to his talent, to his capacity - it may be great capacity or a very small capacity. It may be modern Rock or Bach - sorry to compare the two! They are quite incomparable, but it doesn't matter.

So we human beings have accepted that as creative because it brings you fame, money, position, you are in the same room as the great artist - right? So I am asking is that creativity? Can there be creation in the most profound sense of that word, as long as there is egotism? As long as there is the demand for success and money? And the recognition of that? You understand? Then it is supplying the market. Don't agree with me please. I am just pointing it out. I am not saying I know creativity and you don't, I am not saying that. I say we never question these things. There is a state of creativity, you can doubt it but it doesn't mean a thing if you doubt it, it doesn't matter to me. I say there is a state where there is creation, where there is no shadow of selfishness. That is real creation, which does not need expression, it doesn't need fulfilment, which is myself fulfilling, or that fulfilment, it is creation. You know I don't want to go into all this. The origin of the word for the Christians is: god - you know, Genesis - suddenly came into being. The other is evolution. And perhaps sex is felt to be creative, apart from children. And also has it become important because everything

around us is circumscribed. You are following all this? Everything around us, the job, the office, going there every day for fifty years, going to the church for fifty years, following some philosopher, some guru, you follow? All that has deprived us of freedom. And we are not free from our own knowledge. It is always with us, the past. You are following all this? And so sex, perhaps there is freedom there. But also there too it is circumscribed. You are following all this?

So we are deprived of freedom outwardly and inwardly, for generations upon generations we have been told what to do. And the reaction to that is: I'll do what I want. Which is also limited, based on your pleasure, on your desire, on your capacity and so on. So where there is no freedom all round, both outwardly and inwardly, and specially inwardly, then we have only one source which is called sex - is that right? Why do we give it importance? Do you give importance, equal importance, to being free from fear? No. Equally the energy, vitality, thought to end sorrow. No. Why don't you? Why only this? Because that is the easiest thing to hand. The other demands all your energy, which can only come when you are free. So naturally human beings throughout the world have given this thing such tremendous importance in life. And when you give something, which is a part of life, tremendous importance then you are destroying yourself. Life is whole, not just one part - right? If you give importance to everything then this becomes more or less unimportant. And the monks and all those people have denied all this and turned their energy - at least they think they have turned their energy, to god. But the thing is boiling in them, you can't suppress nature. But when you give that thing

only all importance, then you are corrupt - you understand?

SAANEN 4TH QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 26TH JULY 1980

As we said, and I hope you don't mind my reminding you again, that these questions are put so that we share the answer together. It is not a Delphic Oracle that is speaking, but together we are going to explore into these questions. And as we pointed out the answers are in the questions themselves.

1st QUESTION: You seem to object even to our sitting quietly every day to observe the movement of thought. Is this by your definition a practice, a method and therefore without value?

This is a question. We mean by question, the root meaning of that word is to seek, derived from the Latin, Greek and also from Sanskrit - to seek. Now the questioner asks: what is wrong with sitting quietly every morning for twenty minutes, in the afternoon another twenty minutes and perhaps another twenty minutes in the evening or longer, what is wrong with it? I do not know if you have heard of that ridiculous meditation that is practised - T.M. - have you heard of all that, Transcendental Meditation? The word 'transcendental' is a good word but it has been ruined. They have learnt that by sitting quietly you can relax, you can observe your thinking, your reactions, your responses, and your reflexes and so on and so on. Now behind all this so-called meditation, what is the motive? Do you understand my question? What is the motive of all those people who sit quietly - I don't know why they sit quietly - sitting quietly by themselves, or together in a group, what is the motive behind the desire to sit quietly for half an hour every day and so on and so on? What is the motive? Isn't that important to

enquire before you sit quietly for twenty minutes a day, or half an hour a day, or whatever you do? Isn't it important to find out why you want to do this? Is it because somebody has told you that if you sit quietly you will have parapsychological experiences, that you will attain some kind of illusory - oh, I mustn't use the word illusory - you will have some kind of peace, some kind of understanding, some kind of enlightenment, some kind of power. And being rather gullible, pay thousands of dollars or francs, or pounds, to receive instructions and a mantra so that we can repeat those. I know some people who have spent thousands and thousands of dollars to pay the man who will give you something in return, specially a Sanskrit word, that is much more romantic than saying Coco Cola! and you repeat it. You have paid something and you have received something in return, and what is the motive behind it? If you go into it, ask yourself why you are doing this. Is it for reward - not a financial reward but a psychological reward? Is it that by sitting quietly you attain some kind of super consciousness? Or is it that you want that which has been promised by your instructor?

So it is important before we plunge into all this kind of business, to find out why, what is your motive, what is it you want. Isn't it important? But you see we don't do that. We are so eager and gullible that somebody promises something and you want it. Now if you examine the motive, it is a desire to achieve something, like a businessman, his desire is to earn a lot of money. That is his urge. Here the psychological urge is to have something that you think the other man, a guru, or an instructor, you know, all the rest of it, promises. You don't question what he promises, you don't

doubt what he promises, you don't say, "Do you do it?" "Do you meditate, you know about that, do you?" But they say, "No, I am too old for that kind of stuff, I have done it", you know, pass it off. But if you question the man who is offering you something: is it worthwhile, is it true, who are you to tell me what to do? Then you will find that sitting quietly without understanding your motive leads to all kinds of illusory psychological troubles. And the speaker has met dozens and dozens and dozens of such people and they have mentally become gradually unbalanced, slightly neurotic and something psychologically goes wrong. Don't accept my word for all this. You can see it in your own faces, if you are doing it.

So if that is the intention of sitting quietly, then it isn't worth it. Naturally. But sitting quietly, or standing or walking, without any motive - the word 'motive' means movement, the part moves, and when you are walking quietly by yourself or with somebody you can watch the trees, the birds and the rivers and the mountains, and the sunshine on the leaves and so on and so on, and in the very watching of all that you are also watching yourself, not striving, making tremendous efforts to achieve something. I know, those of you are committed to all this, to the other kind of meditation, find it awfully hard to throw it off because your mind is already conditioned, you have practised this thing for several years and then you are stuck. And somebody comes along and says, "What nonsense all this is" - and perhaps at a rare moment you become rational and say, "Yes, perhaps this is wrong" - then begins the trouble, the conflict between what you have found for yourself to be wrong and what you have been practising for the last five, ten, three years. And the struggle is called progress, spiritual progress.

You understand all this?

So if you have observed, the mind is always chattering - right? Always pursuing one thought or another, one set of sensory responses to another set of responses. So the mind, the brain is always chattering, consciously or unconsciously - right? This is so if you observe your own mind, this is what is happening. So you want to stop that chattering, then you try to learn concentration, forcing the mind to stop chattering and so the conflict begins again. Right? This is what we are all doing, chattering, chattering, talking endlessly about nothing. Now if you want to observe something, a tree, a flower, the lines of the mountains, you have to look, you have to be quiet. But you see we are not interested in the mountains, or the beauty of the hills and the valleys and the waters; we want to get somewhere, achieve something, spiritually essentially, when you are young because you are dissatisfied with the society as it is, with all the corruption that goes on, but we don't mind being corrupted spiritually - right?

So is it not possible to be quiet naturally? To look at a person, or to listen to a song, or to listen to what somebody is saying quietly, without resistance, without saying "I must change, I must do this, I must do that", just be quiet. And apparently that is most difficult. So we practise systems to be quiet. Do you see the fallacy of it? To practise a method, a system, a regular everyday routine, then you think the mind will at last be quiet; but it will never be quiet, it will be mechanical, it will be setting a pattern, it will become dull, insensitive but you don't see all that but you want to get something. An Initiation - oh, for god's sake it is all so childish.

So if you listen, now I hope we are listening, if you listen

quietly, not saying he is right or wrong, I am committed to this, how am I to give it up, I have promised not to give it up - I am this, that, the other thing, but to listen to what is being said without resistance. Because the speaker is not saying something irrational, something stupid, or exotic, he is just pointing out. And if you can listen to that, to what he is pointing out, which is your own discovery of what you are doing, then your mind in the very process of investigation it becomes quiet. You understand this? I do not know if you have talked to any serious scientist, and if you have, serious, not those who are employed by the government, who are trying to compete with another scientist, but who are really scientists, that is, to discover something totally new, to discover the cause of anything, who go beyond the enquiry of mere matter. Such scientists must have a quiet mind when they are observing, investigating.

So can we, ordinary people, with all our troubles and turmoils, be quiet? And listen to all the promptings of our own movements? But apparently that appears most difficult. It is not. If you are interested in something you are naturally attentive. But if you say, "I am bored with myself"... So it is possible to sit, or stand or walk quietly without any promptings from another, without any reward, or having extraordinary super physical sensory experiences. Begin at the most rational level for god's sake, then you can go very far.

2nd QUESTION: I have a cancer and find myself in the following dilemma: should I try to let medicine save my life, even if it may mutilate me? Or should I live with this illness and pain and meet the consequences, which could be death, candidly without an operation?

Do you want me to decide this? This is a very serious question. We all have illnesses, pain, physical pain, perhaps unbearable pain. And one may have cancer, which is, I believe, very, very painful. Now first let's enquire into how to meet pain - right? Are you interested in this? How to meet pain? How do you meet pain? Look at it. You have had pain, toothache, tummyache, various kinds of headaches - pain. Now how do you meet it? Rush immediately to the pill? Medicine? An Aspirin? So how do we meet it?

All right, let's make it much more simple. How do you meet a noise? A train goes by - four trains during the hour that we sit here - how do you meet that noise? We are talking, thinking over together, and this train rushes by, how do you receive it? Do you resist it? Or let the sound go through you and it is gone? You follow what I am saying? Which is it that you do? I am not instructing you please. I am not your guru, I have no followers, I am not your authority - thank god! How do you meet this tremendous noise that is so disturbing? Do you let it come without any resistance and go on? You understand? Do you do that?

Now if you have pain, and the speaker has had part of it, like every human being, do you allow it to end? Or you want to end it with some medicine? You are following my question? Say you sit in the dentist chair, the speaker has done quite a bit of it, you sit in the dentist chair; he drills. Do you associate the pain and identify yourself with the pain? Of course if the pain is too intense he gives you some kind of novacocaine or whatever he gives you. But if it is not too unbearable, do you observe the pain without identifying yourself and say, 'My god' - you are following what I am saying? Which do you do? Is it immediate identification with the pain? Or

disassociation and observe it? When you have pain, you instinctively hold, if you are sitting in the chair. But if you don't identify with the pain, put your hands out quietly and bear it without too much. Which means is it possible to disassociate oneself from the actual movement of pain? Enquire into it. Don't say, "It is", "It is not". Find out for yourself. How much, how far, how deeply one can not identify, "I am in great pain" - you follow?

Now the questioner asks, he has cancer - I am sorry - and should he take medicine or an operation, or bear with it? I know people who have cancer, I have seen them and they don't want to go on the table to be operated on, and they bear with that enormous pain. Whether that pain affects the brain which has its own capacity to protect itself - I don't know if you have gone into this, I am just pointing out. You understand what I am saying? If one has great, unbearable pain, the brain has its own capacity to protect itself against pain. The brain specialists are enquiring into this, or finding out - because I have talked to them - are finding out that the brain has the capacity through some chemical reaction to protect itself against, not too much pain, but some pain. Don't accept my word for this. The speaker has found that out long ago: that the brain has the capacity to protect itself against danger, against pain, against a certain amount of grief. Beyond that the brain becomes unconscious, it is giving up. And the questioner says: what shall I do? Right? How can the speaker decide this? Perhaps I can hold his, or her hand for a while, but that is not going to solve the problem. Either one has great sense of not identifying with the pain, but it is impossible when you have tremendous pain. And if one can bear without operation the extraordinary pain that one has,

one must also be aware that it might injure the brain. You understand what I am saying? Haven't you noticed this in yourself? That you can bear pain up to a point, which is, the brain has the capacity to bring about some chemical responses which will safeguard it against pain. But if you have too much pain of course that is impossible. Is that question clear?

Questioner: May I ask about the cancer? Is it possible to heal it?

K: Ah, that is a different question altogether. Sir, is that what you want to ask? Please sir. Is it possible to heal people? Just a minute. Sorry, unless you write out the question I won't answer it.

Questioner: I think because people are suffering from cancer that it is possible to heal it.

K: I am going to go into it. Sit down please sir. If you don't mind, I'll explain it. The question is - just a minute sir, don't agree or disagree, let's examine it. There are people who heal by putting their hands on somebody. Wait, wait sir. It has been proved. Don't agree or disagree. For god's sake look!

There are people in India, and there are people in England who have this capacity, nothing spiritual, divine, etc., that by putting their hands on somebody's head who has a great deal of pain, they seem to cure the pain. And the speaker has done it. Don't turn up to be healed! Quite a lot. And please remember, please don't want to be healed by me, go to somebody else. And it is possible. But to have such healing capacity, really, deeply, there must be no shadow of selfishness. It is not healing and then give me money. There must be no quiver of selfishness, of the centre, the me, healing. That is a perfectly different matter.

3rd QUESTION: What is enlightenment?

Again this is one of those words that have come from India - to be enlightened. To be enlightened about what? Please let's be rational, not irrational. When we say enlightened, I am enlightened about what? Say for instance I am enlightened about my relationship with another. That is, I have understood that my relationship with another is based on my image, about the other, however intimate. That image has been put together through many years by constant reaction, indifference, comfort - you follow? - the nagging, all that between man and woman, all that. So the image is built and she has built an image about you, so the relationship is between the two images, which is obvious. And that is what we call relationship.

Now I perceive the truth of it and I say I am enlightened about it. I am enlightened about violence. I see clearly without any distortion, with clear eyes the whole movement of violence. I see how sorrow arises and the ending of sorrow is that I am enlightened about it. But we don't mean that - right? We mean something else. "I am enlightened, I will tell you about it. Come to me." And you, rather gullible, say, "Yes, tell me all about it." Sir, I don't want to go into all this, I don't know if you are interested.

You see we must understand if we really go into what is enlightenment, illumination, the voice of truth, not my voice, the voice of truth, we must go very carefully into the question of time. The so-called enlightened people have come to it through time, gradually, life after life if you believe in reincarnation, I have come to the point when I am enlightened about everything - right? Which is, it is a gradual process of experience, knowledge, a constant movement from the past to the present and the future, a cycle.

Right? So if you are interested in it, is enlightenment, the ultimate thing, a matter of time? Is it - I hope you aren't bored by this, are you? - is it a gradual process, which means the process of time, the process of evolution, the gradual becoming that? You follow? So one must understand the nature of time, not the chronological time, but the psychological structure which has accepted time. You are following this? That is, I have hoped to ultimately get there. The desire which is part of hope, ultimately says, "I will get there". And the so-called enlightened people, and they are not, because the moment they say, "I am enlightened" they are not. That is their vanity. It is like a man saying "I am really humble" - when a man says that you know what it is. Humility is not the opposite of vanity. When the vanity ends the other is. Those people who have said they are enlightened, say you must go through it step by step, practise this, do that, don't do this, become my pupil, I'll tell you what to do, I'll give you an Indian name, or a Christian new name, and so on and so on and so on. And you, a kind of irrational human being, accept this nonsense.

So you are saying, asking, is that supreme enlightenment - you understand the meaning of that word? A mind that has no conflict, no sense of striving, going, moving, achieving. So one must understand this question of time, which is the constant becoming, or not becoming, which is the same - right? The becoming and the not becoming. And when that becoming is rooted in the mind, that becoming conditions all your thinking, all your activity, then it is a matter of using time as a means of becoming, achieving. But is there such a thing as becoming? You understand? "I am violent, I will be non-violent". That is, becoming an idea - right? I am violent

and the non-violence I project the idea of not being violent, so I create duality. Violent and non-violent and so there is conflict. Then I say, "I must control myself, I must suppress, I must analyse, I must go to a psychologist, I must have a psychotherapist" and so on and so on.

Without creating the opposite, the non-violence, the fact is violence, not non-violence. Right? The fact. The non-violence is non-fact. If you get that once, the truth of that. That is, I am violent, the concept of non-violence brings about this conflict between the opposites. The non-fact has no value, only the fact, which is I am violent. Now to observe the whole movement of violence, anger, jealousy, hatred, competition, imitation, conformity and so on and so on, to observe it without any direction, without any motive - right? Then if you do that then there is the end of violence, which is an immediate perception and action. I wonder if you understand this?

So one can see that illumination, this sense of ultimate reality and so on, is not of time. This goes against the whole psychological religious world, the Christians with their souls, with their saviours, with their ultimate etc. etc.

We say perception is action; not perception, great interval and then action. In that interval you create the idea. Right? Are you following all this? Sirs, we are pointing out something which is: can the mind, the brain, you know the whole human nervous structure as well as the psychological structure be free of this burden of a million years of time so that you see something clearly and action is invariably immediate. That action will be rational, not irrational. That action can be explained logically, sanely.

So we are saying that ultimate thing, which is truth, is not to be achieved through time. It can never be achieved. It is there, or it is not there.

4th QUESTION: People talk of experiences beyond the senses. There seems to be a fascination in such experiences but the lives of those who claim to have had them seem to be as mediocre as before. What are these experiences? Are these experiences part of enlightenment, or a step towards it? And so what is enlightenment?

Do you like these kind of questions? It is strange isn't it? You are always talking about enlightenment, what you have said, what the speaker has said, what somebody has said. You never say, "Look, it is my life. I am in great pain, sorrow, this, how am I to resolve all that?" - not what some idiot says. Everywhere the speaker has been there has always been these kind of questions. Not how shall I live in this world which is so corrupt, where there is no justice, and I am part of all that, what shall I do? You never ask those questions. Why don't you? Why don't we ask really a deep fundamental question about ourselves? Why is it we never asked: I don't seem to have loved. I know all the descriptions of love, I know when I say to my friend, or my girl, or my wife, "I love you" - I know it is not quite, quite, quite. I know it is sex, sensory, pleasure, desire, companionship, I know all that isn't that bloom that flowers, that has beauty, that has greatness. But we ask about enlightenment - why, if I may ask? Is it we are frightened to be, to uncover ourselves? - not to me. I am not your father confessor, or group therapist - I have a horror of all those things. If you ask yourself that question: why is it that I don't ask the most deep fundamental question about myself? Is it we are frightened?

Is it that we cannot bear to see what we are? The shoddiness, the ugliness, the pettiness, the vulgarity, the commonness, the mediocrity of it all - is that what we are frightened about? And if we discover what actually we are, we say, please help me, tell me what to do. The father figure comes into being then.

So apparently we never face ourselves. We avoid it at any cost. And that is why we become so irrational. And that is why we are exploited by all these people. It is really a tragedy: grown up people, at least we think we are grown up, playing with all this, and not coming to the root of things, which is ourselves. We have to be forced, urged, compelled, to face ourselves by somebody. And so we never, never under any circumstances face this thing. That is why there is no change in us.

Since this question has been put I must answer it: People talk of experiences beyond the senses. There seems to be a fascination in such experiences but the lives of those who claim to have had them seem as mediocre as before. What are these experiences? Are these experiences part of enlightenment, a step towards it? Can you bear me going on?

You know life, the daily living of everyday, is a vast experience - right? A tremendous experience, the joys, the pleasures, the anxieties, the burden of sorrow, the injustice around you, poverty, over population, pollution, lack of energy - energy as petrol and in ourselves. This life is such a tremendously complex problem of experiences - not problem, experience. And we are bored with it. We cannot face it. We don't feel responsible for this. We separate ourselves from all this. And the separation is fallacious, unreal, irrational because we are that, we have created that, each one of us.

We are part of all that. And we don't want to face it. So being bored, being exhausted by trivialities of life, then we go and ask somebody, pay him, initiate, beads, new name, and hope to have new experiences. And you will because when you want something you are going to get it, whether it is rational, irrational, sane or insane, it doesn't matter.

So first - I will go into that presently - first we must understand the nature of our living, the daily living, the daily irritation, the daily angers, the daily boredom, the loneliness, the despair. Instead of facing it, understanding it, cleaning all that, we want super extrasensory experience beyond the senses, when we haven't understood the activity of the senses, the daily response of the senses. And there are those people who will give you experiences; it is all trickery, gadgetry.

When one has really understood, lived, so that life, the everyday boredom, the loneliness, the ache of something better, when that is all understood, not intellectually, not verbally but cleansed, free of all that. That is to understand very clearly the sensory responses, how the sensory responses dominate, how they condition the mind - right? And unaware of all that, unaware that one's mind is conditioned, and from that conditioned state you are asking something more. And the man who promises you something more gives you according to his conditioning. He may say, "No, no. I am not conditioned. I am much too advanced". So what happens? If the depths are cleared, that is, when the foundation is laid - no conflict, you have understood desire, pleasure, fear, sorrow - you are shrugging it off, that is your daily burden, then when you go beyond it you will find a mind that is asking for experiences is still

in the state of being conditioned by the senses. And there is a mind that has no experience whatsoever.

5th QUESTION: Insight is a word now used to describe anything newly seen, or any change of perspective. This insight we all know. But the insight you speak of seems a very different one. What is the nature of the insight you speak about.

Please this is an important question. It will affect your daily life if you have understood the insight.

You understand the first part of the question, which is: they have experimented with monkeys, they hang up a bunch of bananas and a monkey takes the stick and beats it and the bananas drop, and you say he has insight. And there is the other monkey who brings the furniture together, on top of one another and gets on top and reaches up. That is also called insight. And also they have experimented with rats, put a bait at the end of it and he has to do all kinds of tricks, press this button, that button, and the other to get at that. And that is also called insight. You understand? That is, through experiment, through trial, through constantly trying this button the other button, it doesn't work, does it work, that does, then pressing that button is recorded, which becomes knowledge - you understand? And pressing that button opens the door, the trap and you get the cheese or whatever it is.

So this process of so-called insight is essentially based on knowledge - right? I wonder if you understand this? This is what we are doing. You may not call it insight, but this is the actual process of our activity. Try this, if it doesn't suit, you try that. Medically, physically, sexually and so-called spiritually you are doing this all the time. That is, in trying, in experimenting and

achieving, which becomes knowledge, and from that knowledge you act - right? This is called scientific insight. Right? Is that clear? Can I go on from there, if I may?

We are saying insight is something entirely different. Which is, I will explain a little bit: when I try this and push that button and achieve a result the brain has recorded that button and the result. Then it becomes automatic and the experimenter changes the button. The monkey or me presses that, but it doesn't work so he gets disturbed. This is what happens to you, please watch it. Disturbed and you press that by accident and the trap is open and you get your cheese. Right? So through experiment, through trial, you find a way of living, which suits you, which is the cheese. And that is called insight. Now if you watch it that insight is the repetition of knowledge: acquiring knowledge, discarding knowledge, acquiring more knowledge, discarding - you follow? It is always based on knowledge, and knowledge is the past. I don't know if you see that. There is no knowledge of the now or of the future, except under certain circumstances, you foresee the future, that is a different thing - we won't go into that because that leads to somewhere else.

So this insight of which people are talking about is the outcome of knowledge, modifying itself all the time. Which is recorded in the brain and therefore in the cells of the brain, which is, the rat, or the mouse, or whatever they are experimenting with, or the monkey, remembers that button is going to give me the cheese. If you change that button I get disturbed. The monkey gets disturbed - we are monkeys anyhow. The monkey gets disturbed and that disturbance is the disturbance of the pattern of memory. And you

change the button and I accidentally press that one and I remember this, that button. So if you constantly change the button the monkey goes mad. And that is why we are going mad too. I don't know if you realize all this. That is what we call uncertainty. This constant danger. As we said the other day, the scientists are saying that by two thousand the earth will be almost uninhabitable because of pollution, of what we are doing with the earth, the rivers polluted, the air polluted, over population - you follow? So the brain - please listen to this - the brain is accustomed to one button. You understand what I mean by button? One pattern. But that pattern changes, it accepts it, it will not accept basic change. That means he doesn't know where it is. Like the monkey if you keep on changing the buttons it gives up. Because it won't move. It is paralysed because it doesn't know what to do. I don't know if you are watching all this in your own self. Not knowing what to do you rush off asking somebody what to do and you press the buttons.

Sirs, this is very serious, what we are talking about. It isn't just casual, this is your life. And so this constant change, which is happening in the world, brings about this sense of paralytic inaction. I can't do anything. I can go off into monasteries and all that, but that is too immature, childish when you are facing something tremendous. So we are saying: unless there is change - please listen to this - in the brain cells themselves, the mere pressing buttons is the same pattern repeated. You get the point? Unless the brain, which is composed of a million, a trillion, or whatever cells - unless there is a radical change there it will be repeating the old pattern, modifying itself, uncertain, insecure, paralysing state of inaction, and being paralysed go off to ask

somebody else. You follow the whole movement. This is what we are doing.

So the question is: can that brain which is common to all of us, can those brain cells change? - not operated, not heat on the head, not given new drugs, not enter into new states of scientific investigation, astrophysics instead of something else and so on. You have understood this? Really in depth, not just up here?

Then the question arises: is it possible for the brain cells themselves to undergo a change? Otherwise we will keep on repeating this, this pattern. Certainty, uncertainty, certainty, uncertainty and keep on repeating, it goes on. Right?

Now is it possible for the brain cells to change? The speaker has discussed this point with several scientists - probably they will come out a little later. Which is: it can be changed. Don't accept my word for it. I say it can be changed. This movement from certainty to uncertainty, certainty to uncertainty, is a pattern of time - you are following all this? Exercise, keep moving sirs, with me, the speaker. This is a movement of time. And the brain is used to that. That is why there are all these questions about enlightenment, discipleship and you know, all the rest of it - systems and all that. It is accustomed to that. And they are saying can that brain itself undergo radical change? And the speaker says yes it can. Which is - I'll explain it to you. Rational, not some illusory, fanciful, romantic, blah. Which is: can the brain, the mind and so the nerves the whole of that, observe? Observe itself. Which means no direction, no motive - you follow? When there is no motive, no direction, the movement has already changed. I don't know if you follow all this? Have you followed this? My brain, your brain is

accustomed to function with motives, certainty, my golly I am uncertain, motive. So when there is no motive in observation you have changed the whole momentum of the past. Right? Is this clear? Don't go to sleep please. Exercise your minds. This is rational what we are talking about. Therefore when there is no motive, no direction, the mind becomes absolutely quiet. Inward observation. And that observation is insight. And therefore the brain cells which have been accustomed to a certain pattern have broken the pattern. I wonder if you understand this? Are you doing it with me?

Look sirs: we are brought up on ideals, the greater the ideal the better, the nobler and all the rest of it. And the ideal is more important than 'what is'. Right? So there is 'what is' and what the ideal is must breed conflict. I hope you are exercising your minds. Please follow this. And that is the pattern in which you have lived. This pattern which creates conflict - the 'what is' and 'what should be'. Now somebody like this person comes along and says, look what you are doing. The ideal is the creation of thought in order to overcome 'what is', or use the future as a lever to change 'what is'. So this is fact and that is not fact. So you are using a non-fact to deal with fact. Therefore it has no result. You understand? Oh, for god's sake please, it is your life. You are trying to change 'what is', which is a fact, with non-fact, the ideal, therefore it can never change - you understand? It is so simple once you see it. So the discarding the ideal, because it is valueless, and only the fact. That discarding the ideal has changed the pattern of the cells because it has lived in that pattern and it has now broken. And one has lived in the hope that I will gradually change. And then you see the

gradualness means the same thing repeated, modified, repeated, modified, repeated - right? And therefore never a basic change. So when you see that the whole structure of the brain has changed: that is insight. Not the repetition or the action of knowledge. Sirs, this requires putting your blood into this.

SAANEN 5TH QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 27TH JULY 1980

This is the last meeting. Perhaps we shall meet again next year.

There are many questions and some are quite absurd with very little meaning, and others are rather superficial, like the one that I am going to read presently, and there are some rather serious and worthwhile questions. As we said the other day, and if we may repeat it again: the root meaning of the word 'question' means to seek; and in answering some of these questions we are sharing it together. It is not that the speaker is answering them and that you must accept them, or deny them, but rather together in a kind of good relationship, amicable, try to understand together the depth of these questions.

I will read the first one.

1st QUESTION: There are many people in this tent who have seats reserved for them. Many are from the K. Foundation. The people close to you cannot change, and are still superficial and proud and unaware, what is the answer?

The people who have reserved seats come at the last moment. They have been working, they have been doing a great many other things connected with the Foundation, with the tent and all the organization of this gathering. And also some seats are reserved for those who are not too well. And it is rather unfortunate to judge superficially that many of these people are rather proud, vain and all the rest of it. I don't think that question need be answered.

2nd QUESTION: I have a young child. How do I educate him so that he will live a different sort of life without being so different

that society will destroy him?

You know there are many schools, in India we have six schools. There is one at Brockwood, one in Canada, one in California, Ojai. First of all it is very difficult to get the right kind of teachers. When they come to teach the difficulty is that they have all kinds of opinions, how it should be done, how it should not be done, the teaching, and so on. They project their own desires and volitions and their own prejudices. They may be very capable of transmitting information, knowledge, but they also project their own personalities, their own peculiar idiosyncrasies. So it is a constant trouble to get the right kind of teachers who are really interested in teaching, not only the academic subjects but teaching something much more: teaching how to live a life as you go along, older, adolescent and so on, how to live a life which is rational, not superstitious, not confused and so on. It is very difficult. And when we were in India with these six schools we sent a letter to all the parents saying that these schools intend and are doing, as much as possible, to free the mind of the child, the student, from fear, from confusion, and to have integrity. So when the parents came, not many of them, they were really not interested in their children, except the mothers, the fathers wanted them to go on to earn a livelihood, follow the old usual routine, but the mothers were a little bit concerned. But perhaps the parents and the children are really responsible. Perhaps they may destroy their children.

And when one has a small child, how are you going to educate it? This is a great problem. And we are trying at Brockwood to answer this question. Perhaps we shall have young children but we are going to go into it. But the difficulty is society is so strong, the

temptations of the young person who wants to be with other young children who are already corrupt, who have already - you know - have accepted all the nonsense of society, and it becomes extremely difficult to bring up a child who will not yield to the tremendous weight of society.

So it beholds not only on the part of the teachers, but also on the part of the parents. It is a cooperative business, it isn't just you send the child to the school and forget all about it. Here in these schools we are strict vegetarians, and when they go back they eat meat, so the conflict begins. You know all the rest of it. And this is a question that cannot be so easily answered, because to run these schools you have to have plenty of money and these schools survive just on a shoe string. And the parents are only too willing to send them there and the responsibility, the work, the immense concern is there, it is not theirs, it is there. We have been through it year after year and this requires not only cooperation from the parents but also good teachers who are capable of understanding not only the academic subjects but also something much more serious.

3rd QUESTION: I think I can solve my problems. I do not need any help. I have the energy to do it, but beyond this I come to receive - and if you don't like that word, to share something measureless to man, something that has great depth and beauty. Can you share that with me?

It is a quotation from Xanadu by Coleridge 'measureless to man' - that phrase 'measureless to man' is a poem written by Coleridge called Kubla Khan. And the questioner says I can solve all my problems - and problems can be solved without the help of others,

because the problems are created by oneself in relationship to another and these problems, however subtle, however superficial, however great, they can be solved if one applies one's mind and heart to resolve them. That is fairly clear. That is, if one has energy, not be slack, lazy. And if one really wants to solve them they can be solved. The questioner says that is simple.

But he wants to go much further. He says, yes, I can do all that. I come here to share something as he calls it 'measureless to man', something beyond all measure, something that is not given in churches, and you know, all the rest of it.

First of all we are sharing this together. I am not a Delphic Oracle, there is no authority here. I happen to sit on a platform for convenience so that everybody can see, if you want to see. And that little height doesn't give him any authority whatsoever. And I really mean this. You are not my followers, and all the rest of it. So the first thing is to realize what do we mean by measure - because he uses the word 'measureless'. You are following all this? Thought can be measured. Distance can be measured, from here to there. And the so-called progressive evolution can be measured. One was this yesterday, through meeting the present what was yesterday is modified and the movement to the future. That can be measured. Measured, if you are good today, and tomorrow you might not be, and that can be measured. And thought, which is a material process can also be measured. The shallowness of one's thinking, the superficiality, the deeper and the deepest. As long as there is the more and the less it can be measured.

Comparison is a process of measurement. Please follow all this, if you are interested. And imitation can be measured. Conformity

can be measured. And the word 'measure' in Sanskrit too, means to regulate, to measure. Meditation, that word means not only ponder, think, investigate, observe, but also it means to measure - from the Sanskrit word Ma (I won't go into all that).

So as long as there is measurement the mind can only function in that measurement, whether it is long or short, whether it is wide or narrow. It can only function in that which is measurable - right? I wonder if you understand all this? And the word meditation, in that word is implied also measurement. Now the mind, the brain has been trained, accustomed, fallen into a habit of measurement. Obviously. And is something which is not measurable, if there is such a thing, can the mind, the brain, and the heart, they are all one, can that whole structure be free of measurement? You follow? Then only you can find out. Are you meeting me?

The brain is, as we pointed out several times, and the scientists are beginning to agree too, so perhaps you will also accept it because the moment you talk about scientists you worship them and you think they have achieved something and when they also say, "Yes, partly you are right", then perhaps you will also come along! You see the brain, as we said, is not your brain. It is the brain which has evolved through time, millions and millions of years. And that brain is the common brain of humanity. You may not like to see that because we are accustomed to the idea that we are individuals, that our brains are individual, ours, mine, not yours. And that concept has been a constant tradition through millennia. And so the brain is conditioned to that and that brain is constantly measuring - the more, the less, the better and the best - the very word better is measurable. So this brain is constantly

functioning in that pattern. I don't know if you have observed yourselves, you can see this in yourself. Physically, objectively, you can see that a workman becomes a foreman, and if he is good he is a manager; a priest becomes a bishop, cardinal, pope. The apprentice, then the master, the master carpenter. This is the whole pattern of our existence, which are all measurable. And the questioner says: is there something beyond measure, measureless to man?

Now how are you going to find out? We will share this together, as the questioner says, share it with me. How are we going to find out if there is something beyond all measure, that is beyond all time, because time is measurement: yesterday, today, tomorrow, 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock, measureable, distance, measureable. And as thought is measurable, if you have gone into it, which you are doing now please. Whoever the questioner is, please do listen. Is there something beyond time, which is thought - time is movement - right? And thought is movement. So time is thought. Thought is born out of memory, experience, knowledge. That is the process of memory, of thought. And this process is a material process because in the very cells of the brain are the memories, so it is a material process, and everything that it creates is a material process. Right? Please follow this, not accepting or denying but logically, observing it in oneself, and also observing externally.

So as long as thought is measuring, moving in measurement, there can be no other than measurement - right? Obviously. Now the question is: can all measure end? Measure as comparison - comparing oneself with somebody else, the hero, the example, the ideal, the perfect one and so on and so on and so on. If you observe

for yourself from childhood we are trained to compare - better marks in a school, the various classes, college, university, a degree, it is all measurement, which is essentially comparative - right? Now can you, the questioner, who is sharing this with us, stop comparing completely? That is, psychologically, the other thing is that academically you have to. So can you psychologically end immediately, not tomorrow, another day, but immediately all sense of comparison, if the mind wants to go much further? And imitation, conformity, which are all the same movement, comparing, conformity imitation, are all the same movement - can that movement end totally? In comparison there is aggression, there is competition - I am better than you, and all that. And, as we talked about it yesterday, have an insight into measurement.

I explained very carefully yesterday, if I may repeat it again briefly: insight, as man and scientists and others have experimented, insight is the accumulation of knowledge - I told you about the monkeys and so on - and from that accumulation of experience, knowledge have an insight into the understanding of the structure, that is based on the past. Now we are saying that is not insight. Insight is total perception of the whole complex movement of measurement. And you can only have that insight when you perceive it without previous knowledge, then if you are using the knowledge then it is comparative, it is measurable. Insight is not measurable. Got it now?

Then when there is that measureless insight the unfolding of the whole movement of comparison, and all that, is not only seen but ends immediately. You can test it out. You don't have to accept the speaker's word for it, you can test it out.

So: what is beyond measure, there must be freedom from fear, naturally, deep rooted, conscious or unconscious fear. That is a problem which can be observed, resolved, because the root of fear, the root, not the various branches and the leaves of that tree, the root of that fear is time - right? I am afraid of tomorrow. I am afraid of what has happened. The physical pain which I have had, gone and the fear it might occur again. The whole physical phenomena of pain. And psychologically too one has done something wrong, not right, not honourable - honourable, I am using the word in its dictionary meaning, not what you call honourable - and psychologically fear is time. "I am afraid of dying. I am living but I dread what might happen" - which is the measurement of time. So the root of fear is time and thought. Right? Now to have an insight into that is the ending of fear totally. When one ends fear you will say, "What is there?" You follow? We will go into that later.

So the ending of fear, which means the understanding of time and the ending of sorrow. If this is cleared, if the mind, the brain is not afraid then there may be something more. But you see we want to be assured, we want it guaranteed, like a good watch, specially in Switzerland, like a good watch you want it guaranteed, that will last at least three years. We have the same attitude that if I do this what will I get? That is commercial mentality - right? If I do this will you guarantee me that? There is no guarantee, and that is the beauty of it. You have to do it for itself, not for something. And that is very difficult for people. One gives up this in order to reach that, Nirvana, Heaven whatever it is, which are all acts of measurement.

So can the mind - we are sharing this together - can the mind be free of all measurement? In your relationship to another, which is much more difficult? And to be free of all that is to be measureless and then something totally different takes place. When that is described, that which has taken place beyond measure, that which is described is not 'what is' - you understand what I am saying? You can describe the mountain, the shape of it, the line of it, the shadows, you can paint it, make a poem of it, describe it - all that is not the mountain. We sit in the valley and say, "Please tell us about the mountain". We don't walk there. We want to be comfortable. So there is a state, not a state, there is something beyond all measure.

4th QUESTION: What is our consciousness? Are there different levels of consciousness? Is there a consciousness beyond the normal one we are aware of? And is it possible to empty the content of our consciousness?

Please we are sharing this together. I may use the words, the descriptions, but what is described is not the fact. So don't be caught in descriptions, in explanations.

What is our consciousness? To be conscious of, to be aware of what is going on, not only outside but also inside. It is the same movement. So when we say we are conscious, we are aware - our consciousness is the product of society, our education, our culture, racial inheritance and the inheritance of one's own striving, the result. And our beliefs, our dogmas, our rituals, our concepts, our jealousies, anxieties, our pleasures, our so-called love, all that is our consciousness. Right? Right? That you cannot, nobody can dispute that. You can add more to it, or expand it, but that is the

structure which has evolved through millennia, after millennia. Wars, tears, anxieties, sorrow, depression, elation, all that is part of us. Right? And the content, which is all this, makes up our consciousness - right? Right sirs? You are following this? I believe, I am a Hindu, with all the Brahmanical superstitions, with their rituals, with their absurdities, with their gods, with their belief in this and that and the other thing. That is the consciousness of a Hindu born in that country; in the west the consciousness is the content, the Christian, the Saviour, the whole hierarchical system. The soul, the redeemer, the original sin and so on and so on and so on. If you are a Communist you will say according to Marx, environment, which is economy, has shaped your consciousness. And there are those people who say you can't change it. You can modify it, you can polish it up, but you have to accept it, make the best of it but it is there. You are following all this?

And, as we said, the content makes the consciousness. Without the content, consciousness as we know it doesn't exist, obviously if I have no belief, no dogma, no this and no that. And the question is, the questioner says: is it possible to empty all the content? You understand? The sorrow, the strife, the struggle, the terrible human relationship with each other, the quarrels, the anxiety, jealousies, the affection, the sensuality - you follow? All that is our consciousness with its content. Can that content be emptied? And if it is emptied is there a different kind of consciousness? And has consciousness different layers, different levels?

In India they have divided consciousness, clever people they are, the ancient people, into lower, higher, higher. I won't use the Sanskrit words and so on, it is divided. And this division is

measured. I don't know if you are following all this. The moment there is division there must be measurement. Division between the Arab and the Jew, the Englishman, the Frenchman - it is all measurement. And where there is measurement there must be division, and effort, wars and all the rest of it follows. Whether that consciousness has different levels, it is still within consciousness. I don't know if you follow it? It has been divided by thought, by clever people, by so-called people who have gone into this, it has been divided. That division is measurement therefore it is thought. Whatever thought has put together is part of consciousness - right? Whether you divide that consciousness as the highest supreme, it is still the movement of thought. Right? You agree, we are moving along together?

Now the question is: can the content be emptied? Can sorrow be ended, not only your personal sorrow but the sorrow accumulated through millennia of mankind? By personal sorrow I mean immediate sorrow: "I have lost a son" - I have lost this - the tears, the despair, which is momentary. But there is this vast sorrow of mankind, which has been accumulated through five or ten thousand years of wars - tribal divisions, tribal hatreds, the various aspects of religion, organized, not organized, those who believe and those who don't. And so on and so on and so on. Can all that be ended? Must you take one by one - please listen - and resolve them - you understand? Fear, conformity, pleasure, the nature of pleasure, the whole movement of pleasure, and sorrow - will we take one by one and resolve these? That will take one's whole life time. I don't know if you are following all this? Or, can one have a total insight into all that? You have understood? We have explained what

insight means, not the insight of remembrance, not the insight of knowledge, time and action. I wonder if you are following all this? I am afraid you are not. Please don't meditate now, don't go off, this is very, very serious because it affects your life.

And we say it is possible to empty this content completely. The essence of this content is thought, which has put together the me, the me which is ambitious, greedy, aggressive, all that. That is the essence of the content of consciousness. Can that me with all this structure, selfishness, you know all that, can that be totally ended? The speaker can say, "Yes, it can be ended completely" - which means no centre from which you are acting, no centre from which you are thinking. The centre is the essence of measurement, which is the becoming. Can that becoming end? And we say probably it can, but what is at the end of it? You understand? That is, if I end this becoming, what is then being? I wonder if you follow all this?

First of all find out for oneself if this becoming can end. Can you drop, end something which you like, that gives you some deep pleasure, without a motive, without saying, "I can do it if there is something at the end of it"? Can you do something immediately, end something that gives you great pleasure? You see how difficult this is? Like a man who smokes, his body has been poisoned by nicotine and when he ends it the body is craving for it, and so he takes something else to satisfy the body. So to end something rational, clear, without any reward or punishment, just to say finished.

Selfishness hides in many, many ways: seeking truth, social service, surrendering oneself to something, to a person, to an idea, to a concept. It also hides itself in social work, in devotion to

nationalism, to god - right? One must be so astonishingly aware of all this. And that requires energy. And that energy is now being wasted in conflict, in fear, in sorrow, in all the travails of life. That energy is being wasted in so-called meditation. And this requires enormous energy, not physical energy, that is fairly easy, but the energy that has never been wasted. Then consciousness can be emptied, and when it is emptied you will find if there is something more, or not, it is up to you. We like to be guaranteed that, there is no guarantee.

5th QUESTION: Why is it that almost all human beings apart from their talents and capacities are mediocre, including Beethoven, Mozart and Bach and all the rest of them? I know I am mediocre. I don't seem to be able to break through this mediocrity.

First of all are we aware that we are mediocre? You answer it for yourself. Mediocre means neither high nor low, just hovering in between. The great painters, the great musicians, the great architects, they have got extraordinary capacities and talent but in their daily life they are like you and me and like everybody else. Like Haydn, when he composed he put on his best clothes. And when we go to church we put on our best clothes - you understand what I am saying? Was it Haydn or somebody else? It doesn't matter.

If I am aware that I am mediocre - just a minute, go into it slowly with me, let's share it - if I am aware I am mediocre, what does that mean? I am neither hot nor cold - right? Neither passionate, I may be lustful and I cool off. I may have great talent, a writer, a painter, sculptor, musician, teacher; that is all outward dress, outward show of inward poverty. Being poor inwardly we

are always struggling to become rich, not financially, but in knowledge, in understanding, in striving to something nobler, nobler, nobler. This sense of insufficiency and trying to fill that insufficiency with the latest gossip of politics, with the latest rituals, the latest meditations, the latest this and that - all that is an act of mediocrity. Right? Please don't get angry with me, we are just sharing it, pointing out to each other.

And this sense of mediocrity, if one is aware of it, shows itself in outward respectability - right? Or the revolt against mediocrity, the hippies, the long haired, the unshaven, the latest fallouts. It is the same movement, you understand? I can join a community, a commune, because inwardly there is nothing in me and by joining I become important, there is something, there is an action. So when one is aware of this mediocrity, which is this utter sense of insufficiency, this sense of deep frustrating loneliness, which is covered over by all kinds of activities. If you are aware of that, then what is insufficiency? You understand my question? What is loneliness? How do you measure this insufficiency? You follow? The moment you measure you are insufficient. I wonder if you capture it? Do you see that? Right? No, don't agree, but don't measure. Like depression is measurement, don't reduce everything to measurement. That is another catchword. You are good at catching words and repeating it and it becomes worthless. But we are saying this insufficiency comes into being as long as there is comparison. Right? And this measurement is limitless, you can go on measuring, measuring, measuring - but not limitless, sorry I used that word. It is a constant movement from a human being who is insufficient in himself.

Now can that comparative observation end? Then is there insufficiency? You are following what I am saying? Come on sirs. I compare myself with you and I realize that you are much cleverer than I am, much more intelligent, nicer, alive, full of this and that. I compare myself. And then I say to myself how dull I am in comparison. So I strive to compete with you. But if I don't compare with you who are very clever - the 'very clever' is already comparison, I don't know if you follow - if I don't compare am I dull? Or am I aware of what is actually taking place in me? When I compare I am avoiding the fact of 'what is'. Is this too much of a thing for a morning? Perhaps for some of you it is.

So this mediocrity that all of us seem to have can be broken through when there is no sense of comparison, measurement. It gives you an immense freedom. Where there is freedom there is no mediocrity - right? Do see it sirs. The more - not the more, where there is complete psychological freedom there is no sense of mediocrity. You follow? You are out of that class altogether - not you - a totally different state of mind exists.

6th QUESTION: Attachment brings about a kind of emotional exchange, a human warmth, this seems a fundamental need. Detachment produces coldness, lack of affection, a break in relationship, it can also deeply hurt others. Something seems to be wrong with this approach. What do you say?

I don't have to say anything. (Laughter). I am attached to you. The word 'attach' means to cling, to hold. The feeling that you belong to somebody and that somebody belongs to you, to hold, to cling, to adhere, like a plaster. Sorry! All that is implied in that word. And the questioner says: cultivating detachment breeds lack

of affection, a coldness, a break in relationship. The cultivation of the opposite, naturally it will. You understand? If I am attached to you, the audience, and I feel this attachment is dangerous because I know I will be unhappy if I don't meet all of you and talk to all of you, which is my fulfilment, which is called attachment, then seeing the danger of that, depression when I don't meet a large audience, only two people and you know, I go through all that ugly business, and seeing all that I say I must cultivate detachment. So I must break from you. I must break my relationship if I have a wife or a husband, or a girl or a boy or whatever it is. So I gradually withdraw. And in this process of isolation I hurt others - right? I hurt my wife or my father, I hurt lots of people and so on. Now is there - please listen - is there an opposite to attachment? If detachment is the opposite of attachment, that detachment is an idea, is a concept, is a conclusion that thought has brought about realizing that attachment produces a lot of trouble, a lot of conflict, jealousy, anxiety and so on and so on. So thought says, "By jove, much better be detached". Detachment is non-fact - right? Whereas attachment is a fact. I don't know if you are following all this. Please don't go to sleep. Another ten minutes or a quarter of an hour, keep awake then you can go to sleep! Or meditate afterwards!

Look: the speaker has done this - not attached to a thing: the house, the audience, the books, the speaking, people - he has been like that from childhood. So he is a freak! A biological freak, so leave him alone. But you can see clearly the fact and that which is non-fact - right? When attachment is there, to cultivate detachment is a movement towards illusion. And in that illusion you become

cold, because that is illusion, it isn't reality, you become cold, hard, bitter, isolated without any sense of affection. That is what we are all doing. We are all living in non-fact.

So can you face the fact that you are attached? It is not only to a person, to an idea, to a belief, to your own experiences, which is much more dangerous, your own experience gives you such a sense of, you know, excitement, a sense of being alive. So are we aware that we are attached to something or other? And you may be attached to a piece of furniture, it is old, polished, well kept, fifteenth century, and it is immensely valuable, and you are attached to it. See what happens. When you are attached to a piece of furniture you are that furniture. Yes sirs. Go into it.

So if one is aware that one is attached and see all the consequences of that attachment - anxiety, lack of freedom, jealousy, anger, hatred - follow the whole consequences of human attachment to something or other. In that attachment to something there is safety, there is a sense of stability, a sense of being guarded, protected. And where there is the possessor and the possessed there must be jealousy, anxiety, fear and all the rest. Now do you see the consequences of all that? Not the description of it but the actuality of it? If I am attached to you and that attachment takes place out of my loneliness, and that attachment and that loneliness says, "I love you" - you understand? - I feel a communication because you are also in the same position - right? Two people clinging to each other out of their loneliness, out of their depression, out of their unhappiness, you know all the rest of it. So what happens? I am clinging not to you, but to the idea - you follow? You understand what I am saying? - so I am clinging to

something which will help me to escape from myself. Right? Right sirs? Don't agree with me, just observe it.

You are attached to your experience, an incident which has given you great excitement, a great sense of elation, a sense of power, a sense of safety, you cling to that. That experience, please listen to this if you are interested, that experience which you have had, what is it? Either you have projected it - right? You want some kind of experience and you will get it because that is what you want. And then that experience is registered in the mind and you hold it. That is, something that is dead you are holding on to - right? So that which you are holding is dead, and you also are becoming dead. I wonder if you see all this? So if you see all this, without any direction, without any motive, observe it, then you will see, if you observe, that insight shows the whole thing as a map. When once there is the insight the thing disappears completely, you are not attached. You have been attached to this and let go and you are attached to something else. Attachment is the ending of attachment.

7th QUESTION: As you pointed out yesterday, being uncertain we seek certainty through different channels, trusting them, then distrusting them, is there an absolute, irrevocable certainty?

Isn't it odd that I am sitting here and you are listening? Isn't it odd? I feel its rather odd, but doesn't matter.

We move from certainty to uncertainty, then from that uncertainty to another certainty. Trust this person and then later on discover that he is not worthy of your trust and move to another and again put your trust in him then discover he is untrusting, that's our life, right? Please you're not putting your trust in me, be very

clear, I won't have it! To me that is the beginning of corruption, avoided all one's life, this life, not to be corrupted. I won't be corrupted!

So, as I pointed out yesterday, various types of experiments have been made on animals; pigeons, monkeys, rats and, these monkeys, pigeons and rats, by pressing a button get their food. But if you keep changing the buttons all the time the bird, the monkey, the rat gives up, they die. Do you understand this constant movement from certainty to uncertainty, from trust to trust? This is what has happened to all of us, to human beings. This is being the movement from time immemorial, you understand sirs?

You trusted the priest, the whole hierarchical structure of organized religion, you discard it then go to another, it is the same thing in a different garb. There you put your trust and again discover later on good Lord what have I done, and always seeking outside, somebody who will give you hope, trust, certainty either in books, in philosophers, in priests, or in scientists or in politicians, right? And none of them have given... extreme left, right or centre.

So, what is wrong with us? Why are we doing this all the time? Or if you don't do it you become cynical, bitter, you say not worth it and lead your own narrow little ugly life and that is that.

But if you are asking for certainty, which you are, where do you find it? In a human being? In a priest with his garb and with his mitre, with his... all that? Or in India? Where do you find it? What is uncertainty? Where do you find it? In somebody else, in (loud noise) Sorry, not hysterics. In somebody else? In idea? In a concept? In the state? You understand what I'm asking? In having plenty of money and feeling completely safe? There is no such

person anymore. So where do you seek certainty? Please if you seek it you won't find it, right? Because you have sought it in everything around you.

I used to know a man who one day while walking, he was walking one day along the beach, let no other dog bark! You know that saying? It doesn't matter. He was walking one day along the beach and he found a piece of wood washed by the sea for many many years, piece of wood which looked like a human head with a face and eyes it was the most beautiful thing, polished wood, and he took it home and put it on the mantelpiece and said what a beautiful thing that is, I'm glad I found it. As he looked at it, week after week one day he put a flower, and then a few days later, incense and began to worship it. By some misfortune, by the maid or somebody, by misfortune burnt it, pushed it into the fire, burnt it. He came to me and explained to me the whole thing and was literally a grown up man in tears, you understand what I am saying, there was his certainty, in a piece of wood.

So where do you seek it? If you don't seek it anywhere outside you, then what happens? You understand my question. Apply it to yourself, we are sharing this thing together, what happens if you don't seek certainty in anything that thought has created? In God, in illumination, you know in the whole thing. So you don't ask for certainty, I don't know if you follow, you've asked there and found nothing and you are going to ask if there is here! inside your brains, your mind, your heart and you know your brain is volatile, moving, changing, adjusting, breaking one pattern taking another pattern, the same phenomenon which is out there is happening inside. I wonder if you understand all this?

So the moment you don't seek certainty, certainty is. That means you have really stopped seeking any kind of permanency in yourself or in there. If you have sought it there you turn inward and you discover it is the same thing, can I trust myself? I can when I'm doing a technical work, but can I trust myself, myself which has been put together by thought and thought has put trust in you, and thought has discovered there is no trust there, you follow? It is the same movement, so when you don't seek certainty there's something far greater than certainty. Are you all tired? spoken for an hour and a half. There's one last question.

8th QUESTION: Are there different paths to truth?

The speaker has said sixty years ago, truth is a pathless land. The ancient Hindus have laid down paths according to the tendency of human beings. They said that truth can be obtained through knowledge, that truth can be obtained through work, that truth can be obtained through devotion, romance, imagination. You see. Gratifying each human being according to his state, according to his idiosyncracies, and that is well established. There have been volumes written on each path. Which is, the clever birds at that time laid down these paths for the convenience of human beings, for the comfort of human beings. "I am devotional, romantic, idealistic, and there is a path for me" - you follow? So this idea that there are different paths to truth is utter nonsense. Follow the idea: the path leading to a point. I wonder if you understand this? That truth is fixed and this path will lead you there. Or that path, devotion, action, knowledge - I think there are four, I have forgotten, it doesn't matter, it is not important. So the Christian path, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Tibetan, the Muslim - you

follow? Then you are safe. You don't have to give up your path. It is a game they play.

So truth is not something that is fixed. And therefore there is no path to it, which means the mind must be free from all movement - you understand? Path means gradual arrival. And you can take your time. If you can't do it this life, perhaps next life. If you want to do it quicker, go to somebody who will help you, but it is still the movement of walking, striving, moving towards an idea. And when you see the falseness of it, it is really utterly false, that there is your way and my way, you see because your mind is the mind of humanity. It is not your mind, therefore it is not your path. It is the human path, human life, the way we live, the way we meet life, not according to your temperament or my temperament, or my idiosyncrasy or your idiosyncrasy, which is what we are doing now. This is the human mind, common to all of us. And when one realizes that, not verbally, actually, inwardly, the feel of it, the beauty of it, the depth of it, the extraordinary width of such a thing, then one realizes there is no path, there is no striving for that, there is only this, the transformation of 'what is'. The transformation of hate, jealousy, fear, sorrow, all the travail of our daily human existence.

And if there is no love and compassion nothing exists. You understand? The love that we have is not love, it is based on pleasure, maternal instinct - you understand what I am saying - which you have derived from the animals. The love of one's wife or one's husband or one's children is still me and you. And with that love and compassion goes intelligence, without this, do what you will, you will never have that thing.

Goodbye sirs, a pleasant journey.

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 24TH JANUARY 1981

If I may, I would like to point out that this is not an entertainment, either intellectual or emotional. We are going to talk over together a great many things during these six talks and it is not a speech by the speaker but rather that we are going to think together - not what to think, but how to think. That is, together we are going to examine very carefully, investigate together with considerable interest, dedication and together explore what is happening in the world and what is happening in this country, and together with scepticism investigate why human beings throughout the world, and specially in this country, in this part of the world, have become so corrupt, lack of integrity and no sense of co-operation and we are together sceptically going to investigate into what is religion. Because religion from the ancient days has played an immense part in life; it has guided man, it has helped man to bear with life, with all the travails of everyday work, everyday misery, confusion, sorrow, fear. Religion right throughout the ages has been controlled by the priests, by those who say, we know, we will tell you what to do, we will tell you what gods to worship. And as you have probably observed organized religions whether it be Christianity, Islam, Buddhism or Hinduism have utterly failed. They have become a mass of superstition, rituals, utterly meaningless. But we are going to investigate together into what is the nature of religion, what is the mind or the brain that comprehends the true non-sectarian, non-theoretical, non-believing, state of mind.

That is what we are going to investigate together throughout the talks. Because without finding out what is the nature of religion we cannot possibly create a new civilization, a new culture. Culture is not a mere pursuit of tradition. It is not merely following certain edicts, certain sanctions, certain beliefs, which are utterly meaningless. But together, and the speaker means together, you and the speaker are going together to investigate with scepticism, never accepting any belief, any theory, any ideological principles. So please bear in mind throughout these talks that we are working together and if you are serious we will go very far into the exploration but if you merely want to be amused, curious, not exercising your brain, but merely sitting there to be talked at, then I am afraid it will be rather a waste of time on your part. But if you are serious, and the condition throughout the world demands that you be serious. So bearing all that in mind we will talk over together.

First of all, what has happened to man, why has man become so corrupt, so utterly lacking integrity, no sense of co-operation. We will go into these three words very carefully. That is, why you, as a human being, have become corrupt - not corrupt financially, that is a very small affair, bribing to get little things, to get a ticket on the train you have to bribe, that is a result. We mean by corruption a brain that is merely becoming mechanical, that is totally unaware of what is happening globally, a brain that is becoming more and more self-centred, more and more selfish, it may pretend to join various sectarian groups, follow various gurus, go to temples or mosques or churches, but if you examine our daily life there is a great deal of fragmented action. That is corruption, when action

becomes fragmented, when action is not whole then there is corruption. We will go into it much further a little later on.

And also when there is lack of integrity, say one thing and do another. Here we are all theoretical, we all believe in some ideal, some form of theory, some kind of ultimate something or other which has nothing whatsoever to do with our daily life. We think and act totally differently. You must be aware of all this. And why is it that there is no spirit of co-operation, not with your family, but the feeling that as we have created this society, the society in which we live, that society can only be changed when we are all working together, not for a theory, not for a country, not for some authority or a principle and so on, but the feeling that we human beings have created this ugly monstrous society, utterly immoral, ruthless and we seem to be utterly incapable of working together to bring about a radical change in society. Why? You understand?

I hope the speaker is making the point very clear: why we human beings have become so utterly careless, brutal, thoughtless, following some stupid tradition, utterly meaningless. What has happened to man? Please ask this question of yourselves, because you, as a human being, are like the rest of the world. You suffer, you go through great loneliness, there is fear, anxiety, ambition, cruelty, you are only interested in money, power, position, this is the common ground of all human beings whether they live in America, Europe, Russia, China or here. This is a fact, that we are basically similar psychologically. You may be tall, you may have a different name, you may have a bank account, fair, dark, but psychologically, inwardly we are the same, similar to all other human beings. Right? This is a fact. Therefore you are not an

individual. Now that will take a lot of investigation because we have been trained, conditioned, to use a modern phrase, wired, programmed to believe that each one of us is an individual, separate, with his own particular soul or whatever that thing is called, and this has been throughout history emphasized by the priest, by religion, through education, to maintain an illusion that you are a separate human being from the rest of mankind. But if you examine very, very carefully the psychological state of man, which is the inward process, the ambition, the envy, the cruelty, the self-centred activity, the enormous suffering, that is the common ground of all human beings. That is an absolute fact, irrefutable.

So you are the entire humanity. Therefore there is no such thing as an individual. Therefore there is no individual salvation at all. Though religions, established religions, the Christian world, the Hindu world and perhaps slightly modified in Buddhism and Islam, there is this idea, this concept, this belief that you are an individual separate from all the rest of mankind and so each one is striving after his own security, his own happiness, his own salvation. But there is no such thing as an individual. Please, we will go into it together, don't accept what the speaker is saying, question it, be sceptical and find out for yourself that you, living in this country, are like the rest of mankind. You suffer, so do the Americans, so do the Europeans, the Africans and so on. You are lonely, desperately anxious, uncertain, insecure, envious, competitive, this is the common thing psychologically for all mankind. Right, you are following all this? So you may have a different name, you may be tall, fair, dark, but inwardly, which is the psychological structure, is common to all mankind, therefore you are mankind.

Right? Please don't accept this. See the truth of it for yourself. That means your brain is accustomed through centuries to think that you are a separate human being. Right? All your religions say so. You act as though you are an individual.

So there is the individual and the community, there is the individual and society, and so there is conflict between the individual, community, society, the family. In that there is constant conflict, a battle going on all day long. This is a fact. But the actual psychological reality is that the common ground, the common factor of all human beings is psychologically more or less the same.

So in listening to these talks if you are going to listen at all, we are not pursuing individual salvation. On the contrary we are trying to find out, we are going to investigate together what it mean to have a common ground upon which we all stand and whether the mind, your brain is capable of totally disassociating itself from the concept of this individual, and so capable of taking a global outlook, not a provincial sectarian narrow outlook, which is the individual outlook, as it is now, but when you see the fact, the truth that you are not an individual then perhaps we will have the global outlook. Therefore our relationship utterly changes to each other.

Society is an abstraction. I hope you understand all this. I hope I am not insulting you, if he asks if you speak English, that we are in communication with each other verbally, intellectually, seeing the same thing together, not you see something different from the speaker. It doesn't mean that we disagree or agree, but see the same thing together, through investigation and exploring sceptically, never accepting a thing the speaker or anyone says so that your

brain becomes extraordinarily active to discover the way of living which is entirely different from what we are doing now.

So as we said, man has tried to change society, there have been revolutions, various thinkers throughout the world tried to change society, the communists have tried it, the various socialists have tried it, and governments have tried it, whether it be the socialists, the fascists, the communists and so on. Society has not been changed. Right? That is, in that society there are wars, sectarian wrangles, that society is utterly immoral, there is no justice, there is immense corruption, and that society man has tried in every way to change. Right? This is an historical fact, and that society has not been changed. So we are going to find out why.

Society is an abstraction. You understand the word? An abstraction is not a reality, what is reality is relationship between man and man. The relationship between man and man has created this, which we call society. Man is violent, man is self-centred, man is seeking pleasure, frightened, insecure, in himself he is corrupt and in his relationship whether it be intimate or not, this way of relationship has created this so-called society. That is clear, obviously. But we always try to change society, not change man who creates the society in which he lives. Please, this is logic, simple, clear. And the socialist, communist, capitalist and so on and so on have always tried to change this amorphous, abstract thing called society. But never tackled the problem of relationship between man and man. Right? Now can that be changed? That is the whole point. Can your relationship with another intimate, sexual, pleasure seeking, this idea that you are separate from another and therefore battle between each other, can all that

psychological structure be transformed? You understand? Are we together in this? Or are you just merely following verbal structure? The speaker is not a reformer, a social reformer. He is essentially a religious man. He doesn't belong to any society, to any group of religious cantankerous believing types, he doesn't belong to any country, he has no belief, has no idea, but only facing what is going on and seeing if that this is possible radically to change. If you, as the audience, now are serious enough to go into this let us walk together, knowing that individual salvation which is promised throughout all this structure of religions, has no meaning. The speaker is not offering personal salvation. We are trying - the speaker is saying that there is an ending to sorrow, there is an ending to conflict between man and man and so a new kind of society can be borne out of that. Are you all interested in this?

Who has created the social structure, the psychological, the nature of psychology, the 'me' which is essentially the psychological structure, who has made it? You are following this? We are asking who is responsible for the actual state of the present world? God certainly has not created this present world, present structure of society with wars, with appalling cruelty, with self-centred action, competition - certainly god, if you believe in that kind of stuff, has not created this society, but man, you, has created god in your image. You are frightened, you want comfort, you want security, a sense of stability, so you have created an idea, a concept, called god, whom you worship. You understand the irony of it? The absurdity of it? God has been created by man. What is the origin of all this? Origin of the nature, the universe, the beginning of all this, who is responsible? And most of us, most of

you rather, believe in something which is comforting. Whereas to find out what is the origin of all this, the origin of a river it begins very slowly with a few trickles of water, the source, and then gathers strength as it goes down the hills, mountains, the valley till it reaches its enormous volume of water, the sea, what is the origin of all this? Man has always tried to find out, and they are still finding out, the origin, through telescopes, going to the moon, and saturn, the Western world is enquiring into all this, the origin. And to find that out if you are serious, not just accepting some printed book, if you are serious it requires enormous enquiry and energy, it requires a brain that is extraordinarily active, a brain that is not tethered to any problem. A brain that is full of problems can never solve any problem. It is only a brain that is free of problems can solve problems. And to find out, not as an individual, find out the truth of the origin one must understand the nature of meditation, the ending of all conflict. Then only, and more, can one find out the origin, the ground from which all this begins can be seen - which we will go into later.

But who has created the psychological structure? You understand? The structure which is called the `me', the `you', `we' and `they', who is responsible for this? The agony, the anxiety, the enormous suffering of mankind, not only personal sorrow with all its tears, depression, anxiety and loneliness, but also who has created this extraordinary world of technology which is advancing at an incredible speed? Who has created this inward feeling, this inward sense of despair, anxiety, sorrow? You understand all this? Who has created all this? If you say it is god, he must be a rather strange god. If you say it is karma, past life, which means again

you believe, you are struck in the idea of individuality which is non-existent, so if you begin to question, investigate sceptically, never accepting any authority, the Gita, the Upanishads, the Bible, the Koran and all the rest of it, you have a brain that is free to look.

So we are asking, the psychological structure and also the technological world, who has been responsible for these two states; the technological world in which you are living, the computer, the robot, the extraordinary quick communication, the surgery, the medicine, and the inward state, the greed, the envy, the hatred, the brutality, the violence. These two co-exist together and who is responsible for all this? Please ask yourself. Surely thought is responsible. Right? Thought. Thought has created the technological world. Thought has concentrated great energy to go to the moon, thought has created the rapid communication, thought has created the computer with the robot - we will talk about it a little later, in a minute. So thought has created the technological world. Thought has created the pictures, the paintings, the poems, the language which we speak. Thought has created the marvellous architecture, perhaps not in Bombay, the great cathedrals, marvellous mosques, the great temples of India, the sculptures, thought has done all that. Thought also has created war. It has divided people as the Hindus and the Muslims. I hope you are following all this. This division into nationality, which is poison, thought has created it. The Muslim with his belief, with his dogmas, with his perpetual repetition of something or the other, as the Hindu with his conditioning, with his repetition of the Gita and all that stuff, so they are both being programmed. Both have been conditioned. Perhaps the Islamic world for the last, not more that

two thousand years, but the Hindus perhaps three thousand years. They have been conditioned that way. So thought has created the world outside of us, the technological world, not nature. Thought has not created the tree, thank god. Thought has not created that marvellous animal, the tiger, the gazelle, the river, the ocean, the heavens. But thought has created our psychological world with its fear, anxiety, searching everlastingly for security, it is a fact. When he goes to the temple, it has been built by thought, and the thing that is inside the temple is put together by thought, the rituals are created by thought, and all the things that the priest says is created by thought. Right? That is a fact. You might like to say that is sacred, because it has been handed down by generation after generation, but it is still the movement of thought. Thought is not sacred. Thought is a material process. This is where our difficulty comes. Thought is a movement - right - a movement in time.

I will go into it, you will see for yourself. Thought is the result or the response of memory. Memory is stored up in the brain, memory is knowledge, knowledge is experience. So experience, please just listen to it, experience, knowledge, memory, action, from that action you learn which becomes more knowledge. So man, the brain is caught in this process: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. This is the process in which we all live. Right? There is nothing illogical about this. So thought has created the technological world and thought has created the psychological world, the world of 'me', my wife, my husband, my daughter, my ambition, my greed, my envy, my loneliness, the despair, the sexual appetite, all that is brought about by thought. There is no denial of this, it would be absurd to deny it. The guru that you have

created is the result of your thought. So you follow what your thought has created. See the absurdity of it all, the immaturity, the childishness of it all. I know it is obvious that you will listen but you will go on in your way because that is the most convenient irrational thoughtless way and if it is comforting, which indicates that you really don't care what happens in the world, you really don't have any affection, love for mankind, all that you are concerned with is your own little comfort. Right?

But if you want to go into this very deeply one has to enquire into relationship which thought has established. That relationship has created the society in which we live, a society that is so utterly contradictory, a group of people making enormous money and the others living in poverty, war, the butchery that is going on and all the rest of it. So to bring about a radical change in society, and that society is an abstraction of a relationship between man and man, it is your relationship with another that has created this monstrous world. I wonder if one realizes this. Not accept it as an idea but the truth of it, the inwardness of it, how dangerous everything is becoming in the world. You understand? Over population, division of nationalities, communal divisions, all that is going on in the world. This problem cannot be solved by any politician, by no scientist, by no bureaucracy, and no guru will ever solve this problem. And it is only you as a human being who is the entire humanity, if you see that it is an extraordinary vital thing because when you are living just for yourself as an individual that is the most destructive thing because in that there must be everlasting conflict, but if you actually, not as a theory, not as an idea, but see the truth that you are psychologically the entire world, entire

human being, then you see what happens. It gives you enormous vitality and strength. But the conditioning is so strong, it has been going on for thousands of years, that you are a separate human being, your religion, your books, everything says that, and if you accept it and live with it you are going to be everlastingly unhappy, everlastingly in conflict.

So come to the point: why do human beings never change. This is an important question. Why you who live in conflict, misery, confusion, uncertainty, quarrelling with your wife, with your husband, with all that is going on in the family, why you accept it, live with it, why? You understand my question? Is it because we are so accustomed to a particular pattern of thought, to a particular pattern of living that we are incapable of breaking that pattern. You understand my question? Please. Is it laziness, is it fear of the unknown, accepting `what is' rather than moving out of `what is'? Is it our brains have become so dull because of our education, you are all BA's, MA's, PHD's, and all the rest of it, is our education conditioning you to become an engineer for the rest of your life so that you are incapable of thinking of anything else except building bridges, railways, or if you are a biologist or a philosopher, is our education destroying humanity? Please sir enquire into all this for god's sake. And what will change man, which is, what will change your relationship with another? You understand? That is the basic question. We are all concerned with the changing of society, the ugliness, the brutality, the horror that is going on and we never ask or demand why each one of us doesn't change, change in our relationship.

So what is our relationship? Right? What is your relationship

with your wife, with your sister, with your daughter, with your husband, whatever it is? What is your relationship? Come on sirs. Is that relationship based on egotistic pursuit, each one wanting his own particular way? You understand all this? So we have to enquire very carefully and of course sceptically, what is relationship. If we don't understand relationship we will never bring about the necessary revolution in society.

So what is relationship? Are we ever related to each other at all? You may have a wife or a girl friend, which is the modern fancy. You may have a husband or you may have several girls or several ladies but what is the basis of that relationship? Is it merely pleasure, sexual, is it merely a sense of comfort, convenience, social contract? Please sir enquire into all this. Do we dare to look into that relationship? Are we frightened to look into it? You understand my question? Are we frightened to look into our relationship - wife, daughter, girl friend, husband, the whole structure of relationship in the family? Here in India the family matters enormously. So shouldn't we find out for ourselves what is the truth of relationship. So let us enquire whether, please don't accept what the speaker is saying. That would be too absurd, that would have no validity. It will have no significance in your life if you merely say, yes, somebody said that. But if you look into it, if you go into the question of relationship and observe it without any direction, without any motive, just observe it, what it is? First look at what actually is going on. Is it pleasure, sexual, or pleasure in companionship, pleasure of having someone with whom you can talk, bully, quarrel, or worship, adore? You understand? As we came down from the house where we are living there is an

advertisement there, 'Body Beautiful' - do you understand this? In that relationship, is there any love, or that word, that feeling is totally absent? And in this relationship with another you have an image of the other and she has an image about you. Right? The relationship is between these two images which thought has created. Right? I wonder if you see all this for yourself. I may have a wife or a husband. We have lived with each other for a number of years and I have built an image about her, sexual image, the image of comfort, encouragement, somebody on whom I can rely, who will bear my children, and she has an image about me. I am not married, don't worry. Thank god! You laugh, but you don't see the tragedy of all this.

So what is your actual relationship? You have none. Right? You may have a house, a wife, children. You go to the office every day from nine o'clock to five or six o'clock for the next fifty years, come home, bed, quarrels, no time for anything except for money. If you are seeking power, position, status, that is your life, conflict, and you call that relationship. Right? Don't agree. See the fact and see if that image building can stop. You understand? Because most of us live with images, about ourselves and about others. The image of the politician, the image of the scientist, the image of the guru, the images made by the mind, and by the hand. We live with images. The images become all important. Right? Not living.

So the question is whether the machinery that creates the image can come to an end. You follow what I am saying? Please come with me. We are taking the journey together. You are not being hypnotized by the speaker. So please, don't go to sleep. We are together walking the road, a very tortuous road, very complex road,

with many turnings, dangerous roads and together we have to understand a way of living that may be totally different, therefore a society that is different and that society can only be different if you as a human being are different. It is a simple equation. So can we live without a single image? You have an image about yourself as a lawyer, as an engineer, as a saint, as a guru, as a follower, you have an image about yourself. Why? Is there security in that image? Because our mind, our brain is always searching for security, and there is security in a concept, in a belief, you think there is security, till somebody comes around and shakes it.

So is there security in the image that you have built about yourself? Because there is no security in a living thing, in a moving thing, active, but there is security, there is security, at least we think, in the image which we have created. You know, we think there is tremendous security in knowledge. Right? If you are a professor, if you are a teacher, if you are a guru, if you are some kind of careerist, you have certain knowledge, that knowledge gives you a job, a skill, and in that you think there is great security. You have never questioned what is knowledge - knowledge apart from technological knowledge. Knowledge is invariably incomplete. You cannot have complete knowledge about anything. That is a fact. So knowledge is always in the shadow of ignorance. Just swallow that! It is always within the shadow of ignorance. So any action born out of knowledge must be incomplete. Therefore, being incomplete it must invariably bring conflict. So the knowledge which you have about another in our relationship is incomplete, and therefore in that knowledge which is the image which you have about another, any action must bring about

conflict. This is obvious. So is there a relationship which is not based on knowledge? That is, I know you as my wife, I have lived with you for twenty years and I know all about you, which is nonsense of course. But the knowledge I have is the image about her which thought has built. You understand all this?

We are asking is the machinery which is the movement of thought in relationship which creates the image and therefore division, where there is division there must be conflict between you and the Muslim, between so-called India and Pakistan, the Arab and the Jew, the socialist, the communist, the catholic, the Hindu, and all that nonsense, there must be conflict. So is it possible to end conflict in relationship? Right? Enquire into it with me. The complete ending of conflict. Let us enquire into it, why humanity, you, human being, who are the rest of mankind, why you live in conflict in your relationship. Conflict must exist where there is division. Right? That is the law and if you see the fact that you are not an individual, but the rest of mankind, including your wife whom you have looked at her face for the last twenty years, got bored, you know all that. Can conflict end? That is, why does thought enter into relationship? You see the point? Thought invariably divides, thought invariably creates the image: you and the other. Why does thought enter into relationship? Which means is thought love? Is thought desire, is thought pleasure in relationship?

So we are asking why thought enters into relationship at all? Please, sir, go into it, enquire into it. Is not thought dividing us, you a Hindu, I a Muslim, I a communist, you a socialist. You know all that stuff. And specially in our relationship, why should thought

enter at all? Please ask this question, not superficially, not merely verbally or as an abstract idea which you are going to examine, but if you say why should thought enter my relationship with another? What place has thought apart from the technological world? You understand my question? In the technological world I need thought to build a computer, to build a robot, to build anything, a chair, to plant a tree, I need thought. To learn a language I need thought. But why should thought enter into our relationship? Is it because, please look at it, is it because it has created the image about you as one has the image about oneself and that image becomes more important than actual relationship. You follow, you understand? So is it that we like to live in illusion and not with actuality? Is actuality so unpleasant that we are unwilling to look at it? So if you can look at your relationship, your daily relationship with your wife, with your boss, with your servant, if you have a servant, to look at all that relationship. In that relationship you as a self-centred entity become all important and therefore there must inevitably be conflict. And can thought itself realize that whatever it adds in relationship, not buying furniture and all that, when you look at your wife, at your husband, to look and not let the word interfere - the word is the thought. You understand? The word is the symbol, when you say, my wife, see what you have done. The word has become important. Right? In that word there is this whole structure of possession, domination, attachment and where there is attachment there must be corruption.

Sir, you listen to all this, does this listening bring about an abstraction called an idea, or in the very act of listening you see the truth of it? Which is actually going on in your brain? Seeing the

actual truth or listening and making an abstraction of it into an idea and therefore the idea becomes all important and not the fact, which is what is going on. Are you actually observing what is the fact and can you - this is, if I may point out, this is important - can you remain without any movement of thought with the fact? I have created an image about myself, myself sitting on the platform with a large audience, with a reputation, the world blah, blah, have written books, praised, insulted, all that. So I have created an image about myself, if I have, and that image can be trodden on, can be hurt, somebody will come along and tell me, my dear chap, you are very small compared to somebody else, etc., etc, I get hurt because the image is hurt. If I have no image about myself at all, which is a fact with me, nobody can tread on it. Therefore a relationship with such a person is not based on thought. Therefore there is a relationship entirely of a different kind. That is for the speaker. It is not important. What is important is you in your relationship, can you see the fact and remain with the fact. Not find excuses, justifying it, suppressing it and running away from it, but actually remain with the fact that you are an image, which is the factor that brings conflict with another.

Then if you do so remain solidly, without any movement, then that energy which has been dissipated through suppression, and so on that energy dissolves the fact. Do it and test it out, and you will see then you have a totally different kind of relationship with another. Therefore a different society in which this terrible concept of an individual with his pursuit, his shoddy ambition, and all the rest of it comes to an end. You live totally differently. That means you live with love. I am afraid in this country and other countries

that word has lost its meaning, without that beauty of love,
relationship becomes a horror.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 25TH JANUARY 1981

May we continue with where we left off yesterday evening? We were talking about the importance of bringing about a real change in society. We said that society is made by human beings and it is only human beings can change that society in which we live. The society which has become so corrupt, a great deal of injustice, where there is inequality and all the rest of it is brought about by human beings in their relationship with each other and that relationship becomes very important if we are going to discover a new way of living in this world. We talked about relationship. That relationship is essentially based on image which we create about each other, and the thought is perpetually creating various types of images, not only has one an image about oneself, but also images about others. Thought, we said yesterday afternoon, has created the temple and the things that are contained in the temple. Thought has created the church and the things therein and so on. And as thought is based upon knowledge, experience, memory and action, and thought is always limited, always fragmentary because knowledge can never be complete. And we said, knowledge always goes with ignorance. And whether it is possible to live in this world, whether we are intimately related or not, without a single image about ourselves, about another.

And we went into the question of thought. And I think it is very important to understand the whole nature and structure of thought because thought has created all the things with which we live. Thought is the essence of our existence. Thought translates our

emotions, our sensory responses, thought has created the technological world and the world in which the psyche, you, live. Thought has been responsible for creating god. Thought has been responsible for the searching for illumination, enlightenment. Thought has been responsible for wars, for all the appalling cruelty that is going on in the world. Thought has been responsible for the technological development that is going on so rapidly. And also thought is responsible for the psychological structure which is the 'me', my problem, my ambition, my superstitions, my fears, the pursuit of pleasure, the sorrow and the everlasting search of man to find something beyond time, if there is something eternal, something everlasting which thought tries to capture either through theory, imagination or various forms of supposition. Thought has been responsible for ideals. Thought has created the communist world, the so-called democratic world, the capitalist world, the socialist world and so on.

I think we should realize the nature of thought because thought is the basis of our life. And if we do not really go into the question what is thinking, why thought has become a major instrument of our existence, our existence is the becoming, and not becoming, the achievement both physiologically and psychologically, the becoming as a movement to achieve what we desire, thought is pursuing all the time, moving from one experience to another, and thought in every direction of our life plays a major part. This is an obvious irrefutable fact. And thought is born of experience, knowledge, from that experience, that knowledge is stored up in the brain, in the book written down, in the word, that knowledge is memory and from memory there arises thought and action. This is

the process in which we live. There is nothing sacred about thought and there is nothing sacred about whatever thought has made. That which is written in the Gita, the Upanishads, the Bible, the Koran, and so on, they are all the result of thought, and what is written can be made sacred by thought and thought is inevitably fragmentary because knowledge can never be complete about anything.

So one has to find out in our daily existence what is right action. As we said yesterday afternoon, or rather in the evening, that we are walking together, that we are thinking together. You are not merely listening to a talk by some preacher, and I happen to be a preacher. And we are together exploring the nature of thought, whether thought can ever end, what is its place in life, what is its position with regard to relationship and where is this thought leading us. I don't know if you are aware of what thought is doing in the world, in the technological world. Probably in India, in this country, you are not aware of it because we are so concerned with our own particular little problems, with our own salvation, with our own happiness, with our own jobs, so we have made this extraordinary vast life into a small narrow groove in which we think we exist. And as most of us have problems of various kinds, problems of not having a job, problem of having too much money, problem of not being a hypocrite, problem of trying to find a way to that which is sublime, problem of meditation, problem if you are loved or not loved, problem of divorce, problems of loneliness, despair, suffering, fear, these are the problems that each one of us has to deal with. But we are rather negligent, we don't seem to care to resolve these problems so that our mind, our brain is free from all burden. We don't seem to have sufficient energy

psychologically to free ourselves from this tremendous weight of tradition, the tradition which is to put up with fear, to admit, accept sorrow, to continue in our conflicts both personal and collective. We seem not to have enough vitality, enough perception to be free.

As we said, let us walk together. Let us examine together this problem why the brain, you, as a human being, are not free, that is if you want to be. Perhaps most of us do not. Why we put up with problems, day after day, year after year. Please investigate it together. Because it is only a mind, a brain that is free from problems can solve problems. That is fact. But a brain, you, that is crowded with problems, of various kinds, are incapable of solving problems. So you put up with them. You accept them and when the mind, the brain is crowded with problems, as most peoples are, then it slowly withers, it slowly destroys itself. So what is a problem? Look at your own problem if you have any and I hope you haven't got any, which would be a god-send, but if you have, which you have, you must have, what is a problem? What is the motive, what is the cause of a problem? You understand my question? If you are afraid of death, which is a problem for a great many people, why has man, you, not solved that problem? You have solved it in one way which is, next life, that you will reincarnate in the next life for a better position, for more money, for greater happiness, for more something or other, which implies that if you are going to be born next life, that you must behave correctly now. But though we believe in this kind of pleasant theory, we live as we do, careless, indifferent, without any love, putting up with all kinds of horror.

So if that is a problem, and with most of us it is, why doesn't our

mind, brain which is capable of solving problems, the brain is capable of solving technological problems of any kind, but apparently that very same brain which tackles very, very complex technological problems and resolves them, is incapable of solving our daily problems. I wonder if you have ever asked, why. Why as we live in conflict in our relationship, why we have not solved that problem. Why we are perpetually seeking either an escape or are so attached to a person or to an idea, to a concept, that we cling to it with all the consequences of it. As we pointed out yesterday, attachment is corruption. Do you accept all this? You are listening to what the speaker is saying and therefore you must be listening either attentively or casually, but you are listening and the speaker says attachment is corruption. Don't you ask why? Why do you say that? What right have you to say it? Who gives you the authority to say it? You can examine that statement for yourself. When you are attached to an idea, to a concept, and another is attached to another particular concept, to another ideal, you must invariably be in conflict. When you are attached to a person however pleasant, however necessary, the consequences of that attachment are jealousy, anxiety, fear and so on. You know the consequences of attachment, which is corruption. And why is it, though you listen, that you are not free of attachment? When there is attachment is there love? Or attachment totally denies love? Because when you are attached there is fear, jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, all that exists when there is attachment.

So one asks, why we human beings, though seeing a danger, physical danger act instantly, but psychological dangers we avoid. We don't even know them as danger. Take a very simple example:

nationalism is a poison. When I say that you ought to throw a stone at me. Nationalism brings wars, one of the causes of wars is nationalism. You know that, any intelligent man knows it, he is aware of it and yet clings to nationalism. You may not, one or two may not, but the vast majority do, encouraged by the politicians. So we are asking, examining, we are walking together on the same road, perhaps holding hands, not leading each other, but walking together in companionship, in friendship, why human beings, that is you, have all these problems. A problem demands that it should be solved. And it must be solved immediately because if you do not solve the problem, psychological problem, immediately, what takes place in the human brain with you as an entity? If you have a problem you carry it with you day after day, month after month, year after year with the result that inevitably your brain becomes dull. You can't help it. You lose sensitivity. Your senses become dull, atrophied. So can you solve the problem, your own problem, whatever it may be immediately? Which means our brain which is the centre of thought, thought has created the problem. Right? I wonder if you see that.

The problem of conflict is created by thought, conflict between two human beings because each one wants his own particular way, each one is so ambitious, greedy, envious, and all the rest of it, each one wants his own fulfilment and therefore conflict is inevitable in relationship. And to end that problem of conflict in relationship one has to look at it, one has to be aware of it, not escape from it. Look at it so as to see all the consequences of it and when you are diligently aware how the problem arises, the cause of it, it is all very clear. But we are afraid that if we have no problem

what happens, that is, if we are not occupied all the time with something or other, with meditation, with god, with your wife, with your sexual problems, with earning money, all the time being occupied, there is no space in the mind and space is necessary, space means silence, space means energy, But our brain refuses to act differently so we carry on with the problems. And as we said, thought is the very source of our existence. Now modern science with its vast technology is taking over what thought has done, can do. Please listen to this if you are interested.

Thought has created the social world and the psychological world. And the computer - perhaps you have heard about it, some of you - can do exactly everything that thought can do. Do you realize the sequence of that? The computer can learn, can correct itself, and from that correction learn further. So the computer can do what thought can do. The computer will say, I believe in god, because it has been programmed that way, the expert can tell the computer what to say, as we human beings have been programmed, as we human beings have been wired, which is to say I am a Hindu, I am a Buddhist, I believe in god, and the computer being programmed like us can say exactly what you are saying. I wonder if you realize the consequences of this. You understand sirs? Modern technology has taken over your brain. Right? It is happening sir, it is not the invention of the speaker. We have talked to several computer experts and they are very clear that all that thought can do the computer can do. And with the computer, the robot, which is computer plus the robot can do the mechanical work in a factory. It can produce cars without the help of man. So what becomes of man? You understand my question?

What becomes of you, when what you think, what you feel, what you have, all that thought, the machine can do. You understand this? The seriousness of this? We have to meet a tremendous crisis. Perhaps not in India because here perhaps we are thirty, forty years behind. But this is a problem facing mankind. When the machine, invented by thought takes all the activity of thought and leaves man what? What has he then? Do you understand all this sirs? It can be told how to meditate, it will tell you how to meditate, it becomes your guru. No, no don't laugh, it is much too serious, I don't think you realize what is happening. It will give you new mantras. It will take over all the activity of thought which you have, and where is man then? Either he pursues pleasure, entertainment - please listen to this if you care to, because this is much too serious, you don't know what you are facing. If the computer and the robot takes the place of man, what is man then? Either he pursues entertainment, football, television, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, which is another form of entertainment, or he turns inward. You have that choice in front of you, it is coming, that is your challenge. Whether you are going to pursue entertainment invented by thought through computers, robots, and your life then becomes totally empty. You understand? So either you turn to the psychological search inward or pursue pleasure which is entertainment, sexual and all that.

So this is facing you as a human being. So if you are concerned and therefore accept this challenge, which is, you, as a human being, who have lived on thought, whose activity is based on thought, who has thought which has denied love and thought has made the computer and you, as a human being, have been deprived

of all the things that thought has done. So you have to either turn inward or pursue pleasure, entertainment. And if you are inclined to be entertained for the rest of your life then what happens to your brain? You understand all this sirs? I wonder if you do. It will either wither, slowly decay, because the computer is doing everything that thought can do. Or you turn and look at the psychological structure of yourself and that psychological structure is consciousness. Consciousness is common to all mankind, it is not your consciousness. It is not individual consciousness. We went into that yesterday.

There is no individual though all your scriptures, all your training, education, your religion has emphasized that you are an individual, that you must seek your own salvation. But you are not an individual. You are like the rest of mankind, suffering, lonely, despairing, anxious, fearful. This is common to all mankind. And when one sees the truth of this, then there is no individual, you are the rest of the world, you are the rest of mankind. In that there is great beauty, great strength, great vitality, but your brain refuses to accept such truth because you are so programmed, so conditioned to think that you are an individual, and your salvation is through search, all that for yourself, whereas the fact is psychologically you are mankind. Your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind. Consciousness is made up of its content. Right? Your belief, your pleasures, your fears, your anxieties, your superstitions, the beliefs may vary, but it is belief, your desires, your disorder, all that is your consciousness which is common to all mankind - mankind whether he lives next door to you, he is also very lonely, he is uncertain, he is confused like you, he is all the time seeking

security like you, security in relationship, security in his job, security in a projected concept. He is thinking like you.

So please realize the truth of this, that you are not an individual. There is no salvation for an individual, there is only salvation for man, for a human being which you are, the entire human being, not just you as an individual. You understand this?

So as the computer and the robot are taking over the activities of thought we have only these two choices: either pursuing pleasure, entertainment, or entering into the whole psychological world and see how far, how deeply one can go into it. So if we can take the journey together, we will walk together into the world which are the senses, sensory perception, desire, will, fear, pleasure, sorrow, that is the psychological world in which we live, and together let us explore it and find out how deeply, and how far we can go into it. That is the only choice you have. Please realize this, either entertainment of various kinds or this entering into the psychological world which is the whole movement inwardly projected by thought, the 'me', my desires, my pursuits, my ambition, the competition, the vanity, the hypocrisy, the habits we fall into, sexual, drink, various kinds of habits, all that is the psychological world in which we live and without understanding that you are inevitably caught in the world of entertainment.

So if this is very clear we can go together very far and find out if there is something beyond all time, beyond sorrow, if there is something sacred, not the sacred that thought has made, but something utterly untouched by thought. If your mind, your brain is capable, let us walk together.

First our senses, sensual activity has created the world of the

psyche. You understand this? The touch, the seeing, the hearing, and translating all that in terms of pleasure, reward, or pain. You understand this, obviously. So psychologically we are programmed to reward and punishment. So one must examine what great part the senses, the sensory perceptions, hearing, all that plays in our daily life. That is, let us go into the question of desire which is part of our nature, part of us, the constant urge, the desire for something all the time, more, more, more. You understand? Desire. Which has tremendous vitality, however painful it is there is this constant movement of desire. Desire may change, the objects, I may desire a car, or a woman, or to have knowledge, or heaven or desire for illumination, enlightenment, which is still desire, desire for a drink, desire for power, position. So one must understand, go into this question of desire, not the object of desire, you may wish to have a better house, you may want a better job, if you have money you want power, if you have power you want more power and power in any form, whether the power of the guru, or the politician or your power over your wife, your neighbour, your husband, is evil, is destructive. So we must go into this question of desire.

Please, you are not listening to me. We are working together. We are treading the same path. As we human beings have created this society, we human beings must understand that we are working together to change society. You can't change the society by yourself, no government, no politician, no scientist, but you and I together, we can change. That is our responsibility. And let us go together and investigate the nature of desire. Why man has been a slave to desire. Why man has said, desire is wrong, you must suppress it like the monks, as the sannyasis, as the religious people

have tried in every way to suppress desire, we are not saying you must suppress it or express it. We are trying to examine what is desire. When you understand it then you will see that desire plays very little part in life, something else comes into being. So let us together go into this question.

You see what desire has done to man? Desire plus thought has made man an instrument of violence, has made man into a cruel human being. Fifteen million whales have been killed. You don't know anything, you don't care either. You are slaughtering thousands of animals, they have killed thousands and thousands of human beings for ideas, for beliefs, for the desire to dominate, the totalitarian world with their leaders have killed millions and millions because of their desire for power, for position. So please apply your mind, your brain to examine what is desire, not that we are propagating suppression or the aggressive pursuit of desire, but we are examining it together. Together, I am not telling you and you accept it and then say, well, I agree or disagree. But together let us find out. Because desire plays an immense part in your life: desire for sex, desire for power, desire for a drink, desire to have money, position and all the rest of it. What is desire? What is the nature and the structure of desire? Please let us think together about it. Look at it. When you see something beautiful, something in the window of a shop, a dress, a shirt, when you see that in the window what takes place? You understand my question? What takes place when you see an object which gives you, of you think will give you pleasure? What takes place? You see, the shirt, or the dress or the sari, or whatever it is in the window, you see it, then you go inside and touch it. Which is, seeing, touching, contact,

from that contact, sensation. Right? This takes place. Seeing, that is visual perception, then physical contact, then sensation. Right? This is the movement. Then what happens? Thought comes in and says, how nice it would be if I had that blue shirt. Right? Thought creates the image of you in that blue shirt or sari or whatever it is. You are following this? This happens. If you look at it very closely this is the process. Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought creating the image and from that desire is born. Right? Do you see this? Right sir? Somebody help me out. This is the natural progress. So desire is born only when thought creates the image of you in the car, you in the shirt, you in the sari or dress. You understand? This happens. This is the movement of desire.

Now the question is, if you go further into it, it's natural to see, to touch, sensation, then why should thought come in and create the image? You are following this? Why? When thought creates the image of you in that, all our problems arise. You see this? That is, I see one of the ministers go by in a big car and I would like to be like the minister-not me - somebody says, I have reached enlightenment, I am a mystic, and you want to be like him. Which is, watch it, you see the guru or the politician or the priest or the executive chief boss and you watch, see them, their pleasure, their money, you know all that and you want the same thing. That is, you see, you may not touch it actually, but you have a sensation what it is to be like them. So the image is created by thought, you sitting in the big car driving, and everybody saluting you. Right? That is desire.

So the question then arises, can thought not create the image? You understand my question? Please this is important if you want

to go into the question of this enormous energy which is called desire. Desire has created havoc in the world. And if we don't understand it very deeply we will be caught, our psyche will be caught in the net of this very, very complex activity. The desire to become, this is what we all want, to become; if you are a clerk, you want to become a manager, if you are a manager you want to be the executive, if you are a priest you want to be the archbishop, the same thing to become something all the time is the movement of desire.

So we are asking, you are asking, rather, can thought with its created image not interfere with sensation? That is - let me put the question differently: have you ever observed the sea, the mountain, the marvel of a tree, have you ever observed it or have you only observed it partially? You have never observed the sea, the mountain, the marvellous tree with all your senses alert. Have you ever watched anything like that? Is this Greek to you? When you watch, when there is an observation with all your senses there is no centre as the 'me'. That 'me' is created the moment when there is partial perception. You understand? Sir, this is one of the most difficult things to communicate to an audience that are not sensitive, to an audience who have never looked at anything. Have you ever looked actually at a tree, or come nearer, have you ever looked at your wife or husband completely? That is, without the image that you have created about her or him, that is, to observe a person entirely with all your attention, which means with all your senses. Have you ever done it? No, I am afraid you haven't. It demands that you be sensitive, alert, aware.

So where there is desire with its imagination that desire creates

a centre as the `me', the `me', separate from you, the `me' with my ambition, and so on and so on, and you with your ambition and so on. So in our relationship desire plays havoc. Desire is not love. Please see this. Understand with your heart not with your petty little minds: desire is not love, pleasure is not love, thought is not love. And a life without love is a corrupt life. Then you will say, how am I to get love, how am I to practise, do something in order to have love. You understand what it means? We are always thinking of getting something, which is desire: tell us, show us the way of love, and we will follow, which means you are not walking with the speaker, you are not investigating with the speaker, we are not walking together to find out the nature of desire, the nature of love, the nature of conflict, the problems which exist in our daily life, because without freedom from all problems there is no love and without love life is completely meaningless and empty. Right sirs.

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 31ST JANUARY 1981

If we could this evening find out for ourselves how our brains are so crowded, weighed down with so many problems, with so many issues, and there is a challenge which every human being, at least those who are aware of the world condition, not only in this country but also what is happening the world over. It is important that one feels that we should start with a clean slate, if that is possible, to free the brain, or thought can see itself, from various accumulated beliefs, concepts, ideals and the superstitions we have about religion. If it is at all possible to cleanse the brain of all the burdens it has carried, through so many, many centuries, millenniums. Because as we perceived, as we discussed the other day, last weekend here, our brains are gradually becoming atrophied, that is, withered, because most of us follow a set pattern, a particular way of thinking, a particular formula, a way that is constantly narrowing down our activity of the brain. I think this observable if you have gone into the matter. If you keep an arm in a sling, the arm withers after a long time. If you keep your eyes closed for a number of days or months, the eyes become almost blind. So every organ that is not used becomes atrophied, that is an obvious fact. And the biggest organ that we have is the brain. It translates all our sensory reactions either into pleasure or pain, reward or punishment. And as our senses are becoming more and more atrophied so our brain is becoming more and more so.

Because we are never aware of the beauty of the earth, the beauty of the trees, the squalor around us, the dirt, the filth, the

corruption, lack of integrity and so on. We are not even aware, watchful, see or hear, so gradually our brain which is the central factor, which is the very essence of our being, that is gradually being made dull, stupid and atrophied. This is observable. And the question then is, if you are at all serious and want to go into this problem deeply, the question is: is it possible to awaken the brain so that it acts completely, wholly. That is, if you are trained as an engineer, you are only using one part of the brain, if you are a business man, again a very narrow part of this extraordinary thing called the brain, if you are a scientist it is equally so, an artist or various types of activities which have been narrowed down. So is it possible for the human brain to become acutely alert, clear, sensitive, and is it possible for each one of us, if you are at all concerned with the problems of the world and problems of our own individual or personal relationships, it becomes extraordinarily necessary that we understand, not only the nature of our thought, how thought arises, but also whether it is possible to be free of all the burden that man has carried for millions and millions of years. That's what we are going to talk over together this evening.

As we said the other day, if one may repeat it again, this is not a gathering for entertainment, to be entertained either intellectually, emotionally or to be stimulated by the speaker. If you are stimulated by the speaker, then it is merely another form of drug. But if we can think together, observe together, listen together then there will be no question of being influenced, stimulated or in any way persuading you either to accept or reject. So we are together exploring, investigating why the brain, our brain, each one, why it has become so extraordinarily dull, so insensitive. So if we can

take the journey together we will explore it.

I wonder why you are here, why you have come, for what reason, what motive, why you take the trouble to come and listen to a speaker who totally contradicts everything that you hold dear - your religion, your relationships, your beliefs, your dogmas, your rituals and so on. So the speaker is not persuading you to follow him, he is not your guru, he is not trying to convince you of any issue or any answer to any problem. So we are together, please bear this in mind that we are together co-operating in the investigation why we human beings have become so dull, otherwise you wouldn't be here. Right?

The question is first, why do we have beliefs, dogmas, opinions, conclusions, why? Are we aware, know, conscious that we have innumerable beliefs? And if you examine those beliefs, will we not find out that beliefs divide man? Right? The Hindus, what they believe, the Christians, what they believe and have faith in, the Muslims, the Buddhists, every human being has some kind of belief - how to live properly, what is the correct action, what should be the relationship, what is right action and so on and so on. Why do we carry these beliefs, what is their value, if they have any? Is it that in having beliefs we find security in them? Right? Are you following all this, I hope. Don't go to sleep at the end of the day. Probably you have been working all day, and come here, sit under the shade of the trees and listen rather casually without any deep interest and perhaps you will catch one or two ideas and go home with them. So they will have no value.

So please have the goodness to see the importance that we human beings are gradually losing all that is absolutely necessary.

So first we are asking each other why human beings right throughout the world have accepted doctrines, have, through the authority of the church, of the book, of the guru, accepted beliefs which may not be true at all, which may have no value at all, which promises but that promise is never fulfilled. So one should very carefully examine this cluster of beliefs that man carries with him wherever he goes. As you observe, any form of doctrine either political or religious must inevitably separate man against man and therefore bring about conflict. Conflict has become part of our nature. We accept conflict not only in personal relationship but also conflict in ourselves, and conflict in any form must not only wear down the brain with all its sensitivity but also conflict wastes our energy. So one must find out why we human beings live in perpetual conflict. Right?

You are in conflict, obviously, you have problems. Can the conflicts end, because any machinery that is working in friction must wear itself out; a piston engine if it is not oiled properly, not running smoothly will very soon wear itself out. Similarly our brain will wear itself out and gradually become dull if it lives in perpetual conflict. Right? Are we following each other? Now we are asking whether such conflict can end? What is conflict? Conflict exists when there is opposition, when there is resistance and also conflict exists when you accept, obey. Right? Does this mean anything to you? Do you really want to find out if you can end conflict in your relationship, in your actions, in your thought? In everything that you do, there seems to be a great deal of friction and is it possible to live a life without a single conflict? Man has always sought to live a life without conflict, so he invents a belief

without any truth behind that belief and in that belief he hopes to end conflict. Or he hopes to end conflict by obeying, being told what to do, conforming to a pattern. Why is man, you, doing this all the time? Essentially is it not that we are seeking security? Right? Each human being is seeking security. Right?

I feel I have no contact with the audience. Why? You understand my question? If you and I were sitting in a room together, talking about these things, we would establish a communication very quickly. Is it that we don't communicate with each other, or the speaker is not communicating with you with regard to what he wants to say, or you are not interested in what is being said. You are probably here in the hope that your personal problems will be solved. If you understand that the personal problem is the world problems, it is not only yours, but all human beings have the same problems - envy, anxiety, uncertainty, sorrow, lack of love and so on. Every human being right through the world has these problems. So if you are merely considering only the solution of your own problems, or trying to save your own particular soul, please realize that there is no such thing as personal salvation. Please realize we are concerned with the human being, the human being who represents all, is the whole of mankind; that is very difficult to accept or see for most people that you are like the rest of mankind who are in trouble, who are confused, who want to be led, who believe in so many things, neither politics nor religion, nor any guru has solved all this. They will give you escapes, entertainment, but we human beings wherever we live have to solve the problems that arise, not in time, immediately. You understand now the question?

So are we in communication with each other? May I ask this? Are you following what the speaker is saying? Sir, do we realize that the world, the human world is in great danger? Do we realize that we are in great crisis, which is not going to be solved by any particular theory, or any book or any philosopher or any psychologist, political, religious and so on? We have to face this problem ourselves, we have to be able to stand alone, not depend on anybody, including the speaker. Do we realize that man throughout the ages has depended on some priest, on some ideal, on some philosopher and so on? Always looked outside to be led, to be controlled, to be cajoled, to be persuaded. And we here, this evening, are trying, communicating with each other to understand our problems. To understand the problem is not to find an answer for it. Please I'll go slowly into the matter. Each one has a problem, sexual, drink, business, or if you are inclined so-called religious problems, how to meditate, what is meditation, who is the right guru to go to, you know all the games we play. So we are saying if you want to resolve a problem, one has not to try to find an answer to the problem, please listen, not try to find an answer to the problem, because the answer is in the problem itself. Have we communicated that?

If one has a problem of violence the answer is not non-violence but the understanding of violence itself. Right? What is violence? Violence is not only anger, hate, envy, imitation, conformity, all those are contradictions that bring about in oneself violence. In looking at that and not escaping from violence, you understand, that is, if we are violent, we are trained, educated, conditioned to be either non-violent, which is to escape from the actual fact or to

suppress it. Or we try to indulge in it. So either we escape, indulge or suppress. Escape means to project an idea called non-violence and pursue that. When you are pursuing that you are still violent. Right? So it is an escape from the fact of violence, and if you suppress violence it is still there. Or if you try to indulge in violence it brings about a great many other problems. So is it possible to look at violence without escaping, suppressing or indulging, just to observe what is violence. You understand the speaker, what he is saying? Or are we so conditioned, so programmed or to use a modern phrase, so wired, that we cannot possibly understand what is happening to us?

So the question is, can you end violence, not take time over it, but immediately. You will do so only when you don't run away from it. When you don't suppress it, when you don't indulge in it, that is, to remain with the feeling of violence, not introduce any other factor, you have understood it? If you are envious, jealous, it is the same process. All that involves time, to suppress it, indulge, to run away involves time. During that period or interval there are various other factors that come into it, therefore you will never solve the problem. Right? Whereas if you are actually facing the problem, not trying to solve it, but look at it, hold it, then you will see that as we said, how you approach a problem is all important, because the problem holds the answer, not away from the problem. Right? Will you do that, or are we so conditioned, the response is so quick, run away and all that? So can you observe a fact and slow down the whole process of reaction? You understand?

Now is it possible for each one of us to have a brain, because the brain is the only instrument we have, because in the brain are

all the nervous, sensory responses translated as pain, pleasure, reward and so on and can that brain become extraordinarily alert, even though we are living in a world where you have to work, where you have a career and so on. You understand my question now?

Look sirs, what do you want? What would you like me to talk about? What is it each one of you want? Now just a minute. I can't give you money, I can't give you a job, I can't lead you to heaven, to your salvation, so what can the speaker do? All that he can do is point out certain factors, certain incidents, experiences that are detrimental to human existence; like nationalism is a great danger, communalism is a great danger, a small community opposed to the global existence is a great danger, and any religion that does not liberate man is an extraordinary danger, your books, so-called sacred books, if they don't help you to be free they are worthless. So can we together help each other to be free, free from fear, free from sorrow, anxiety so that we shall have some kind of peace in the world, have love in the world. Can we do this together? Or is this impossible? You understand my question? Would you like the speaker to talk about the ending of sorrow? Would you like the speaker to convey to you a way of living which is totally different from the way we are living now? Or is it possible that we together can bring about a totally different society? And that is possible only if our relationships are correct, if our actions are right.

So shall we go into the question of what is right action? Shall we? Right action that will be right under all circumstances, wherever you live, whatever the environment, however limited your activity is, can we find out together what is right action.

Because it is very important. So let's find out together the two words, the meaning of those two words, right and action. Right? When we use the word 'right' it means whole, not fragmented, not broken up, an action that is complete, an action in which there are no regrets, does not bring in any kind of disturbance 'right' which means a movement that is constantly whole, precise, accurate under all circumstances. And action means, the doing, the doing, not having done or will do. Right? You are following this? So action means the doing, right action means an action which is whole, which is immediate. We have explained these two words. Now what is our action, actual action now? It is based on an ideal, or on a memory or an action that you should do, so our action is always building, the becoming. Right? I wonder if you understand this. If we have a motive for an action, that action is essentially inaction because in that action you are continually building, becoming and therefore you are only concerned in becoming, not in action. Right? So we are now going to find out for ourselves what is right action.

Because if you can really understand this for yourselves, you will have solved numerous numbers of problems. Our whole life is a becoming. Right? If you are a clerk you want to become a manager, if you are a manager you want to become the super manager and so on. You want to climb the ladder, in the business world, or in the political world, and it is the same thing in the religious world. In a religious world it is your practising, following certain dictums, certain concepts, ideas, you are again becoming, constantly achieving. So our life is actually, if you observe it, a constant process of becoming. In that becoming time is involved.

Right? I am this, I will be that, that involves a movement from here to there which is a psychological distance as well as physical distance. You understand? You need time to move from here to go to your home, you cover that distance which is time. There, it is necessary because you live far away or nearby. Both, if you live far away or nearby that involves time. Psychologically inwardly you say to yourself, I am this, but I will become that. There is a distance between what you are and what you want to be, which involves time, in that time you are becoming something. Right? That is clear. So our life is always a becoming and in that becoming there is action. Right? So action is never complete. Right? I wonder if you see this. When you are allowing time in action that time indicates that you are moving from one point to another point. So your action will inevitably be limited and therefore any action that is limited will bring about greater conflict. That is clear. Right?

So is there an action which does not involve time? Right sir? You have understood? At least somebody I can talk to. Sir, please see the importance of this. There is biological time, the growth from the infant, there is the psychological time and there is the time by the watch which is day and night. So there are three types of time: biological time, you can't do anything about it unless you take drugs and all that and your babies will be deformed and so on but in the very genes time is involved. Right? That is to help to grow, from childhood to manhood, old age, time is necessary there. And time is necessary to go from here to your house. Time we think is necessary in bringing about right action: I will learn what is right action and in that learning - to learn implies time. You

understand? You are getting all this? So is there an action which does not involve time, which means, is there an action which is not controlled by the idea of becoming? Is that all right? May I go on with it? I will go on, it is up to you. Please see the importance of what is involved in time, psychological time. That is, I am angry, I will take time to get over my anger. That is how our brain functions, it has been trained through millennia to function that way. That is also you find that illumination or enlightenment needs time, life after life, following a system, following a meditation, obeying, that all involves time. Right?

And we are saying time is danger. Psychological time is danger because it prevents you from acting. If I am violent, if I say, I will be non-violent, you have taken time, in that time you are not free from violence, you are being violent. Right? So if you understand the nature of time there will be immediate action. That is, there is the ending of violence immediately. Have you understand this? Please let us understand the question of time, it is very important because we think we need time to change; we think we need time to grow, evolve - time means that. That is, what we are and what we should be. Right? This is our constant, continuous tradition, our conditioning. Now we are pointing out that time, psychological time, not biological time or time by the watch, but the psychological time, that is, admitting tomorrow, that is, tomorrow may be a hundred days ahead, but the idea that time is necessary to change from 'what is' to 'what should be'. Right? Right sir? So we are saying, that is one of the most dangerous factors in life, to admit time in action. Now wait a minute. I need time to learn a language, I need time to take an engineering degree, if I want to be

a computer expert I have to study, go into it, it takes time, it takes time to go from here to your house. You see how our brain is working, please follow all this. We need time physically to go from here to over there. We need time to learn a language, we need time to become an expert in anything, to be a good carpenter you need time.

So our whole brain is working with the concept of time. Right? Our whole way of life is to become something. And the becoming is the most dangerous factor in action. I wonder if you understand this? You see, sirs, we have never enquired whether it is possible not to have tomorrow. You understand? Not to have future, the future is the becoming. Right? And we have never enquired into what is being. We have accepted the tradition, the conditioning, that all life is becoming. You plant a tree, a seed, it becomes a plant, that takes time. So that same movement is accepted in the psychological world. Right? We are questioning that. We are saying any form of psychological becoming, not only prevents the actual action, but it is an illusion. There is no psychological tomorrow, but thought has created the idea of becoming, and thought has projected the tomorrow. You understand? Not that there is no tomorrow, there is tomorrow, you have got to get up tomorrow morning, but the idea that psychologically, inwardly, I will become something. I will ultimately find heaven, I will find illumination, enlightenment, life after life, if I live rightly I will have my reward. You follow? Time is necessary for a plant to grow, and we also think time is necessary to become something.

Now, in that becoming is all our problems: I must be better, I must be good, I must love more, or I am greedy for money, and I

keep pursuing money, money, money. So you see what is happening? The brain is the result of time, it has evolved from the ape to the present time. It has grown through experience, knowledge, memory, thought and action. Now see what is happening? Experience, knowledge, memory, action, to acquire knowledge requires time. I wonder if you are following all this.

So we are asking, what is right action. It cannot be in the field of time. I can't learn about right action. If I learn about right action that learning takes time. Right? If you catch the full meaning of it immediately then out of that immediate perception is action, which is not involved in time. I wonder if you understand this. I will go into it more deeply.

As the speaker said, time is danger. Either you perceive directly and act directly now, or if you say, I will think over what you have said and see if you are right or wrong, then you have taken time, whereas if you say, let me listen very carefully to what he is saying, which means you are paying attention to what is being said, that attention has no time. You are following this? You attend, you listen, not, you will listen, or if you listen and interpret what is being said, that takes time, or if you are translating what you hear with what you already know, that takes time. So can you listen so completely that you catch immediately the significance of time. I will go into it again. Scientists, specially the computer experts, have realized that what thought can do, or has done, the computers can do. That is a fact. What thought can do, the computer can do it much faster, much more accurately and extraordinary things the computer can do. You understand? What thought can do, the computer can do. Then they are asking what is intelligence then.

You follow? If the computer can do what thought can do, what is man's relationship, what is man? Now the computer, please listen to this, the computer is programmed by a human being and the computer can never be free from knowledge, it is based on knowledge. Right? Human beings can be free from knowledge. That is the only difference. The freeing from knowledge is not time. If you allow time the computer can do that. I don't know if you are following all this.

So the computer, whose very existence is invented by thought, and thought is the result of memory, knowledge, experience and that experience, knowledge, memory, thought, all that the computer can do. So man is the only one who can free himself from the known. The computer can't. The known is time. I wonder if you understand all this. To acquire knowledge needs time. Right? Wait, to know oneself you think you need time. Right? To know myself is the book of mankind. Right? I am mankind. There is the book which is the history of man, and I think to read that book I need time. I have to understand why I have reactions, why I have accumulated memory, why this and that. So to read that book we think, which is self knowledge, needs time. I need time to know myself. Right sirs? That is, I need to know myself which is the whole structure of knowledge. Right? To know myself I think I need time, which is, I am going to learn about myself, which is, I am going to learn a language which needs time, and to learn all about myself I think I need time. We are applying the same principle to learn a language, to learn about myself or yourself. Right? So we think time is necessary. Now the scientists are saying you can put in the brain some instrument which will teach you a

language overnight. Follow all this. And I don't need time there. I wonder if you are following all this. We think we need time to become.

So we are asking, is right action, please listen to this, does right action imply time? I am going to show you something, I will point out something. Our actions are based on memory, our actions are based on experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. That is the chain in which we live, from which we act. And that process is a movement in time. Now we are pointing out something else, which is, to see this movement of time, knowledge, experience, memory, action and then repeat that same pattern, that is time and as we have lived in that process we are caught by it, we are conditioned by it. Now to act means the doing now, not tomorrow, not have acted. Action means the doing, the doing without time. That is action. So if you have a problem, not to carry that problem overnight, not allow time to solve the problem. Time will never solve the problem. You understand? Not to burden your mind with problems, psychological problems. If you are a technician you know you have a brain, and you have been trained to solve the problem, that is simple. But now you are being so conditioned by time, that is, acquiring knowledge and acting from knowledge, acting from that which you have learnt. Now we are saying, see this movement: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, see that fact. That is a fact, see it, see it in the sense be aware of it and if you see that very clearly, your perception then is without time and therefore action in which time is not involved at all. I will show you.

Most people are hurt, psychologically they are hurt from

childhood. Right? In school you are compared, you are compared with somebody else who is brighter, all the rest of it and you get hurt. This hurt is carried through school, college, university, or you get hurt psychologically, inwardly by somebody, by a word, by a gesture, by a look. Right? We are all of us, most human beings, psychologically hurt. What is hurt, please listen, is the image that you have built about yourself. That is clear. That is hurt. And as long as you have an image, you are going to be hurt, or flattered, it is the same thing, whether you are flattered or hurt it is the same thing, two sides of the same coin. That's a fact. Most human beings are hurt and they carry that throughout life and that hurt results in more and more withdrawal, fear, resistance, avoidance, isolation. Right? See all this, you see all that. That is, you have listened, you see the reason, see the logic of it, you have comprehended it intellectually, which means you have only understood the verbal meaning of it but you don't actually see the truth of it. Right? The truth, that as long as you are hurt, and that hurt is the image you have about yourself created by your society, by your family, your education and so on and so on, there is that image you have built, like the politician, he builds an image about himself, wanting power, position and all the rest of it, and somebody comes along and puts a pin in your image and you get hurt. Now do you see that fact or is it merely an idea? You understand the difference?

You hear verbally what is being said, you listen to it and when you are listening you have made an abstraction of it which becomes an idea and you are pursuing the idea and not the actuality. Right? Do you see the actual fact that you have an image about yourself? If you do, and that is a fact, that image is going to

be hurt. Right? You can't escape from it. It is there. Now do you completely realize that as long as you have an image about yourself you are going to be hurt. Right? Do you see that as a fact. If you see that as a fact then you can enquire who created it? Thought, experience, education, family, tradition and so on, all that goes to create the image. Right? And you see the truth that as long as you have an image you are going to be hurt with all its consequences. If you see the truth of it, that is, if you see, if you perceive the actual fact, then the image disappears instantly, immediately. Have you understood this? But if you say, how am I to get rid of the image, what is the method to get rid of the image, show me the way, I will practise it, in all that you are allowing time and therefore you are perpetuating the image. Whereas if you see the fact, the truth that as long as you have an image about anything you are going to be hurt. That is, the seeing of the truth is the ending of the image. That is, seeing the fact is all important. Perception and immediate action. Have you understood this simple thing? It is not simple.

So sirs, we human beings have problems. As I said, one of the problems is conflict, conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. That is a conflict. And belief in any form, psychologically, which gives a certain kind of security is detrimental for man. If you see conflict is a danger, a fact, look at it, see all the consequences of it, then see it as a fact and don't move away from that fact, then the very perception of it is the ending of it. That is why one has to understand the enormous complexity of time. Even if you understand it intellectually, that is, the function of the intellect is to reason, discern, choose, weigh, balance and so on. That is the

function of the intellect and what has been said, if you understand it intellectually, has no value, it's just a verbal communication. But if you really understand, that is, to see actually that you are greedy, envious, see it, and if you say, I must not be greedy, then you are wandering away from it, but if you stay with greed, see it instantly, the very perception is the action of ending envy. Are you doing it, or are you just verbally accepting all this? You understand?

So sirs, as we said, we are walking together to explore our human brain, our human life, everyday life with all its conflicts, illusions and so on. And we think time will solve all these problems, next life. Time is the greatest enemy you can possibly have because time prevents action, action which is whole, complete, not divided so that it does not leave a mark as regret. So if you have listened very carefully, seen it for yourself, then you will understand that freedom from time is the greatest enlightenment.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1ST FEBRUARY 1981

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were talking about time and action, and we were saying that if you allow time in action then conflict arises. We said yesterday that there are three types of time - genetic time, biological time, that is genetic, psychological time and time by the watch, day light, sunlight. There are three types of time and we were talking mostly yesterday about psychological time, the time we allow to do something. Time is necessary to learn a language, to learn a technique, to learn a skill, and to go from here to there needs time physically, and we were asking if there is time in the field of psychology, in the field of the psyche? That is, the inward state of man, his responses, his anxieties, his depressions, his immense loneliness, fear, sorrow, and does it take time to end these? That is, is it necessary to have time to end fear, anxiety, to comprehend the whole nature of loneliness or to end sorrow. We have dealt with it rather briefly and perhaps it may be necessary to go into it again.

But before we go into that, I would like to talk about beauty, not the beauty of a face, or a dress, or the beauty of a gesture, the beauty that lies in a word, but the beauty of a tree. If you approach it commercially, that is, make a profit out of that tree, then you don't see naturally the enormous, the intrinsic essence of the beauty of a tree. And we consider beauty in a picture, in a painting, in architecture, the marvellous cathedrals, the old temples, and the extraordinary silent beauty of a mosques; we pass them by, we never look at them with all our hearts and minds and feel the

quality of a tree that is alone in a field. We have lost all that quality of perceiving beauty. We think beauty lies in a statue, in a building, in a woman or in a man. When you look at a mountain in the still sky of an evening with the light on it, the enormous weight and the grandeur and the solemnity of a mountain, the very beauty of it, the magnificent skyline of it against a clear blue sky, you become utterly silent, all your thoughts, and your worries, and your problems are driven away for a moment and you face this and you say how beautiful it is. I don't know if you have ever seen a mountain or a tree. When you look at the vast expanse of the sea with all its quiet undercurrent, the tremendous weight of water, and the crushing of the waves against the sands. If you do look, for the moment you are not there, only the sea, only the tree, only the magnificent mountain, and the deep valley with all its shadows, you are not there when you see beauty. I wonder if you understand this.

You with your worries, with your money problems, or if you have problems with your wife or your husband, your loneliness, your despair, all that is put aside when you see something magnificent, which indicates there is only beauty and truth and love in you if your problems are not there. And to act from that sense of beauty which is morality, for us morality is being more or less dictated by society, by the circumstances in which we live or according to the sanctions, edicts, of a religious establishment. But there is the sense of beauty in which alone there is morality which is to act, which is to behave, to conduct oneself. Without that beauty you have no morality.

So we must go into this question this evening, not only what is

the mind or the brain that perceives the enormity of beauty and truth and also morality which is to behave correctly, to conduct oneself with dignity, with respect for others, with homage, with a sense of right action. If we could go into this very carefully, perhaps we shall discover for ourselves, living in a world that is becoming more and more dangerous, more and more ugly, destructive, degenerating, we will be able to find for ourselves a sense of great beauty from which alone love, good behaviour, all that comes.

You know verbal communication is not really communication at all. You hear the words, they have a certain meaning to you and perhaps the speaker is using words which may have a different content altogether. So communication becomes rather complicated. The speaker would like to tell you what it is to live in a sense of total wholeness, complete action in which the self is not. And where there is self, the 'me' with all one's problems, with all one's despairs, anxieties, miseries, confusion, and in that state one tries to find right action, in that state one tries to find clarity. And a confused mind can never find clarity. You may go to all the temples, read all the books, follow all the gurus with all their absurdities, one never will find this clarity of perception. And to understand the nature of what is action and correct action, right action and to find out for oneself, not be told, not be guided, but to find in oneself, the action which is utterly moral, in which there is no sense of regret, sense of hurting and so on. So together let us explore this question of behaviour. Why human beings throughout the world are behaving so utterly crazily, so utterly without any meaning, living a life that has no depth, no substance. And life is

action. Life is action in relationship. There is no other action - perhaps the action of sending man to the moon, that is a different kind of action. There, thousands were needed to put together a machine that could go to the moon. There, they worked for prestige, a sense of accomplishment, and also for money. They co-operated together to produce a marvellous machine that could travel to the moon and return. But we human beings seem to be utterly incapable of finding out for ourselves, not from books, not from another, but for oneself deeply how to behave. There are all kinds of theories about behaviour, the behaviourist, the theory of what makes man behave as he is doing, what makes him so corrupt, so utterly undignified, without any sense of beauty, sensitivity, affection, care. And could we this evening go into this question of why you, as a human being, living in this extraordinary beautiful world - the earth is very beautiful, the rivers, the seas, the mountains - why we live such shabby, ugly, cruel lives.

What is action, which is behaviour, in our daily life, not a theoretical action, not an ideological action, nor the action established by a doctrine, by a faith, by a belief, or by someone who is your leader, religiously or otherwise? What is action in our relationship with each other? How do we behave? When you look into yourself, if you ever have, when you look about you, the squalor, the dirt, the appalling corruption, all that we have created; we have not created nature, the tiger, the marvellous rivers, thought has not created them, but we have created the world in which we live. And that world is action. You cannot live without action, without relationship, which is, action is a movement in relationship, whether that relationship be most intimate or casual

and so on. Why do we behave this way? We take drugs, alcohol, we indulge in so many useless ugly destructive ways. Why? Is it that we are escaping from ourselves? Is it that we are bored with life? Please examine what the speaker is saying. See it in your own life. Is it that we are trying to escape from this enormous weight of sorrow and loneliness? You may have been married with children, you may have - I hope - a good affectionate caring husband or wife, you may have all this, but inwardly, deeply, there is a sense of abiding loneliness. Is it that we are escaping from that, which is the action? You understand? That is why perhaps we are cruel, we are indifferent, because we are so concerned with our own loneliness.

What is loneliness? You understand this? Do you follow this? Because most of us are lonely. We want out of that loneliness companionship, we escape from it through every form of entertainment, religious as well as that which is most amusing. We escape in so many ways. But like a deep disease that must be cured it is always there. So one must go into this very carefully because if we don't understand it, our action, which is our daily relationship with each other will distort that relationship. That relationship then becomes merely exploiting each other to escape from this deep abiding loneliness. Why is man so lonely? I don't know if you are aware, if you have ever experienced the state of loneliness, isolation, having no relationship at all with others. Perhaps some of you have experienced this, or most of you. And if we don't understand that loneliness, our actions will be distorted. We are enquiring not only into action, but also into loneliness, which destroys, disrupts, distorts all relationship in action. Right? I hope

you understand this. What is loneliness? Why is man so self-centred? Why is he so in his own life, he may have friends, married and all the rest of it, he is always concerned with himself. His actions are self-centred. He may be married, but he or she goes their way, ambitious, greedy, envious, suffering, aggressive, that is self-centred action. That is fairly clear. And is that the root of this deep loneliness of man? And can that loneliness utterly disappear? You understand my question?

As we said yesterday, when there is a hurt, psychological hurt, any action that takes place must inevitably be affected by the hurt. You understand this? We human beings, as we pointed out yesterday, get very hurt, not only about silly little things, but deeply hurt in not being able to fulfil, not being able to achieve, not being able to achieve, not being able to become something. We get deeply hurt and that hurt affects our actions. You can't escape from distorting action if you are hurt and we went into it. That as long as you have an image about yourself you are going to be hurt inevitably and when there is hurt, action will be destructive, will bring about conflict and so on. Now is it possible to be aware of this loneliness and not escape from it, but remain with it, not take a drink, not pick up a thriller, not rush off to some form of entertainment, but to completely, without any movement of thought, remain with that feeling of utter isolation. Then you will see, if you do that, that which one has felt as isolation disappears entirely, because it is thought that creates this sense of isolation. We went into the nature and source of thought. The source of thought which is experience. From experience you learn, which becomes knowledge - that knowledge as memory is stored in the

brain, in the very brain cells and from that there is memory. And the reaction to that memory is thought. Right? This is a fact.

So from thought there is action. That is our way of life. So as thought created this sense of isolation, as thought has created this sense of 'me', my house, my property, my wife, my husband, my quality. Right? My experience, this thought, which is limited because all thought is limited. Right? I wonder if you understand this? So, as we pointed out, knowledge from whatever book, from whatever experience, from any leader who says there is a great deal of knowledge I have acquired, all knowledge at whatever level, whether in the physical world or in the psychological world is always limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything. Therefore from knowledge comes thought. So thought is always limited. If one really understands the truth of this, then there is nothing sacred which thought has created. Right? So thought has built the whole psychological structure which is 'me', which is 'you'. And so that structure must inevitably create that sense of loneliness because thought itself is lonely. I will go into it a little bit. I have ventured on something, let's go into it. Right?

We live in disorder. Right? That is clear. Not only outwardly, but inwardly. We are confused. There is constant change, there is no stability, there is not a sense of utterly being. I will go into it. So we live in disorder. If you are aware of your own life it is obvious. What has created that disorder? Thought. Right? Thought, which is limited and any action born out of that limitation must create disorder. Right? Please, first see the logic of it, the reason, because one must exercise the intellect, and the function of the intellect is to reason, is to question, is to discern, is to weigh, balance, but

reason can never solve our problems. Right? However much you may exercise logic, a way of living that is merely the pursuit of limited thought in action. So thought is the origin of disorder and thought perceives disorder and tries to create order politically, religiously and in our relationship with each other. So thought is perpetuating disorder. I wonder if you understand this. So is there an action which is not the action of thought? So we have to enquire into something, which is, what is perception.

First of all one must learn the art of listening, listening to that noise without any resistance, listening to those crows calling to each before they settle down for the night, listening to your wife, to your husband to your children, so that you listen without any interpretation of resistance or translating what you hear, just the act of listening. You understand this? The act of listening. You will see that presently. Can we perceive, that is, visually see without naming? Which is without the interference of the word? To see a tree and not name it as a tree. You understand? Why do I ask if you understand? I am not going to ask any more. It is rather stupid on my part. If you understand you will pay attention. You will understand if it really concerns your life. And as we are talking about your life, your everyday life which is fear, anxiety, sorrow, which is ambition, cruelty, we are talking about your life, if you understand your life, the depth of it, the ugliness, the shoddiness and also the great beauty that lies beyond all this, it is your life, and if you are interested to bring about a radical revolution in the psychological world you will naturally listen without any effort, without any contradiction, you will listen first to find out if the speaker has anything to say, if the speaker is telling the truth or

merely indulging in a lot of idiotic theories and words. It is important to find out for yourself by listening carefully and if you listen carefully you will see for yourself in the mirror of the words which the speaker uses, you will see for yourself exactly as you are, and if you want to go very deeply, enter into a totally different world of right action, right behaviour, then it is up to you to listen with great care, with affection, with a sense of urgency, only then you will find out for yourself that the speaker is telling the truth. So I am not going to ask any more if you understand. It is up to you.

As we were saying, it is very important to learn the art of listening. You listen to a certain kind of music that you like, you listen to it day after day, with all the notes, the nuances, the silence between the notes, the depth of the sound, gradually you get used to it. It is no longer so enormously beautiful as it began, as you once heard it for the first time. So you lose the art of listening. The art of listening is to listen not only to the words, the meaning of the words, we are both speaking English, and go beyond the words, get the substance, the meaning, the full significance so that we are not only listening to the words, to the cadence of the word, but also listening to something that lies behind the words. That is the art of listening.

And also the art of seeing. To see not only with your visual eyes, but to see without the remembrance of what you have already seen, that is, when you look at a sunset with its radius, with its extraordinary light, you remember other visions, other sunsets, or seeing that sunset, you want to see it again the next day. So you remember it and when you come back the next day you look at the sunset and it is not the same, because you are merely remembering

what has happened, the previous sunset, therefore you are comparing, you are losing. So can you look without any remembrance, without any picture, without any word? To look at a tree, not to name it, just to look at it; can you do the same with regard to your wife, your husband, to look, to observe, not to record all the hurts, the nagging, you know all that goes on in relationship, just to observe.

Now I am going to go into this question, which is to observe actually what is going on in ourselves. That is, to observe without any distortion, and there is distortion when there is a motive, so to observe without motive. That is the art of observing. So the art of listening, the art of seeing, perceiving, observing, the art of listening is not only with the hearing of the ear but hearing the subtleties, listening between the words, listening to the depth and the beauty, not of the speaker, but listening to something that is much more subtle. If you have learnt such an art, which is not the learning of a language which takes time, but the learning of hearing, seeing is immediate. If you are listening it is immediate in which there is no time involved at all.

What is the central factor in our life, one of the central factors? It is, all we human beings want security physically as well as psychologically. Every child wants security, that is why it clings to the mother and so on and so on. Security is one of the greatest demands that human beings make, not only upon themselves, but security in the religious world, in the political world, in action and so on. That is the basic demand, the deep demand of a human being. Security in relationship, security in a belief, security not only in the physical world, to have a house, property, in the

physical world you want security. Now can we listen to the demand that each one has, listen to the demand that each one wants security, listen to it? If you listen to it carefully, do you listen with a questioning, or do you listen merely demanding that you must have security? You understand? (I've caught myself!) Can you listen to your own demand for your security? That is, to be secure in your relationship, can you listen to that demand? So do you approach, do you answer that demand with a continuous urge for security or do you question it? Do you question your demand because you are listening to it and as you are listening are you doubting the demand or merely saying, I must have security? Find out. Find out for yourself whether you are asking, demanding, insisting that you must have security in a belief, in your relationship, in a dogma or security by having faith in god or whatever you have faith in. Do you listen to your own demand and if you listen are you listening with doubt, with scepticism, with asking, questioning or do you listen to it without any motive so completely that you will discover for yourself if there is security at all?

Are we doing it together? Or are you merely listening to the speaker or translating what he is saying into an abstraction, into an idea, the idea is not a fact, it is an abstraction, it has no reality. What has reality is your urge, search, longing for security in every direction because one thinks in security there will be no confusion, no sense of despair, you are secure, safe, protected. Do you listen to it carefully? That is, listen without any motive, therefore listening without any direction? And if you do, do you find out the truth about security that in your relationship with another there is

no security at all? You may be attached to another, as one may be attached to a faith, to a belief, to a concept. You are attached to your wife or your husband or whatever it is. In that attachment is there security? And in attachment one feels one is secure. But see the consequences, listen to the consequences of attachment. There is fear, there is jealousy, anxiety, continuous possessive assertion, which all means that attachment breeds fear, can you listen to that. Can you observe the movement of attachment? Observe, you can't watch naturally with your eyes, but watch this movement taking place, as you can watch anger arising, so similarly can you watch and listen to the movement of attachment? So you will discover for yourself where there is attachment of any kind there must be corruption. You are not accepting the statement of the speaker, but you are discovering it for yourself, you see the truth of it, and therefore when you perceive - please listen carefully to this - when you perceive without any motive the nature of attachment, how attachment arises, out of loneliness, wanting some comfort, wanting security, when you see the implications not only logically, but see in depth the nature of attachment and listen to it completely without any motive, that attachment comes to an end, which does not mean you become callous, which does not mean that you become indifferent. You see, when you end something you are seeking something else. You understand? You say, if I end attachment what is there? That is, in the ending you are becoming. This is too complicated.

So can you observe, listen to yourself? We will take the question of fear. Most of us have various types of fear. Fear of the boss, fear of loneliness, fear of death, fear of not achieving what

you want, fear of failure, many kinds of fears. Fear of tremendous loneliness and fear of not being able to do something which you want to do. We are burdened with an enormous sense of fear. Now can you listen to it? Can you observe your fear without trying to overcome it, trying to run away from it, suppress it, can you observe the nature of fear, how it arises? What is the movement of it, the whole nature of fear, can you observe it? Take your own particular fear, it may be darkness, it may be of your guru, it generally is, it may be fear of your wife, or husband, take your own particular form of fear and look at it. Of course you can't look at it visually, but you can feel it. You can feel it as it arises. And listen to it very carefully. Then you begin to enquire what is fear. Who created it, how does it come about? You can only ask that question when you are really listening to it. That is, suppose I have a fear of not achieving enlightenment, or achieving some political nonsense, or some religious nonsense, suppose I have a fear, can I listen to it so that it tells me the whole story, how it arose, how it came into being. Let fear tell the story, not I. You see the difference? So I am listening to the story of fear. The story is age, time beyond measure. It has been there with man from the beginning of time. Physical fear and psychological deep, unresolved, undiscovered fear, deeply in the resources of one's own mind. Now can I listen to it? To listen to it thought must not interfere. That is, to give a motive to the fear, saying, I must go beyond it, I must escape from it, it is terrible to be afraid - all the rationality of fear, and condemning it. Without that, can I listen? As I listen, it tells me the story, which is, time is the factor of fear, time, then as I listen it says, what is time. Don't say, who is asking the question, it is

asking itself, it is moving, a living thing like a river that is moving. If it is only a seasonal river which is not great value, but a river which has got great volume of water behind it which fear has, then you can listen to it. In listening to it, it says, I am born out of time. Time is the factor that created fear. Time is the movement from here to there. Time is thought. So time and thought are the factors of fear - it is telling me, which is so obvious. It is very clear. That is, time, which is, something happened yesterday or a week ago which has caused, brought about a sense of fear, that fear is recorded in the brain, and that recording of an experience and the recording is a matter of time. That time may be instant, immediate but it is still within the field of time. Thought thinking about the cause of fear of yesterday or a week ago, remembers that incident, has recorded it and says, remembrance of the past is a factor of fear.

So time and thought have brought about fear. Look at it for yourself. You are discovering it. The speaker is not telling you. You are your own authority. There is no authority because then if you follow the authority, the statement of the speaker then you have not understood the nature of fear. But if you listen to your own fear very carefully then you will discover for yourself it is a matter of time and also, thought has created fear. So thought is time. Thought as time creates, brings about fear. That is the story which, in listening, in seeing, I have discovered, which is, you are discovering, not me. When you discover it, don't move away from what you have discovered. That is, I have discovered time and thought are the factors of fear: remain with that. Don't move away from it. Have you ever watched the new moon or the full moon?

Watched it perhaps for five or ten minutes, even for a minute, without any movement of thought? Then you begin to see the beauty of a new crescent moon, the slip of it, the enormity that it is going to become. So if you watch very carefully this sense of fear, listen to the whole story of it. You know when a child is telling you a story, if you listen to your child who is telling you a story, you don't interrupt in the middle of it, you listen to it, you listen to it with great care because he enjoys telling some story which he has invented and you listen to it with care, with affection, though it may be nonsense you are full of affection so you listen, listen, listen. In the same way listen to fear, till the story is complete. Then you will see there is no fear at all.

And a mind, a brain that has no fear psychologically is an extraordinary brain; and it is very important to understand because a brain that is afraid can never understand the nature of the mind, which we will talk about some other time.

So we are learning the art of listening and seeing. In the seeing and in the listening there is no learning. Learning means accumulation which becomes knowledge - please follow this carefully - in listening and in seeing there is no learning from which you accumulate knowledge as you accumulate knowledge in mathematics or in physics. Here there is only seeing and listening. There is no learning. Therefore the brain is beginning to free itself from the known. Come on sirs. As we were saying, man has never been free from the known. The brain has always recorded, which becomes knowledge and knowledge is limited, therefore man, whatever he does, is limited. He is limiting himself, making himself fragmentary, broken up. And when you are listening very

carefully without any motive, seeing without any distortion, in that there is no accumulation, so that next time you listen and see the previous knowledge doesn't interfere, you are listening afresh each time. Seeing each time anew. The tree is never the same, the sea is never the same, but if you look at it with your knowledge, with your words, then the tree is just a tree. But if you listen to the tree, to the sea and perceive the nature of fear, listen to it so completely to the last page of its story, then you will find that fear comes to an end, not that you become courageous, not that you become something beyond fear, the ending is important, not what lies further, because if you are enquiring what lies beyond fear then you are not listening to fear. It is very important if you want to listen, listen so completely, with your heart, with your whole being to fear, then that fear ends. And the brain then becomes extraordinarily active, alive.

And likewise listen to pleasure because man throughout the ages from time immemorial has sought pleasure, sexual pleasure, the pleasure of possession, pleasure of an athlete, pleasure in competition, in achievement, pleasure in having power, position, prestige, that is what man is seeking all the time, pleasure, pursuing pleasure in different forms. Now can you listen to it? Listen to it and not say, I must pursue pleasure, just listen to it. Because in pleasure there is a great deal of desire involved in it. Pleasure and desire go together.

And we went into the question of desire the other day, how it arises, which is, if one may repeat it briefly, there is seeing a dress, a car or a woman or a nice picture or a house or a lovely garden, seeing, then touching it, feeling it, then sensation, then thought

creating the image, you having the garden or that dress. From that, desire arises and desire and pleasure go together. And if you can listen to it so completely then you discover for yourself pleasure and fear are two sides of the same coin. So you are beginning to discover for yourself the nature of pleasure. It is always insubstantial. Pleasure is never ending. You always want more, more, more. The ultimate pleasure is god. So can you listen very carefully to your own demand for pleasure, to your own state of brain when it is afraid so that you begin to see for yourself the source of it, how it arises, and the ending of fear? And when there is the ending of fear, pleasure undergoes a radical change. There is no longer the pursuit of it. This is the story of fear and pleasure.

Without understanding fear and pleasure however much you may seek truth, enlightenment, good behaviour unless these are radically, deeply understood, then action becomes a conflict, a repetitive thing. So there is an action which is not born of thought, which is the seeing and the listening and acting immediately, which means allowing no time between action and seeing. That requires a brain that is active. That is why it is important, as we pointed out the other day, that to observe the sea, the tree, the beauty of a night, with all your senses, not just one part of your senses, with all your senses which means all your brain, with your heart to observe, then that observation is action itself.

BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH FEBRUARY 1981

As there is going to be this talk this evening, and tomorrow evening, I think we ought to consider what is the most important thing in life. Most of us generally accept things as they are, or revolt against them and join some institution, some organization, follow somebody. The more amusing, entertaining, the more promising, we accept very easily thinking that we are going to arrive or get or achieve some kind of ultimate pleasure, and we never consider what is most important in our existence. Our existence is so full of labour, travail, anxiety, every form of problem, both mechanical and psychological, and if we are at all serious, not joining any particular group, or organization or led by some guru, who are really not serious at all, we should ask what does it all mean, the existence that we lead, what is the meaning of all this work, misery, confusion, a sense of meaningless existence. You may go to the office every day for the rest of your life from 9.00 o'clock to whatever it is and labour there or practise some kind of meditation day after day, following certain systems or get lost in the mediocrity of this world, but when we ask ourselves what is the most important thing in our existence, actually not theoretically, not an abstraction but in our daily existence, what is the most essential thing? Is it seeking some kind of comfort, physical or psychological, is it something to escape from our constant urge with all its pain, to fulfil, to become, is it that we want somebody to guide us because we are so confused, so uncertain we want somebody to lead us, to tell us what to do?

So one should I think ask, what is the most fundamental question in our life, which in the understanding of it will reveal the whole psychological structure with its inhibitions, with its restraints, with its traditional discipline or revolt from that discipline. So we should demand of ourselves what is the essential movement which, if one can understand it fully, will go very far. As we said the other day and at every talk we have repeated, we are together investigating, together we are exploring into this question, together, please let us clearly understand that. Most of us are accustomed to be talked at or listen to some kind of theoretical or satisfying issue or translate what you hear to your own particular narrow groove, or one is serious enough to demand of oneself this question. So please, if one may point out again, we are together walking on the same road, on the same path, together examining this question.

Is it not the most important thing to know oneself, whatever you are, because that is the source from which all our action, our ideas, our thoughts, our theories, our longings are based, to know oneself, that is, to have knowledge about oneself. Not who am I, but rather what is the whole structure which makes up the idea of me, me, my ego, my demands, my pleasures, all that. Self knowledge has been, from the ancient days, asserted. People have said, know yourself first, and apparently it is one of the most difficult things to know oneself, and we join groups, and through various forms of dialogues, experiences, hope to reveal ourselves. There are those psychological philosophers who say, man cannot change his condition and improve that condition. And I think we should this evening, if you will follow this question and enquire, look into

ourselves. The speaker can only act as a mirror, the words that he uses are an indication, the words themselves are not the actual reality. They are a means of communication with each other.

So together let us enquire into this whole question of knowing oneself. First of all in that enquiry one must ask what is knowledge? Knowledge obviously is the accumulation of experience, accumulation of millions of years of man's existence. We are not only talking about the technological knowledge which is so rapidly advancing but also the psychological knowledge. One has read various volumes about oneself, what you are, or what you should be. Various theories have been propagated but if you could put aside what others have said however professional, however ancient, whatever the tradition may be, if you could put all that aside, that is, the authority of tradition, the authority of your gurus, the authority of the psychologists, the psychoanalysts and so on, so that your mind is free to observe for yourself not according to somebody else. Can we do that or is it one of the most difficult things to put aside. Please enquire into yourself whether it is possible for you to set aside every form of psychological authority and enquire for yourself. If you don't you merely remain a second hand human being. That is not an insult. You are merely repeating what others have said, of what you are, in what manner or assert various forms of your psychological existence. If you could put aside all that and come to afresh, then there is a possibility of enquiring into the nature of oneself very deeply and perhaps one can go very deeply, far in this enquiry.

So as we said, self-knowledge, knowing oneself, what is oneself? What are you? You go to the office every day, earn a

livelihood, been educated, so-called educated with a name, certain attributes, qualities, tendencies, idiosyncrasies, certain urges, sexual, urges for power, position, status and all that. So actually what are you? That is to know what you actually are. How will you enquire into this? You have only one instrument, which is thought. Please see that thought is our only instrument of enquiry, and thought is the result, the outcome, the excrescence of memory stored up in the brain, which is knowledge born out of experience. So thought is the only instrument that we have in our enquiry into the whole psychological structure of each one of us. Right, sir? We are not analysing, analysis does not lead us anywhere. I will make all this very clear. First of all who is the analyser and the analysed? Please see it for yourself, when you say, I'll analyse my motives, my despairs, anxieties, sorrow and loneliness and so on, when we begin to analyse, as most of us do, who is the analyser and what is analysed? Is there a difference between the analyser and the analysis and that which is analysed? Do you understand? Please follow this a little bit, if you will. The analyser is put together by thought. The analyser is one we think who is separate from that which is analysing. We are talking about the psychological world not the analytical process of science, but only the psychological structure of the `me', of the `you'.

We are trained, educated by tradition, by education to analyse ourselves. The whole psychological, psychiatric world is a process of analysis. So we should be very clear with regard to this. Is the analyser different from the analysed? Please ask, question. If one is angry or envious, when you analyse that envy, is the analyser different from the anger, the envy? You are following all this? Or

the analyser is the analysed. Right? Because when you are angry or envious you are that envy, you are not different from that reaction called envy. But we have separated anger, envy and the 'me' who is going to analyse envy. Is this clear? Please do not accept anything the speaker says. That is the first thing to understand. We are together examining this.

In the process of analysis, time is required. Right? Time for the analyser to find the cause of the event, or the reaction or the inhibition and so time, the division between the analyser, and the analysed, all that is taking place, so when your mind realizes or perceives the truth that the analyser is the analysed. Right? So we are now going to enquire, or observe rather, a better word than enquire, we are together going to observe the whole psychological structure without analysis. When you observe, do you observe as an outsider looking at something from the outside or do you observe without the outsider interfering in his observation? I will explain this. See, thought has created the observer or the past with all its tradition, the past is observing. The past is the observer, is the thinker, and thought we think is separate from the thinker. The thinker is the thought. There is no thinker apart from thought. There is no experiencer apart from experienced. They are both are the same.

So can you observe yourself not as an outsider looking in but observe yourself as you observe every reaction, every movement of thought, of depression, anxiety, just observe, not analyse? Right? Can we do that? To observe without judgement, without condemnation without any form of thought interfering in your observation. Can we do that? Can you observe a tree without

giving it a name but merely observing that which is there? Can you observe yourself in that manner? In observing yourself do you observe every reaction that you have, which is anger, jealousy, despair and so on, so on and so on, do you observe yourself without the previous knowledge which you have acquired about yourself? I wonder if you see this. Sir, let's put it very simply. I want to know myself because, without knowing myself, not from others, actually knowing myself, what I am, how can I find out what is right action, how can I find out what is love, what is meditation? How can I find out if there is any possibility of ending sorrow. How can I find out if there is an end to loneliness, despair, anxiety, all the misery and confusion in which one lives. So it is very important, it is essential that we understand ourselves and to understand ourselves we must look at ourselves. As you look in the mirror, so can one look at oneself without distorting what you see. You distort the moment you want to change it, that is, if you are envious, to observe it, not say, I must change it, or indulge in it but just to observe it without any motive, then you are beginning to learn about yourself. Right?

Are we doing this together now, not when you are go home, then it is too late, but here, sitting, having leisure and I hope not too tired, to watch yourself, to observe the nature of your thinking, what is thinking, why you act in a certain way, why you meditate, why you put on some peculiar robes and so on and so on and so on. And we are enquiring into sorrow which is part of man, part of you, which is you. Sorrow is not different from you. Right? You are sorrow. When you feel sorrow, we try to run away, all kinds of things take place. So we are going to enquire together, observe

together the nature of sorrow which is man's immemorial burden and see if we can put an end to it, not temporarily but completely because where there is sorrow there is no love, there is no passion, there is no compassion, and without ending sorrow there is no meditation. So it is important if you are at all serious to enquire whether sorrow can end.

There is not only personal sorrow but also the sorrow of mankind. The sorrow that man has carried with him through all the wars, the sorrow of thousands and millions of people who have cried, the sorrow of millions and millions of people killed because of our nationalism, our tribalism, killed through our beliefs. There have been wars for the last 5,000 years historically, practically every year somewhere or other in the world. There is that tremendous sorrow of the brutality of killing somebody. All that is there. And also one's personal sorrow. You lose somebody, death intervenes, the sorrow of not being loved or loving not finding the right person to love. There is the sorrow of ignorance, perhaps that's the greatest sorrow, not ignorance of books, but the ignorance of oneself, ignorance of the illusions in which we live with all the fanciful day dreaming and so on, there is the immense sorrow of mankind. Can it ever end?

So we are together enquiring, observing the nature of sorrow. There are many factors that bring about sorrow: the factor of death which reveals loneliness, losing somebody whom you have loved, in whom you have put all your hope, all your intimate reactions and that person is gone, brother, wife, husband, son and so on. There is the factor of loneliness which is one of the reasons why this sorrow is? Sorrow is also a form of self indulgence. So as we

said, we are not analysing the causes of sorrow. We are only observing sorrow. Please, let's be very clear on this matter.

Observing, looking not moving away from that which is, which is sorrow, moving away in the sense, escaping from it, avoiding it, finding reasons, wanting comfort and so on, which are all avoiding the central factor of sorrow. To observe it and not move away from that. Can you so observe the sorrow that one has without any desire to run away, to translate, to escape, to submerge, all that without any movement, just to live with that, can you, are you doing it or are you off in some kind of dreamy illusion? Please see the importance that without understanding, without ending sorrow there is no love. And without love life has no meaning. You may be very rich, you may have all your desires fulfilled, because desire and pleasure are not love. And in your relationship with another, whether it is a woman or a man, without that love you merely pursue your own narrow pleasure.

So it is very important, because we have destroyed love in this country, and perhaps also in the other parts of the western world. So it becomes of the utmost important and urgent to find out for ourselves whether there is an ending to sorrow. There is an ending to sorrow if one remains completely with it, hold it as you hold a precious baby, hold it in your heart, in your brain, remain with it. And you will find it is extraordinarily arduous because we are so conditioned that the instinctive reaction is to get away from it; but if you can remain with it then you will find that there is an ending to sorrow, totally, which doesn't mean that you become insensitive to sorrow. Please listen to this. You may end sorrow, sorrow may end, but you are not insensitive to sorrow of others. You

understand?

And also we ought to ask the question, what is love. Most of us are so embroiled, caught up in pleasure. And we have translated love into pleasure, sexual pleasure, and there is always this absurd, nonsensical theory that through sex you achieve heaven, which is through pleasure, or going beyond pleasure. First indulge and then go beyond it. Which is absurd. But if we understand what love is then we will be able to understand the nature of pleasure and desire. So we are asking, what is love. Why doesn't it exist? Is love attachment? Please, we are enquiring together into a most serious thing, because if we are not clear of all this whatever you meditate has no meaning whatsoever. You may sit by the hour in any posture you like, breathe and all kinds of nonsensical processes one goes through, but without understanding love, without ending fear, without understand the nature of pleasure and the ending of sorrow, meditation has no meaning whatsoever. If you are frightened, there is fear in you when you meditate, it will inevitably lead to some kind of illusion. So we must be watchful, aware and find out, discover what love is.

Obviously, love is not attachment. If you are attached to your husband, to your wife, or to your family, that attachment leads to corruption. I am sure you may not like to hear all this, but one has to look at it very carefully. Because we said, attachment leads to corruption, corruption is when you are attached you are frightened, you are jealous, you are anxious, you are uncertain, the more you are attached the more the corruption is, whether you are attached to a belief, to an ideal, to a person, to a concept, to a symbol. Obviously, if you observe it, attachment in any form, of any kind,

must inevitably lead to corruption. So love is not attachment. It is not that you search out and cultivate detachment. Detachment is another form of attachment. So is love jealousy? When you love somebody and you are pursuing your own ambition, your own desire, your own particular form of idiosyncrasy, can you love another when you are ambitious, competitive, seeking your own fulfilment? Then in that relationship it is exploitation, it is not love. So can you, hearing all this, hearing the truth of it, it is not an invention of the speaker, these are facts, can you observe that fact without any resistance, see the truth of it? Then the very hearing of that statement, that attachment is corruption, is the ending of that attachment. And when you hear the truth, it is not my truth, or your truth, the truth that where there is love there cannot be any form of desire. Desire is merely the outcome of sensation, thought using that sensation to further pleasure. Desire, pleasure, attachment, jealousy, has no existence where love is. You may have innumerable theories about love, but that is not love. The word is not the thing. Please, explanation is not the actuality.

So without understand that life, whatever you do, you may be a great scientist with all the accumulated knowledge of the past, adding to that past new concepts, new inventions, exploring the nature of the atom and so on and so on, without love the scientist is creating misery in the world. He may have the Noble prize, but if there is no love he is bringing danger to man.

And also we should enquire what is the relationship between love, living, existence, to death. One hopes you are not tired and we can go into this question. What is the relationship between the living, the life and death? We are always asking what lies after

death, what is beyond, the unknown? That is our constant enquiry. Volumes have been written about it, but we never ask, what is before death. Do you understand? Not after death, what is before death, before our brain, our organs, through disease, through accident, through malnutrition, through drink, drugs, smoking, through various forms of self-indulgence and the body withers, dies, before it dies you ought to ask, what is before death. Please ask yourself that question. That is, what are you doing, what's your life, what is your way of earning a livelihood, what's your existence now, actually as it is? Whether it is constant conflict, constant strife between yourself and another, constant becoming from what you are to what you should be, through prayer, through meditation, through all kinds of things, your daily live, what's your relationship to another, to your wife, to your husband, to your children, to your neighbour. That is far more important than what lies after death. So can you look at your life without distorting it, without any motive, just to look at it - your going to the office day after day, for fifty years, your accumulation of money, power, position, your accepting authority of another in the religious world, in the so-called psychological world, in the so-called spiritual world. If you have any form of authority in the spiritual world you are not spiritual, you may struggle for it, but if there is any authority you are not really a religious man. We will go into that another time.

So what's your life? Not after death, but now? If you believe in reincarnation, as most of you do, probably, that is you will be born next life. Look at it, sirs, what are you? You who hope to meet your son, your wife, your husband, next life, what are you? Is there

anything permanent in you, which is not put by thought as permanent? Is there anything that is enduring, which is timeless? We can invent that there is something in me which is timeless, the atman, you know all that, theories - we are not dealing with theories. Theories are poison. We are dealing with actuality, what is going on in our daily life, the hypocrisy, the deceit, the corruption, yielding to something from which you hope to get profit, psychological or financial. This is your life now. And if you believe in reincarnation, what is most important then is what you do now because that is going to affect your next life, but you don't believe in your next life, that's just a theory, comforting, hypocritical way of living.

And why do we separate life, living with death? You understand? Living is this colossal mess that we have made for ourselves, the pain, the grief, the sorrow, the uncertainty, the insecurity, searching for security, that's our life. And we are frightened to end this. I know, it is obvious that you will listen to all this but you won't do anything about it. That is one of the great sorrows of life, you hear the truth and not do a thing, because we are so heavily conditioned, afraid and so on. So if we don't understand our life, the way we live, then we are afraid of death. So can we while living, energetic, alive, aware of all the beauty and the ugliness of existence invite death? Not jump out of the thirtieth floor, not commit suicide, we don't mean that, invite death, which is to end. Death, when there is death there is no argument, you can't argue with death. So can you end, for example, attachment? Because when death comes it is out. When the speaker says, invite death, which is to end, end that which is already

known. End your attachment to your guru, to all the things that you put on your body in order to be kind of spiritual, end your greed, your envy, your ambition. That's what death is going to do anyhow. So can you invite death? Which means to end that which you have experienced, that which you have gathered, psychologically, so that you become totally inwardly anonymous, so that you are inwardly absolutely nothing? That is what death is going to make of you.

Then the problem is, if you don't do all this, and inevitably you are not going to do all this, one is absolutely certain about it, what happens to you? What happens to your consciousness? Your consciousness is put together by thought. Thought has put together your envy, your greed, your ambition, your conformity, thought is responsible for all this. The content of your consciousness is put together by thought. You may say thought, super consciousness, higher consciousness, but it is still within the realm of thought, it is all there in your consciousness. And if thought which has put together all this content which makes your consciousness, which is you, then what happens to you when you die. You are very anxious to learn, aren't you? You are all waiting for the answer! Look what you are doing now. You are not concerned about living, you are concerned about what happens after death to you. See the tragedy of it, sirs, see the immense ignorance which is the cause of sorrow, see it. Which means you don't want to be disturbed, you want to carry on your daily life, the things you are accustomed to, the following, the obeying, the worshipping a person and all that childish stuff. So as most of us are not going to free our consciousness of the things that thought has put together then what

happens to that consciousness, what happens to you as a human being when he dies? To answer that question you must find out for yourself what you are, whether you are an individual human being, separate from all the rest of mankind, that you are totally separate. Individuality means that. Whether you are actually an individual, which is a human being that's totally a whole entity, that what it means, individual. Or you are not an individual at all, you are like the rest of the human kind, psychologically, you may have a different colour, your face may be different, you may be dark haired, light hair and so on, but psychologically your consciousness, what you are, your sorrow, your misery, your confusion, your loneliness is like the rest of mankind. Please, enquire into this. You are like the rest of mankind. Your consciousness is the consciousness of man, of the entire humanity, because they suffer, they go through agonies, loneliness, despair, not loved, seeking love, caught in some absurd religious sect and so on and so on, just like you. So you are the rest of mankind. That is the truth, you may not like it but you are that. So please see what happens. You have thought all your life, all your tradition, all your religious books and so on say you are an individual soul, you are separate from mankind, and when you die then you begin to enquire what is after as an individual, which is an illusion.

So what happens when you die? You, who are the rest of mankind. Please look at it. You know it is very difficult to look serenely, with benevolence, with affection, with care, with love, to observe death, not be frightened of it. You will be frightened inevitably if in living, our daily living we don't end, not begin something, end, because that is what is going to happen. What will

happen is that human consciousness will go on with all the travail, with all the misery, labour, sorrow and the agony of daily existence, that will go on. And so it becomes very important that you, living, invite death. So that there is no longer that river of human consciousness which is the volume of all our misery, insecurity, all that. You are part of that. When you die you are part of that, not you die. Your body will be cremated, or buried, or whatever it is, but your consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of humanity. See the beauty of it. See the truth of it. If you see the truth of it there will be no fear, no fear of death. And because there is no fear of death then there is an acceptance of ending things. And when you end jealousy, anxiety, ambition, then there is love. Therefore love and death go together. They are not two separate things. And where there is the ending of sorrow, the ending of it, the ending of sorrow is passion, not lust, then with that passion there is beauty. Beauty is truth, and there is no path to truth. Your guru cannot lead you to truth, nobody can lead you to truth. All the pretence, all the nonsense that goes on that you can be lead to truth, truth is something that comes into being only when you know the art of listening, seeing, where there is love and compassion, which has its own intelligence. So don't follow spiritually anybody. Don't obey. So to have a free mind, where there is freedom there is love, and without freedom one remains in a prison and decorates the prison. Right sirs.

BOMBAY 6TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH FEBRUARY 1981

This is the last talk. We began the series of these talks enquiring into the salvaging of society; the society in which we live, the society which man has created in his relationship with each other and whether that society, which is man's relationship with man, can ever be transformed, can be salvaged. And we enquired into the nature of that society. That society is the product of human relationship, that society is the consciousness of man.

Consciousness is the society. And we went into that question whether that society which apparently began from the immemorial days of man's existence can ever be changed, transformed into a peaceful society, a society in which we can live with honour, not rooted in dishonour. I hope you understand. Whether we can live without exploiting each other, and that society apparently has never been able to be transformed. Man has tried every kind of way to bring about a different kind of society: the Communists have tried it, the Socialists, the Capitalists, the totalitarians have every kind of method to transform the society, and apparently that society has never been able to be changed, because man himself has not been able to be changed. That is, man in his relationship with another has not been able to be changed. And that society, which is an abstraction, is now being changed, not by man but by machines, not by any form of endeavour, political, religious, economic and so on. It has been changed by machines which man has invented. It is called the computer. I won't go into all that.

But one should realize what the computer can do. It is the

product of thought and whatever thought can do, the computer can do. It can learn, it can correct itself, it can think out problems, and introduce new problems. With the computer, the robot is changing industry. The Japanese are already doing in, introducing the computer and the robot to create cars and so on and so on. So the computer is artificial intelligence; it can learn, it can correct itself, it can write out, it can compose music and so on and so on. So the computer, the machine invented by man, is changing society. It is changing the structure of outward human existence. Whether you know about it or you are not conversant with it, perhaps it is of very little importance, but it is taking place, it is happening. So then what is man then? This is an important question you have to ask. If the machine can do everything that thought can do, it can invent gurus, rituals, belief in god, it can write poems, it can beat a grand master at chess and so on.

I don't think many of us realize what a dangerous state we are in, that man is now becoming more and more helpless, man is becoming a danger to man through machines. These are facts, not the speaker's invention. This machine, the computer is going to change the structure of society. We have talked a great deal about it, perhaps in India, in this part of the world, that is not known, the danger man is facing, the crisis in his consciousness. Because we said consciousness is the content. The content makes consciousness. What you think, what you believe, what your concepts are, ideals, your anger, jealousy, your beliefs in god, your acceptance of gurus and their rituals and there absurdities, all that is part of consciousness. This consciousness is the consciousness of all human beings, not your consciousness, it is the consciousness of

all human beings wherever they live. If you examine it a little bit closely, objectively, you will find wherever you live whether in this part of the world or in the East, Far East, or in the West, man suffers, goes through various forms of anxieties, uncertainties, obeying, accepting, imitating, conforming. This is psychologically, what man is. So you as a human being are the rest of mankind. This is a fact. We think we are individuals, we are not and therefore we seek individual salvation. There is no individual salvation at all. It is only the salvation of the consciousness of man, of which you are. We have talked about that a great deal.

We also talked about order. In our life there is so much disorder. That disorder is brought about by conflict in our relationship with each other. We all believe in something or other which contradicts other people's beliefs. We are all some form of nationalist, sectarians and that again brings conflict. We live in constant conflict, struggle with each other. We belong to a certain community professing peace, but in that too there is hierarchical existence, the one who knows, the other who does not. This is the tradition, this is the whole way of living. So our consciousness, with its agonies, beliefs, sorrows, pleasures, is the consciousness of mankind. Mankind goes through every form wherever he lives: sorrow, pain, uncertainty, confusion, utter misery, loneliness, despair, every form of neuroticism. This is the human consciousness of which we are.

This consciousness is the product of thought. Thought has put together all our existence both inwardly and outwardly, It has created marvellous architecture, great temples and the things that are in the temples, the marvellous mosques, the cathedrals and all

the things that are in the cathedrals, in the mosques, the rituals, the dogmas, the beliefs, all are the product of thought, so there is nothing sacred that thought has not produced. Thought itself is not sacred, but the things that thought has produced, we worship, we follow. Please understand this very carefully. And thought has brought about disorder, disorder in our private life, and disorder outwardly. This disorder cannot be brought into order by any government, by any religion, by any guru because they are all based on thought. And thought is a material process because it is based on knowledge, experience, stored in the brain as memory and the response of that memory is thought. So whatever thought has produced, whatever it has written, whatever it has said that there is the timeless, the eternal, nothing that thought has produced is sacred; and we worship that which is the product of thought in a temple, in a guru.

One of the strange things in this country is, personal worship. It is the most undignified, inhuman thing to do, to worship another human being. And thought has created disorder. That disorder is brought about in our personal relationship, which is based on image, about which we talk a great deal. The relationship between each other, man or woman and so on, is based on the image making. If you have observed yourself, you will see that you have an image about your wife, or your husband, or your guru and that image is produced, manufactured, put together by thought and so our relationship is not actual but a relationship between two images and so there is - must be - everlasting conflict. We went into this considerably, perhaps those of you who are here for the first time may not understand it quickly and deeply, but you can see this

obvious fact that you have an image about yourself, what you should be, what you are, what you might be, all put together by thought; and thought has built the image about each other and that image has no relationship except between another image. So we are saying thought itself, which has created disorder, is disorder. Thought itself is disorder and so it cannot possibly bring about order.

So we are going to go into that question because meditation is the understanding of knowledge, not sitting repeating some phrase, following a system which somebody has laid down, whether it is Buddhist meditation or Tibetan or Zen, or your favourite guru putting out his particular form of meditation, it is not meditation because it is all based on thought. Unless one understands this very deeply that it is the nature of thought, because it is the outcome of knowledge. Please follow it, it is the outcome of knowledge and knowledge is never, never complete. So thought is never complete and its action then must inevitably be incomplete and therefore conflict. As we said we are thinking together. The speaker is not laying down any law. He has no authority. He is not a guru. He has no followers, because the follower destroys the guru and the guru destroys the follower. And we are enquiring into the nature of knowledge. And meditation is the ending of knowledge. Our consciousness is the custodian of knowledge.

Please let us think together about all this. Don't accept what the speaker is saying. He may sit a little higher on a platform, that is merely for convenience. A little height does not give him any authority. But if we could for a change co-operate together in our thinking, we are walking along a path, a road, not my road, or your

road, or the guru's road, we are human beings, and we are walking together investigating together, thinking together. So please don't go to sleep. We are together examining what is meditation, not how to meditate, which then becomes mechanical, which then becomes a repetitive, meaningless illusion. But meditation is the way we live, meditation is part of our daily life, not that meditation is something separate but an actual activity in our daily life, and our daily life is based on knowledge, on memory, on remembrance. Which is, our life is based on the past, the past experiences, the past knowledge, the past incidents and the remembrances of all that. So our life, our daily existence is based on knowledge. Knowledge both the scientific and psychological, the inward knowledge and the vast technological knowledge which has been accumulating with such rapidity within the last fifty years or so. So knowledge is the basis of our life. That knowledge is acquired through experience which then is stored up in the brain and memory and thought and action. It is a fact that we are always operating from the past which is the known, meeting the present, which is then modified, the past then is modified and then goes on into the future. So our action is based on knowledge: how to speak a language, is based on knowledge; how to drive a car; how to put things together. And also-that is outwardly - inwardly it is based on knowledge which is our relationship with each other, which is the image you have built about your wife, husband and so on.

So meditation is the understanding of knowledge and the ending of knowledge. As we said, our consciousness is the storehouse of knowledge: knowledge of fear, knowledge of pleasure, knowledge of all the travail, the labour, of anxiety, jealousy, envy, the

immense sorrow that mankind carries, the despairing loneliness, and all those entertaining activities through which we escape from the actual facts of life. So all that consciousness is the storehouse of knowledge. You are the self and the self is the essence of knowledge.

So meditation is the enquiry, free sceptical enquiry into the whole field of knowledge which is our consciousness. To enquire freely, you must have doubt. Doubt is an extraordinary factor that cleanses the mind: to doubt your guru, to doubt the tradition, to question your relationship, never accepting any psychological authority. So doubt which gives freedom; it's like leading a dog on a leash, if you keep the dog all the time on a leash, the dog is never free to enjoy itself. So one must know the art of the whole movement of doubt, when to let it go, and when to hold it back. So we are asking, saying, we are enquiring together, please, together which means exercise your brains to enquire into what is meditation.

As long as we function in the field of knowledge, which we are, we are acting, functioning, living in the field of knowledge and as long as we are doing that our brains become mechanical. It becomes routine like going to the office from 9 o'clock in the morning and coming back home at 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock in the evening, or whatever it is. This repetition, this constant mechanical way of living is essentially knowledge. I hope we are moving together.

So our consciousness means the storehouse of knowledge. We know we are afraid, we know we are lonely, we know we have great sorrow, we know we are depressed, anxious, uncertain,

unhappy, trying to fulfil, trying to become, trying to get something all the time, all that is the movement of knowledge. So we are saying, asking whether knowledge can come to an end, not the scientific knowledge, not the knowledge of driving a car, speaking a language, writing a letter, all the technological or physical knowledge, we are not talking about that, that must go on, that is inevitable, but we are talking about the psychological knowledge which always overcomes, distorts the technological knowledge. That is, technology has invented the extraordinary instruments of war, and the psychological world is divided into nationalities, into various socialist, communist, capitalist and so on. The inward always overcomes the outer, unless there is order inwardly outwardly there will be disorder, there will be wars and so on. So it becomes very urgent, imminent that we understand the whole psychological world of which man is and that psychological world is the world of knowledge.

Knowledge means time. Are we following each other in all this? Time of which we talked about the other day, there are three types of time - the biological time, the psychological time, the time by the watch; that is chronological time, time as psychologically - I will become, I will be, if I am not, if I am angry, I will be less angry tomorrow, all that implies psychological time and there is the biological time in the genes in which time is involved, the growth from childhood to manhood. So time is, psychological time, is knowledge. To know myself requires time. To know myself, which is, the self is put together by thought. This is obvious, isn't it? Thought has put together the structure, the psychological structure of the 'me', the self through education,

through the past knowledge and so on. This nature of `me', you, as the self, the self is knowledge, and that knowledge requires time, and to know oneself, we say that we need time. So time is knowledge, knowledge is thought. So time is thought and we think the ending of knowledge, the ending of any fear, the ending of acquisitiveness, attachment needs time. We are saying time must have a stop, which is, thought must have a stop and that is meditation. To enquire, not follow any system but enquire, which means freedom, freedom to enquire and you can only have that freedom if you begin to doubt, to question, not accept any spiritual authority. Where there is authority in the world of the spirit, it is not spiritual, it destroys the spirit of man.

So together we are going to enquire whether this enormous field of knowledge which man has acquired, which is our consciousness, whether that consciousness can ever come to an end as knowledge. Are we following each other? Or is all this very strange, or probably you are not used to this kind of enquiry, probably you are all used to being told what to do, guided, led, following a leader like so many sheep, so probably you are not free to enquire because if you begin to enquire, you awaken all fears in you which you have submerged by accepting authority. So there must be freedom to enquire; and that freedom begins only when you are questioning, doubting, asking, never accepting, but always searching, demanding. And that is what we are doing now.

So we are saying, please don't accept a thing the speaker is saying. Follow his reason which is logical, go into it step by step and all the subtleties that are involved in this, your mind, your brain, has to be quick enough to follow, not drugged, drugged by a

belief, drugged by following somebody. This demands, please, that you be a light to yourself, not the light of another. Light which comes through enquiry and religion is sceptical enquiry. Religion is that. Religion isn't all the circus that goes on in the world - the puja, the rituals, the worship of idols, worship of symbols in the Christian world and so on. That is not religion. That is just amusement. What is religion, is sceptical enquiry into the whole of our existence, which is our consciousness. Our consciousness is made up of its content. The content is your belief, your dogma, your rituals, your jealousies, your anxieties, your nationalities, your favourite guru and so on and so on. All that is your consciousness and that is the essence of knowledge. Now we are asking, please together, I am not asking, please let us ask together, whether that whole field of knowledge in which we have lived, in which there is conflict, in which there is never peace, in which there is never a sense of light, always strife, struggle, escape from reality, all that we are going to enquire into, which is knowledge, whether that knowledge can come to an end. That is meditation. Because just see the reason, the logic of it. You may intellectually, if you are intellectual, or inclined to think intellectually see the reason of this. First verbally understand, that's the communication through words, then exercise our brains to be logical, objective, not personal. And then we can enquire into what is religion. Is that which is going on, is that religion? Putting on various clothes and various types of rituals in which there is fear, superstition, worship of personalities, worship of symbols, is that religion? Obviously it is not. So if you discard all that, discard it absolutely so that there are no illusions, but only facing facts, facts being that which is actually happening

in our daily life, those are facts, and that which is happening is from the movement of thought which has put together our consciousness. So we are asking something, which is, whether thought, except in the technological world, which is based on knowledge, whether thought can come to an end. Thought, as we said, is operating always in the field of knowledge and when it is operating in that field it must be mechanical - and our brains have become mechanical: following systems, obeying, imitating, conforming, repeating, repeating, repeating in different forms. You may leave America to come back to this country and join some Ashrama and think you are totally new, you are not. It is the same problem that exists for each one of us.

So how do we begin to enquire into the nature of religion? Because man throughout millennia upon millennia has thought something beyond himself, something which is not born of knowledge, something timeless, something most holy, sacred. Man has always sought that because he realizes life is a flux, life is constant change, life is uncertainty, sorrow, misery. So he says there must be something beyond all this chaos, and in his search he is trapped by the priest, by the guru, by some clever individual who has a certain philosophy. He gets lost, he gets caught up in these things and thus he never finds that which is beyond time, beyond thought, beyond all measure. And meditation, which is the path of enquiry into what is religion, that enquiry is the ending of knowledge. You hear that statement, probably you have read it many times in your books or somebody has told you: the ending of time, the ending of thought, the ending of knowledge. Is that possible? Please enquire with me.

Is it possible for the brain which has been accustomed, trained, conditioned to function within the field of knowledge? Is it possible for that brain to break through that, through that conditioning? And there is a whole group who say, it is not possible, it is just imaginary. So they say as man is conditioned, conditioned within the field of knowledge naturally, as man is conditioned, let us improve the conditioning ecologically, socially, morally, and so on, but remain in that conditioning. Which means remain in the prison and beautify the prison, make it more convenient for him to live in that prison. There is a whole school of philosophy of all that. Then there are the so-called religious people who have their belief in something which is non-existent, their gods, their rituals all invented by thought. So thought, that which is created by thought is not sacred. You may worship the image, that image is not sacred. You have made it sacred by your thought and thought is a material process. If you realize all this then you will put aside all the religious nonsense, including your gurus with their authority. Then we can proceed to enquire, proceed to enquire with a free mind, a mind that is not clogged, clogged by fear, by the pursuit of pleasure, not clogged by desire, which we went into very carefully the other day, what is the nature of desire. And before we can meditate, there must be freedom from fear, otherwise that creates illusion. You may sit in a corner or repeat some mantra or follow some system, prostrate to some person, which is the most undignified, unworthy of a human being to prostrate to another, all that must be totally set aside, which means there must be no attachment whatsoever to anything because then your mind, your brain is free and it's only in freedom can you find truth.

So meditation can only begin with the ending of fear. If you are afraid psychologically, inward fear, because you want security, permanency and so on, we have discussed and all that I won't go into now. If there is fear your meditation is utterly meaningless. If there is any kind of conformity, meditation has no meaning.

So there must be order in our relationship, not conflict. There must be the ending of sorrow, not only the personal sorrow, but the sorrow of mankind, and the understanding of what love is. Love as we pointed out yesterday and other days, is not desire, is not pleasure, though we have translated it in the modern world into sexual pleasure, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of being attached to something. All such forms of pleasure must end. And as love is the very root of meditation, without that love which means no jealousy, in which there is no attachment, in which there is not a breath of hatred, and when there is that compassion, with its intelligence, without that, laying the foundation of all that, whatever you meditate, whatever you do, you may sit by the hour in a room meditating, it has no value. So one has to lay the foundation, then you can proceed to find out what is knowledge and the ending of knowledge.

Also one has to understand the whole movement of concentration. From childhood we are trained through school, college, university to concentrate. I hope you are following all this. Are you are asleep or am I talking to waking people? Which is, you are exercising your capacity to think, to be logical, to observe, to listen, to learn. One hopes that you are so awake, not to some imaginary awakesness but actually listening. Concentration. What is concentration? If you have gone into it, if you have examined it,

what does it mean to concentrate, that is, to concentrate your energy on a particular thing, a particular image, particular picture, a word, and that concentration is to exclude every other thought. You see this. When you are trying to concentrate, you are building a resistance to every other movement of thought than this one thought. Right? So in that concentration there is struggle, there is effort because your thought keeps on wandering all over the place, and thought tries to pull it back. You know all this. So concentration is a form of resistance.

Attention is something entirely different. When you attend, if you ever do, when you give attention it means to give all your energy not to a particular thing but gather all your energy to attend, that is, are you now, if one may ask, attending or merely listening to a lot of words, getting emotional about those words, denying the meaning of those words because you believe in something or are you attending completely, listening with all your heart, with all your brain, with all your senses? If you are so completely attending then there is nothing more. That is meditation. That state of brain in which there is no centre from which you are attending; whereas concentration is always from a point to another point; whereas attention is a state of brain or mind in which there is no point as the 'me' attending. Now if you so listen, then you will find for yourself the brain becomes astonishingly quiet. Please do not be hypnotized by the speaker or stimulated by the speaker because you have to be a light to yourself. And as we said, if you listen not only to what the speaker is saying but to listen to your wife, your husband, listen to your leader, your teacher, to your guru, listen completely, then out of that listening you will find what is true, and what is false,

because in that listening there is no acceptance, in that listening there is not the one who knows and the other who does not know. There is only that acute activity of listening which is total attention.

When there is that total attention, which is, the brain becomes absolutely quiet, the brain has its own movement, not the movement of thought. I hope you see the difference. The brain must be in movement, it is its nature, but the movement that thought has created in the brain, that movement comes to an end. Therefore the brain, which has its own natural activity, that may go on, but that brain has the capacity when there is this complete attention to become utterly quiet. That is, silence which thought can produce and there is silence which has nothing to do whatever with the activity of thought. You can make your brain completely still by thought, controlling thought. That is, the controller is thought, he is put together by thought, and that controller says, I am going to control thought. He is playing a game with himself. So there is a silence which is not the silence of thought trying to become silent, there must be that silence. That is, the ending of knowledge, that is the emptying of the content of consciousness which is the self, the 'me', my ego, my self, the ending of that self which is the essence of selfishness, which is the essence of desire, which is the essence of trying to become something, all that must end. And that ends when the mind, the brain has understood logically, reasonably, sanely the activity of knowledge, which is the activity of the self with all its pleasures and agonies, miseries, confusion, uncertainties, sorrow, that self can never know what love is. And in that silence, if you have gone that far, there is something beyond words, beyond all thought which time has not

touched, which is the origin of all things. God is the invention of man but this is not god, which is the invention of man. This is the origin of all things, therefore the most sacred, most holy, timeless. These are just words, but if you live without fear, if you have understood knowledge, you have gone beyond sorrow, therefore you have this quality of love and compassion with its intelligence, and having laid the foundation then meditation is something marvellous, something that thought can never understand. Then only there is that which is timeless, most holy.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 29TH AUGUST 1981

I hope that you will not treat this as a weekend affair.

The politicians are thinking in terms of tribalism, they have not the global outlook, or the concern with the whole of humanity. They are concerned about their own insular party, their own ideologies and theories. They are not concerned with humanity. Nor are the scientists, they are helping to create the bomb, or have helped to create it, and they too, it appears, are not deeply concerned with the future of man. Nor, obviously, the religious people, the established, orthodox, traditional religion, they are not thinking in terms of the whole religious mind of all humanity. Nor are the gurus - you have seen the latest television and all that nonsense that goes on in the world. And they have their own particular form of discipline, ashramas which are really concentration camps and so on.

So when you look around all over the world, there is no one concerned deeply, sincerely, with the future of man. So it behoves us not to depend on anybody, including the speaker. It behoves us to be utterly responsible for our own conduct, our own attitudes, prejudices and so on. If one is concerned at all about mankind, about man, about the human being that is caught in this modern society, which is already disintegrating, where there is so much violence, despair, anxiety, uncertainty, it seems to one that we have to be responsible for all our actions. We are the humanity. What we suffer, what we go through in daily life, our quarrels, our disenchantment, all our troubles, religious, psychological, political,

is the concern of all human beings.

Wherever you go all over the world every human being faces these problems, not only us here in this tent, in this island but all over Europe, America, and India and Asia, they are all uncertain, there is no security, there is terrorism. And to escape from all this they are trying to form some kind of community, a commune where they can be safe. But one cannot be safe in this world as it is. So what we are, our consciousness, our attitudes, our miseries, are like the rest of the world. This is a fact. And our consciousness is the rest of mankind. Please, as we have said, during all these talks, during the past and the present talks, please let us think together, not you think one way, I think another way, but let us think together and observe what is happening round us. Not as British, as French, as Irish, or American, or as Hindus, but as human beings living on this earth, which is our earth, not the British, not the French, not the American, nor the Russian, it's our earth on which we are supposed to live happily, securely, which is being utterly denied to all of us. After all these twenty, thirty centuries, we are what we were at the very beginning of time, slightly modified, perhaps better bathrooms, better communications, better hygiene and so on, but there are the wars threatening, not only far away but this may happen at any time very close to us; because it is in the hands of these extraordinary politicians and we have trusted our lives to them and they are not giving us security.

And seeing all that, what is one to do? What, as a human being living in this dreadful world, which is becoming more and more dangerous, more and more insecure, both theologically as well as

physically, what is one to do? What action, what kind odd attitudes, what kind of beliefs and so on is one to have? Or we have tried all those, we have had ideals, various forms of faiths, dogmas, political theories, dialecticism, opinion against opinion, and through opinion trying to find out what is truth. We have had all these and many more varieties of political, religious thinking. But apparently all those activities have not deeply, profoundly affected man. We have not, observing what is taking place in the world objectively, progressed very much psychologically, inwardly. We are still burdened with sorrow, with fear, with the urge to find something that is beyond all time, beyond all belief. And after all these millions of years we are still where we were, fighting each other, killing each other, more efficiently and on a vast, wide scale.

So seeing all that, one asks oneself if one is at all serious: what is our action as a human being, living in this world, what is it to be? Or is the question limited? Not what I should do, or you should do, which becomes rather limited, but rather as a human being representing the rest of mankind, because we are the rest of mankind, all mankind wherever they live go through all kinds of disasters, despairs, anxieties, fears, we are like the rest of mankind. I think the right question would be: what, as a human being who is the whole of mankind, if you realize that, that you are not a separate individual fighting your own little battles in your own backyard, as it were, between two human beings, but rather that we are, each one of us, is the rest of mankind. one may intellectually observe it, logically see that wherever one lives and whatever form of government, tyrannical or so-called democratic, Left or Right, and whatever their religious beliefs may be, man throughout the

world is in a state of confusion, state of despair, there is very little future for him. So if one realizes that we are the rest of mankind, then as a human being, who is the whole of mankind, what is he to do?

Then the question becomes extraordinarily wide and important. I do not know if we agree to this, if we see this thing together. That is, if we both of us observe the same thing - not according to one's own particular conditioning, as a Christian, Hindu or whatever it is, but seeing the actual that we are not separate individuals living in this planet, struggling, struggling, struggling but we are the rest of mankind, actually psychologically. Physically we may be different, we may be tall, brown, white, pink, black, whatever the colour, but inwardly, psychologically, deeply there is a great similarity, a common ground upon which we all stand. This is logical, this is real, this is not a theory invented by the speaker, an ideal to be pursued, some Utopia to be worked for, but an actuality, which is that each one of us is not a separate individual on this earth but we are the rest of mankind. One may intellectually, that is, verbally, theoretically, accept such a proposition, but the intellectual comprehension is rather superficial. But if one felt this actually in one's heart, in the very depths of one's being, that we are not individuals as we have been educated, conditioned, all religions have maintained that we are separate individuals, our separate souls, separate - to use certain Indian Sanskrit words, which we won't - that we are all separate individuals, each one seeking his own salvation, each one seeking his own fulfilment, fulfilling his own particular demands, which is what every human being in the world is doing. This is the common ground on which we stand. If

one - or when one actually realizes this, that our consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind, it is a tremendous revolution. Not only the verbal logical understanding of it but the feeling, the beauty, the passion behind it, the vitality behind such comprehension of truth, then one has a great deal of energy. The battle then is with the world not with your little self.

So our consciousness is made up of all our thoughts, is made up of all the contents of our civilization, traditional religions with their dogmas, beliefs, all that, and also the specialization, being educated in a certain direction, that is part of our consciousness. Part of our consciousness is our beliefs, our experience, our griefs, sorrows, pains, accidents, experiences, all that and more is our consciousness - right? Can we go on? Are we thinking together? I am not telling you for you to accept or reject but we are thinking together by observing what is going on in the world and what is going on inwardly in ourselves, and seeing what other human beings are going through, you must invariably come to this reality, to this truth that they are all whole, we are not separate. And our consciousness is put together by thought. Are we together in all this? Thought predominates all our activities, thought has constructed the atom bomb, the marvellous cathedrals and the things that are in the cathedrals. Thought has created all the travail, all the problems that we have. If we do not think at all, if there is no possibility of a single movement of thought, there would be no problem. Probably we would be like vegetables but we would have no problems.

So thought is responsible for fear, for anxiety, for sorrow, for the pursuit of happiness and the pursuit of what is called god,

enlightenment, it is all the movement of thought. Again it is not a particular theory of the speaker but it is an actuality. Thought has invented all the religions, all the content of the religions, the rituals, the dogmas, the beliefs, the hierarchical outlook of a religious mind, all the product of thought. There is no denying of that. Thought may say what is being said, in all the scriptures it is about thought, but it represents, is put down by thought, obviously. All the literature, religious and otherwise, is the result of thought. And our brains are trained to solve problems which thought has created. I think that is fairly clear. I hope you are all following this. Are we following each other - right?

Our brains are trained to solve problems, whether the problems be scientific, engineering, social or religious and so on, the brain through all these centuries has been trained to solve these problems. The brain is the movement of thought. We are only using a small part of the brain. The specialist will tell you this too, that we are not employing the whole of the brain but only a small part of it. And the part is conditioned by time, which is evolution, by experience, by knowledge, that part has been trained to solve problems which thought has created. See what the brain is doing. First it has been educated to act partially, and that partiality is the result of partial thinking. Thinking is limited because it is based on knowledge, on experience and so on memory, so knowledge can never be complete about anything - right? And so our thinking is limited. And that thinking creates the problems and our brains are trained to solve the problems which thought has created and so it is caught in the cycle - right? I wonder if we see this together - right?

Please, let's think together. Don't make an effort to think.

Probably you are not used to this kind of thinking but just observe. Let's observe together what thought is, how thought has created this tent, the electric light, the roads, the motor cars, the gods, all the things that thought has done is incredible. Not only has it created wars but also all the instruments of wars. It has created nationalities, divisions, the separate religious divisions, like the Hindus, the Buddhists, and so on. Thought has been responsible for it because thought says I must be secure. To be secure one must have a relationship with others, with those others who live in a community, the community being isolated, separate nationalities in which there is security, then that seeking security through nationalism is creating partly wars. So the problem is there again. Do you follow all this? Thought creates the problem and then tries to solve the problem. And in trying to solve the problem it becomes more and more complicated, which is happening in the world. The politicians are trying to solve problems, but they are not, they are increasing them. Like the gurus they want to solve problems, they are again multiplying them. This is happening.

So if we begin to understand the nature of thought, and thought being limited and knowledge also always limited, one must find a different action, not that of thought but there must be a different avenue, a different approach to the whole problem of existence. Is this somewhat - are we meeting together? We have approached the problem of existence with all the travail, with all the complexities of it, by the employment of thought, by the intellect, or romantically, emotionally, sentimentally. Neither of these two have worked, which is obvious. So there must be a different approach to the whole problem of existence. The existence which is common to

all mankind, not my existence, your existence, but the existence of mankind, living on this earth. Mankind that has suffered so enormously through innumerable wars and we are still perpetuating the same thing. I wonder if you have noticed that no one talks anymore about peace, even the priests have given that up, except the gurus who talk about peace somewhere else. There are no pacifists any more, there are really no deep conscientious objectors, nobody says, "Let's all be against war, the whole world". Nobody talks about it. They demonstrate against this or that, or they have peculiar isolated demands but nobody, as far as one observes and one may be mistaken, there is not a group of people, as there were in the ancient days, who says, "We are against wars, we will not kill under any circumstances" - and then the usual question: "What would you do if your sister is attacked?" - you follow? That is just an evasion of the real issue. I wonder if you have noticed this, which is an obvious deterioration of the world. Nobody says "I am entirely against wars." War means against nationalists, against separate gods, religion, the whole thing that is divisive - only then you can have peace. But if each one of us trying to find peace through or own little meditation, this or that, it is utterly meaningless.

So we have come back to the question: if thought is not capable of solving all these problems, human problems, the problems of relationship with each other, the problems that thought creates images, the problems of fear, sorrow, meditation, all that, if thought cannot resolve all these problems, which apparently it cannot, after all these millenia, we must look in other directions - right? Not pursue the same old traditional path. Are we prepared

for that? Are we prepared, or do we see that there must be a totally different approach to the whole problem of existence, whether it is sexual, religious, sensory, and all the rest of it. How will you find out a totally different approach which is not contaminated by thought, because one realizes thought is utterly limited? The problems are much too great which thought has created, and thought cannot solve them any more. If one actually, not intellectually nor emotionally but actually realizes it, as you realize pain, if one is passionately aware of it, then what is the other direction? Right?

How does one respond to a challenge of that kind? How do you respond to that question? Seeing that thought cannot solve these problems, technologically it can, a better means of killing, laser beams - you know all that. What is your answer? You are supposed to be educated people, some of us have been to college, universities, highly sophisticated and as one cannot escape from all this, even if you went off to some isolated monastery, or became a hermit, you would still have these problems. You may not want to look at them, you may turn your back on them but there they are. So what is your response?

There is another question arises from this, which is: the computers are taking over all our thinking. They outstrip man, they are going to, or already have done. They think much faster, they can learn and unlearn, and so keep on learning and discover that their learning is not complete and learn further. Which means they are being programmed by experts and the machines, these computers can learn not only from the professors, from the programmers, but from themselves. Probably some of you know

about this, you have read about it. We have talked to some experts on computers, and within ten years they say they will completely outstrip man. They think faster, learn faster, correct themselves, perhaps invent something new, new theories which man has not thought of. So there is this question. This is a very important problem for man. Of course the computers cannot look at the stars and enjoy the stars; they can compose, perhaps not like Beethoven. Perhaps they do not know what love is, but neither do we. So there is this machine which is ultra intellectual machine - ultra intellectual machine it is called. They are inventing this; it is so rapid. So what becomes of man? Do you understand? Look at the problems, please face the problems. What happens to us who have lived by exercising our brain, whatever little part of that brain is, and that little part is being taken over by a machine which is super brain, then what happens to each one of us? What happens to our brain which is no longer being employed as a thinking machine? I wonder if you follow all this? I am afraid you don't.

They are very concerned, some of us, we have gone into this a little bit, we are very concerned what is going to be the future of man. When the machine can take over all the activities of the brain, then what happens to the brain? Either - there are only two possibilities - either the brain pursues entertainment, football, which is already happening, sports, religious entertainments. That is one direction, to be amused, entertained. Or a totally different thing, which is go, pursue the inward process of man, the inward psychological discovery, deeper and deeper. Those are the only two possibilities left to man. But the entertainment industry is already gaining. The televisions - you know all this, I don't have to

tell you. And there are very few who are concerned with the psychological understanding of man, completely, not the psychologists, not the professionals, not the psychiatrists, but you and I, who are the rest of mankind, we have to discover whether our brains are being trained by the entertainment industry to pursue that line - please this is awfully serious all this, do please pay attention. Either we pursue that, or turn inward, not selfishly, not egocentric movement, or an ego trip, but to understand the whole psychological movement, the self, the me, the ego, and see if it is possible to go beyond all that. So those are the only two paths left for us when the computer takes completely over. The computer with the robot is already building cars. When the robot doesn't do it properly the computer tells it and it acts properly - you follow? So all that is being taken over gradually.

So what is a man to do? You understand my question? Do we think or observe individually, personally, from a particular condition, from a particular form of belief, prejudice? Or do we free ourselves from all that and turn inwardly, not selfishly, not saying "I must save my self" - that would be too silly. But to enter into a world which will eventually dominate the outer, which it is doing now - the ambitious politician may use party politics but the ambition, the personal ambition overrides everything else. This is all so obvious.

So psychologically one has to understand the whole structure of the human being. Is that possible? Have we time? Have we enough energy? Or is it all too vague? You follow my questions? It is like looking at a map. If you have a particular direction from here to there, then only observe the road, how many miles, what are the

towns you pass through and so on, so as long as you have a direction you never look at the whole map - right? So to understand the psychological structure of man, there needs be no direction. I wonder if you see this? Direction is a motive. As long as I have a motive to understand the psychological depth of humanity, which is as long as I want to be free from something or rather, then I have a direction, I have a motive, therefore I do not comprehend the whole psychological structure of man. You understand this? Are we thinking together? Or am I just talking to myself? So is that possible, first that mankind has developed a machine that is going to take things over, our thinking, it will learn faster, it will correct itself, build new machines from the old constantly improving much more rapidly than man can, till it reaches ultra intelligent machine. And realizing all that what is a human being to do? Please put yourself that question and answer it, not turn to a guru, to another priest, to another psychologist and all the rest of it. Let's find out together what we can do, because they have all failed us - right?

Do we want to solve our problems - the problems of relationship, problems of society, problems of war, the problem whether there is god or not, whether there is something beyond all time - are all these problems? Do we make of them problems? Or they exist, we have to find the truth of them, either they are false or true - right? To find out the truth of relationship, not the solution, or the issue which arises in relationship which must be solved. You understand the difference? That is, to find what is the truth of relationship. Not how to solve my problem with my wife but to discover for oneself the truth of relationship - right? You understand? Now what is relationship? The truth of it, not what I

would like it to be. What is the truth of it? Whether that relationship is intimate or not, what is the actual fact of it? Because if I know the actuality, the truth of it, then I can work at it, it can be dissolved. But if I am merely concerned with solving problems which my brain is trained to solve problems, then I am back in the old rut. I wonder if you understand this? Are we together in this? So I have to find out the truth of relationship. Or what is false in relationship. Both the positive and the negative, not in between. The fact in relationship is division - me and you. That is a fact. Why does this division exist? What is the truth or the falseness of this division between man and woman and so on? Why is there this division between people? Not the problems it creates and the pursuit of solving the problems it creates, but rather why the division exists at all? I wonder if you follow this? Is this getting too much? (What time is it?)

Audience: Twenty five past twelve.

K: Twenty five past twelve - goodness how time flies!

Why is there division between me and another who happens to be my wife, or my husband - why? What creates this division? This is a problem for all of us. Not only - you follow - the division between nations, the division between religions, the divisions between various gurus - you follow? The absurdity of it all! All of them saying, "We are seeking truth". Why is there this division? What has created this division? Is it one's particular demands - sexual, ambition, desire, each one of us seeking fulfilment in his own way, each one of us pursuing a path different from another? I am married, I am not but suppose I am married. I am ambitious to climb the ladder, the ladder of a certain career, my wife is also

concerned to succeed in some other direction. So is ambition the factor of this division? Please go into all this. I believe in god and she doesn't. I never enquire why I believe, I just believe. And she doesn't, she hasn't either enquired why she doesn't. We are both prejudiced and we hold on to our prejudices - is that the cause of division? Or is the cause of division much deeper than that? These are all superficial reasons. Is there a deeper cause which brings about this terrible division between human beings? Because of that division they are willing to kill each other. Is there a deeper cause? Think it out sirs, go into it. Is it our training, our education, religious and otherwise, that we are separate individuals, only sexually we meet and otherwise we are totally separate? I pursue my path worldly or otherwise, and she does the same. So is the division caused by this idea that we are separate? Psychologically, inwardly she suffers, I suffer. She is unhappy, depressed, moody and I am also on my own occasionally and so on. So is the root of all this division the concept of an individual? I know it goes against all tradition - you follow? Against all social, moral religious structure - we have to tear down all that because we have to understand that as we are now living we are going to destroy ourselves. It is happening. It is happening in Beirut - it may not be happening in England but it is happening in Far Asia.

So we have to understand very deeply and so eradicate that which is false, not the problems that falseness creates - right? So is this the root of it, that each one of us has been brought up to be separate individuals with his own soul, with his own - the whole of it - is that a fact? Or is it merely a concept? What is the difference between a fact and a concept? You understand? Concept being that

which has been put together by thought, by experience, by knowledge. That is a concept, something conceived, something that we have accepted through a million years of tradition. So that tradition may be utterly false. So the fact is something and the conclusion, concept is another. Right? The fact is I am separate from my wife. That is a fact. And my concept says, we are separate - you understand? Is my concept stronger than the realization that I am separate from her - the realization? You understand what I am talking about? The fact and idea are two different things - right? The idea is that I am separate, that is the idea. I want to find out if the idea is different from actuality. Am I actually an individual? Right? Am I? I suffer like you suffer, I am anxious as you are, I am frightened, as you are, I am lost, I am confused, as you are. So psychologically, inwardly, we are the same, with variations but we stand on the same ground. The ground may be unequal but it is the ground on which we all stand.

So the concept must be wrong. So can I be free from the concept, not from the problems, and face the actuality of what is? The actuality of 'what is' is that I am like you, that I go through hell as you do, tortured, disturbed. So the realization that I am like you altogether removes the image of you - you understand? No. I have created an image of you, as I have created an image of the things and the ministers and all that business, I have created an image about you, about my wife, you, or husband. That image has been put together through many years, or through many days. The creating the image is to be secure - right? I have an image of my guru - thank god I haven't got one, but suppose I have - I have an image of my guru, which I have built up through reputation, not

knowing at all what are the implications of it, because I am too gullible, I will accept anything anybody says about that, which I want to achieve also, so I accept, I build an image. The image is not the actual. I have an image about my wife. My wife is not the image, and that is one of the factors that divides - right? So image making ends when I realize we two are standing on the same ground - right? I stop building images - you understand all this?

So we are not concerned, either she nor me, with the resolution of problems, which is, if I am merely concerned with the resolution of problems then I am operating with a brain that is trained to solve problems. I wonder if you see this? And therefore I am beginning, caught in it and the solution of problems can never end because in solving one I create another, which is happening politically. We are a crazy crowd all right.

So one has realized that it is not important to solve problems but to face actually what is going on. What is going on, happening, is I have separated myself from you. That separation is the creation of image about you, and that separation is the education in which I have been brought up, the culture, the tradition that I am totally separate from you, which is so idiotic. It has no basis, and yet I accept such a concept.

So I now have moved altogether into a different dimension - you follow? Which is we are all standing on the same ground, man, woman, whether he is black, white, purple, or whatever colour he is. Inwardly we are tortured, all that. That is important to understand, not the problems that it creates - right?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 30TH AUGUST 1981

I think there are better things to photograph than the speaker.

One has to go over a little bit what we have been talking about yesterday. Perhaps there are some new people and if you don't mind we will go briefly over what we talked about last time that we met here. We are not doing any kind of propaganda, nor trying to persuade you to think in a particular direction, nor asking you to join anything, but seeing what the world is, the terrible mess it is in, we ought, if we are at all serious, to look at the actualities objectively, with clarity, without any personal prejudice.

And we were saying thought has been responsible for the great calamities of the world, and also thought has been responsible for the good things of life - surgery, communication and so on. Thought has done great harm both in the world of technology and in the world of religion. Thought has invented the tank, the submarine; thought has also invented the computer, it is being programmed and will outstrip man in his thought. And also it has created, invented all the religions in the world, and the content of those temples right throughout the world. And there is nothing sacred about thought, but yet what thought has invented thought assumes that it is sacred and then begins to worship that which it has created as being sacred. So thought is worshipping itself. It is a form of self illusion and self worship. And we were saying yesterday that thought can never be complete, whole because thought is based on knowledge, experience, memory. Without memory, without knowledge there could be no thought, we would

be in a state of amnesia. And thought, being partial and therefore never complete, never whole, whatever it creates must be partial, limited, and whatever it concedes as the supreme, as the immortal, as the timeless must also be limited.

And thought has created all our problems, both outwardly and inwardly, psychologically we have a great many problems, problems of relationship, problems of fear, pleasure and the enormous burden of sorrow, not only the personal but also the global sorrow of mankind. And where there is sorrow there cannot be love or compassion, which has its own intelligence.

And we were saying yesterday that we must, if we can, think together about the whole problem, of existence, not according to the speaker, or to your own particular point of view, but observing what the world is, that we human beings have created it and we together have to totally transform it. It is not the problem of one person, it is the problem or the issue for all of us. We cannot possibly escape from it.

And we were saying too that our consciousness which is the very structure and nature of our being, is the common ground on which all humanity stands. We said yesterday that wherever you go, whatever climate, whatever the environment, totalitarian or democratic, man suffers, man has carried the burden of fear and everlastingly pursuing pleasure. And there is a great deal of uncertainty, anxiety, confusion. This is common to all mankind whether they are brown, white, pink or yellow or black, this is the common ground on which we all stand. This is logical, rational, sane, this is so obvious. But we are unwilling to face that which is obvious, true because we are all thinking in terms of individuality,

separate entities, separate human beings. But when one observes psychologically, closely one sees that our consciousness of each one of us is similar to the consciousness of the rest of mankind. Where mankind suffers, mankind goes through a great many travails, anxieties, depressions, loneliness, confusion, misery, like each one of us. So we are the rest of humanity. Either you reject that entirely and say that we are all individuals, inseparable, or that may be an illusion in which we have been educated both religiously, socially, morally. Or you observe actually without any prejudice, without any conclusion, the actuality of the common ground on which every human being stands. Then and if you perceive that in its entirety, not only intellectually but deep down in one's heart, then our problem is not individual salvation, or individual problems but the problem of humanity, which is you and so we move away from the particular little problem to a much greater problem. What is the future of mankind when the computer takes over all our thinking, as it will, learns much quicker than we can, corrects itself and creates better machines than the first one that has been put together by man and so on? Of course the computer cannot love, cannot look at the stars, the beauty of an evening, but the computer can work out human problems much quicker and so what happens to man? This is not a question put by the speaker only but it is being put by all the so-called specialists who are involved in the computer business.

So our consciousness with all its content, the beliefs, the dogmas, the experiences, the rituals, the democratic, the totalitarian, the symbols which we worship, which have been created by thought, the fears, the pleasures, the pain, the loneliness,

the anxiety, sorrow, the content of our consciousness is all that. I don't think anybody can dispute that, it stands any kind of argument.

So either, as we pointed out yesterday, we pursue entertainment for the rest of our lives and the future generations, football, religious entertainments, and all that; or move totally in a different level. That is, to know oneself most profoundly, not according to any psychiatrist, not according to any philosopher, but to discover actually what we are, see actually all the complexities of our nature: and either go in that direction, or in the other. That is the problem in front of humanity. That is the crisis, not the financial, not the political, not the crisis of war but what man, you and the rest of us, in what direction shall we go, what is the future for us? Apart from the nuclear bomb and all the rest of it, are we serious enough to face this challenge, the crisis? That is, either we turn into understanding ourselves most profoundly, or live a very, very superficial life, entertainment of various kinds. And to understand ourselves is one of the most difficult problems. It is easy to understand the whole movement of entertainment, the industry, that is fairly simple. But to understand ourselves not according to anybody - Freud, Jung or the latest psychologist - but putting aside all those, to look at ourselves. Can we look at ourselves actually as we are?

In all of us there is the urge to become, to be somebody both outwardly as well as inwardly. Outwardly it is obvious, the worship of success. And inwardly there is always this movement to be something more than what one is because we don't know what one is first but we are always eager to be more than what we are.

The more or the better is the enemy of the good. So to understand ourselves, to look at ourselves, which is to be aware of all the content of our consciousness, is that possible?

I hope we are thinking together. Please the speaker is not giving a talk, a lecture, a sermon, which would be horrible. But we are thinking together. That may be one of the most difficult things to do because we are so concerned with our own thinking that we cannot cooperate in thinking together about the same thing, to look at it not from any particular point of view, to look at it freely, that seems to be one of the most difficult things to do.

So can we look at ourselves freely, actually at what is going on without any motive, distortion, or direction? Is that possible? As we have said, the content of our consciousness is put there by thought, the gods we believe in, the invented symbols by thought, all the fears, the enormous sense of loneliness, the violence, this whole content is you and I. Can we look at that content as a whole, or must we look at it bit by bit - fear, pleasure, pain, grief, loneliness, sorrow, love, death, meditation and so on and so on and so on? That is, our brain which is now functioning partially, that part is looking at the content of all the consciousness - right? That content can be perceived through relationship. That is the mirror in which the content of our consciousness can be observed. That relationship between one another, intimate or otherwise, in that mirror you can see your reactions of fear, possessiveness, domination, violence, sexually and otherwise, all the reactions and the responses in that relationship are revealed, if one observes it, if one is aware of it. Are those reactions to be examined one by one? That would take an enormous time, perhaps a whole life and that

would be impossible. Or can one perceive the totality of it at one glance? You understand my question?

Are we thinking together? Are you merely listening to the speaker? Please don't, it is worthless, then it has no meaning, you are just merely hearing a lot of words and ideas, but if we are thinking together, observing together, the whole structure of a human being, his existence, his reactions, his pains, his suffering, then we can together walk the same path, in the same direction, the same movement. So please we are thinking together and you are not merely listening to the speaker though he may act as a mirror for the time being. That mirror can be broken at any time, that mirror isn't worth keeping. But that mirror is merely that you can see what is actually going on.

So the question is: the content of our consciousness makes up the consciousness. In that consciousness are all these things, all the things put together by thought, even the ultimate principle, all the gods, all the saviours, is all put there by thought, conditioned by two thousand years of propaganda of Christianity, or perhaps four or five thousand years propaganda, tradition of India and so on.

So can we look together at the question say, for example, of fear, or look directly, simply at our relationship with each other? Let's begin with that because that is much closer. Wherever one lives one is related, it doesn't matter to what, to nature, to another person. What is that relationship? Not the problems that are inherent in relationship, not the problems but what is relationship? We are enquiring not into the resolution of problems in relationship, but rather enquiring together into the question of what is the truth about relationship. Is it merely sensory, sexual, is it

merely a companionship depending on each other, exploiting each other, trying to dominate each other, possess each other? Or is it much deeper? Please you are asking these questions, I am not asking only. So we have to enquire very closely and deeply into what is relationship because human relationship has created this society, the social order or disorder. Our relationship together is the outcome, is the giving birth to society. Society as it is now is based on aggression, violence, competition, hierarchical structure and is our relationship similar to that? - greed, envy, jealousy and so on.

So first one has to enquire very deeply into what is relationship? Is it merely a pursuit of pleasure, or the expression of one's desire, or is there basically, deeply love? So can love exist with desire? Or with pleasure? Or if they exist love is not? So one has to go into this very carefully to discover for ourselves, if we are at all aware, serious, and all that, whether it is possible to live a life in which relationship doesn't become a conflict. We partially talked about it yesterday. We said our relationship is now based on two separate individuals, two parallel lines like a railway, they never meet, perhaps they meet sexually but otherwise each pursues his own direction. And that relationship becomes distorted, in that relationship there is an enormous amount of conflict, misery, confusion, escaping from that relationship to another kind of relationship, in the new relationship the same thing exists and so we carry on.

So the deep cause of this division is thinking that each one is separate, obviously. "I am separate from my wife. I must fulfil in my way, and she must fulfil in her way. She must climb the ladder of success socially and I may not want to climb the ladder of

success socially but I want to climb the ladder of spirituality." So there is conflict between us. Each person wants his way. Each one is so consumed with his own selfish point of view. Is that the deep root cause of conflict in our relationship? And if it is, is it possible to totally wipe away this separate feeling? You are following all this? Is that possible? And it may be possible if we begin to understand the nature of ourselves, the structure of myself. What is myself? You understand? We are going into it. What am I? A name, a form, certain physical structure, apart from that I am the result of thousands of years - right? My brain has evolved through time, accumulating a great deal of experience, knowledge, both inherited and acquired genetically, which involved time, and the conditioning in which I have been born - Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, hot climate, hot food, cold climate, not tasty food and so on. Sorry!

Also the religious conditioning, the superstitions, the worship of symbols, not the actual but the worship of symbols, the image created by thought, or by thought, by hand, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals, you know, all that I am. My education, my ambition, the whole structure of me is not only the influence of the environment, the cultural but also the so-called spiritual, religious. And the religious conditioning is merely carrying on old tradition of belief, dogma, rituals, repeating certain meaningless words, so I am all that. That is what I am. That is what each one of us is, only different environment but basically the same. And my brain is operating only partially. This is really important to understand if you want to go into it deeply. My brain is functioning partially because knowledge is partial, knowledge can never be complete

about anything, even about the most complex technology it is not complete, there is always something new taking place. And the accumulated knowledge of experience is very limited. So knowledge always goes with ignorance. So the brain is trained in knowledge and continues to live in ignorance, they are both functioning. I hope you are understanding. And so the brain is functioning partially because it is based on knowledge. And so whatever it does must be partial and therefore its action must be partial and when the action is partial there must be regrets, pain, anxiety, worry, loneliness, and all that follows. And the partial activity of the brain has broken up life: the business life, the religious life, the family life, the spiritual life, the technological life - you follow? It has broken it up, because the brain itself is partial, it is not operating as a whole - right? Is this somewhat clear between us?

So relationship when based on thought, which it is now, because it is partial, there is division and therefore conflict.

The next question is: can the brain function as a whole? Right? Is that possible? Because we have been trained for thousands of years to only function partially. And we must understand together the partial effects in our life - fear as separate from pleasure, pleasure separate from pain, pain separate from sorrow and so on. Or can we look at the whole movement of existence as a whole? I hope we are understanding each other. May we continue along these lines?

We are saying it is possible. It is not a trick, nothing to be learnt from the speaker, not a new school to be started - you know, guru and all that nonsense. But one can discover this thing for oneself

and therefore you are then free from everybody, you don't depend on anybody. And we are going to go into that. That is, to find out for ourselves whether it is possible, though the brain has been for thousands of years only active partially, whether it is possible for the brain to function as a whole? And then it would have tremendous energy. Right? Not to do mischief but to live a life which is whole, unbroken and therefore a life that is good. Let's find out if it is possible.

First let's take out of the content of our consciousness fear. We have talked about relationship. Let's talk about together fear. You may not have fear sitting there now, I hope not. But our background, our daily life, either one is conscious of the various factors of fear or one neglects it, accepts it and carries on. That is, one has become accustomed to fear and therefore the brain naturally becomes dull. When one becomes accustomed to anything it becomes a routine, it is not active. Any specialized career though it is partially active the rest of it is inactive. So one of the factors of our life is fear - fear, so many forms of fear, fear of tremendous loneliness, fear of death, fear of darkness, fear of a dozen things. But can we look at fear as a whole, not my particular form of fear, my loneliness, but the fear both hidden and obvious, can one find out, discover or observe the whole movement of fear? Right? Is that possible? First of all can one observe holistically, if I can use that word which science is accepting, holistically, can we look at ourselves as a whole? Which is, take fear and look at it as a whole. That is, the cause of fear. When you discover the cause there is an end to the cause, surely. If I discover that I have cancer which is causing pain, then it can either be eliminated or I die.

So one has to discover for oneself, not be taught, not learn from somebody, but the root of fear. What is the root of fear? Is it time, time being the past, meeting the present and modifying itself in the future? The movement from yesterday, today and tomorrow, that is time. Is the root cause of fear time? The fear that tomorrow I may not exist. Fear of not being successful. Fear of being this and wanting that. And the wanting that and not being able to achieve that, and so on. So we are asking is fear a matter of time? Just wait, find out. Fear is also a movement of thought - right? I had pain last week and I might have pain again next week, there is the element of time. Thought which says, "I have had pain" - the memory of it, and that memory continues to next week and says, "Be careful, don't have pain again" - there is fear. So is fear, the root of fear, time and thought? Or time is thought? They are not two separate movements, time is thought. Right?

Are you getting bored with all this? It is a nice day, you can go out. So time is movement from last week, today and tomorrow, thought also is a movement born of the knowledge of pain of last week and not wanting it again next week. So time is thought; and so time, thought is the root of fear. Not how to stop time or thought, but we are observing the cause of fear, not what to do about the cause. If you act to eliminate the cause - please follow this carefully - if you wish to eliminate the cause then you are still caught in time. You may not be able to do it, then you search or ask somebody to help you and you are caught back again - you follow all this? Right?

That is sirs, let me explain again. I want to find out the root of fear, not trim the branches of fear but the very root of fear, the

cause of all my fear, loneliness, despair, fear of another, fear of being hurt. And I am hurt from childhood, from the other boys, parents, school, college, I am being hurt all the time. I am hurt because the cause is that I have an image about myself. The image which my parents have given me, society has given me, and the image which I have built about myself. So when I say I am hurt, the image which I have created for myself, which is me, the image is trampled upon and it gets hurt. And the consequences of that hurt is to resist, build a wall round oneself, becoming more and more lonely, avoiding - you know, all that business. So gradually I withdraw with all the neurotic symptoms. So I want to find out if it is possible to eliminate the root, to first find out the root and what to do about the cause. Right? Is my motive to be free of the cause because it brings fear, therefore I say my motive is to be free of it? When there is a motive that very motive becomes the fear. I wonder if you understand this? Are you following? All right. You look puzzled, I will explain.

I have discovered for myself the root of fear: time, thought. That is the cause, the basic cause, irrefutable. And my natural instinct is to be free of the cause so that I will be free from fear. A marvellous thing to be free from fear. So the motive colours the cause. Or the motive directs in what direction the cause will dissolve. I wonder if you are following this? Right? No? Gosh do we need to explain every darn thing!

What is a motive? The meaning of that word is movement. The movement is my desire to be free of the cause. My desire which says, "I must be free of that in order to be free from all pain of fear". What is my desire? What is desire? You follow? I started out

with fear, by examining what is the root of fear, I have discovered the root of fear which is thought, time, and my motive is to be free of it, which is my desire, my will, to be free of it. So I have to enquire into what is desire, which says I must be free of it. The desire itself may be fear, the desire itself may be the cause. So I have to examine very closely what is desire. We are doing this together please. I am not examining and you just listening.

Together we are examining, exploring, investigating, looking into the nature and the movement of desire. What is desire? Is it a sensation? Is it a sensation transformed by thought, with the image of being free from the cause? You are following this. Is this too much of a thing for you in a morning? That is, I have a sensation, the sensation is fear - right? It is a sensation, unpleasant, narrowing, an ugly thing. And I find the cause of it, and desire says get rid of the cause because the cause is a part of sensation, and desire is also part of sensation - right? And that sensation manifests itself by thought with the image of being free from the cause - right? Is this too much? All right, let's make it much simpler.

First I have a sensation that I must be free of the cause of fear. That is a sensation. The sensation which awakens the thought, being free of the cause. That is, I see something pleasant, the perception, the seeing, causing sensation, then contact, then thought creating the image of me having that blue shirt or blue dress or whatever it is - you follow? That is the movement - first perception, sensation, contact, touch, then thought says, "How nice I would look in that blue shirt" - or with that pink dress. So desire is a movement of sensation, then thought creating the image, from that moment desire is born. Is that clear? So then desire itself

becomes the cause of fear - right? Are we seeing this? I have traced the cause of fear to the basic cause, then desire says I must be free of it. That desire is the image of me being free. That image is going to be hurt - right? So I am back to fear. I wonder if you see it? Right? Can I go on?

So this is the whole movement of fear. Any action the partial brain takes with regard to it is still within the framework of fear. I wonder if you realize this. Right? That is, to have an insight into the nature of fear. That very insight dissolves fear. Then you might ask: what is insight? Shall I go on with all this? You are very patient on a hot day!

You see what we are trying to find out is whether the whole of the brain can operate, not the partial brain. Because if the whole brain can operate the things which the limited brain has created disappear. The part disappears in the whole - you understand? So I have to discover, we have to find out, whether it is at all possible for the whole brain to operate. Then whatever the part has created is dissolved. The part doesn't exist because it is whole - right? And insight is the perception, is the action of the whole because it is not based on time, it is not based on knowledge, on remembrance, but instant perception of the truth of fear. That is to open up the whole brain to act. Am I conveying something about this? That is sirs, look, we are operating now, our whole action is based on knowledge - experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action - right? That is how we operate: experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, thought, action, and from that action we learn more and repeat the pattern. That is simple enough - right? This is what is actually taking place all the time. Learning more, slowly or

quickly, acting and from that action learn more. This is the cycle in which thought is operating. And in this operation we have all the problems: linguistic, social, religious and so on. Right? And insight is not an action based on memory, on experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. It is free of all that. Surely you must have had occasions when you saw something immediately, instantly understood something, and from that deep understanding you act. It has happened to all of us, either partially as in the case of poets, artists, scientists, or with the really religious people, with the deep profound religious people, not the orthodox religion, they have a tremendous insight and the clarity of the whole thing is clear, is made clear. We will go into it as we go along.

One of the factors of this content of consciousness is the pursuit of pleasure, different from fear. We avoid fear, run away from fear, cover it up and pursue pleasure, sexually, in ten different ways. The pleasure of reputation, the pleasure of talking to you, which I haven't got, thank god! And so on and so on and so on. So what is pleasure? Why does man cling to pleasure, pursue pleasure? From time immemorial pleasure has been one of the principles that man has pursued in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of ten different ways - what is pleasure? Why this insistence on pleasure, both externally and inwardly? Is pleasure a memory? A remembrance of something in the past which gave you a delight? At the moment of perception, the delight, and then the remembrance of it and pursuing the remembrance not the fact - right? That is, pleasure, is it a remembrance? Pleasure as a future, is there pleasure in the future, which is hope and so on? So please examine, let's look together at this factor that human beings have

been pursuing for thousands of years, in the name of god, in the name of nations, every form of pleasure, why have we pursued pleasure, always avoiding fear and pursuing pleasure? Or, are they both related to each other? What is pleasure? You look at a sunset, all the glory of a sunset, the beauty of it, the radiance, the extraordinary light in the clouds, at that moment you have forgotten yourself and you are looking at the sunset. It is recorded, that delight, and you pursue the record, not the actuality of the sunset. Right? This is what happens. You may have had sexual pleasure, then the remembrance of it and the pursuit of it - or different forms of pleasure, you know, I won't go into all that. It is fairly simple. So is pleasure a remembrance? So is pleasure a thought? So is pleasure time? Of course it is. So thought, time, is the movement of fear as well as pleasure. I wish you would see this. not from me, see it for yourself, see the extraordinary reality of it: that thought and time have been the factors of pleasure, pain and fear.

And is love thought and time? Now we have associated love with pleasure, with all the problems involved in it, jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, dependency, all that. So one has to understand, go into this whole question of what is love. One can go into it verbally but the word is not the fact, the feeling, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the vitality of it. So if love is not desire - right? - and is not pleasure, then what is it? Does it come into being only when the self is not? The self is time and thought. I wonder if you are following all this? 'Me' is time and thought, and as long as that exists the other cannot possibly exist. Love cannot exist with selfishness. Selfishness may take different forms, cover it all up

with kid gloves and roseate colour, but it is still selfishness. That is the 'me' and the 'you'. As long as that element exists in one's heart obviously the other cannot exist. You may talk about the love of god, the love of Jesus, love of Buddha and so on, but that is empty words.

So is love the awakening of the whole of the brain? You understand? We have been carefully going into this. That is, we started out with relationship, the various forms of hurts, the image about oneself, and that image gets hurt, flattered and so relationship always remains separate, two railway lines never meeting. And fear is time, thought, as pleasure. Is love time, thought, a remembrance? And time, thought has put together the whole structure of myself, psychologically as well as genetically. And where that structure as itself exists love cannot possibly exist, obviously.

Then one might ask: what am I to do? I see this fact, I logically agree. I see the sanity of what you are saying but I am still terribly self-centred and I still love my wife. So what am I to do? Right? That is the obvious rather limited question. When you put that question: what am I to do? - what is the reason of that question, the cause of it? Either you are asking somebody else to tell you what to do, which of course there are thousands of people who will help you what to do; or you are asking that question to find out what not to do. You understand? If you ask what to do, it is simple enough, they will tell you - meditate, sit like this, breathe like that, levitate, pay so much - you follow? And all the rest of it. But you see if you ask or you realize that whatever you do is still selfish - right? You understand? If I say, "I must get rid of myself", it is still the

movement of the self. If you realize that then you don't do a thing.
That is total negation of action. What is total negation of action is
action - you understand? I wonder if you see that? Right?

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 1ST SEPTEMBER 1981

This is a question and answer meeting. Over a hundred questions have been sent in, more perhaps, and we cannot possibly answer all those questions. It would take a couple of months and I am quite sure you wouldn't sit here and I wouldn't be here too. So we have chosen some of the questions, and I hope you understand that we do not answer all the questions that have been sent in.

I wonder why one asks questions - not that one should not - but why? Whom are you asking that question, and from whom do you expect the answer? A question is a challenge, not only to the speaker but also to the person that puts the question. It is a challenge. Either one responds to it totally, that is, comprehending the whole content of that question, not trying to find an answer but rather enquiring deeply into the question itself, and that enquiry in itself is the answer. I hope we understand that. That is, you put a question to the speaker, it is a challenge. He responds to it, either partially or wholly, or you yourself who have put the question you are challenging yourself. And in the enquiry into the question, the very enquiry begins to unravel the answer. I hope this is clear.

So really there is only the questioner who is challenging himself and in that challenge responding. Whether he is responding accurately, precisely to the content of the question, or he merely wanders off. So here you are putting the question to the speaker but the speaker is throwing it back to you, and together we are enquiring into the question. Not that the speaker is going to answer the question and you wait for it, disagreeing or agreeing with it but

together we are enquiring into the question, not into the answer, because the answer is fairly simple, but the question itself indicates the whole content of the mind of the questioner. To enquire into that content of the questioner of his mind, one has to understand why the question has been put. It is not an impudent response to ask why such a question has been put. Is it casual? Is it just insulting? Is it just a superficial curiosity? Or is the questioner, now I am the questioner, deeply concerned with the understanding of the problem. I hope that is clear.

1st QUESTION: You have often said that no one can show the way to truth. Yet your schools are said to help their members to understand themselves. Is this not a contradiction? Does it not create an elite atmosphere?

The speaker has said that there is no path to truth, that no one can lead another to it. He has repeated this very often for the last sixty years. That is what the speaker has said. And the speaker with the help of others have founded schools in India and here and so on. And the questioner says: are you not contradicting yourself when the teachers and the students in all these schools are trying to understand their own conditioning, educating themselves not only academically as well as possible, but also educating themselves to understand their whole conditioning, their whole nature and the whole psyche of those people in the schools. One doesn't quite see the contradiction.

Schools, from the ancient Greek and ancient India and so on, are places where you learn, learn where there is leisure. Please go with me a little bit. One cannot learn if you have not leisure. That is, time to yourself, time to listen to others, time to enquire. Such a

place is a school. The modern schools all over the world are merely cultivating one part of the brain which is the acquisition of knowledge, technologically, scientifically, biologically or theology and so on. They are only concerned with the cultivation of a particular part of the brain which acquires a great deal of knowledge, outer knowledge - astrophysics, theoretical physics, architecture, engineering and so on, surgery, medicine, so they are cultivating only as far as one can see knowledge. That knowledge can be used skilfully to earn a livelihood, or unskilfully, depending on the person. The schools, such schools have existed for thousands of years. Here in these schools we are trying something entirely different. You don't mind my telling you all this. Are you interested in this? Not very much, but all right! (Laughter)

Here we are trying not only to educate academically, 'A' levels and 'O' levels and all the rest of it, but also to cultivate, to understand, to educate, to enquire into the whole psychological structure of human beings. Students come already conditioned, so there begins the difficulty. One has not only to help generally to uncondition but also to enquire much more deeply. This is what these schools with which we are connected are trying to do. They may not succeed - probably they won't - or probably they will. But as it is a difficult task one must attempt it, not always follow the easiest path. This is a difficult subject to go into but it doesn't create an elite?

What is wrong with being an elite? What is wrong with it? Do you want everybody, and everything, to be pulled down to the common denominator? That is one of the troubles of so-called democracy. It has been a problem in India - I won't go into all that.

So there is no contradiction as far as one can see. Contradiction exists only when you assert something and contradict it at another time. But here we are saying that no one can lead you to truth, to illumination, to the right kind of meditation, to right behaviour, no one because you, each one of us, is responsible for himself, not depending at all on anybody. And we are trying in all these schools in India, here and so on to cultivate a mind, a brain that is holistic, not just knowledge per se for action in the world, but not to neglect the psychological nature of man because that is far more important than the academic career. One must have in the present world, in the present civilization, whatever that civilization is, they must have the capacity to earn a livelihood, and apparently a certain kind of education is necessary, and most schools in the West and in the East are neglecting the other side which is far deeper and greater. And here we are trying to do that. We may succeed. We hope we do but we may also not. But we are doing something that is not done in other schools, it doesn't mean that we are the only school but we are trying to do it. There is no contradiction. Is that all right? I have answered the question.

2nd QUESTION: What is it in the human mind that wants to follow a leader, a guru, a system, a belief, be obedient to something?

Right? Otherwise you wouldn't be here, nor I. The questioner is asking: why is it that human beings from time immemorial, from the most ancient Hindus and Egyptians and afterwards other civilizations, why through all these periods of time why has man followed somebody - a political leader, a general, a high priest, a psychologist, a philosopher, why? What is it in the mind of the

human being that says, "He knows, I don't"? Because he knows he will help me to live a different kind of life, help me to get over my pain, my sorrow, my anxiety and so on and so on." So one being confused, the other is not, at least I think he is not, most gurus are but we attribute to them all kinds of fanciful romantic nonsense. So there is this first point: I don't know but you know - at least I think you know. You have the reputation, there are lots of other idiots like me following and the greater the following the more I feel it is accurate because so many people believe in that kind of stuff and I follow. That's one thing.

Also the leader, political, religious, as the gurus and so on, they have assumed certain authority, whether it is logical, reasonable, sane or illusory, they have assumed a sense of authority. They have received from the guru, a superior guru, the rest of it: apostolic succession and also the similar thing in the Sanskrit in India. It is an old game played by all the priests in the world, the leaders. So there is the question. The question is why human beings follow another. Let's enquire into it.

Is it because we are not clear, we are confused? Suppose I am confused and I choose you as my leader. I choose out of my confusion, not out of my clarity. Please see the sanity of it first, the logic of it, and then you can throw it out if you disagree. I am confused. My brain is in a state of contradiction, I am frightened, I have no psychological security, I come to you because you have a certain authority, a certain dress, certain paraphernalia around you and I come. I am impressed by the dress, by the people, by you know, the whole set-up. And you assure me that surrendering yourself to me and I will save you. Give yourself over to me

because I know, you don't, so I will help you. And I am only too willing and gullible because I want comfort, I want some security, I want some hope, someone on whom I can depend, in whom I have trust, in whom I know, or perhaps I think I know that he will guide me, help me, and he is only too willing to help me me. It begins very gently, there is the inner circle and the outer circle, and the outer and outer circles, and gradually that help becomes dependence, and I depend on my guru, on my priest, on my leader - the political leader of all the various countries. I don't know why we are slaves to the politicians all over the world. I don't know if you have ever enquired into it. We have elected them, or they have assumed power in the Totalitarian States and they put their thumb on you and for the rest of your life you are stuck. Or in the Democratic world it is every five or seven years you change. But it is the same. You elect them out of your confusion and there they are. They are confused and every seven or five years this goes on. And it is exactly the same thing with the gurus. "I don't like that guru but I like the other one. He is more indulgent, he allows me to do what I like" - You know many gurus have come to see the speaker many times. The funniest one of them all (laughter), he had been in that particular country for many years and he came to see me with all the robes and beads and all the rest of it. And he said to me most respectfully because he assumed I was the guru of gurus, and he said, "Sir, I have been in this country for many years. I have talked all over the different parts of this country. I have a large number of followers but I have run out of ideas." (Laughter) "So I have come to you and so please give me some ideas." (Laughter). I am not - we are not joking but this was an

actual fact.

You see when we have really understood why we follow, why a guru assumes authority, why he demands so many things, or allows another follower to throw off his inhibitions, doing what they like, sex, you know the whole performance, the ugliness of all that. I naturally feel there is somebody who will help me, so why do I ask help of another? That is the real point. Apart from joking about all this, this is a very serious problem because they are multiplying these gurus, with enormous wealth. Think of a religious man having enormous wealth and property, millions and millions of dollars, thousands of acres, hundreds and thousands of followers, what is wrong to allow such a thing to happen in a world that is already so utterly destructive, so degenerated, to allow the so-called religious people, who are really not religious, to acquire such wealth, such power. And because they have enormous amount of money they bribe - you follow? - they skip through all the regulations and rules.

So, why do we allow all this? Why do we allow terrorism, for example? Which is spreading. And is it because we are slack, indulgent, what does it matter, indifference? Or do we really want to find somebody to help us? Some honest man, not a guru, they merely repeat over and over again, you follow you have seen all this. Look sirs, I am not attacking anybody personally, please I wouldn't do that. But for over sixty years I have watched this, one cult after another, one guru after another, more and more wealth accumulating, private planes, and they are all religious people. So the world has gone mad and we are helping these people to go still madder.

So we come back to this question: why do I want help from another? If I am physically sick I go to a doctor. If I have cancer I consult specialists, he puts me on a table, or kills me, it is the end of it. But psychologically we are also diseased. Psychologically, inwardly, we are wounded people. And we hope others will cure us. And this has been the story of mankind, from the ancient civilizations, from the Sumerians and so on, until now, we are still doing the same. We are psychologically unhealthy, and we are depending on another to cure us. And we have not been cured. That is the first thing to realize. You can go from guru to guru, from guru to guru, as so many are doing, it is so thoughtless, and you are still unhealthy psychologically at the end of it. So if we realize first be aware that we are inwardly unhealthy - I am using that word without any further meaning than that - wounded people, disappointed people, lonely people, full of pain, anxiety, sorrow. It is all an indication of lack of health. Now can anybody cure you of it? You understand? Historically from the very ancient of times man has always looked to somebody else. And up to now they are still doing the same, which all indicates that nobody outside can cure you. Nobody. Your saviours, the Buddhists with their Buddha, and the Hindus with their - and so on - none of them have succeeded, or will ever succeed in bringing about psychological sanity, rationality. So if I realize that - right? - logically, sanely, if you have observed all that then what am I to do? That is the real question. What am I to do when I have discovered that nobody can help me - prayers, meditation - wait a minute, I must be careful here.

Meditation is very important in life. But that meditation must

come after putting the house in order, your house, inside, otherwise it merely becomes an illusion, it leads to illusion, fanciful images and all things of silly experiences, they have no value at all.

Meditation has got immense significance when the house is in complete order. But we have turned it the other way round: we meditate hoping to put the house in order. Or meditate hoping some kind of miracle will take place that will put the house in order, the house being oneself. The other way round - you follow? The speaker generally talks about meditation at the end of the talks. He has done this purposefully because all that he has said previously is to bring about order in the house. A man who is frightened, is pursuing pleasure, he can meditate until he is blue in the face, stand on his head, cross legged, do all kinds of things that have been prescribed by the innumerable gurus, he will still be what he is, perhaps a little modified, but basically he is still a frightened entity. So we are saying begin the other way round, then meditation is a marvellous thing which we will talk about next Sunday. That is not an enticement! (Laughter)

So if I cannot depend on anybody to heal my wounds, my state of psychological health, I have to look to myself. I cannot depend on anybody when I say that am I frightened. Please enquire with me into this question: When I say to myself I must stand alone, nobody can help me, because I have realized I have been through various gurus, studied, prayed, meditated, at the end of it all I am what I have been when I started. So logically, sanely, I observe that nobody can help me. It is not that I become cynical, it is a fact. And am I willing to stand alone? I need companionship, I need to talk to somebody, but they are not going to become my gurus, they

will be my friends, but I will talk about it but I realize deeply I cannot depend. I depend on the postman, the milkman, and so on but inwardly there is no dependence because I realize also that attachment, which is to give oneself over to the guru, that very attachment leads to corruption - right? I don't know if you have noticed this: any form of attachment, to any person, to any belief, to any ideas, to any country, and so on must inevitably breed corruption. So I realize all that. So what am I to do? Can I be a light to myself? I am not a light to myself now, I am a confused entity. Personally I am not, we are talking about it together. I am a confused entity and you tell me to be a light to yourself. I understand that very well, logically, intellectually but I am not a light to myself. I am terribly confused, deeply wounded, unhealthy psychologically, I am unbalanced, neurotic, romantic, sentimental, so I take all that in. I am all that. So what am I to do? To study myself I must have a book about myself, and you are willing to give me that book. And I refuse that book, what you write is myself. You are writing out of your confusion, like most psychiatrists - sorry about that! So I have to have a mirror in which I can see myself. I hope you are following all this. We are talking together. We are investigating the question. I have to have a mirror in which I can see exactly what is going on. And no hardware store is going to supply that mirror, no shop, no guru. You follow? I have pushed aside all that. So I must have a mirror in which I see myself accurately, without any distortion. What is that mirror? We are enquiring, please, I am not telling you, we are enquiring. That mirror is relationship, relationship with my neighbour, or with my wife. That is the only relationship I have. In that relationship,

which is the mirror, I see myself as I am, jealous, anxious, frightened, possessive, attached, hurt, anxious. The more I am anxious the more I am attached. My family becomes all important. So in that whole relationship I begin to see myself accurately as I am - my sexual demands, my arrogance, my vanity, the ugliness of what I am. Or assume that I am extraordinarily beautiful. But the mirror shows me that I am not.

So what is shown in the mirror is far more important than what I should be. I wonder if you follow all this? The mirror doesn't show me what I should be. That is the beauty of that mirror. That mirror shows me exactly what I am. I may turn away from it. I may escape from it, which we generally do. But if I say to myself nobody can help me, then I am looking at that mirror, and that mirror is showing 'what is', not 'what should be'. And perhaps I don't like 'what is', and the psychologist and others say, "Express yourself as you are, immediately." And again I depend. So I am all the time aware that people are trying to brainwash me according to their own pattern, and I refuse. And I begin then to have a great deal of vitality, naturally. I hope this is clear, is it? I see 'what is', not 'what should be', which is the future. I see exactly the present. The present 'what I am', in that mirror of relationship. But what I see is me, I am not different from what is shown there. I don't know if you follow this carefully. That which is seen is me, I am not different from that. That is clear obviously. But my thought says "No, I am different from that. I won't accept that." That thought says, "I am different, so I must control it, I must shape it." So the battle begins. You understand? I hope you are following. The battle begins, the struggle, the conflict, all the travail that goes

on when I refuse to acknowledge actually what is shown in the mirror. What is shown in the mirror is me, I am not different from that. That is a tremendous realization because thought is always saying "You are different. You know more", and so on. So there is a division between that which is seen in the mirror and that which thought has accumulated in the past, which is the observer, the witness, the see-er, you follow? Right? Am I making this complicated? Thank god!

So one of our difficulties is then the observer says, "I am different from that which is observed." - because traditionally through millenia I have been educated in the separative action, that 'what is' is different from me. You understand? That is, to make it very simple, look at it. When there is anger there is only that state. Later on that reaction, later on I say "I have been angry. I shouldn't be angry." Or I rationalize why I am angry. Which is I am different from anger. The moment I said, "I have been angry" I am different from anger. I don't know if you see this. But when you realize that which is shown in the mirror of relationship is 'what is,' and 'what is' you are, the division entirely comes to an end - right? And therefore conflict comes to an end. Are we following? We are eliminating altogether conflict, because it is conflict that wastes away our energy. The intellectual, the emotional, the energy that is needed to remain with 'what is' because we are refusing to stay with 'what is'. We are moving away from it all the time, verbally saying "That is anger, that is greed, that is violence" - these are all verbal descriptions of 'what is'. The word is not that. I wonder if you follow this - right? The tent - the word 'tent' is not the actuality. So can I remain absolutely with 'what is' without the

division of "I should be", or "I am different from 'what is'" - 'what is' is me, the observer, and the observed is me. So there is no division and therefore total end of conflict because I remain with 'what is'. I refuse to move out of that state. So I am looking at that state. I am observing it, looking, looking, looking. That needs attention. Attention means energy which I have been wasting by separating myself from that and fighting over it. You understand? Are we wasting our energy now?

So I realize - we realize together now that we are not dependent on anybody. That means no saviours, no symbols, nothing. We are dealing only with 'what is', which is my whole wounded psyche. That wounded psyche cannot be helped or cured by another. When I realize that in the depth of my being then the mirror becomes all important, relationship. Then relationship has an extraordinary vitality.

So if you penetrate into all that then you become entirely a light to yourself. When there is a light to yourself experiences are not necessary. It is only those who are asleep that experience is necessary. But if you depend on experiences to wake you up, you are still asleep. I wonder if you see all this?

We can go on talking like this endlessly. The speaker has been doing it for over sixty years but words have very little meaning. It is only when we realize the truth of all this that it has got tremendous vitality. I do not know if you have not noticed as we grow older we are losing our capacity to think clearly, if we ever saw clearly, even in childhood. As we grow older our brain not only is not receiving enough blood, the arteries are beginning to deteriorate - too much drink, too much everything, not enough

exercise, proper exercise, please don't go off into yoga and that kind of stuff. So our brain is gradually deteriorating, senility may begin at the age of thirty, when you are constantly repeating - I am a Christian, I am a Hindu, I am a Democrat, I am a Socialist, I am this, I believe in god, I follow that man - you follow - that is all indications of senility. Please don't laugh it away. It is a fact. When we are caught in routine, psychologically - think of a man spending - or a woman - fifty years every morning going to the office. Think it out.

So at the end of the question and after investigating the whole psychological structure of obedience, obeying another, if you realize that you have put aside all that. Any intelligent man does it. Then only you become a light to yourself and perhaps in that light various other things can take place.

3rd QUESTION: I am in pain. However I try to meet it I do not come to the totality of the fact. It invariably remains partial and becomes an abstraction and the pain continues. How can I penetrate the problem without it becoming theoretical?

Right? The questioner is you and I. The questioner which is you and I saying "I am in pain" - not merely physical pain but the psychological pain which I have endured for many, many years. And I have tried to analyse it, I have tried to understand it, I have tried to go to the very root of it, which is the totality. And at the end of my long strenuous enquiry I have still the pain left. And apparently it is becoming an abstraction, a theory which I am grappling with, not with the fact but my appreciation and my investigating has made that an abstraction. You follow this? Right? Are you tired?

I have pain. Pain psychologically he means here, I think. I may have physical pain but I can put up with it or go to a doctor. I can do something about it. But the psychological pain, it is a fact. I know it as a fact because I have pain every day. But in the process of understanding the pain, my understanding is partial and being partial it becomes gradually an abstraction. So I have a problem now: the pain and the abstraction which is born out of the examination, which is not complete, I have made an abstraction, a theory of it. You follow? That is, I have pain, I am wounded - we will use that word - I am wounded, hurt, pain. And gradually it has become an idea - you follow? So I have now a different problem: the idea opposing the fact. I wonder if you see all this? Can we go on with this?

We are divided that way: the idea and the fact. Or the idea about the fact - right? See how we are complicating everything. The fact is there, I am hurt. Then I have an idea, which is I must not be hurt. And how am I then to get out of it, not to be hurt. The idea becomes far more important than the pain itself because my whole endeavour is directed towards moving away from it - right? That becomes the theory, a theory which is opposed to the fact. See, this is our life - the bible, the Upanishads, the Gita and the Koran say something and our life is different. So there is always this battle, conflict - the idea and the fact. The meaning of that word 'idea' originally in the Greek and so on, is to observe. You understand? To observe 'what is', not make an abstraction of it - right? We live in abstractions. I wonder if you see all this? My husband should be that. My wife is not that. You follow? I am brutal, I must not be brutal, and so on and so on. Always the avoidance of the fact by

escaping to the theory, to the idea, to the ideal.

If that is clear then the question is: I am hurt, I have been wounded from childhood - right? From my parents, from other boys, because I happen to be a little sensitive. My parents have scolded me, beaten me, harsh words, do, don't do, and the other boys too. So right through life, school, college, university if I am lucky enough, I am being hurt all along, being compared with somebody much better than I am, much more clever, getting greater marks - you follow? This whole educational movement is a process of getting hurt - compare, compare, compare. You are not important, the other fellow is important. This is actual, I am not exaggerating. So I am hurt, that is a fact. m The gentleman probably means in this question: I am in pain. We are taking it for granted that it is not physical pain but psychological pain - we may be wrong. We are talking about psychological pain - right?

So the pain is being wounded, being hurt, being criticized, being scolded, all that is the pain. Or the pain that I have induced by wanting something more than I am capable of, by comparing myself with somebody who is far more intelligent, brighter, nicer looking and all that, and through that comparison I have hurt myself. This is a common factor for all human beings, this goes on. So I am hurt and I have analysed it and analysis has not solved the problem. I do not know if you want to go into the whole meaning of analysis, perhaps not now because the analyser is not different from the analysed. It is a waste of energy to analyse.

I don't understand what the gentleman is saying. What sir?
(Inaudible question)

I don't quite follow what you are saying sir. Why don't I talk

about beautiful things, why talk about pain, the more you talk about it the more you strengthen it, the gentleman says. Yes sir, I have got it. Now we have talked about beauty. Beauty is not the opposite of ugly. Pain is not the opposite of not having pain. It is pain. When you talk about the opposite you are avoiding the present. Would you mind letting me finish what I am saying? I am sorry sir, we are trying to answer the question. All right. Toothache is not real. Pain, you understand, is not real, the gentleman says. Perhaps to him it is not real but to most human beings it is a very real thing and that is why a great many hospitals are crowded with these people who have pain, not being able to solve it and going off into neurotic states and these hospitals are filled with them. So we are not talking about something unreal, illusory. It is an actual fact. Please sir, if you don't mind let us finish this question. If you don't want to listen close your eyes, ears.

Aren't we most of us hurt? Or we are unaware of that hurt? Or we have totally become used to it and therefore we don't know we are hurt? It is like living in a filthy slum and we are used to it. And we are talking about actual psychological pain, when you are not loved and you want to be loved, when you love somebody and that somebody turns his back on you, you are hurt. We know all this as well as we know toothache. So we are talking about this deep psychological hurt, we are not exaggerating it, we are not emphasizing that hurt by talking about it, but we are looking at it together. We are communicating with each other about it, and to communicate with each other we must employ words. If we spoke Italian or French it would be in Italian or French, but as we are speaking in English it must be in English, which is to use English

words to communicate about something which is common to all of us, which is, being hurt in different ways. And if one becomes conscious of it, aware of it, and sees the consequences of that hurt, that is, fear, not to get more hurt, so building a wall round oneself, isolating oneself, afraid of others who might hurt you, always seeking companions who will be pleasant and avoiding, always on your tenter hooks - you follow? - nervous, so gradually becoming neurotic. The consequences of that hurt is not only a withdrawal from other human beings who might hurt but also gradual isolation taking place. And through that isolation all kinds of neurotic habits and attitudes and behaviours.

So when one observes this, is the hurt different from you who have an image about yourself? You understand my question? That is, I have an image about myself: I am a great man, or I am this or that. And that image has been created from childhood, you must be somebody - Julius Caesar if possible, or a great saint if possible, or the top executive, or one of those politicians. You must be somebody. And gradually one builds up an image about oneself. Noble or ignoble, insufficient or sufficient, there is that image in most people. And when you say something harsh, being my wife, husband or friend or neighbour, I am hurt, which is, the image is hurt, which I have created about myself. That image is me. And when I say I am hurt, I am saying not only the image which I am, but also the maker of that image. You are following this? So I am not different from the image which I have built about myself, and when there is hurt it is the image that is hurt, with which I have identified myself as the me, so I say I am hurt. And the whole of society, the social structure, the moral, the religious structure is

helping me to maintain that image. Obviously. And so as long as I have that image I am going to be hurt. Do what I will, try to suppress it, run away from it, analyse it, go to an analyst, and all the rest of it, it always will remain because I have the image about myself.

Now the question is: is it possible to live without a single image? That is the real question. Not how to be not hurt. Or being hurt how to be free of that hurt. But the real question is: as long as there is an image, that image will retain that memory of that hurt and avoid the future. So the question is: is it possible not to have a single image about your country, about yourself, about anything? Why do we have images about ourselves and about our neighbour, wife, somebody or other, why? About politicians - all images, who is the present minister here, oh, Mrs. Thatcher. You all have images about everybody but the most important image is yourself, why? Is it because it gives one a security, a port of safety, a port which is permanent, which is unshakable, secure and that image sustains you, and that image as long as it exists, however much it may protect you, is going to be hurt. There is always somebody better, more beautiful, more clever, more this, more that.

So the question is not how to be rid of the image or what is the machinery that makes the image, which is fairly simple, which is our thinking about ourselves endlessly. That is not the question. But the question is: is it possible to live a life without a single image, living in this modern world, that demands that you have an image, and be completely free of the image? Because you see the image is inevitably going to be hurt. Inevitably. And if you like being hurt and enjoy being hurt, there are people sadistic and

neurotic and all kinds of people love that kind of thing. A friend of mine long ago said, "How can you say love cannot exist where there is jealousy? If I am not jealous of my wife I have no love for her." You understand? So similarly I realize that as long as I have an image I shall be hurt. That is a fact. And my enquiry now is to live without a single image. And it is possible totally - don't accept my word for it but you can enquire into yourself if you want to - to live a life without a single image about anything, only when you realize the nature of that image, how it has been put together, how thought and desire and all the things that sustain it, when you see the fact of it, the truth of it, then the image-maker comes to an end. Then you are a mind that has no image, which means a mind that is totally, completely free. And most people don't want to be free, it is too frightening. So they go back to their pet image.

So at the end of this morning's talk for an hour and a half nearly, where are we? Do we actually see an image is the most destructive way of living? Do we actually see that following another will never cure our illness? The cure, sanity, health lies when one is totally a light to oneself.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 3RD SEPTEMBER 1981

I am glad it is nice weather!

As we said the other day in answering these questions, there are too many of them. We can't answer all of them and we have chosen some which I hope will be representative of all the other questions. We can together examine the question, explore as far and as deeply as possible into the question, but there is no end to talking, to answering questions and reading. But if we don't put any of them into action, into our daily life they have very little meaning. And it is becoming more and more difficult in a very complex society to live a sane life. By sane I mean a life which is whole, healthy, normal, and therefore holy - h-o-l-y. We have lost all sense of simplicity, not in clothes, I don't mean that. Simplicity of outlook, simplicity in our life, to be not so terribly self-centred, that is becoming more and more difficult, and it seems rather difficult to live a life that is free from all the cruelties and the bestialities, and the vulgarity of life. And during all these meetings that we have had here for the last thirteen, fourteen years and all over the world there seem to be so few who really apply, who are consistently, continuously applying what we hear and to find out the truth of it and live it. And not escape into some kind of idiotic, foolish ashramas - the word ashrama means in Sanskrit, retreat. It is good to have a retreat but not in a concentration camp which the gurus have cultivated. So in answering all these questions, please we are together examining them, together we are seeing the whole implication of these questions and see if it is possible to live a life

of sanity in this world.

1st QUESTION: We find ourselves living in fear of war, of losing a job, if we have one, in fear of terrorism, of the violence of our children, of being at the mercy of inept politicians. How do we meet life as it is today?

How do you meet it? One must take it for granted that the world is becoming more and more violent, it is obvious. The threats of war are also very obvious - South Africa, the Middle East and so on. And also it is a very strange phenomena that our children are becoming violent too. One remembers a mother coming to see us one year, in India. The mother was horrified because in the Indian tradition mothers are considered with great respect. And she came to see us and said, "My children have beaten me" - an unheard of thing in India. So this violence is spreading all over the world. And there is the fear of losing a job, as the questioner says; facing all this, knowing all this how does one meet life as it is today?

I don't know. One knows for oneself. I know how to meet it for myself but one doesn't know how you will meet it. First what is life, what is this thing called existence, full of sorrow, overpopulation, inept politicians, all the trickeries, dishonesty, bribery that is going on in the world, how does one meet it? So one must first surely enquire: what does it mean to live? What does it mean to live in this world as it is? How do we live our daily life, actually not theoretically, not philosophically or idealistically, but actually how do we live our daily life? If we examine it, or are aware of it seriously, it is a constant battle, constant struggle, effort after effort, having to get up in the morning is an effort. What shall we do? It comes down to that. We cannot possibly escape from it.

One used to know several people who said the world is impossible to live in, and they withdrew totally, completely into some Himalayan mountains and to the Sierras of California and disappeared. That is merely an avoidance, an escape from reality. Or to lose oneself in a commune, or join some guru with vast estates and get lost also in it. Those people do not obviously solve the problems of daily life, or enquire into the change, or into the psychological revolution of a society. They escape from all this. And we, if we do not escape and are actually living in this world as it is, what shall we do? Can we change our life? To have no conflict at all in our life, is that possible? Because conflict is part of violence. This constant struggle to be something, both in the world, economically, socially, morally and inwardly, to be something is the basis of our life - the struggles to struggle.

Can we, as human beings living in this world, change ourselves? That is really the question. Radically, psychologically transform ourselves, not eventually but not admitting time. For a serious man, for a really religious mind, there is no tomorrow. This is rather a hard saying: but there is no tomorrow, there is only the rich worship of today. And can we live wholly this life? And actually, daily, transform our relationship with each other? That is the real issue. Not the world, what the world is, the world is us. One more and more sees the actual reality that the world is us. Please this is so: the world is you and you are the world and the world is you. That is an obvious, terrible fact. And if we don't meet that challenge completely, that is to realize that we are the world with all its ugliness, we have contributed to all this, we are responsible for all this: what is happening in the Middle East, in

Africa and all the craziness that is going on in the world - we are responsible for it. One may not actually be responsible but our grandfathers, grandmothers and great grandfathers have been responsible - slavery, thousands of wars, Empire, the brutality of empires, of which we are a part. And if we don't feel very responsible for all this, which means responsible utterly for ourselves, what we do, what we think, how we behave, then it becomes rather hopeless, knowing what the world is, knowing that we cannot individually, separately, solve this problem of terrorism, which is the problem of governments, to see that its citizens are safe, protected. They don't seem to care. If each government was really concerned that its own people must be protected there would be no wars. But apparently governments have lost sanity too, they are only thinking party politics, of their own power, position, prestige - you know the whole game.

So can we not admitting time, that is tomorrow, the future, live in such a way that today is all important? So one has to become so extraordinarily alert to our reactions, to our confusion - you know, work like fury on ourselves. And that is the only thing we can do apparently. And if we don't do that there is really no future for man. I do not know if you have not followed some of the headlines in the newspapers, they are all preparing for war. And if you are preparing for something you are going to have it - like preparing a good dish. And apparently the ordinary people in the world don't seem to care. Those who are intellectually, scientifically involved in the production of war don't seem to care. They are only interested in their careers, in their jobs, in their research. And those of us who are fairly ordinary people, so-called middle class, if we

don't care at all, then we are really throwing up the sponge. And the tragedy is that we don't seem to care either. We don't seem to get together, think together, work together. We are only too willing to join institutions, organizations, hoping organizations, institutions will stop wars, will stop butchering each other, they have never done it. Institutions, organizations will never stop any of this; it is the human heart and the human mind that is involved in this.

Please we are not talking rhetorically but we are facing something really very, very dangerous. We have met some of the prominent people who are involved in all this, they don't care. But if we care and our daily life is lived rightly, if each one of us was aware of what we are doing daily, then I think there is some hope for the future.

2nd QUESTION: Is man's search for something truly religious simply an extension of his eternal acquisitiveness, selfishness or is it something entirely different, not a reaction, but a deep fundamental movement towards an ultimate reality?

This is a very complex question. Let's go into it carefully. Why do we search? Why do we seek something? We are always seeking, why? Is it that we are so utterly discontent with everything that we touch, see, smell, feel? Is it our search is really deeply for satisfaction? We may call it the search for truth - the search for god, search for happiness, search for this or that, but is it that we are all seeking some kind of deep, abiding contentment, satisfaction in one form or another? You might call it god, you might call it truth - give it any other name one likes, is it that we want an abiding, lasting, unshakable contentment, some deep security? And is there ultimately security and contentment? What

is security?

Let's examine please together. What is security? We need to have security physically, to have a roof, clothes, food. That is absolutely essential. But in an overpopulated world that is still lacking. If you go to the Eastern countries, Africa or India, or those countries, where fifteen million people are born every year, adding to the population in India - fifteen million people every year. That is as much as the population of Holland every year it is added. Governments are inept to control, birth control and all the rest of it. And also the problem there is, they are religious. They believe in reincarnation and the souls are waiting to be reborn - so give as many births as possible. And those people have no security at all physically. India is having nearly seven hundred million people. There is overpopulation in Europe too. And we are all seeking security - security physically. And that too is being denied in the affluent societies like Europe and America because they are also preparing for war. They talk about having physical security, some of them, or the majority of them have physical security but always there is the threat of war that denies physical security. National division prevents security. That is, tribalism is preventing security.

And also we want intellectual or psychological security. The churches throughout the world, the temples, the mosques give you psychological security, at least they think they give it. The book - you know all that. And is there psychological security at all? Please let's talk it over together. One feels one needs psychological security, to depend on something. To possess something that is unbreakable. So we invent a belief - a belief in god, belief in something or other. It is invented by thought. And that invention

we think is necessary to be secure. I am a Christian, I believe in a saviour, I worship, I hold on to that. And they do the same in India, all over the world with their own particular form of belief and faith. And when we look at it closely, intellectually even, and if you look at it much more deeply, it is fear. Fear of not being anything, fear of losing your experiences, your values, all that. And we hold on to something that is illusory. Now a man, or a woman, when we use the word 'man', the woman is included please. Don't let's become Women's Lib and all the rest of it. When man, seeking security, finds some kind of thing, however illusory, however neurotic, he clings to it. And he will fight for it, kill for it, you have seen all this. So is there any security at all psychologically? Please think it over, let's talk it over together. I want security psychologically. I find security in the belief of Nationalism. I find security in god, if I don't find it in god I will find it in some theory, in some ideal, or go off abroad, to the Asiatic world, and find something that they have thought out for the last three, four thousand years. So I am always seeking that security. And intellectually I see the absurdity of it, the foolishness of it, the illogicality of it, but yet emotionally I want to have something in me that I can rely on. Is there something?

There is something only when I realize completely that all the theories, the beliefs, the dogmas, the nationalisms are illusory; the very realization that they are false is the action of intelligence. I wonder if you see that. To realize something that is illusory, that is false, that has really no substance behind it, that very realization is the action of intelligence. That intelligence is the total security. Are we meeting each other? I have accepted say, for example, suppose

that I have accepted some kind of belief which has given me, and my fathers, my grandfathers, generations, a certain security, and I realize - their grandson realizes that what they believed, what they have put upon me is illusory, it has no meaning. That perception itself is intelligence and that intelligence is total security. Nobody can destroy that intelligence. That intelligence is common to all of us, it is not my intelligence, or yours. It is the intelligence of perception. It is the intelligence that says these leaders, inept politicians, the gurus, all that is so nonsensical. The realization, the perception is the abiding intelligence, which is the everlasting security. Do we see that? Not theoretically, not as an ideal but actually say "This is it" - do you follow? It gives you an extraordinary sense of independence, a sense of deep freedom, because that intelligence guides. It is not your will, your opinion, your values, your prejudices, but that intelligence is watching, guiding, helping.

And we must distinguish, I think, between reality and truth. Could we say reality is everything that thought has created? The tent is a reality, it is created by thought. The chair on which one is sitting is created by thought. But the wood is not created by thought. Nature is not created by thought, the tree is not created by thought. Don't say "Who is creating it" and go off into something mystical, god and all the rest of it. We are talking about perceiving the actuality, the reality which is the actual and truth. So we are saying all the things that thought has created is reality. Nature is not created by thought, the tiger, if you have ever seen one in the wild, as we have on several occasions, almost touched it, that is not created by thought, it is much too vast. And thought has created,

made the surgeon, communications, the buildings, and all those things that are in the temples. All that is reality. Truth is not put together by thought. Truth is something free of time, thought and something that is beyond all perception. So if we are clear on these two matters: reality and truth, then we will never get confused about these terms. And it is only intelligence that can perceive that which is eternally true, not sacrifice, worship, prayer, all that, they are all done at the instigation of thought, or the invention of thought. But truth demands compassion, love, and with compassion and love goes intelligence. Intelligence is not separate from compassion. Compassion is not separate from love. It is all one. And without that truth cannot possibly exist.

3rd QUESTION: What is right action that we meet everything in our lives?

First of all let us examine together how we have broken up action. There is the political action, social action, religious action, idealistic action, action based on some experience, theory. So our action is broken up - business action, family action, sectarian action, the local action of the parish, the action of the lobbyists who are interested in their own particular safety, or safety of a particular investment and so on. They are all broken up actions. That is a fact, that is a truth. And there is also personal action based on one's own will, one's own anxiety, relationship with another. So our existence, which is our daily life, is totally broken up. I wonder if one is aware of that at all? Or we just drift from one action to another, go off in the morning at 9.0 o'clock to the office, that has a particular action there. Come back home and there is another action. I wonder if one is deeply aware of this fact, that our life is

broken up, carefully departmentalized: the surgeon, the carpenter, the priest and the politician, and we are the laymen with our own action. So if one realizes that one's life is actually broken up into various departments of actions, contradicting probably each other, insufficient in themselves from each other, and time to integrate all of them together, which most of us are trying to do, that becomes impossible, this integration. You can't integrate two opposites. I don't know if you see this. Yet that is what we are trying to do. So if one realizes, actually perceives, or is aware that one's life is broken up then one asks: is there an action which is whole, not broken up? Such action is applicable to everything that you do. I wonder if you are following this? Are we together in this?

I realize that my life, if I realize it, is broken up; I realize it is broken up. I know too that it cannot be integrated. Integrity is something entirely different. So I ask myself: is there a life, not superficially but deeply, is there a life that is not broken up? Is there a life which is not pursuing an ideal - which means also broken up. If I am violent and I have the ideal of not being violent, I have already broken it up. I don't know if you follow this. I have already divided my life. So I realize the ideal is futile. When I am violent why should I have the ideal of non-violence? I know this is one of the things that have been brought over from India, this adoration of non-violence, politically, religiously and all the rest of it, and the speaker has discussed this point with the originator in India, and it is so impossible, we have talked with people who are so deeply rooted in some prejudice. Or they call them idealists. But the fact is: any form, any division, any sense of breaking up one's life will inevitably bring about conflict. That is, if I am violent I do

not need the ideal of non-violence. But I am violent; what is important is to understand that violence, see the cause and the perceiving the cause is the ending the cause. It is like a surgeon who sees that I have some disease and says it must be operated on, and it is finished. Similarly if I am violent, to see that I am violent, discover the cause, and that cause can be eradicated, obviously. But if I pursue the ideal of non-violence I am moving away from the fact. The ideal is not fact. The opposite is never the fact. What is factual is what is happening now. Right? If I am violent I face it, I look at it, I go into it, I see the cause of it. I see the cause is the thinker who thinks he is violent. I don't know if you follow all this? No. I'd like to explain this a little.

Is violence different from me? Let's go into it slowly. We will meet each other. I have this sense of anger - if I have. First of all let us define what is violence. Violence is anger, hate, anger, imitation, conformity, obeying - all that is part of violence. And I happen to be violent - suppose - and I see by looking at it very carefully the causes of it. Step by step I see it. And I do not know how to deal with it, to eradicate the cause so I invent the non-violence as a lever to get rid of violence. Right? So I am escaping from a fact to non-fact. So I stop that movement and I realize I am escaping. Then I see I am violent: is violence separate from me? Or I am violent? You follow? Violence is part of me, like anger is part of me, greed is part of me, suffering is part of me, anxiety, pain, depression, loneliness, is me. But thought has separated the me from violence. I don't know if you realize this. So I am always acting on violence - suppressing it, rationalizing it, finding excuses for it, but when I realize the thinker is the thought - right? - the

observer is the observed then the division comes to an end. And where there is division there must be conflict. So please follow this: I have totally eliminated conflict. You understand? I am not separate from violence but I have been educated for generations that I am separate. And my habit, my condition is to fight violence, which is part of violence. So I realize the observer is the observed, the experiencer is the experience. I don't know if you see this. So I realize that. So I have eliminated from my mind the whole idea, concept, habit of conflict. Are you doing this with me? Which is, to remain completely with that word, the word 'violence' and the remembrance of past incidents which brought violence, the word is the remembrance, the picture, and that picture, that symbol, that word, is me - right? Please this is logic, it is sane: look at it. It is me. And so I stop, the mind stops acting, but remains with it, it doesn't escape from it. So when you remain with something entirely, completely with all your attention, the thing disappears completely. So one eliminates altogether violence. But if you pursue non-violence you will never end it because in the pursuit you are sowing violence all the time. I wonder if you understand this?

So the questioner asks: what is right action? We said there is right action only when we see that we are broken up, our life is broken up, and from that awareness one asks the question: is there a life which is not broken up. living in this modern world, can I live without different contradictory actions? Going to the office, coming home, being a surgeon, coming home, a scientist, coming home - you follow? - all broken up. And the result of this contradictory, broken up life will inevitably bring violence, strain,

heart failure - you know, the whole circus.

So we are asking: is there a life that is whole? Not what is right action, but can one live a holistic life? That is, when I go to the office I am always the same - you understand? When I come home I am what I am. I may be a good carpenter, a plumber a technician, but I am living a life which is whole. Do we understand each other? When there is that wholeness of life, that itself is right action. Do whatever you do, out of that is right action. There is no right action per se, but there is right action when I realize the broken up, contradictory life with all its complications, that very realization brings about a perception of the whole. Is this happening with you now? For god's sake! That is why sirs you may listen to the speaker for the next hundred years but if one doesn't actually realize as we are sitting here together, the action of intelligence is holistic. And that intelligence cannot be cultivated. It isn't a thing you go to school and learn to be intelligent, or become sensitive by going to college and being told how to be sensitive. But if one sees the actuality without any desire to alter it and fuss around with it, if one sees actually what is happening, that very perception is intelligence. And out of that intelligence is always right action.

4th QUESTION: What is the right relationship to money?

If you haven't any you have no relationship to it! (Laughter)
Like the speaker, it is very simple! But to be serious: what is right relationship to money? Why has money become so important? Let's enquire into it. We are not the Delphic Oracle, or laying down the law, or telling you what you should think or do, but we are trying together to understand the problems of life, which are very

complex, which need deep examination impersonally, objectively, sanely. So this is one of the problems, money. Why has money become so important? Is it because we have become worldly? I am using worldly in the sense of attached to the things that thought has put together. That is the first question I am asking. It is a complex question, we will go into it.

Is it because money gives us freedom? You can travel if you have lots of money, you can become powerful, become Lord this and that. If you have money you have a status, you are respected, you are looked up to. This is happening. If you have money you can do almost anything - go against all the laws. You see this everyday. Money is not supposed to be transferred from one country to another but if you are wealthy you have a secret account in Switzerland - you know all this - or transfer great wealth to America and so on. And if you have money you can enjoy yourself. So money has become extraordinarily valuable in all those senses.

And without money you can't do much. You want some clothes and so on you must have some money. But the question is really: why has money in our life, apart from buying necessary things or having something which is pleasant, nice picture or a nice vase or some beautiful ornament, apart from all that - or a beautiful garden if you are lucky - apart from that why do we lay such emphasis on money? You answer it please.

I do not know if you realize what religions have become, organized religions, vast wealth, they are really business organizations in the name of god. This vast wealth of the gurus, incredible wealth, which all of us - not all of us, some of us have

given to these gentlemen. And so money has become important. And when you go to the temples and so on, there is always money being asked. Are we so occupied with money? Naturally the poor man who has no money, he is naturally thinking about it. But those of us who have a little money, are we occupied with it? Is our main concern or occupation money?

That awakens another question which is: why are our minds perpetually occupied? - occupied with something or other. If you are occupied when you are talking about meditation, then you are occupied with it. God - you follow? Everything from the housewife to the highest religious authorities are occupied - why? You understand my question? This is not an irrelevant question, it is relevant because our occupation with money or with sex, with this or with that, indicates the state of our own minds, our own hearts. To be occupied with something. Does it mean that this occupation with business, with money, with sex, with god, with the guru, with the politician and so on and so on, keeps our brain full? You understand my question? Is it that we are afraid not to be occupied? Please look at it. Look at ourselves, which is: am I occupied from morning until night and when I go to sleep the brain is also occupied, with dreams, with all kinds of sensations. So there is never a moment when the brain is not occupied. Is that so? And when the brain is so occupied there is no space and so the brain becomes more and more shallow. You can see this happening. Is it because we are frightened of not being occupied, therefore having no space, the brain having no rest at all, therefore wearing itself out - right? The wearing itself out is part of senility - right? So is there a possibility of not being occupied? Merely to look, to observe, not

be occupied with observation. Just to look, to observe so that the brain has a rest, not to record because our brain is all the time recording. I don't know if you are following all this? If it interests you? Then your brain becomes extraordinarily alive, pliable.

Have you ever observed without a single thought? To observe a tree, to observe the water, a sheet of water with the light on it, to observe a woman or a man without all the consequences of that observation, the sensations, so that your mind is really free from occupation. How can a brain that is occupied ever observe? You understand my question? How can a mind - a brain rather that is always occupied with something casual, daydreaming, with the kitchen or with god, they are all the same, all occupations are the same, there are not superior occupations or inferior occupations, we are talking about occupation per se. Such a mind is really the most bourgeois mind in the world, including the Communists. Is chattering part of this occupation, talking, talking, talking, endlessly - you follow? Now are we aware of this occupation, and experimenting with ourselves to see if it stops? Then to find out whether there is fear and pursue that fear - you follow? Go to the very end of it and end it. As we talked about it at previous talks. Then see what happens to this brain which has space, which has quietness, which is not occupied. If you say, "How am I to do it? Tell me the steps, the method how not to be occupied", then those steps, those methods becomes your occupation, you are back in the cycle. But if you see the consequences of occupation, and see the fact of it, you move away from it. So if one is occupied with money, why? Either you are poor, which is natural then you have to be concerned about it, but even if you are poor to be occupied

eternally from morning until night, and a man who is very rich is also terribly occupied, how to keep the money, increase it - you know the whole business.

So the real question is: can the mind be free from all occupation? If I may repeat some incident: we were in the Himalayas once far away from all noise and in a cottage, and a group of monks, sannyasis came rushing into the cottage to tell me something. They knew the person who was occupying it. So they came to see me and they said, "We have just come from a man who is far away in the hills who is full of knowledge. And we have just come and we are filled with that knowledge." And I said "What is that knowledge?" And we went into it. At the end of it we discovered the solitary person living in the Himalayas was really not solitary at all. He has carried all the world's knowledge up there and so he is never alone, never quiet. And he is full of that knowledge and can therefore perhaps can never experience something totally original. A mind which is occupied can never experience something original. It is only the mind that is free, if I can use the word, that is empty.

We were talking with a scientist some days ago and we were saying that emptiness is very important in life, not vacuum, not being just vague and daydreaming but really a mind that is not occupied has space and is totally empty. And we were saying that such a mind is full of energy. And the scientist agreed. He said "Where there is emptiness it is not empty, that very emptiness is energy". I am telling you something. So let us think about it, look at it.

5th QUESTION: You say liberation is not an individual matter

but concerns humanity as a whole, yet liberating insight has been the unique achievement of individuals like the Buddha and the Christ, and perhaps yourself. How can it be a matter of the whole of humanity?

The question is clear isn't it? First of all let's leave the Buddha, the Christ and the speaker alone, they are not important. You know what disciples are? Disciples destroy the teacher, they invent a lot of theories, a lot of nonsense, write about it, they are the interpreters, and when there are interpreters you know what takes place. So let's look at the question very carefully, if we can liberate ourselves from these figures.

Is insight, the liberating factor which is insight, is it an achievement? First. Is it only granted, or given to the few? Is it something that demands an utterly unselfish life? Is it something that is not personal? To go into this one must go still deeper, further, which is: the world is me and I am the world. That is a fact for me, to the speaker. The speaker is not separate from the world the world is not different from him. We have gone into this very sufficiently. Human consciousness with all its content, which is belief, experience, knowledge, memory, fear, pleasure, suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair and all the pain of the world is common to all mankind. This is so. It is common to all of us, whether we live a million miles away or very close. So we are the world psychologically and you are the world. Now is liberation, illumination or that enlightenment, only reserved for the extraordinary few? Or if you had that tremendous insight into the wholeness of life your consciousness is totally different - right? Naturally because that liberating insight frees you from all the

content of that consciousness - the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, sorrow, depression, all that is wiped out. It is a fact if you do it, and it can be done. And it is not reserved for the few. But we human beings are not persistently, continuously applying, we are slack. We do this one day and we are weary of it the next day, we go off. So the ball is never in our court, it is always in other people's court. So if we are capable of maintaining not by will but by perception, by seeing the fact, and remaining with the fact without any movement away from the fact, then the fact undergoes a radical change. You can see this if you do it. That is, if I remain completely with violence, that is, not try to do something about it because I am violent, then the very attention you give to that factor of sensation which is called violence, when there is this light of attention on it, it disappears completely, for ever. If you do it you will discover it for yourself.

And if you as a human being who recognises that you are the entire humanity, psychologically, the entire humanity and therefore you are extraordinarily irresponsible, without any feeling of guilt, then your consciousness undergoes a change - obviously. That is the liberating factor of insight. If you have that liberating factor of insight and you have transformed your consciousness, you are bringing a factor of something new into the whole consciousness of humanity. You understand? I do not know if you have not followed a recent experiment which has been written about - I don't want to go into all this. I have started so I must finish it. They have put some rats in a tank of water and there were two outlets. One a dark one, and one with a light. When the rat climbed up the ramp and went to the light which he thinks he can escape through, he gets a

shock, so it comes down and goes to the other, which is black. Then it escapes through that. And generally the father, the mother rat takes time to discover this. Then its children learn much quicker. Please it is not genetic. They learn much quicker. So without taking many experiments, after a few experiments they go off through the black and they escape. And they were doing this in England, in Australia and perhaps in some part of America, totally different, not communicating with each other. And the rats in Australia - please listen to this - the rats in Australia discovered much quicker the black way of escaping, not through light. You understand this? I am not going to explain it if you don't. It is very simple. Without genetics entering into it, the rats in England took time to learn and the grandchildren or great great grandchildren learnt much quicker. Two attempts and back out. The same thing happened in Australia. The doctors were not communicating with each other. So they have discovered there is a group consciousness, as well as chemically, it is so. You understand? So this group consciousness exists and therefore when there is one rat who learns much quicker, that quickness is transformed, is given to the whole consciousness. You understand? So if we - you can see from that. Do you get it? We have been talking about this for years, only the rats have illuminated this, our minds! Very interesting. Look how we are operating ourselves. We don't see something true immediately. It takes time. Then we learn and genetically we transform. We don't say - oh, I won't go into it.

We are saying if you transform yourself through the liberation of insight, you are communicating it to the whole of consciousness of man. You understand? This is happening, like the great rulers of

the world, or the great killers of the world, have affected the human mind - right? Attila, Genghis Khan, Hitler, Napoleon and on the other side Buddha and so on, they have all affected the human mind, human consciousness. But if we actually daily live this intelligence, the insight which liberates, then you are bringing to the whole of the consciousness of man a totally different air, different value, different movement, which is not based on knowledge, it is based on insight and intelligence. You understand?

Sorry we have taken an hour and a half. We will meet on Saturday. May I get up please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 5TH SEPTEMBER 1981

I suppose one must talk and that is why you are here.

We have been talking over together the many problems of our daily life. We have talked about fear, pleasure, pain, and also the importance of relationship and the conflict in relationship, and whether it is at all possible to be free of all conflict, not only in our personal relationship but also in the world in which we are living, the world which is so tragically disintegrating, where there is terror, misery, confusion, poverty, and always the threat of war - it may not be in this country but there is always a war going on somewhere or rather in the world. We all know this.

And also we talked the other day about right action: what is a man to do in a world as it is. And also we talked about the future of knowledge, what place has knowledge in our daily life? What place has knowledge in our relationship? Whether knowledge is the cause of conflict in relationship, knowledge being the whole structure of memory, experience stored in the brain, recorded and acting according to that record, like a computer. But the computer is far more alert, far more capable of out-thinking man; being programmed properly it can outstrip man altogether. Of course it cannot perceive the beauty of an evening, it may compose but the feeling of music, the joy of it, the pleasure, the intense beauty of it, the computer cannot.

And also we talked in the last two talks and in the question and answer meetings, whether knowledge, which is part of desire, whether that knowledge has any place in love, whether knowledge

contributes to love, whether desire with all its complications is love. And the pursuit of pleasure which has been most constant in one's life, whether that pursuit of pleasure is love. And pleasure is based on knowledge, as fear is based on knowledge, and that knowledge, is it not also part of sorrow?

As we said the other day, if one may repeat it again, this is not a weekend affair. It's a lovely day, and you have a nice garden, green lawn and it is a pleasant day, but when we are gathered here together it is not a weekend affair, we are talking about our daily life, and our relationship to society, our relationship to all the terrible things that are going on in the world.

And also we have been saying that we are thinking together. That is, we are, each one of us is looking at the problems that we have and talking them over together. It is not that you are thinking according to what the speaker wants you to think: we are not doing any kind of propaganda, or any kind of sectarian guru business, but together we are examining, thinking, feeling our way into the very, very complex existence and our relationship to the whole world, and the future of mankind, what is going to happen to our children, to the future of all those people who are coming.

So we must go into this problem over again, considering what our life is, what the future of our life is, whether that future, based on knowledge, that is, experience, from that experience knowledge, from that knowledge memory, reaction to that memory is thought, and from thought there is action. That is the cycle in which we have been functioning: from experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. Whether such a cycle has any future at all; or it is merely repeating over and over and over again the same routine,

facing the same problem which thought has created, and whether thought is capable of ever solving these problems at all. We went into that considerably.

And also this morning we ought to talk over together, the very complex problem of love, compassion and from that compassion intelligence. That intelligence is not yours nor that of the speaker. It is intelligence, totally objective, impersonal, non-sectarian and so on. We ought to talk over that together. It is difficult to talk over together with such a large audience. We can perhaps talk over together if we are sitting quietly under a tree or in a room, you and I single, two people having a good dialogue, that is very possible, but to have a dialogue of this kind with such a large number requires that we all think together, be attentive together, face the problem together. Because we have created the problems together. Our society which is so corrupt, so disintegrating, so violent, it is our responsibility, we have contributed to it, society is not different from us, we are part of it, though the communist maintain that society is us - we are talking about psychologically, totally differently. They are materialistic, dialectical people, interpreting history according to their own opinions and values, but we are not communist, we are not doing any kind of propaganda, but talking over together the immense problem of existence.

And I think it is important to talk over this question: what place has knowledge, which is always clothed in ignorance because knowledge can never be complete about anything, even technologically, astrophysically, it cannot possibly be complete at any time. And any action born of that knowledge must be incomplete. And from that incompleteness all our problems arise.

So we have to talk over together: what place has knowledge, or what relationship has knowledge with regard to love? Knowledge is memory, remembrance. Is remembrance part of love? We are not talking of the love of god, the love of something or other abstract, but love between people, between human beings, not only the personal, limited love, but also love of mankind, love of human beings, because as we said the other day our consciousness is the common consciousness of all mankind. All mankind suffers, all mankind, every person wherever they live, they go through agony, uncertainty, anxiety, guilt, loneliness, the content of their consciousness, the content of each one of us is similar to the rest of mankind, psychologically. And so psychologically this consciousness is common to humanity, it is not my consciousness or yours, it is the consciousness of all human beings because everybody goes through terrible times. And then perhaps one realizes if one goes into it deeply, that one is not an individual at all. You may have a separate name, a separate form, different superficial culture, you may admire some painting which the Asiatics might not, or you might not appreciate the Asiatic culture, paintings, sculpture. But psychologically we are similar, our consciousness is similar, so individuality may be an illusion.

And to understand this problem of knowledge, whether knowledge brings sorrow and what relationship has sorrow to love, whether the mind, the brain, a human being who is suffering for various causes, can ever know love. Or love is entirely, totally different from knowledge and sorrow. We ought together to talk over this problem. Please we are not talking theoretically, abstractly, hypothetically, but we are concerned, not only with our

own lives but the lives of human beings in the future. What will man be in two thousand years, when the computer takes over all our thinking, quicker, faster, correcting itself, learning and creating new machines - the ultra intelligent machine. And what is the future of mankind then? I hope you are following all this together. So this is our problem. A problem that must be practical, a solution to the problem must be applicable to daily life otherwise it is so futile. So I hope - one hopes that together we can talk about this sanely, rationally without any emotion, romantically and all that kind of business. So let us talk over together this.

We know what knowledge is, not only semantically the word, the word which creates the images, the word which is part of thought, that word, symbol, knowledge, what relationship has that to love? Will love exist without remembrance? I may be married, have a wife or a husband, or a girl friend, or whatever you will, and in that relationship there is not only the sensual responses as sex, but also all the psychological responses; the pleasure, the possessiveness, the dominance, the irritations, the quarrels - all those are recorded. If you observe this - please we are not talking for myself, we are talking over together - all those are recorded in the brain. Those records like a gramophone are repeated over and over and over again. In that there is security, in knowledge there is security psychologically as well as physically. And that security, does that deny love? If it does, then what is love? Is it something so abstract, so impossible, that the human brain cannot capture it, possess it, have it? And when we talk about love and compassion with its intelligence we also should discuss suffering, the pain, the grief, the anxiety, the loss of someone one loves, with whom you

have been living for many years, or a son or a brother who was your companion, whom you loved. And when there is that sorrow of loss, of pain, can that sorrow contain love? Right?

So we have to enquire into not only knowledge and its place, or it has no place with regard to love; and is knowledge suffering, and when there is suffering is it possible at all to have love? And facing all this problem, what is the answer? Can sorrow end? Please this is a very important question because for thousands and thousands and thousands of years man has been in wars, facing death, shedding tears, bearing the enormous burden of sorrow and has never been able to resolve it. In the Christian world they have somehow passed the buck to somebody else - you understand that? They have given their sorrow to somebody else, call him whatever name you like, and that symbol, that person is the epitome of sorrow and you handed over yourself to him. So religions throughout the world have not been able to solve this problem, they have escaped from it, they have suppressed it, they have rationalized it, they have handed themselves over to a symbol, to an idea hoping thereby sorrow can end. Man has done every kind of thing to escape from sorrow - through drugs, through drink, through sex, through every form of amusement - football has become the religion of the world now. And through that we are trying to escape from our own pain and anxiety, sorrow. So if one can put aside all that, not escape, not hand ourselves over to somebody who will solve our sorrow, if we can end every kind of escape, even the verbal escape, talking endlessly about it, or living with sorrow, not talking about it, but that sorrow eating one's heart out. And from that all kinds of neurotic habits, ideas, conclusions

arise. So if we can stop all that rationally, sanely, not by will because will is the essence of desire, and desire also is part of sorrow. If we can, not only this morning, which is fairly easy to forget ourselves for the time being, but when you go out again it all starts, so can we totally not escape from the pain of sorrow? What does that mean? Does it mean that knowledge of my son's death, of my wife running away with somebody, and so facing my deep insoluble loneliness, the remembrance of all that remains like a deep wound, and that brings sorrow, not being loved or loving and that person not responding - you know all those things that go on in daily life. We have become so utterly selfish, thoughtless.

So can we together stop the whole movement of escape? It is not an action of will or determination or verbally taking a vow never to escape but actually deeply not avoiding that thing. So that memory of the past pleasures, companionship, all that has no longer a place and so we can remain with that thing called pain completely wholly. Are we thinking together? I hope so. That is, my son is dead, I loved him, and I remember all the things he used to say, play, the photograph on the mantelpiece; there is always the recording going on, the remembrances, which is an escape from the actual pain - right? Or that pain is sustained by remembrances. Or every piece of furniture, the room, the garden, reminds me of it. So I am constantly being reminded, sustained by past events. And can I totally abandon all that? I feel it may be disloyal. So many tricks I play with myself. And so I sustain, nourish by remembrance, the event, all the things that have gone with that person and so I nourish it, keep going. And that is a form of not understanding or facing or going beyond sorrow. We all know this. Everyone of us

knows what it means, sorrow, not only personal sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, the man who has nothing. If you go to the East you will find enormous poverty, no hope. The same limited quantity of nourishment. We were walking once along the highway in India. A poor man had collected a few leaves, dried leaves and branches, and in a pot he had put rice, two or three drops of oil - I am describing accurately - two or three drops of oil and an onion. He was cooking it on the little fire. We were watching him. As it was cooked he explained that it was his only one meal for the rest of the day, and he said take some of it. And he will never be able to have full meals for the rest of his life. I am not playing on your sympathy, please, we are just observing what it is. Man who can never have clean clothes, will always live in poverty, and the very knowing of it is a sorrow. And also those who are highly educated, who only look through knowledge as a means of advancement, the ascent of man through knowledge and keep repeating that. And we human beings because they are scholars, scientists, well-known people, we follow them. And in that too there is sorrow because knowledge is limited. There is this war, which has been recorded for five thousand years and practically every year there has been a war, and how many people have shed tears - wounded, maimed - and we are still going on with it. We have left it to the politicians to decide our future. And the politicians are merely thinking along particular, narrow tribal lines.

So there is all this enormous sense of ignorance which is not ignorance of books, ignorance of oneself. And when you are aware of all that there is sorrow, and you want to do something about it and so you join a group, form an organization, institution, give

money and then you think you have solved the problem. No institution, or organization is going to solve our sorrow. These are all escapes. So can we look at sorrow, be with it completely without a movement of thought? A movement of thought is to escape from it. The very word 'sorrow' colours the fact of sorrow, the pain of it. So to observe it, to live with it without the word, without the remembrance, without the idea of going beyond it, just to hold it completely, wholly together. If one does that, what takes place? I hope we are doing that together now. What takes place when you remain with a fact, and not translate the fact according to your prejudice, to your want, your desire, without any motive, what happens when you remain with a fact which is pain, and not allow thought to come into it? That is, when you give your total attention to the fact, and we do not give total attention when there is an escape, when there is interpretation, when there is rationalization, when the word becomes all important. You understand? You are following all this? Is that possible at all? To so wholly remain with that pain of tears, you follow, the great depth of it. Because thought is very superficial, pain is not. But when thought colours that pain, that very thought becomes an abstraction and therefore it destroys attention, it wastes energy. So to remain with the fact is to give total attention, which is to give all your energy to that. When you give such attention, with that total energy, that fact is transformed. That is, the fact is not different from you. The fact is you. The fact of sorrow, self-pity, the loneliness, the despair, the sense of being abandoned, all that is you. You are that. But thought comes along and says, "You are not that. You are different." I do not know if you are following all this? So there is a division between the you

and the object, the fear, the pain, the loneliness, the despair, the depression, - all that is something different from you, for you to control it, for you to overcome it. So there is a conflict in this division, which is false because that which is taking place is you. You understand? Are we getting along somewhere?

So there is also that thing to be understood: the observer is not different from the observed, sorrow. The observer is the observed, like the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience. But the experiencer says, "I am different from the experience, therefore I must have more experience" - you follow? But when one realizes very deeply that the observer of sorrow is sorrow itself, that is a tremendous revolution because we have been brought up that the observer is different from the observed. To break that whole cycle of tradition is to live with that sorrow, pain, completely without a single movement of thought. That is the ending of sorrow, which means the ending of knowledge which we have acquired, which has been slowly built up, so the ending of knowledge, the ending of sorrow. I wonder if you see this. And is knowledge love? The picture, the image, the name. Where there is jealousy, possessiveness, ambition, competition, how can there be love? Our whole society, our culture is based that you must succeed, you must be ambitious, you must compete. And yet I go home and say, "I love you darling". It has very little meaning.

So one discovers for oneself, no guru, no priest, no god, nobody can help in this, one discovers for oneself that love has no memory, no remembrance, no picture, no image. And that love which is not sentiment, which has nothing to do with devotion and that love when it is sustained, looked at, then out of that compassion and

intelligence. Compassion is supreme intelligence, it is not my intelligence or your intelligence, it is totally objective, and yet you can love another. That is the beauty of it.

And also on a lovely morning like this we ought to talk about something which one avoids all the time, death. Talking about death is not morbid, it is part of one's life, whether one is young, or old, diseased, it is part of our daily existence which we try to avoid. So we ought to talk that over together, and not say "Why do you talk about a dreadful thing like death on a lovely morning like this, green fields and blue sky and lovely trees?" The lovely trees, and the blue sky and the green lawn is part of life. This is also part of life. But we are frightened of it, therefore we say we keep it at arm's length, as far away as possible, don't let's talk about it. But it is there. And man from the beginning of time has faced this problem, this terrible thing called death, and has found many, many explanations, including what happens after. The whole Asiatic world believes in being born again next life. And the Western world is collecting a lot of evidence about it, writing books about it. In India it is as ancient as the hills. But their belief, which is to be born next life to a better life, always a better life. If you are poor, if you live rightly you will be born to money, to a better house. If you have got a better house you will get a better palace next life. If you have a palace in this life, next life you will be a king. You know the game. So what you do now, what you sow now, you will reap next life. They all believe this, most earnestly. It is in their blood. But when one asks: how do you live this life? - they look the other way. So that belief has no value at all - like most beliefs. Or in the Western world you have other kinds of

belief - resurrection, Gabriel - you know, all that.

Man is seeking comfort really. I have collected so much this life, so many pictures, so much furniture, so much land. I have cultivated my brain through education, through study, through experience, travelled a great deal. If I die what is the point of it all? I have lived a moral life and I die, why should I live a moral life? You follow? These are all the various arguments and explanations about death. We won't go into all the details of it but this is a problem that we should talk over together. What place has fear and death? What is the relationship of the two? And what is important, the before or the after? You understand? Before death or after death?

For most of us after death is much more important. But we should consider seriously what is before death, what is this thing called living, and what is the thing called ending? The living and the ending. What is this living to which all human beings cling to, always avoiding the ending? You may not want to end through writing a book and therefore becoming immortal - or a poem, or a painting, do something that will give you a name, a position, well established, therefore you become one of the immortals of the Academy Francais. You understand?

So should we consider, if you are at all serious, which is urgent to be considered: the living or the dying, the ending? Both have importance because that which ends has a new beginning, not incarnation. That is, is it possible to incarnate now? You understand? To reincarnate now, not after, that may be merely idealistic, romantic, sentimental nonsense, but the ending is a new beginning - everything is. I don't know if you follow this? If I end,

totally end, completely all attachment, not at some future day, now, today, completely end my attachment with all its corruption, there is a new beginning - right? But one is so frightened to end, not knowing what will happen. And if what will happen is certain then there is no ending. I wonder if you understand all this?

So is it possible to end while living? - not suicide, I am not talking of that, taking a pill and all that, exit. But I am talking about this life, the routine, the boredom, the self-centred activity, the constant demand, constant wanting something, wanting, wanting, wanting - you follow? The attachment to somebody, the attachment to a belief, to an ideal, to a conclusion, to a concept, to end attachment - let's take that for the moment, if you will - attachment to your religion, to your gods, to your church - you know, attachment, to your husband, to your wife, to your son - not to belief, that is fairly simple, to some image, some picture, some Utopia, concept, or even your own personal experience which one clings to, these are fairly easy. But to be free of attachment to a person on whom you depend, what is this attachment, why is one attached? Let's go into it a bit.

Why am I attached to my son, to my wife? She has given me her body, she has given me comfort, she has encouraged me when I was depressed - you know, all that thing that goes on, and the picture I have built about her, the image, I am attached to that, not to her as a person, but I am attached to all the memories, the remembrances she has cultivated in that relationship in which we have grown together.

I do not know if one has not realized that when one is tied to another there is corruption. If I am tied to my nationality it is

corruption. If I am tied to an ideal it is corruption. Or a dialectal opinion and finding the truth out of that opinion, if I am attached to that as a Socialist, Communist, Left, Right, Centre and all the rest of it, in that there is corruption. So I discover that wherever there is attachment there must be corruption. It is inevitable, it is a law. All that I recognise logically, intellectually but inwardly I am still - I have a battle with the intellectual conclusion and the fact that I am attached. Intellectual conclusions I can let go, that is fairly easy. But though I have examined the cause of attachment I am still attached because I am frightened to be alone, to stand alone. In attachment there is some form of security, and I have no security if I am by myself. And I am frightened to be by myself, to stand on my own feet. Therefore I lean on gurus - you know, all that beastly business.

Now I realize the fact that in that attachment there is really no security because she might die, she might run away, she might look at somebody else, she is a free person, but I don't want her to be free, but I am attached. So can I look at that attachment, have an insight into that attachment, because insight is the liberating factor. Not arguments, not explanations, not the causes, not any amount of pressure but the liberating fact of insight into attachment, then there is a freedom from it completely. Which doesn't mean you become cynical and all the rest of it. Out of that freedom there is love.

So can we look at our present life, the daily living, not the death - we will talk about it if there is time afterwards, but this thing called existence, and end voluntarily, easily to all the psychological factors? Not physical factors - I don't mean that. You can't end

having a house - that would be absurd, end of food, clothes but the psychological factors of attachment, of fear - you follow? - all those things to which you cling to. Can all those end? Not when you die, when one dies but while living, living with the energy, vitality, intelligence, energy, not when you are gaga or senile, but when there is tremendous activity going on, to end these psychological factors. That is death. Not the physical organism coming to an end, either through misuse, through accident, old age and so on but death. It is the emptying of all that one holds psychologically. That is: must one take one by one of all the various factors - please follow this a minute - all the various separate factors like fear, pleasure, pain, sorrow, loneliness, anxiety and so on, uncertainty, one by one and end them? Or have an insight into the whole thing, because they are all interrelated, they are not separate. So to have a total insight into that is to liberate the whole of it - right? That is to remain totally with the whole structure of 'me', because the 'me' is the knowledge, is the knowledge of a thousand years which has made my life into a routine, into what it is now. And to have a total insight into it, that is real freedom. Then there is a new beginning, totally.

And also there is the question: what happens if I don't end all the content of my consciousness? I agree with you, you have pointed out to me all the things but I haven't been able to succeed, I haven't been able to have this deep insight into the whole nature of my being. I have partial insight, I have got rid of one or two, half a dozen little absurdities but I have still got very deep absurdities. So what happens when I die? You follow my question? You are all interested in this? Of course! This is the tragedy. I have got rid of a

few of the things but I still hold on to something which I want, which is dear to me, which is next to my heart. I won't let go. So please tell me what happens afterwards. Are you interested in all this? I am still attached - it might not be to my wife or to my ideal, I am still attached to the money which I have collected, I can't take it with me but I want it until the last moment. So I am attached to that - what happens? To understand this question one must go very deeply into the whole consciousness of man - if you are not too tired, are you?

We must question the content of consciousness. That content is put there by thought. I hope this is clear. Probably it is not. We said the root cause of fear is time, thought. Some of you have heard this probably for the first time, but we have been talking about it in the previous talks. Fear is the product of time-thought. Time is thought, they are not two separate things and time and thought have put all the contents of consciousness together - my belief, my experience, my fears, my pleasures, my specialties, surgeon, carpenter - you follow? All that is the content of my consciousness, my attachment. That content makes consciousness. Without that content consciousness as we know it cannot exist - right? The content makes up consciousness. If the content is not, which is fear, pleasure, anxiety, loneliness, all that, then what is my consciousness? Which is, the content of my consciousness is me - please follow this. The content is me, I am the whole of that consciousness. So I have let part of that consciousness go, the content of that consciousness go. The things that don't matter very much. And the things that matter very deeply, I hold. And I discover also that this consciousness is the consciousness of all

mankind. That is the real thing that we won't face. The content of my consciousness - belief, culture, the pain, the books I have read, the fears and so on and so on, is common ground on which all mankind stands. Go to Asia they have the same problems - sorrow, pain, lack of work, oh god, so many things. So this consciousness is common to all of us. Please follow this carefully, if you will. It is not mine or yours, it is common ground on which humanity stands. And I, part of that consciousness, of the common consciousness, I have let a few things go. So do a few people in India let go, but they hold on to something. So the common thread is there. I wonder if you understand this? And if you let the whole content be wiped away by insight you have contributed to that consciousness an enormous amount. You understand? You have brought a totally new dimension into that consciousness. And what you have brought is so colossally important because you have brought real freedom for man, from sorrow - you follow? - real freedom. So it is of the utmost importance that you empty that content, not just one piece here and there. This is logical, this is what is happening. We are all influenced by the killers of the world - Hitler included. We are all influenced by literature, by various teachers that have been before, all those are part of our consciousness. And when we live within that consciousness there is nothing new. It is like a man who has read a great deal. Personally I used to know somebody who could talk about any subject on earth, Eastern philosophy, anything you want. One day we were talking, he said to me that with all this knowledge I have, I probably can never experience something original. There is the tragedy - you understand?

So what happens to the content of that consciousness, which is

not mine, if I let go of a few things but hold on to something very strongly? I help to continue that consciousness. You understand? Therefore I am utterly responsible. If I am violent I am sustaining that consciousness. If I feel anxiety, pain, grief, you know, all that, I help to hold it. But if you through insight liberate the content you add something incalculably valuable. That is the greatest morality, to be free of that content, to give a new meaning to life which is love and compassion, with its intelligence. Right sirs?

BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 6TH SEPTEMBER 1981

This is the last talk. I am glad we have had such good weather for the whole week. Strange for England!

I think we ought to talk over together this morning not only about meditation but what is a religious life. And we ought also to consider together: what is beauty? Religious life, beauty and meditation go together. They are not separate states, to be compartmentalized, and kept separate. So if we could this morning together first consider: what is beauty?

I think this is an important question: whether beauty is in those things that man has created, paintings, sculpture, poetry, literature; and the beauty of nature, the lovely evenings, the clear stars, and the bright sunlight, the evening light of a sun setting among all the hills and the mountains and the valleys; and the wild animals, though in this country you have almost destroyed them all, they do still exist. So we ought to consider together the question whether beauty is in the paintings, in the poems, or in nature, or it is something entirely different. The beauty of a face, the loveliness of a poem, the great delight of a sunset and a large sheet of water and the border of light, and the breeze on the leaves, whether all that is beauty. Or when you look at a mountain against the blue sky, the deep valleys and shadows, when you look at something enormously great, all the problems that one has had are for this moment wiped away and you are in front of that silent quiet. There the majesty of the mountain has driven away your self, the self with all the problems of daily life, that great rock has banished

your problems for a second. And so, like a child given a toy, a complicated toy, he is absorbed by it for some time, until he breaks it or he gets bored with it. So human beings too are absorbed by the toy of a mountain, or by football, or when one enters into a temple, the temples of the world, where there is a certain quality of silence and all that, that also helps human beings for the moment to forget themselves. And in that forgetfulness they appreciate that which is beautiful for a second. That is, where the self is not beauty is. Is that beauty in the picture, painting, in a concert of Mozart or Beethoven, or in the poems of Keats, or is it possible to be totally free of oneself to look at the world? Then in that there is great beauty, where you are not absorbed by anything. Something doesn't take you over, or the very grandeur, the majesty of something drives away for a second the self. And when there is the absence of that self with all its problems, there is then great beauty, not in something, or externally or subjectively but the very complex problems of one's life, which is the problem of the self, the selfishness, the agony and so on, to be free of all that, totally, completely, then there is great beauty - beauty to be found nowhere else on earth or in any painting or in any poem.

So that is part of meditation.

And also we are going to talk over together: what is a religious life and what is meditation? I think we should begin with meditation. What is meditation? That word has been brought over from India quite recently, unfortunately. They have brought with it a lot of systems, methods and all kinds of fanciful imaginative thoughts and the projection of thought of various types. There are the meditations of Zen, probably you have heard about all these

things, and also the Tibetan meditation, the Buddhist meditation, varieties of Hindu meditation, and one can invent one's own meditation. And one can observe, see logically, that any form of routine, repeating over and over and over again, certain words - Ave Maria - or some words which you have bought with a coin, and repeating those words only makes the mind more dull, makes the mind or the brain continue in a certain pattern. And all these meditations are basically, if you have gone into it and studied it or talked to people who have done it, or you have done it yourself, their basis is control - controlling thought, disciplining it, being aware, exercising great effort to be aware, to concentrate, to attend. In all this there is the exercise of will. If you have studied it, or if some of you have practised various forms of meditation and also if you have done any of the so-called transcendental meditation, guru spoilt by repeating a certain mantra, and all these forms, all these efforts of practising, what relationship has all that to daily life? Is it a form of escape? Or trying to understand something, or experience something, which will then alter your whole way of thinking and then that experience will totally alter the ways of one's life. That is, meditate, whatever that may mean, then that meditation will somehow alter the ways of one's living. That is one approach to this whole problem of meditation. I don't know why we have made it into a problem, but apparently it has become a problem.

Or bring about order in one's daily life, not order based on some form of conformity, imitation, but understanding the whole movement of thought, in daily life, in our relationship with each other, so that we put our house in order first. And that bringing about that order in daily life is part of meditation. There are these

two approaches.

The first, which is the traditional; meditate first, control your thought, concentrate, be aware of every movement of your hands, toes, all that, begin with that and that will transform your daily life. Let us talk that over first. What are the implications of such meditation? We are not denying or condemning one or the other. We are examining together the whole question of meditation, which when it is really understood has an extraordinary significance. So together first let's examine this question of meditation first which will then flow into our life and alter the whole misery of life.

When you meditate in the first category, if we can put it that way, you sit in a certain posture, breathe properly, control your thoughts, concentrate, either on some word, on a sound, which is the word, and put your whole energy on some concept and not let your thoughts wander away, so that gradually over innumerable days of practise not only do you control your body but also you control the very movement of thought through concentration. That is what is generally understood by meditation by those who practise it.

Now in concentration what takes place? Please, as we said, we are thinking together, we are not laying down any laws, we are not doing any kind of propaganda for this or for that, but we are examining together what is right meditation. And in the examination of that we ought to consider all the implications that are involved in concentration. In concentration on an idea, on a picture or a symbol, or on a word and follow the sound of that word because sound has an extraordinary importance, which we

will go into presently, if we have time. Concentration means focusing all your energy, forcing thought in one direction upon a certain point, which the student does in a school, he wants to look out of the window, see that lizard going by and watch that spider spinning its web, or the bird. And the teacher says, "Concentrate on your book, don't look out of the window". So he learns gradually to concentrate, which means focusing thought. But thought wanders off, that is its nature, a movement, a flow. So there is a controller and the controlled. That is what is implied in concentration.

Resistance, narrowing it down and focusing on a certain point by repetition of words or by buying a mantra, making the other fellow very rich, and pursuing all that.

The word mantra, unfortunately you have all heard about it, means, the root meaning is meditate or ponder over not becoming. And also put away all self-centred activity. That's the meaning of it. Ponder over not becoming, put away all kinds of self-centred activity. You understand? And you can't buy that. You can't practise it by repeating, repeating for twenty minutes, thirty minutes - you follow? - all that nonsense that goes on with it. And there are also meditational centres - the Buddhist, the Hindu, - you know - which is a good racket.

And concentration, one must understand who is the controller, who is it that says, "I must control my thought from wandering away" - who is the controller and the thing he is going to control? Are they two different things? This is very important to understand, if you don't mind it being pointed out. As long as there is a division between the controller and the controlled there must be struggle. Thought wanders away and you pull it back by will,

will being the essence of desire, that desire is to achieve certain results, or experience certain states, and so there is this battle going on in concentration. Until of course you can achieve complete concentration which is thought being controlled by thought, so that thought never moves away from its focus. That is mechanical. It is so obvious, you can see it. And that does not alter one's daily life because in that meditation, that concentration, you can experience anything you want according to your conditioning, according to your knowledge, according to your desire. So that is one type of meditation which has been practised throughout the Asiatic world. Take a certain posture, concentrate, repeat and so quieten the mind or the brain which is to make the brain more and more routine, dull and lethargic. And those who practise such meditations have not brought about a social change, or a change radically in themselves. They may be more polished, more theoretically involved and so on. That is one type.

The other is to put your house in order first. If the house has not a deep foundation the house is of very little importance. So the other which we are considering now is to see if we can bring about order, which is an art, not just following a blue print of order, because order is a living thing, like morality is a living thing. Aesthetics or conduct are a living thing. So if we do not put that house in order, do what we will, without love, without fear, finding out the right relationship between human beings, without laying a deep foundation in that, which is in our daily life, not an abstraction called life. So one has to consider what is discipline in that order and what part memory plays in it, that is knowledge, which we went into yesterday. So is it possible living in this

modern world, society disintegrating, the authority of governments which are inept, which follow tribalism and therefore creating more and more wars, more and more misery for humanity, can we live in this world, in the modern world, pursuing our daily life, job, relationship, the whole problem of existence of one's daily life, can there be absolute order? That is really the first question in meditation.

The word 'meditation' means also to measure, both in Sanskrit and in the root meaning of that word 'meditate' is to measure. Measure is not only this act of becoming - I am this, I will be that, I will be better still. This idea of climbing, getting better and better and better, nobler and nobler, getting less and less angry, violent and so on, is measurement. Our brains are trained to measure. This measurement was given to the Western world by the Greeks, the ancient Greeks on whose philosophy, democracy from those Greeks, and the whole mathematical, theosophical world is based in the Western world - measurement is technology. That is part of the word we are understanding, that is the meaning of that word, to measure. And the Asiatic world says, measurement is illusion. Follow this just for fun! Is illusion. And so they look at the technological world, they are full of it, the Indians at present when they come over to the West, they are inventing a great many things, but in their blood, in their past, there is this idea that every form of measurement must be technical and therefore is not spiritual, therefore seek that which is immeasurable. You follow the sequence of it? And so exercise will to find the immeasurable, control thought, back into the old rut. You are following this? It is very interesting if you go into it, observe it, how man plays tricks

with himself. Denying measurement is an illusion and yet be caught in measurement.

So that is one of the meanings of meditation. If you want to go into it very, very deeply, is it possible to live a life without measurement, that is without comparison, without any form of psychological limitation, because all that is measurement? And can the brain, which has been trained for a million years to measure, can that brain put aside its conditioning and be afresh? That is one of the issues in meditation, an issue which must be answered if you really want to find out, if one is really serious enough to find out, or allow that which is eternal, if there is an eternity, to come into being. That is part of meditation.

And also, if one is serious and wants to go into it, to give knowledge its place, because without knowledge we couldn't communicate with each other, without knowledge we could not drive a car, go the office and so on. So knowledge has its place in our daily life, but psychological knowledge is what we are concerned about. Can that psychological knowledge which has been accumulated through generation upon generation, not only the communal knowledge, the family knowledge, the traditional knowledge, the knowledge which one has acquired, can all that psychological knowledge end? Otherwise it will project, that knowledge, which is part of memory, thought, action, if that knowledge is not completely understood, the nature of that knowledge, it must inevitably lead to all kinds of illusions, all kinds of neurotic actions. In that there is no sanity. So that is one of our problems in meditation.

And also another deeper problem is whether the brain which is

constantly recording, recording your reactions, conscious or unconscious, recording every incident which affects the psyche, can that record stop? Please - meditation isn't something you play with if you are serious - you can play with it but that is your affair, but if one wants to go very deeply into the whole nature of meditation one has to investigate all this and be absolutely clear, not vague and fanciful, imaginative. Can this recording, which is psychological knowledge, because that is what is happening, when you tell me something that is harmful to me, that is you insult me or flatter me, which are both the same, it is recorded. That becomes the knowledge and can that recording of this brain, where it is necessary, where it is psychologically not necessary, end? Are we working together in all this? Probably it is all new to you.

So what will bring about the end of recording? You understand the importance of it? I record an insult, it has wounded me, wounded the image which I have about myself. That image is hurt by your insult, by your word, by your gesture. Or that image is strengthened through flattery, you come and tell me "What a marvellous talk that was" - and that image records, the brain records that knowledge. You understand? So you when you insult or flatter to have no record. That is to learn. To learn the process of recording, what is implied in the recording, and the consequences of that recording, when you flatter me you are my friend, when you insult me you are my enemy, you are a foreigner, barbarian, but when you are pleasant and all the rest of it, then you are my friend. So the consequences of recording, that is very superficial but it is the deeper layers of that, the recording of deep incidents, of deep relationship, deep experiences that one holds to, conclusions,

theoretical, practical and so on, all those are forms of recording. On that record we live psychologically, because one needs to record how to go to the office, take the bus, etc., time and so on and so on. A carpenter, a surgeon, or a scientist, they must be recording, not that the scientists are helping the world, in certain ways they are, in other ways they are helping to bring about the destruction of man, because the poet, the artist, the scientist have partial insight. It is only the religious mind that has total insight.

So is that possible? To have a brain that only records that which is absolutely necessary and not record anything else. You understand the beauty of it? In that there is tremendous freedom, that is real freedom, not the freedom that money gives, or some fanciful imaginative idea of freedom. That is one of the problems of meditation. That is, to learn because learning demands certain order. The word 'discipline' means to learn, it comes from the word disciple who is learning from the master. You are not learning from me, we are thinking over together. But learning, not conforming, not obeying, not repetitive: "I have read this, you have said that, what do you mean by this, explain it" - which means you are not learning. Learning is to observe, to observe how the brain records. You can watch it yourself, it is very simple. Recording - it thinks everything is necessary because it is seeking security because the brain must record when it goes to the office because there it is necessary to acquire money and so on and so on. And also it thinks it is necessary to accumulate all the psychological knowledge that is being gathered together in the past generation after generation, which is the structure of the 'me'. In that it seeks security.

So we went into that: there is no security except in intelligence.

The intelligence which is not yours or mine, that intelligence can only come about when there is love, compassion. We went into that yesterday.

So meditation is to understand the futility of all systems, to learn about it, not say it is wrong or right, but to learn the implications of systems, which is to follow a pattern laid down by somebody who says, "I know and you don't know. I am the guru, follow this." - it is too childish. But we all want to follow somebody. The more bizarre it is, absurd it is, the greater we want to follow, we are so gullible.

And the other question is: that knowledge has a certain place and psychological knowledge is totally unnecessary. Because if I am related to you as a wife or a husband, or a girl friend, and if that relationship is based on memory, on the recorded incidents, building images about you and you build about me, then in that relationship, in that recording, it is merely memory. And we have said, is memory love? We went into that yesterday. Knowledge is not love, on the contrary, knowledge brings sorrow, psychological knowledge. So that is one of the questions in meditation.

The other is to be in a state of constant observation and learning which brings its own order. Learning is order. If you want to be a good carpenter you have to learn the quality of the wood, the right type of tools, grain, the beauty of the wood, and all the rest of it you have to learn. If you are a gardener you have to learn and so on and so on. But our brains are sluggish, so we follow the easiest. Therefore not to follow the easiest is to doubt everything, be sceptical about your sacred books, about your gurus, about your countries, about your self, because doubt, scepticism, cleanses the

brain, sharpens the brain, gives clarity. But you can't doubt all the time. You must hold it and let it go sometimes, like a dog on a leash.

And also learn about the whole movement of concentration. It is only strengthening, controlling the energy of thought. Controlling the energy of thought by will, by conformity, by measurement. I hope you are all doing all this. Is this too much for a morning?

Meditation also is to find out, learn, whether it is possible for the brain never to be occupied. Because our brains are occupied all the time: about god, about sex, about oneself, about one's own conclusions, beliefs, you know, you can surely watch yourself how one's brain is occupied. When the brain is occupied there is no space. When knowledge has occupied the brain, occupied it, how can that brain experience anything original? So to experience something original when the brain is crowded, occupied, you take drugs to experience something fantastic - you do, not that the speaker has taken any drugs - he has talked to many other people who have taken drugs, they have certain experiences which are projected by their own conditioning, by their own desire, will and so on, of which they are unconscious, only the chemical alters their focus, and sometimes it does great harm, if one has taken drugs for a couple of years then your brain is gone. Or if you have played with it for a little while there is some still. So one has to find out whether the brain can ever be free from all occupation. That is, are we listening with occupied brains to what is being said? Or watching your own activity of the brain to see whether it is occupied now, sitting there quietly, whether it is occupied. That is, are you occupied with listening, or are you just listening? Do you

see the difference? May I go on with this.

When you are attempting to listen, making an effort, say, "I must understand what that chap says", and so you are exercising, your will to listen, you are occupied. But if you are listening to what the speaker is saying, he is explaining yourself, so you are not listening to the speaker, you are listening to yourself, therefore you are listening very quietly without any occupation. That is, to be aware of yourself, how you are listening. And in this listening are you learning or merely observing? You see the difference? If you are observing there is no accumulation. But if you say, "I must learn what he is saying, I must remember what he says," then your mind is being occupied and therefore there is no space in which you can listen. In the same way to observe without occupation, just to look.

And the other deeper problem is: whether the brain can ever be quiet, absolutely still? It has its own rhythm, its own movement - we are not talking about that, you can't stop that - of course you can stop it if you take some kind of drug, or you die, but we are talking about the movement which thought has created, whether thought can ever be completely still. That is part of the enquiry into meditation, not how to make the brain still because then you can practise some form of idiocy and you can force the brain, force thought to be still - you follow? That is mechanical. So there is no exercise of will at all in meditation. Oh, you don't see the beauty of all this.

And is it possible for thought to be absolutely still? That is, for time to stop, not scientific fiction time, but the actual movement of time as thought. This question is very complex. Unless one

understands the whole movement of thought, sees how thought operates, what it has done in the outside world and the inside world, what is the nature of knowledge, what is the experiencer who experiences, or the thinker who thinks, all that is the movement of thought. And a brain that has been educated for a million years to think, because everything we do is through thought, the movement of the arm because I want to move it in that direction, it is all the movement of thought. And the brain is conditioned to that. And you are asking something enormously significant and against the conditioning. One has to learn the nature of thought and find out for oneself, not through compulsion, imitation, conformity, will, whether there is absolute stillness of thought.

Silence is of many kinds. There is silence between the barking of that dog, when the noise stops there is a certain silence. There is silence between two thoughts. There is silence of an evening when everything is quiet. There is silence of a morning when there is not a movement just before the dawn comes. But there is a silence which is entirely different, which is the silence of a brain which has no movement of thought. In that silence alone there can be that which is sacred. The things thought has created are not sacred. The things thought has invented are not holy. But we worship the things which thought has created. See the game we play. That is, I worship a symbol, a figure, that figure, that symbol is created by thought, invented, moulded by hand or by the mind, and then thought says, "I must worship that", which is worshipping itself. I wonder if you see this. And we pray to that.

So this is meditation. Either you go through all this step by step,

by step, which is impossible. Or you see the whole of it at a glance. You understand the difference? Either we take into consideration, analyse fear, pleasure, pain, wounds, all that bit by bit by bit, having slight insight into each, and then try to meditate, which is obviously incomplete. Or you watch the whole movement of it. They are all related to each other, you can't separate them and say, "This I will examine today, and tomorrow I will do this, and the day after tomorrow that" - that is all... But if you can observe the whole movement of it, and you can only observe it when there is no motive or direction at all. And that silence of the brain is necessary to find out, for into that silence something sublime, something timeless can come into being.

Now the question is: what value has all that in daily life? What value has meditation, the thing which we have talked about, not the first category, what value has that meditation? In asking that question one must ask also what is a religious life? As the world exists now, technology is the most important thing. The marvellous submarine with its atom bomb, the warships, the mechanical culture is spreading through the world. That is not going to bring about a new religion. The old religions have lost their meaning altogether, they are still popular, they own a great deal of property, money, position, all the rest of it, but they are all sectarian - the Catholic world, the Hindu world. And they have broken up the world into their own particular forms of beliefs. One religion is not going to conquer the rest of the world. They may want to - the Hindus want it, so do the Catholics. And the mechanical world, which is now being put together, is not going to bring about a new society, a new culture, only religion has always done it, not the

present religions. So there needs to be a religion, not a faith, not belief, not rituals, not authority, however profitable, however comforting, the hierarchical religious structure has lost altogether its meaning for any intelligent man, for any thoughtful man. The thoughtful man rejects totally all that.

So religion is the way of life which is built on right order in our daily life and the meditation in which is born the most sacred, not that sacred is my experience and your experience, that which is sacred has no experience, you cannot experience it because if you experience it there must be an experiencer. I don't know if you are following this? So we are back then if there is an experiencer who says, "I have achieved. I am illumined" - altogether the very words "I am illumined" is something abominable. So that realization, if all of us can do that we will be the most religious people. We will be responsible then for a new culture, not based on fear. And have a society which is incorruptible because we are incorruptible. That is the meaning of meditation, to gather all our energy which is now being dissipated so that our consciousness is totally empty of its content of fear and so on. So where there is this emptiness and space there is vast energy. And that energy is sacred, it is not the energy of belief in god, that belief in god is created by thought through fear. But when there is no fear, no sorrow, then there is that quality of silence in which that which is nameless can come into being. That has immense significance in daily life.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 26TH DECEMBER 1981

If I may I would like to point out we are not entertaining you. We are not indulging in some kind of intellectual game, or trying to point out what kind of belief you should have; or to seek a leader to solve our problems. We are not doing any kind of propaganda to persuade you to think in a particular direction, or to convince you of a particular point of view. But we are thinking together, observing together the problems, the crisis, that we are facing, the war, destruction, corruption, and the superstitions in the name of religion; all that nonsense that goes on in the name of religion, god and so on. What we are going to do in these talks here, and the discussions, we are observing carefully first what is happening in the world outside of us: the environment, the social condition, the immorality of society in which we exist, the contradictions and so on. We are together, if you will, going to examine, investigate what is happening outside. So please this is not a lecture, something you listen to, agreeing or disagreeing, but rather that together you, and the speaker, together, are going to look at all these problems that man is facing now: the great crisis, not only outwardly but the crisis in our consciousness, in our mind, in our behaviour, in our relationship with each other.

We are going to talk over together the problem of fear, relationship, pleasure, sorrow, death and what is right meditation. During all these talks we are going to cover all that, that is, the whole existence of man. So we are not dealing with ideas, theories, or come to some kind of conclusion and from that conclusion act.

But we are together going to think, we are together examining, we are together going to observe impersonally, not as Hindus or Christians, or Capitalists, or Socialists, or Communists, but together as intelligent, if we are, intelligent human beings who are facing an extraordinary world; the world that has become very dangerous, a world that we have made, a society which we have created. We have contributed to all the horrors that are going on in the world.

So please from the very beginning I would like to point out that this is not a form of speculative entertainment. We are facing a very dangerous world, a very corrupt world, perhaps more so in this country. And no politicians, nor a particular party with their theories, with their promises, are going to solve our problems - no politicians, no politics, no religion whether it be Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, or the Islam world, is going to solve any of our problems. Nor any leader, whether they be political, religious, or some kind of fanciful guru. We have relied on leaders, somebody to tell us what to do when we are so confused, when we are in great trouble, when we are in sorrow, conflict, we look to others, politically, or religious leaders. They have all failed because we are what we are. We are, after two or three million years, or perhaps twenty five thousand years, which is the latest calculation of man's beginning, we have had every kind of leader, every kind of spiritual being who will tell us what to do. We have followed our gods, the scriptures, or perhaps we have not followed them, we have read them. Our minds are filled with knowledge of other people's sayings and their commentaries. And after all these millennia we are finding in the outward world wars, the threat of

the atom bomb, the extraordinary technological military advance, the tribalism called nationalism: all this is what man has created. Man has created his own gods, his own rituals and so on.

So if we are serious, if we are really concerned not only with what is happening in the world but also if we are concerned as a human being - a human being who has lived, experienced, suffered, loved perhaps - and at the end of this millennia we are what we are now; lost, uncertain, insecure, and all the gods that man has invented have failed. So we cannot possibly rely on anybody, including the speaker.

So realizing what is important, realizing that since all these people have failed us, 'led us up the garden path', we have to be entirely utterly responsible for ourselves: responsible for our conduct, responsible for our relationship with each other, responsible to have total integrity. We shall be talking over these things together.

So first if we may let us look at the world, because if you don't observe the world carefully we have no criteria by which you judge when we turn inwardly. I hope that is clear. We must understand the world in which we live; that is the yard stick, how we look at the world: what is our response to what is happening in the world, whether we are committed to any particular form of belief, to a particular system, to any particular institution, or to any particular nation. But if we would understand what is happening one must be free to look, not be biased, not think in terms of Hinduism. But we are facing a global problem; the problem of war, the problem of corruption, the utter lack of integrity. So let us look together, objectively, not personally, not from any conclusion, however

palatable, however logical, because if we hold to a particular point of view whether it be Socialist, or Communist, Capitalist and so on, we shall not be able to understand, obviously, actually what is going on. I think that is fairly clear. So let us start.

The world has divided itself as the one far west, middle Europe and Asia. Each has its own particular point of view; nationalistic, religious, economic and seeking power, great powers in the West and in the East. They are in conflict, preparing militarily for war. When you prepare you must produce; like a good cook who prepares food ultimately there is a meal. Similarly, each country separate, committed to its own borders, is accumulating extraordinary implements of war. The cause of war, one of the factors, is nationalism, which is glorified tribalism: nationalism, patriotism, which is totally different from the love of country, love of the earth. It is not the Hindu earth or the Christian earth, it is our earth to live upon it happily. But apparently that has become almost impossible. And one idea, or set of ideas opposing another. Theoreticians on both sides supplementing logical events. You know all this. Anybody who reads the newspapers, or listens to radio or television, can observe all this phenomena going on in the world; the innumerable books written on both sides against each other.

And religion has separated man: the Christians, the Catholics, the Protestants and the many, many other sects involved in Christianity. And there is this so-called Hinduism, apparently with three hundred thousand gods; local gods, tribal gods, each against the other, tolerating each other.

Economically each country is concerned with itself. There is

great poverty in the world, especially in this country. And anybody who is concerned must naturally be involved in solving the problem of poverty. This poverty throughout the world cannot possibly be solved through nationalism, through separate economic division: it is a global affair. You will not solve your problem of poverty in this country unless we deal with it globally. But the politicians will not listen to this at all because they are concerned with the images of solving immediate problems. So that is what the world is, which we have created, you, your grandparents and so on and so on. This society in which we live is created by man, by you. And this society has become very dangerous, corrupt, in which there is no morality and so on and so on.

So what is our responsibility with regard to all this? How do we psychologically respond to this present condition? That is the world is not separate from you; you are the world because we have created this: the separate religions with all their rituals, with the utter meaninglessness of it all. So how do we, each one of us, respond to all this? Do we still remain as Hindus, Muslims, Christians, and Capitalists, Communists? Or can we have a global interrelationship? That is one of our problems. And do we realize that thought has created all this? Do we realize that thought has created the whole technological world, the astonishing things they are producing: thought is responsible for this. Thought is responsible for the beautiful architecture, the great cathedrals, great temples and mosques. And all the things that are within the temples, within the mosques, within the churches are put together by thought: thought has created the gods, the local gods, or the gods that you have a little further along up the hill. Thought is

responsible for the division of people as Hindus, Buddhists and all the rest of it. Thought is responsible and there is no question about it. You can't argue that some other outside agency has created this mess in which we are living. We are saying clearly that thought is solely responsible for all this horror that is going on: in the technological world, the computer, the submarine, the atom bomb, the gods, their rituals, superstitions, dogmas, the priests and so on; thought has put together this whole structure.

So we ought to understand what is thinking? What is thought? Why have we given such extraordinary importance to thought? We have praised the intellectuals, the writers, the theoreticians, the philosophers; why has thought become so utterly important? We live by thought, our actions are based on thought. Thought projects the future, thought has created all our problems. Please do listen to all this. You may not agree, but listen, find out, don't resist but enquire, explore. Thought has done most extraordinary things: great surgeons, medicine, communication, rapid transportation; but thought also has created wars and all the instruments of war; thought has divided people. Please look at it carefully. So we have to enquire most seriously why human beings throughout the world have given such importance, such extraordinary vitality to thought? What is thought? What is thinking? Please understand we are not condemning thought but we are examining together the nature of thought; together exploring the beginning of thought, which has done such beneficial activity on one side, destruction on the other. What is thought? What is the beginning, the origin of thought?

Thinking is the beginning of memory; without memory there is no thinking. That is so obvious. Memory is stored, stored up in the

brain as knowledge. Knowledge is the outcome of experience: experience, knowledge, memory and the response of memory is thought. Right? Are we meeting each other? Or am I talking to myself? We are together in this. You are not agreeing, we are examining. It is not that the speaker is telling you what thought is, but together we are understanding the nature and the movement of thought. So thought is the outcome of experience, of a thousand million years of experience, vast accumulation of knowledge, scientific, biological, archeological and so on. It is there in our brain as memory; and from that memory thought comes. So knowledge is always in the past. That is obvious. Are we clear? And the past is our life, projected perhaps into the future. So we are living in the past: all our memories, our experiences, the past meeting the present, modifying itself and proceeding further as the future. So thought is a material process. Are we meeting each other? Or is this impossible? Do you understand sirs?

Memory is in the brain, the brain contains the memory, and memory is the outcome of experience, knowledge, and knowledge can never be complete about anything and so thought is always incomplete. Thought is not holistic. So our actions, our behaviour, our outlook is always limited, is always partial because we rely on thought; thought guides us and thought is the outcome of knowledge, and knowledge is always incomplete about anything. So our actions are incomplete, our outlook is incomplete. But thought is necessary, knowledge is necessary, otherwise you couldn't go home, otherwise we couldn't speak English, otherwise we wouldn't know how to cook. So knowledge however limited we must have. That is clear.

So is there any other kind of knowledge? You are following this? I need knowledge to speak English, or French or Tamil or Telegu or whatever the language is. I need to have knowledge if I am a carpenter, or a scientist - I must have gathered a great deal of information to be a top scientist. But to be a good carpenter I must know the nature of the wood, the tools, I must have great skill with my hands. Therefore knowledge at a certain level is necessary completely. That is, to survive physically we must have knowledge. And if you observe, psychologically, inwardly, the same process continues. That is, we must have knowledge to survive physically; and psychologically, inwardly we think knowledge is necessary. The same movement, which is physical survival, that same movement is carried over psychologically. I hope this is clear. Are we together in this or not? Somebody say, "Yes". May I go on? Good. At last, somebody!

Psychologically, inwardly, what are we? We are memory, nothing else. We are a mass of collective memory, remembrance of things past. And we are operating, functioning psychologically on memory as the 'me' and the you. Right? So is there knowledge about oneself? Do we know ourselves? Without going to the psychologists, the philosophers who tell us what we are, or going to the sacred books to find out what we are, do we know, or observe, aware of what we are? What are we? What are you? As a human being, what are you? I know, you have got a name, a form, a job and so on and so on and so on, outwardly; but inwardly - which always overcomes the outer; what you are inwardly conquers whatever system, whatever ideology, it always overcomes that. So it is important from the beginning of these talks

to understand what we are. We are the name, the form, outwardly: inwardly the content of our consciousness is put together by thought. Right? In my consciousness, in your consciousness, is the belief, the fears, the agonies, the pain, the desperate loneliness, sorrow and all the hurts, wounds, psychologically that we have; all that is our consciousness.

Our consciousness, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, that consciousness may invent a super consciousness but it is still part of that consciousness. That is, I may think that there is super consciousness beyond my consciousness, a super consciousness which I have to bring down into myself. That super consciousness is still part of my thinking about it, so it is still part of my consciousness. See, sir, what we are doing; how we are deceiving ourselves, how dishonest we are: because we have never realized that thought can invent and live in an illusion of every kind. So our consciousness is the product of thought. I will go into it, you will see it presently. This consciousness is common to all mankind. All mankind has belief, some kind of belief, he may not particularly have your belief but belief: it suffers, it's anxious, uncertain, insecure, depressed, lonely, great anxiety and so on. This is common to all mankind, whether they live in America, in Russia, or here or in China. Right? So it is not your consciousness, it is the consciousness of man. Right? Please see the logic of it even.

Because wherever you go, from the remotest village to the most sophisticated city in the world, man, a human being, goes through all kinds of travail, all kinds of misery; and that is the common ground on which we all stand. And the consequences of that are that we are not individuals. I know this will be rather difficult for

you to accept.

Are you individual? Which means you are a separate entity, with separate consciousness, with a separate conditioning, as an entity striving to perfect itself. Right? Are you? The word individual means indivisible. That is, individuality is really a human being who has never known fragmentation. Are we meeting this? Don't agree. Look at yourselves sirs. Do look at yourself. The speaker may put it into words, he may act as a mirror but look at that mirror. See yourself exactly as you are: anxious, uncertain, insecure, inwardly, you may be secure - I hope all of you are secure outwardly, but inwardly you are insecure, uncertain, fearful, anxious, in pain, hoping somebody will clear up your anxieties, all the conflicts that one goes through. This is common to every human being - to your wife, to your husband, to the man that lives in far away countries, this is a common factor for all human beings. So your consciousness is not yours. But we are conditioned through centuries to think we are separate individuals. Religions have encouraged this; education has fostered it; your whole literature is based on this: individual salvation, individual prayers, through the prayers you will receive. We are conditioned to think, live as separate human beings. We are questioning that. If you are an individual then you have separated yourself from another and so you have created a society based on this division, each one struggling to succeed, each one struggling to reach heaven, or whatever it is. So we are questioning altogether this whole concept that you are an individual. You are not: you are the rest of mankind; you are the world and the world is you. So, you understand the extraordinary truth of this? It shatters all the ideas

of individuality.

So the question then is: is it possible to be free utterly from all the content of our consciousness? You understand? To be free of all the hurts that one has received from childhood; to be free of fear; to understand the whole nature of pleasure; to find right relationship with each other. So let's begin to find out if it is possible to be free of the hurts, the wounds, that we have received from childhood. You understand the question? All human beings are hurt psychologically. They are hurt through education when they are compared one boy with another boy, that is a hurt. The whole system of education is based on this, competition, and that inevitably wounds a human being. So can we find out if you are at all aware of your hurts, of your psychological wounds, whether it is possible to be free of them. Because if we are not, one must see the consequences of these hurts. You are following all this?

Look: suppose I am hurt - you understand what the word hurt is? By a word, by comparison, by a gesture and so on, I am hurt. And the consequences of that hurt are that I am protecting myself, build a wall around myself in order not to be hurt more. So fear arises. And as you proceed further, in all our relationships, man, woman, if I am hurt, I bear that hurt, continue with that hurt and it has its own neurotic activities in my relationship with another. So we are asking is it possible to be free of hurts? What is it that is hurt? Please sirs. When you say, "I am hurt", what do you mean by that? What is it that is hurt? Is it the image you have about yourself? It is, isn't it? The image that you have; either your parents, your society has given you, or you have created an image about yourself and that image gets hurt. Right? We create the

image in order to feel secure, in order to feel safe. And that image, that picture of what one is, gets hurt.

The next question is: is it possible to live a daily life in this world without a single image? You understand my question? You understand sirs? As long as I have an image about myself that I am this, that I am that, or that I should be but I am not, or I want to be a great success, I can't achieve the top. And that image is being built daily, and that image gets hurt. We are asking: is it possible to live in this world without a single image? It is possible. That is real freedom. That is to be completely free from all conditioning. Because without that total freedom there is no love. And without that love there is no compassion with its intelligence.

So, as we said, seeing what the world is, and that you cannot possibly rely on anybody, your gurus, your leaders, they have all betrayed you, human beings, or probably they have betrayed themselves. So you have to be totally responsible in this chaotic world. And to be responsible one must understand oneself; what you are, not what others tell you what you are. To discover for yourself why you think this, why you have these beliefs, these superstitions, this anxiety. So one has to become sensitive; sensitive to the world, to nature. You know when you have lost your relationship with nature you have lost your relationship with human beings. You understand all this? So that responsibility is not to be avoided; so you have to feel this tremendous responsibility because if you do not we are going to face catastrophe after catastrophe. The human brain is declining, it is caught in a particular conditioning. We will talk about it further.

It is caught in this conditioning, which is, it is functioning

partially. The brain is not functioning wholly, only partially. It is partial because we have limited it by knowledge. As knowledge is never complete, as knowledge will always live within the shadow of ignorance, our conditioning of the brain has become small, narrow. This is a fact if you observe. If you are an engineer and you have spent all your life calculating, you know, as an engineer, your brain is naturally limited. If you are a lawyer naturally your brain is limited. Your profession conditions your brain. And therefore there is division.

So the enquiry is further, if we have time this evening: what is the capacity of a brain which is acting, functioning holistically, as a whole? You understand my question? Oh, my god! You understand sirs? The scientists are also saying, which the speaker has been saying for many years, that we are only using a very small part of our brain because we are all becoming specialists. That is one side. And also it is functioning on knowledge; that is, experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action; from that action you learn more and come back, that is, in the cycle, it is caught in this cycle. Are you following all this? Sirs, observe yourself. You have learnt something through experience; that is recorded in the brain as memory; from that memory there is action; from that action you learn more. So you are caught in this chain of experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. So it is conditioned to that and therefore it has become limited, narrow. If you observe it yourself you can see this for yourself. And the brain is the centre of all sensory responses. It contains all the responses of the senses. Right? And religions have denied the importance of the senses. Right? You know this: suppress. So as human beings have learnt to

use only one sense, or two senses, but not holistically all the senses, therefore your brain becomes narrow, partial and all its activity is partial, therefore there must be conflict. They are discovering too that a human being who has no conflict at all, psychologically as well as outwardly, may not have any kind of disease. Perhaps you will be more interested in that!

So is it possible to live without a single conflict? We are saying, yes it is possible: not theoretically, not as some ideal, not something as a reward, it is a fact. That is, as long as there is a contradiction within oneself there must be conflict. That is when you say one thing and do another, that is a conflict; when you think one thing and do quite the opposite. Right? So there is this conflict inwardly. All human beings live in conflict; in their relationship with each other, however intimate, there is conflict. And we are asking whether it is possible to live in this world without a shadow of conflict? That is, conflict exists only when we do not understand 'what is' but rather 'what should be'. You understand? That is, we are escaping from 'what is' into 'what should be', in that escape there is conflict. All escapes from 'what is' must inevitably bring conflict. 'What is' is what is actually taking place in your mind and your heart; not escape from that. We escape from it when we begin to pursue what is not. You understand? 'What is' is the fact, 'what is' is actually what is happening. To understand that why should we have ideals? Why should we have beliefs and all that business? Just to observe 'what is'.

So one begins then to enquire: what is observation, what is it to observe? Have you observed your wife or your husband? Observed. That is, to observe without the word, without all the

memories you have built about her or him, to observe. To observe, sir, a tree, one of the most beautiful things on earth, a tree. Have you ever observed it? To observe it without a word, without the word 'tree' - knowing the word is not the thing. Right? You understand this? Sir, the symbol is not reality, the word is not the fact, but to us the word has become extraordinarily important: my wife. The word is not the wife, is not the woman, or the man. So we are caught in words. Your religion is nothing but words.

So, sirs, we have observed together what the world is; the world which we have created, the world for which we are responsible. And as nobody in the world is going to help you, nobody, including the speaker, especially the speaker, it behoves then that you as a human being, who is the rest of mankind, that you are totally responsible for what you do: if you are corrupt, end your corruption, suffer for it; if you are dishonest, end that dishonesty because you are responsible for everything that is happening in the world. And mankind is facing a terrible danger. Your grandchildren are facing it if you are not facing it already. So please understand for yourself how utterly responsible, and when you feel responsible then you have capacity, capacity to act as a human being who has got integrity, means what he says, doesn't repeat what other people have said.

And as we will be talking, going over together the whole human existence with its problems, we have to listen to each other. Listen. We have lost the art of listening. To listen so that you see immediately the false or the truth: that means not only hearing with the sensual ear but hearing inwardly. That is why one has to be silent, quiet, to find out. Right sirs.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 29TH DECEMBER 1981

It's a beautiful morning. I hope you are enjoying the lovely morning. Probably there have been a lot of questions. We should put questions, not only to the speaker, but also to ourselves, lots of questions. Not superficial questions, not questions about theories, hypotheses, or some speculative religious concepts, but question our own thinking, why we think in a particular way, why we behave in certain ways, why we accept tradition, what is our relationship with each other. We should have, I think, a great deal of scepticism, not only about others but about ourselves.

So we are going to ask, or try to find out, the answers to the questions. Is the answer more important than the question? Does the answer lie in the question? Please we are thinking together, not just listening to the speaker. How do we approach a question? A question is a problem. A problem, the meaning of that word, is something thrown at you, the root meaning of that word. A question means a challenge. How does one approach a challenge, a question? Because in the approach is the answer, not the question itself. I hope we are meeting each other, are we?

Suppose I have a problem, a question about the world, about my relationship to the world, my anxiety, my agony. And what is my approach to the solution of that problem, my anxiety, my agony, my relationship to the world, how do I listen to the question, how do I approach it, come near it, how do I almost touch the question? You understand? So it is far more important to find out how we approach a question, a problem, rather than try to find out the

answer. Because in the approach, if the approach is correct, then we can examine the problem itself, not try to seek an answer, because the answer is in the problem. We are going to find out presently that way.

So, please, we are not answering the question. We will answer the questions together, explore the questions together, and you will have to find the answer for it yourself, not I answer it and you accept it, or not accept it, which becomes rather silly. But if we could look at the question together, how we approach the question, and investigate the question itself, not try to find an answer to the question. Is this clear? That is, we are together going to examine the question, but how you approach the question is more important than the investigation of the question. First, how do we approach a question? How do we approach a problem? If we approach it with a desire to find an answer, the answer becomes far more important than the question. That's clear. Are we meeting each other with this?

So if we can we will go through these questions one by one, and try to find out how we approach it, how we examine the problem, and discover that the answer is in the problem itself. I haven't seen these questions before. I don't like to look at them previously.

1st QUESTION: Without conflict or struggle in the sense of desire to improve, how can there be any progress, material or social in the world? The desire to change supplies the motive force for work towards achievement and progress. If you accept 'what is' then how can there be any kind of progress?

You have got the question clear? Need I read it again? Thank goodness!

What do we mean by self improvement? Improving selfishness? Improving deceit? Improving hypocrisy? Improving our angers, our anxieties, our pains, our sorrows? Is that what we mean by improving ourselves? Either getting more money, better position` and all that, physical comfort - which is necessary obviously - but when you say 'self-improvement', what is the self? Could we go into that? What is the self? What are you? You have a name, you have a form, how you look, the shape of your body and so on, physical appearance, apart from that, what are you? All that you have been taught in a school, college, university, if you have been lucky to go through that, or unlucky to have gone through that, and what the environment has impressed upon you, upon the brain. You are the tradition, you are all that which actually is - your greed, your envy, your beliefs, your hypocrisy, say one thing and do another, your miserliness, you are all that surely. Or do you think you are something much more than that? That is, your super consciousness, super something or other. If you say you are something, super, super consciousness, that is also the result of thinking. So you are the whole movement of thought. Isn't that obvious? So what is there to improve? Or there is freedom from all this, not improving. That's clear too, isn't it? I can't improve my selfishness, my agony, or my sense of despair. What is possible is to be free of all that completely. I can't improve it. That's simple enough.

The next part of the question is: if there is no conflict, struggle, there will be no progress. Right? What is progress? From the bullock cart to the jet, isn't it? That's an improvement, that's progress, advancement, from one state of lack of communication to

the extraordinary speed of communication. That's all. There is progress in that direction. Before one killed another by an arrow, now you kill another, or millions, through an atom bomb. That's also progress, if you call that progress. But socially, that is, relationship between each other, which is society, socially is there progress? Or we are finding ways and means of going round laws, cheating in tax, which you are all doing - the richer you are the more cunning you become. You know that is all progress, we call all this progress. Is there psychological progress at all? You understand my question? Progress, this is a very complex problem this. Progress means from what I am I move, change, transform myself. That implies time. Progress means time. Right? You are coming to meet this?

What is time? Time by the watch, time by the sun rising, sun setting, time as today, yesterday, tomorrow, time for a plant to grow, time for a baby to become mature, and so on. There is time outwardly, naturally. But is there time at all inwardly? Please we are investigating, you are not accepting what the speaker is saying. Is there time as psychological progress? Time as hope of tomorrow. So all the implications of this idea of progress involves time.

Now there is physical time, to learn a language I need time. But to be free of violence, does it need time? You follow my question? I need time to learn a skill, to become an engineer, carpenter, or a not straight politician. Right, sir? Yes, you know that. But does one need time to be free of violence? Please, find out. I am violent. To become non-violent requires time. You understand? I am violent, to become or achieve, or attain a state of non-violence is a

movement from 'what is' to 'what should be', that requires time. But does being free from violence require time? You understand the difference? Are we meeting each other? To become something requires time, not to be, does it require time? I am violent - suppose I am violent. Can there be freedom from that violence without time? You understand? Our brains are conditioned to time. Now we are asking a question which is totally different from that conditioning. Which is, to be instantly free from violence. Is that possible? You understand my question? My brain is used to the idea that I will gradually get rid of my violence, which is never possible, because gradually, during the interval I am sowing violence, I am being violent. It's like a man saying, 'I am trying to be non-violent', which means he is being violent all the time. Right? Is that clear?

So is it possible to be free of violence instantly? That is, without time. Is the question clear?

Q: I think it is.

K: Sir, don't let's think it is. First of all is it possible to be free of violence immediately, instantly? Or does it take time to be free? If you take time to be free, during that interval you are being violent, and therefore there is no end to violence. I don't know if you follow logically this. But is it possible to be free of violence, not in terms of time? We are saying it is possible. Which is, how you observe violence. When you observe, are you the observer and violence is something apart from you? You understand my question? Or you are violence. The observer is the observed. I don't know if you are following all this. No. You are not.

Is anger different from me? I am anger, it is not different from

me. I am greed, greed is not different from me. Violence is me, I am part of that. But we have divided violence as something separate from me. So there is the observer who says I am violent, therefore I must suppress it, or escape it, but if you see the truth that you are violence, the very observer who says I am violent, he is violence.

So then, there being no division, hence no conflict, and the observer is absent, there is only that state. Then you observe with all your energy and it totally disappears. You try it. Not try it, do it - sorry, forgive me for using that word 'try'. Do it and you will discover for yourself.

So progress outwardly, physically, exists, of course. But socially, that is society, is actually relationship between human beings. Now to understand the nature of relationship and the transformation in that relationship, does it require time? Or there is immediate perception, an insight which transforms the conditioning. Right, may I go on to the next question?

Q: Does this transformation take place through the will of the thought, or some other agency, or energy?

K: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, I have got the question, sir. Does transformation take place through the action of will, or some outside agency, god, or some other factor bring about change? Right?

What is will? When you say, 'I will do that', 'I will be that', what do you mean by the word 'will'? Think it out, sir, let's go into it. Is it not desire? Right? We see that? The summation of desire is will. And - oh, I don't want to go into the whole problem of desire. What is desire? You think it out, sir. What is desire? You desire a house,

you desire a car, you desire a woman or a man, you desire success, you desire money, you desire to be a hypocrite, you desire to be popular, you desire to be famous, and so on and so on. What is this desire?

Q: Thought.

K: Thought. Is desire thought? I desire that house. We are not talking of the object of desire, but desire itself. Right? What is desire? Which all religions, more or less, say, suppress desire. Right? So let's find out together what is desire. We are not saying that should be suppressed, we are not saying that it is an ugly thing, or anything. So what is desire?

Q: Willingness to possess.

K: Willingness to possess. Sir, that's desire. I want to possess that house. That's part of desire. To dominate, to possess, is desire. No?

Q: You want to be something which you are not.

K: Yes, that is desire. You want heaven, that's a desire.

Q: Energy.

K: Sir, shall we throw up a lot of words into the basket and find an answer? Is that the way to find an answer to a question?

Q: Thought, first.

K: Thought. That gentleman also said thought.

Q: Direct from thought.

K: Sir, you are not investigating what is desire, how it arises.

Q: A reaction.

K: May I go into it? That's right.

Q: Desire is the outcome of thought.

K: The outcome of thought. May I go into it very simply? Do

you consider desire part of sensation? Of course. Would you kindly let me first point out and then you can talk, sir. Desire is part of sensation. Right? What is sensation? The response of the senses. There is the seeing the house, nice house, or ugly house, house, the perception, the seeing, the visual seeing, then the sensation of wanting to possess it, then investigating the house. Right? Looking all over the house. So there is first seeing, contact, touching, then sensation. That's normal, isn't it. That is what is actually going on. Then what happens? You understand? Seeing, contact, sensation. If there was no seeing, contact, sensation, I am paralysed - as most of us are. I am paralysed. Then what takes place? This is important to understand. We understand very easily the seeing, contact, sensation. Then what is the next step which brings about desire? You understand my question? Is the question clear? Now there is the seeing, contact, sensation, then thought says, 'I wish I had that house'. Clear? That is, when thought identifies itself with sensation and that house then desire begins. Do you question that? That is, the seeing, the touching, the sensory responses. Then thought creates the image of living in that house. Thought when it creates the image then desire begins. You see this step by step. Is this clear? No, don't, I am not making it clear for you. Through the explanation of the speaker you are making it clear for yourself. It's not you accepting the words the speaker says, but you see the movement of seeing, contact, sensation, then thought with its image begins the desire.

Now will is desire. Does transformation take place through desire? Or thought coming to an end and sensation remains. You follow? This requires, please. You are not clear, quite right.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. Look, you desire something, don't you, sir? You desire to have money, you desire to have position, or you desire, what? A woman, or a man. Of course you are all holy, therefore you never face that issue. You desire. Now see what happens, trace it out. You see something beautiful which appeals to your senses, that is the sensation. Then thought creates the image of you having that. Thought when it creates the image is the origin, or the beginning of desire. Is this clear? Obviously. This is fairly clear, I don't have to repeat it. But the question is, can thought not create the image but only sensation remain. I see that beautiful tree, which is beautiful, but I have a house with a piece of land, I want that tree to grow in my land. So desire has taken place. That's all. And desire cannot possibly bring about transformation. That too is clear. Because you have an image of what transformation is, and you desire that. You follow? Or you say, well, it is not desire but some outside agency. Is there an outside agency? This you would like to know, wouldn't you.

Q: What is ordinarily called luck, the common word is luck.

K: Luck?

Q: Desire is replaced with that word all the time, by most people.

K: What do you mean most people?

Q: Usually desire is thought to be a plane, and luck coming from outside, and people want desire to be enlarged.

K: I don't understand the question, sir. What has luck to do with desire?

Q: It is part of desire.

K: Is it? Now is there an outside agency which will help us to transform ourselves? Go on, sir.

Q: Outside agency can force you only, but not help you.

K: Outside agency, Mr Hitler, you all know about Hitler.

Q: Yes. There should be a father and a mother, for a seed, to luck.

K: All right, sir. We are talking about outside agency, outside influence, outside authority, outside leader. You have had all those, leaders, gurus, the so-called sacred books, you have had outside agency as education, authority, has all that helped you to change? You have had it for millennia. Has that helped you to become transformed? Answer, sir.

Q: Yes.

K: Oh, yes, you have transformed? That you are compassionate, that you love, that you are supremely intelligent? Sir, let's be factual and honest for god's sake. You have had leaders, ideals, outside. You have had all the pressures put on you to change. Have you?

Q: Are you not an outside agency?

K: Am I not, the questioner says, an outside agency to help you - I am not. I am not helping you. Take that, sir. I really mean it, I am not helping you. I say, help yourself. Right? You have relied on leaders, authority for centuries, and nothing, you are what you are now - miserable, confused, uncertain, insecure, suffering, anxious, agony you go through, and nothing has helped you. Therefore you have to find out a different method - not rely on anybody. Right?

Q: Can't you point in a certain direction?

K: No. I am not pointing out, I am only saying, look at yourself.

Q: But that is pointing.

K: No, sir, you can make everything ridiculous. So you believe in god, most of you do, I don't know why, but you do. That is, you believe because you are frightened. If you are very honest you will see that. Because god is perfect security. Right? I am uncertain, insecure, I project a principle, a symbol, an idea, of an image and that gives me a great sense of security. Right? Because you believe in god and that gives you a sense of security. That god you have made. Right? You might say, who created the universe. That's a wrong question. You see, this is a very complex question. Is there - please question yourself, find out the answer - is there a state in which there has been no cause? You understand?

Q: We want to attain something.

K: Yes, sir, yes, sir. We all want to attain something.

Q: Spiritually.

K: Spiritually, oh, lovely. Sir, please. I am asking you a question, which is very serious if you are interested in it. What has a cause comes to an end. Right? But is there a state of mind in which there is no cause, and therefore eternal? Investigate it, sir. For us there is cause. I do this because I want that. There is a motive which is a cause. Right? To compete, to compare. I compare myself with you who are bright, who are intelligent, who are compassionate, who have some flame in you. And I want to be like you, or go beyond you. So in comparing I have made myself something more than what I am. I don't know if you are following all this. I compare myself with you, bright, not a hypocrite, generous.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: A lovely word! I compare myself with you. You are very clever. By comparing I call myself dull. If I don't compare - go on, sir, answer it. You are clever, I am not. I compare myself with you, and then I say I am dull. But if I don't compare what happens? Am I dull? No, no, don't shake your head, sir. Just look at it. Am I dull, or I am what I am. From there I can proceed. But if I am saying to myself, I am not as clever as you, and I must be as clever as you, I begin to compete with you. So can we live without comparison?

Q: No.

K: You have answered the question, you cannot. All right, finished. You are all so thoughtless.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You didn't listen to what I said sir. You didn't listen, if I may point out most politely to what I said just before. That is, you are clever, I am not. By comparing myself with you I say, I am dull. If I don't compare, am I dull? I don't know. Right? See the point: I don't know. So I begin to find out. Sir, be simple about these matters. Can we live without comparison? That gentleman says, no. He has answered the question. But I want to find out. I want to find out if it is possible to live in this world without a sense of comparing myself with somebody. With Ramakrishna, or somebody or other, or with the Buddha, or with the Christ, or with some guru, why should I compare myself? Not that I am vain, not that I am proud, why should I compare myself? Am I less intelligent if I don't compare? Or when I don't compare at all I am beginning to understand myself. You understand? I am beginning to see what I am. A rose doesn't compare with a jasmine. It is a rose. You people don't meet all this.

Q: Is it not a feeling inadequacy?

K: All right, if one is inadequate, insufficient, psychologically, inwardly, if one is insufficient psychologically, inwardly, what do you do? Go on, sir, answer it. I am insufficient in myself because I feel empty, I feel all kinds of things, insufficient. So what happens? I try to fill that insufficiency with words. I don't know if you see that. Right, sir? With images. How do I know I am insufficient? Right, sir, are you meeting my point? How do I know I am insufficient? Because I have compared myself with you who appear to be self-sufficient. If I don't compare what takes place? How do I know I am insufficient? You don't meet this. Right, sir?

2nd QUESTION: Tell us seriously what should be done to help the country and the people of the country, for no philosophy, no books, no talks, can solve these problems.

Are you quite sure? That no philosophy, no leader, no book, the Gita, the Upanishads, no book, no philosophy, no leader will help this country, or yourself. Are you quite sure of that? You understand my question? Or is it just a rhetorical question? If you are serious, and you say, none of these will help, and you are clear about it, that no book, no leader, no outside agency, nobody can help you - right? - to bring about a change transformation, a change, radical change in the structure of this country, moral, ethical, aesthetic, social. Are you quite sure when you put that question, that there cannot? Or you are just playing with words? If you are quite sure that nobody can help you, then what will you do? You know the country is corrupt, you cannot rely on any politician, the people who write books about something beyond the mind, or in the mind, or something or other, they don't know what

they are talking about. Right? Right? So what will you do? Come on, sirs. What will you do?

Q: Look at the problem.

K: We have looked at the problem.

Q: We are not looking at it.

K: Who is not? Please, madam, we are looking at the problem.

The problem is overpopulation, the division in class, the lack of right education, tradition, and we have so depended on others.

Right? Books, leaders, one after the other you have had. Right?

And they haven't, the country, the people, have not changed. What will you do? What will you do, sir, when you realize this?

Q: You have to take the responsibility and behave properly.

K: Are you accepting responsibility? Are you accepting the responsibility?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you accepting the responsibility for yourself to see that you behave properly? Or again is that just talk? Sir, do you know what is happening to this country, do you all realize? I have been - the speaker has been coming to this country every winter for the last sixty years. You have advanced technologically, you are as clever, as inventive as anybody else. And you, as a human being, are slowly dying. The culture that this country has had, gone, finished, torn apart. Right? Everyone is living for himself. He is not concerned about his son's future, his grandson's future. You are not concerned for your neighbour. You follow? You are not concerned at all about another except about yourself. The country is breaking up - Tamilnadu, Telugunadu, or whatever nadus you have. This country is breaking up, the family is breaking up. And

there is no new flame, you are just repeating. When you repeat there is certain dead security, and you are in that state now. What are we going to do? What are you all going to do, sirs? Education, you know what it is in this country, it is the lowest. Professors who have been out from abroad, teachers from abroad have told me, they come here to investigate and they have told me there is no education at all, just book work, learning, memorizing. You understand? So education is at its lowest ebb, there is violence hidden, it may explode at any time. There is all the preparation for war. So the country is facing a tremendous crisis, your country, the land on which you are living, and you don't seem to care. And you build temples, go to the temples, take vows - you follow? Professionally you are a lawyer, or an engineer, and go to a temple with all the superstitions, you follow, the contradiction. For god's sake realize what is happening.

So what will you do? Or will you do nothing, as what is happening now, do nothing, let it go down the drain? You look at me, don't look at me, sirs. Look at the land that you are despoiling, the beauty of the country. Will you undertake the responsibility, not verbally, but actually to be responsible for what you are, what you do, what you think, what you feel, behave honestly, with integrity. Not be - sir, you know, will you. That's the only thing that is going to change this country. If there are a group of people who are really concerned with the future of this country, because the politicians are not, the gurus are not. What's going to happen to your grandchildren? So if you seriously undertake that you will be totally responsible for yourself, that you will be generous, you will not be corrupt. You may lose your job. Lose your job. Starve, die,

you follow, sir, hold to something. Then you will probably help the country to become something totally different than it is. It is a beautiful country, vast space, marvellous rivers and trees and mountains. Somebody said the other day, 'It's a lovely country except for the Indians!' Yes, sir, face it.

3rd QUESTION: What is sorrow?

What is sorrow, the questioner asks. Aren't you in sorrow when you see all that's going on in this country? Or is sorrow only when you personally are affected? You understand, sirs, my question? Is sorrow only when my son dies? Or the sorrow of seeing what is happening in this country? What is sorrow?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, don't answer so quickly. What is sorrow? Tears, pain, self-pity, the loss of somebody whom you love - if you love, which I doubt. You are attached, love is not attachment. You are attached to your work, to your property, you follow, you are attached. Is that love? Is sorrow personal, or there is sorrow in the world, of which you are. You follow? We have reduced everything to a small limited me - my pain, my sorrow - and I hold to that. We don't see the sorrow of man, of which you are. Sir, have you ever realized historically for five thousand years there have been wars, practically every year. This is historical. And see how many women, men, maimed, shed tears, the loneliness, the brutality of all that. You understand, sirs? Isn't that a great sorrow? Isn't it a sorrow that the poor man round that corner will never be clean? You understand? Never have clean clothes, never go in a jet, never ride in a comfortable car, don't you realize all this? Isn't it a sorrow to realize such a state exists?

So the understanding of sorrow is the ending of sorrow. Right? Sir, this requires a great deal of investigation into sorrow. Probably you have never shed tears. You have an explanation for tears. Right? Karma, some cause or other, but you have never actually suffered, felt the intense pain of it, because we are always seeking comfort, escape from sorrow. Right? Aren't you? That there is god, that you have paid. You have got dozens and dozens of explanations for sorrow, and how to escape from sorrow. But a man, or a woman who realizes the depth of sorrow, either he remains with that sorrow, becomes cynical, bitter, angry, violent, or he goes beyond, he is free from sorrow. It is possible to be free from sorrow, only then there is love.

4th QUESTION: What is the nature of freedom? Why does it happen?

Leave the latter part of the question, why does it happen. What is the nature of freedom. What do you mean by freedom? You have had freedom in this country since the British left, what have you done with it? Right? What do you mean by freedom? Freedom to do what you like which is what you are doing. Freedom from anxiety, freedom from pain - freedom from physical pain is comparatively easy, go to a doctor, or if one has some terrible disease you accept it and carry on. What is freedom? There is freedom from something, which is not freedom. You understand? I can be free from attachment that's fairly simple. But that's not actual freedom. I am free from a burden, but what is freedom? Will you know it when you are free? I wonder if you understand this question? When you are happy, if you are happy ever, when you are happy, when you say, 'How happy I am', is that happiness, or is

it only after it is gone? You understand my question? Can you ever know or recognize, or experience, complete freedom - not from anything - freedom? When you say, 'I am totally free', then you are not free. Right? It's like a man who says, 'I know', then he does not know. So freedom is something, sir, that you cannot experience. Like enlightenment is not to be experienced, because where there is an experience there is an experiencer and the experiencer must recognize the experience otherwise it is not an experience.

So freedom is not an experience, it is a state of being, not becoming. That's enough, sirs.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 31ST DECEMBER 1981

As we said the other day, the other morning, in answering some of these questions we are actually not answering the questions but rather exploring the questions. In investigating the question we will find the answer. The answer is in the problem. The meaning of that word 'problem' is, something thrown at you, a challenge - question is a challenge. And whether we respond accurately to the challenge depends on the state of our minds, the capacity of our brains. Most of us, if I may respectfully point out, are more or less asleep. Our brains are not functioning at their highest level because we work and think in a routine, habit, mechanically living and so gradually our brains become atrophied, naturally, like an old car that has lost its vitality.

And in answering these questions, or rather investigating these questions, we are together, I am not investigating and telling you but together we are investigating, together we are observing what the question is. And the investigation or exploration into the question depends on how you approach the question, how you approach any problem in life, whether it is a business problem, a deeply emotional problem, a sexual problem, problem of truth, and so on. How you come to receive it, how you approach it, which means how close you come to the question, when you stand close, almost touch it, feel it, see the quality of it, then perhaps out of that question one finds the true answer.

So if we may proceed with the questions.

1st QUESTION: We live in a corrupt and unjust society, is

there no place in your teachings to fight on behalf of the victims of injustice?

This has been a problem right through history, justice and injustice. Is there justice at all? I know the ancient Greeks talked about it, philosophers have talked about it, gone into the question of what is justice, what is injustice. We are questioning whether there is justice at all. That is, someone may be very clever, intelligent, born to wealth, capacity, and able to think clearly, and the quality of beauty in him; and another may never have that quality, capacity to think, to live. So where is there justice? Do you follow all this? We want justice, we all see victims of injustice, victims who are neurotic, victims who are psychopathic, and those of us who are born to poverty, and struggle, struggle, struggle, for the rest of our life. And those of you who may be born to riches, you have an easy life. Where is justice? You may be extraordinarily clever and I may be very dull. And where is there this quality of mercy, not justice? You understand?

So we are always talking about corruption and seeking justice, in the village, the well is used - you know all that business - by the few and there is violence if the others use it. This has been going on throughout history; those who have and those who have not. And apparently no government, no law, has ever been able to bring about the poor to have the same capacity, same drive, same intelligence. This has been the actual fact in life. We are all aware of it. So one asks, what is corruption, and what is justice?

What is corruption? The meaning of that word, the root meaning of that word, it comes from Latin and so on, which means to break up, to tear apart. Which is, corruption exists where there is

fragmentation. Please understand this. Corruption must exist where there is fragmentation in human beings. Not merely passing money under a table, paying ten rupees or whatever you do for an extra ticket - you know all the game you are all playing in this country, where there is a great deal of corruption. So we are investigating that word first, what it means. There is corruption when an educated human being, a lawyer, or engineer, works, capable, intelligently active in one direction and in the other he is superstitious, goes to temples, takes silly vows. There is this contradiction, which I am sure you know all about it because probably you are also in that way, go to temples, and pray and do puja and all that kind of nonsense, and in the world you are a lawyer, engineer, businessman and there also corruption and so on. This contradiction in oneself, of which most people are unaware of, that is also corruption. Probably that is the deepest corruption: exercising reason in one direction and denying totally reason in the other direction, and living in this contradiction. That is corruption. Corruption is to say one thing, and do another, to think one thought and act totally differently from that. That is dishonest, that is also corruption. We are dishonest, aren't we? In the sense, we have a great many ideals, what we should be, and we live totally differently. That is also corruption. Corruption is to imitate, not in clothes, but to conform to a pattern so that you are never free.

So we live in corruption. There's no question about it. And if we are aware of ourselves, is it possible to move out of that bondage of corruption. Is it possible to live a very deep profound integral life, be a person who is whole, not broken up - is that possible? I do not know if you have ever asked that question of yourself: whether it is

possible to live an integrated life. And to pursue to the very end of it, not just say, well, it is too tiresome, I am too lazy, and all the excuses, rationalizations that one invents.

And also the question of justice: you are beautiful, I am not, you look nice, I do not, you are very, very intelligent, I am not. You can exploit people, and I can't exploit people, you have wealth, fame and power, and I can never have it, you have vision and I have not, you have capacity, a sense of beauty, and I have not. So where is there justice. I am poor living in a village, you live in towns, you are urbanized, sophisticated, clever, and I can never be that.

Should we not talk not of justice but of compassion. Not try to bring about a equality. There is no such thing as equality. It sounds nice on a piece of stone, called equality, but there is no equality in the world. So we are always trying to bring about equality which is democracy, apparently. Ninety per cent of the people in this country know nothing about anything and they are voting. Right? You know all this. Where is there justice? So if you could move away from that word altogether and find out whether one is capable of being compassionate, to love, not seek justice. You are tall, I am short, you are bright, and I am not, I am dull, you have everything, I have nothing, you have health, I am diseased. So should we not look at this question, not from the point of justice, but a human being that has no love, no compassion is worse than an animal. And why is it in this country - don't say, does it exist in other countries, that's a political escape - we are talking about this country, we, you and I, while we are here. When the speaker is abroad he talks about that country. But in this country I wonder if

human beings living in this lovely land, whether they love at all, whether you really love your wife, your children, or you don't know that at all. You have responsibility to your wife, to your children, send them off to school and at the end of that marry your daughters off, that's the end of that.

So do we know the quality of mercy, justice - mercy, love and compassion. If that doesn't exist there is no justice. Compassion has its own intelligence, not the intelligence of a clever mind, of a clever brain.

Q: I see what you say, but are you saying that there is no way by which we can also contribute towards living a reasonably just kind of life.

K: The gentleman wants to know without that...

Q: No, we see what you are saying and we accept what you say.

K: Oh, you don't accept it, you accept the words. The words sound awfully nice, but you don't have the feeling of it, the quality of communication with love.

So you can create a society as they have tried revolution after revolution, historically, but they have never succeeded. You can see the fascist communism in Russian, in Eastern Europe and in China, they try to create a society, but there are the super people who have everything they want, special shops for them, special doctors for them, special clothes for them, not only the top polit-bureau, but the scientists, the artists, and the rest of them. So human beings throughout the world have tried to create a society outside, but society is our relationship with each other. In that relationship there is no love, no compassion, you may have excellent laws, but those laws can be broken. So without that

quality, do what you will, you will not create a marvellous world.

Q: I have to co-operate with a large number of people, can I not community-wise create a sense of justice?

K: Oh, you can create anything you want. That is just a lot of talk. Sir, another question is, in this connection, why don't we co-operate? To co-operate, that is, work together. Apparently in this country it doesn't exist. You are jealous of each other. Right? Don't you know all this? So there has never been a sense of working together. You work together in business because there is profit in that; you work together when you go to a temple because there is a profit in that. But without profit, without motive, is there a sense of feeling of working together. We work together round an authority, because he tells us what to do, and you are frightened to do something different from the authority. We work together for an ideal, if both of us agree, but we soon begin to break up because we each interpret it according to our personal like and dislike, prejudices.

So there is no spirit of co-operation. That again comes only when there is love in our heart. Not the word 'love' in our minds. Right.

2nd QUESTION: What is the place of right action in one's quest for self-knowledge?

Let us look at these words first: right, action and self-knowledge. What do we mean by right? Right is to be precise, accurate, and correct. Like if you are building a bridge it must be mathematically engineering, the stress and the strain of the steel and so on, it must be accurate according to measurement, weight and all the rest of it. And it must also be in proportion. It must be

balanced. Right? It must have a sense of harmony. That is the meaning of that word, 'right'.

And what do we mean by action? Action is the doing, not having done, or I will do. Action is taking place now. You understand? Not acting according to past memories, past intentions, or acting according to a principle. I wonder if you are following all this. Acting according to a concept, according to a projected opinion. So action means really the doing now. Right?

And the word 'self-knowledge', that is to know oneself, which is a very complex business.

Now, right action is freedom from the past - listen carefully - and not projecting the future and acting according to the future. The word 'act' means the doing, the doing not according to some principle, to some pattern, to some ideation. Is that possible? You understand? That is right action. But we are so conditioned by tradition, by education, by our own selfish motives, that we translate action according to convenience, according to environmental influence. So is there an action which is totally free from all that. That is right action. I don't know if you are following all this. Because in that right action there is no regret, no guilt, no sense of fulfilment. It is free from essentially the self. That is right action. When there is right action, it is right action under all circumstances, whether one lives in Europe, or America, or Asia, it is right action wherever you are. It doesn't depend on circumstances. Right? You know what that means? One must have tremendous strength, not courage, strength, like a rock, immovable, because that's right action. Can you do it? Can we live such a life of strength, not feeble, you know, a messy life?

And self-knowledge. The word 'to know', the word, what does it mean to know? Please this is important to understand. When I say, I know, I know my wife. You understand? What do we mean by that word 'know'? Think it out, sir. Is it knowledge? When I say, I know my father, I know my mother, my wife, my children, is that so. You understand? When I say, I know my wife, what do I know? I don't know her. But I have assumed certain tendencies, you follow, I have collected a few data about her, like a computer, collect some data, and then I say, I know her. But I really don't know her because it is a living thing. As I am a living thing I can never know a living thing. I can know a dead thing. I wonder if you understand this? No? I can only know that which has already happened. But a living thing, a living water, a flowing water, a stream, a river that is rushing by, I can't say, I know it, I am watching it, I enjoy the beauty of the water. You understand? I look at the water, delight in the movement of the water, but the moment I say, I know, I have stopped learning. You understand? I wonder if you do.

Therefore the cultivation of memory is not learning. I wonder if you see the distinction. Right? I go to a university, school, college, university, and I have accumulated a great deal of information. That has become my knowledge which I use skilfully to earn a livelihood, or unskilfully. Right? The moment I have accumulated a great deal of information, and act according to that information, according to that knowledge, my skill is limited. But if I am learning all the time, like a carpenter is learning all the time, if he is a master carpenter, like a top engineer, he is learning, not saying, 'I know and I will act according to that'. You follow all this?

Now, can I know myself? Know. That is, I have learnt, I have seen, I have been aware that I am angry. Right? That's part of my being, that's part of me. I am aware that I am angry. Why do I use the word 'anger'? Think it out, let's work it out, sir. Why do I use the word 'anger'? Because I have been told, I have been educated, I have accepted that word and I remember the previous angers which have been named. So when there is a new reaction of that emotion I name it. So what have I done? You are following all this? Are you interested in all this? I am angry. Let's go back step by step. The anger is not different from me, I am anger. I like to think it is different from me because I can control it, I can rationalize it, but it is part of me. That's a fact. And I have named it, as anger. Because that is part of my tradition, part of my inheritance, all that, the word. The word has become important, not the feeling. You see it?

So there has been anger at other times in the past. So I recognize this feeling which has arisen now as anger, by the remembrance of the past. So am I capable of looking at that new emotion without the word, without recognizing it as the past? You understand? I wonder if you see this? It requires a great deal of observation. That is, we are always living in the past. Right? That's so obvious. And the past is a series of memories, which are words, symbols. And with that a new reaction takes place and I immediately name it. Which means I have brought it back into the old tradition. Whereas if I could look at that reaction, the new reaction without the word. You understand? And without saying, 'I know it's anger', so that you meet every reaction afresh. I wonder if you see this. That means your brain is extraordinarily alive, sensitive, not just caught in the old repetition. Right? Will you do

that? That is, to be aware of this whole movement of some reaction, naming it, the very naming of it strengthens the past, and so we are strengthening anger by repetition of the word. Clear?

Now the ancient Greeks and the ancient Hindus have talked about self-knowledge, knowing oneself. That is, I want to know myself because if I don't know myself I am just a leaf in the wind. So I have to learn about myself, not according to some psychologist, some philosopher, or from some book, whether you call it sacred or not, it is just a book. So can I dispense with all that, the authority of what other people have said about me, the tradition, you follow, put aside completely all that, because what they tell me I am not. I wonder if you see all this. I have to discover myself. Myself is a living thing, so I have to learn. Now I have seen I am angry, or I have had one experience, whatever it is, an experience. It has been recorded in the brain, which has become the memory, with that memory I examine myself. You are following this? So the past is examining myself. But I am the past. I wonder if you see all this. So is there a looking at myself as though for the first time? Not with jaded memories, not with previous knowledge which I have learnt about myself. That is, to learn about myself anew because I am a living thing, not a dead thing. You may be dead, because you are all so caught up in memories, which is dead. Tradition is dead.

So it becomes extraordinarily interesting, vital, energising if you can look at that tree as though for the first time. At your wife for the first time. And at your reactions, your sensations, not name them, which is to catch it in the net of the old, so that every time it's new. You understand this? Do it, sirs. Don't agree with the

speaker. You will see what extraordinary vitality one has. Not to do mischief - that you have anyhow. But the energy that has an extraordinary quality of freshness, of something totally new.

Q: Why are we not able to do this?

K: Why are we not capable of doing it. Because you don't want to.

Q: I want to.

K: Sir, how many hours of the day do you spend in an office, or in a factory, or how many years you have spent to learn a skill, to become the BA, MA, PhD, adding alphabets after your name, how many years. And this requires not one day, you have to be so tremendously aware all the time, watching, watching the trees, the moon, the birds, and watching yourself like a hawk, to see that not even one thought escapes. How much time will you give to that? Or you make your own time. Or you deny time.

3rd QUESTION: Even though I am able to bring about order within myself, the disorder and pressure of the world around me constantly affect my daily life. Is it possible to remain unaffected?

Aren't you under pressure all the time? The newspapers tell you what to think, and what not to. Newspapers can be a lot of gossip. Right? So you are under that pressure. You have the pressure of your parents, and your nephews, your family. Right? You are under pressure of your own desires. In fact you are constantly under pressure. Are you aware of this? Your wife is under pressure, exercises her power, pressure, and you exercise over her, pressure. The gods that you have created, you are under that pressure. The pressure of books. So don't say there is order in us. As long as there is pressure and you are conforming to that

pressure there is disorder. You understand, sir, life isn't a game. Life demands that you be serious.

So the questioner says, I am able to bring about order within myself. See what his question involves. I am able to bring about order in myself. As though order was something outside which he has brought into himself. He doesn't see the 'I' is disorder. Right? You have understood? The 'me', the self, and the super self, which is still part of me, is not the self in itself disorder. Right? Because there is contradiction in the self: I want, and I don't want; I am bad but I want to be good; I am envious and - you follow? So there is a contradiction in myself. Where there is contradiction there cannot be order. And our consciousness is total disorder. No? You look doubtful. All right, I'll explain.

Our consciousness is greed and non-greed, the bad wanting to be good, I am a nationalist, I am lawyer, I have anxiety, and I am lonely, all contradictions. That's my consciousness. Right? And in that consciousness there is the desire to be orderly, which is another contradiction. You are following. I wonder if you see all this. Sir, learn. So I am total disorder. But we say, oh, no, no, I am not total disorder because there is something in me which wants order. Or, there is god in me which is orderly - which is another invention of disorder. I don't know if you follow all this. So we live in this constant disorder. Right? So there is no order as long as you say, I am able to bring about order, you are bringing about greater disorder. But if you understand what is disorder, be aware of disorder. That is, I am in disorder, I say one thing, do another, modern and traditional, which is disorder, obviously. Either you are conscious of it or you are unconscious of it. Put up all these

things on your forehead and put on European clothes, which is disorder. So we live in this constant state of disorder.

Now order is not born out of disorder because if it is born out of disorder order is still part of disorder. I wonder if you see that. Right, sir? So to understand the nature of disorder, when I understand it, then when there is no disorder I am orderly. The art of learning, you understand, sir, not saying, I must be orderly, or try to be orderly, but to learn what is disorder. Not memorize what is disorder, but to learn about it. Can you learn about your disorder? The way you treat your wife, and the wife treats you, the way you talk to your servant, if you have a servant, the disorder of contradiction. To learn about it, sir. A mind that's capable of learning, not memorizing, which you are all capable of, that's what has happened to your brain. It is becoming dull, atrophied, not active, otherwise you wouldn't be sitting here.

So order is not a blueprint. It is a living thing. We will talk about it on Saturday, much more, go into it. So a mind, a brain that is being influenced all the time - it is being influenced, by the food you eat, by the words you use, whether the brain is capable of being quiet, all that is - you follow. So to understand is to learn. Not the verbal comprehension.

Q: Why did you say, otherwise you wouldn't be sitting here?

K: Oh, lord, need I say that? Need I explain that? Sir, if you are all very intelligent, compassionate, you would not be here, and I wouldn't be here.

4th QUESTION: You once said, give your life to understand life, what does it mean?

Sir, have you given your life to anything? Your whole being to

something? You understand my question? Have you given generously, completely, if you believe in god, to god? You understand my question? Or we are always giving a little, but withholding a great deal. To understand life, which is myself, the world around me, the beauty of the trees, you understand, to understand life you must give something to it, learn from it. Obviously. Will you? Have you given your wife, your children, completely anything? Or is there always a string attached to it? If you are rich, as some of you are probably, do you give generously, or you always have a motive behind that generosity. I watch people who are very rich, how extraordinarily miserly they are: they build temples. It's a crazy world.

Sir, to understand life one must be extraordinarily committed to life. To live it, to understand the beauty of living without conflict. And to understand conflict you have to go into it, search it out, work. Nobody is going to help you. Therefore you have to have an extraordinary strength. We are brave but not strong. Right?

Q: Isn't there intense effort needed to love?

K: No, sir, there is no effort. Is love an effort? To love somebody, does it require effort? Do you really mean this, you are asking this question? To be kind to somebody, does it require effort? To give what little you have to somebody, does that require effort?

5th QUESTION: I am a twelve-year old boy. I am constantly afraid of death. How shall I get rid of this fear?

How tragic this is. Isn't it a tragedy for a twelve-year old boy to think about death, not about living, but about death. What has happened to our culture, to your civilization, of which you are so

proud when a boy can ask such a question. You understand, sir? The other day in Rishi Valley a boy asked the same question. He was probably still younger. He must have seen death, a dead bird, or he has seen in his family somebody dying, and all the people weeping, weeping for their own amusement, for their own self-pity, for their own loneliness. And this little boy wants to know death, not how to live, why?

It is a very complex question, what death is, and fear. We will deal with it. I don't want to answer it now because it is a very complex question. I am asking the forgiveness of the boy who has put this question, if he is here, please come Saturday or Sunday we will answer it.

But, see sir, what we have done to our children. What have you done to your children? You have them by galore, meaning many children, overpopulation, what have you done to them. You marry them off, or you send them off to schools, if you are rich enough, to boarding schools, residential schools, and at home you are constantly scolding them, do this, don't do that, be like your father. So you are all the time bullying that boy. And he grows up to bully others. This is happening, sir. And we don't see that it is our responsibility to create a good human being; neither the educator, nor the parents see that we ought to create a new society, a new human being. Right? We don't feel the responsibility of that. And it is very difficult to have good teachers too. They pass some exams, get a little title, and can't get a better job, they turn to teaching. And you despise teachers, but you respect the governor. Right? What a crazy world this is. You entrust your children to somebody who is not interested in your children, nor are you interested in your

children. Right? And he grows up in fear, in solitude, in anxiety. There is no love at home, no love at school. Right? And he grows up. Please see your responsibility for god's sake. Education is not merely to have some academic capacities, but to bring about a good human being who will know what affection is, who will care, who has love, consideration, sympathy, generosity. Will you see to it for your own children, demanding the right teacher, pay him. You see, you don't. So we are creating a generation of people like ourselves; dull, insensitive, superstitious, and very clever at business, getting money, and so as a parent you are interested that you should get a degree, and get a good job, and wash your hands of him completely. Right? That is, every parent in the world is concerned with that. Get him a good job, get him married and settle down. Settle down to what? To misery. Right?

6th QUESTION: Kindly give a straight reply. Does god exist, or not? Yes, or no. If yes, how best to realize him in this life?

This is a lovely question, isn't it. Man throughout history from the ancient Greeks, from the ancient Summarians, had this idea of god. Right? I am not at all sure whether in the Upanishads they mention god at all. Or is it a later invention? You understand?

So what is god? We are investigating, I am not attacking god. I am not denying god, but we are investigating whether there is such a thing as god. Who invented god? Did god invent us, did god create us? Right? God, who is omnipotent, omniscient, eternal, merciful, just, all goodness. Right? That's your concept of god. And if you say, he has created us, then we are part of his image, we are part of him. That is, we are omniscient, generous, loving. Right? And eternal. Right? Are we? Or we think we are? You

understand my question? If god created you, he must be an extraordinary entity, because he wants you to lead a terrible life. You understand my question? If god made you, why are you like this? You must be extraordinary human beings, mustn't you. Beautiful, full of joy, excitement, full of delight, but you are not. So either you have created god, or god has created you. But if you examine very closely, you have created god. Right? In India there are about - I was told - about 300,000 gods and more. You understand? Every local person has his own god.

So, sirs, we have created god. See the irony of it. Thought has created god and then thought worships the image which thought has created. Which is, to worship oneself and call it god. You understand all this? The better part of you is god. Right? I wonder if you understand this. First of all, let's be clear. Have you created god? The local gods round the corner, or the local gods in Rome, or Tirupati, or wherever, you have created them, haven't you? You are so very uncertain, aren't you, so frightened. If you say, we have created, then you are scared stiff because you have created out of your fear that. Out of your fear you want security. Right? You want safety, you want to feel there is somebody looking after you because you are afraid. You follow? So you create that, and then worship that. Just see what you are doing. Going to Tirupati and putting all your money in the bag - do you think gods want your money. Sir, look at it all. You have nothing to offer but money, garlands, prostrations, rituals. Right? You have nothing else to offer. Have you realized the tragedy of this, sirs?

If you love, not god, that's very easy to love god because it is an abstraction, it has not much meaning, but if you love, that very

love is god, that very love is sacred. You won't go outside to look for god. You understand all this, sirs.

And the questioner wants to know if I believe in god. I don't. Because god is not something created by man. There is such a thing as eternity, which is to be outside of time. Right, sir. For that you must have a mind, a heart that is completely free from all the burdens of life. Right? From your vanity, your arrogance, your selfishness, you follow, sir. And we say, we are not capable of it, tell us what to do. You are back in the cycle, somebody to tell you what to do. Sir, you are in a jungle, you have to walk through it by yourself. Right? And for that you need vitality and vigour and strength. Not belief in god, in goodness - belief has no place where truth is concerned. Right?

Q: Then what is atman, sir?

K: Who is that?

Q: The conscience inside each of us.

K: Who is atman?

Q: The conscience inside each of us.

K: Is conscience atman?

Q: What they call the soul.

K: Soul. Which soul? The sole of a shoe, or a soul! I don't know what you are talking about.

Q: Atman.

K: At last you are all getting excited! Because your belief is being attacked. You are not meeting the challenge, but you are resisting it. You think there is something inside you which is permanent, which is the light of god, which is nameless, etc., etc., call it atman, soul, light, whatever you like to call it. That there is

inside you, in your conscience, in your brain, in your mind, something which is not worldly, which is not of thought. Right?

You believe that, don't you? Yes, sir?

Q: I don't believe in it.

K: Why?

Q: There is no such thing.

K: How do you know?

Q: I believe there isn't.

K: Just belief, belief, belief. What kinds of brain have you, sirs? Don't you want to find out? Don't you want to investigate into the truth of this matter, whether there is soul, atman, whatever you like to call it. Just believe. If you believe, what value has it? Suppose I believe I have got atman, or whatever it is, super-atman, I'll call it. I believe in that. What value has it? In my daily life what part does it play? I am miserable, I am confused, I'm lonely, anxious, in agony, what's the point of my having a belief in atman? If I am free from all that, completely, then I shall find out. But suppose - you follow, it becomes so childish. For god's sake. And we are all grown-up people - jobs, children, wives.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, would you forget all these people, including Ramana Marheshi, or whoever the other gentleman was. Would you forget them? What value has their life to you? You have your life to live, not their life. And when the people say they have attained - whatever they have attained - how do you know?

Q: What do you mean by timeless eternity?

K: I have said it, sir. Don't believe it! It is not fair, I know, it is not quite fair. But, sir, just listen. Sir, truth is that, something you

cannot experience, it cannot be told to you, the word is not that. But if you live on words it is that. You understand? The word is not that; like the word 'tree' is not the tree. I can describe eternity, blah, blah, but the word is not that. But we are satisfied with the word. Right, sir? You love with your heart, with your mind, with everything that you have, you love somebody, and you tell me of that love, and I accept the words but the flower isn't there, the perfume isn't there. You see, sirs, you have leaders: religious leaders and political leaders. I don't know why, why you have leaders at all. Rama Krishna, or gurus that you have had, one after the other. Right? This country is full of them. And why do you follow? You understand? If once you realized that you are responsible entirely for yourself, that you are in a jungle, literally in a jungle, where you have to make your own way out, there is nobody to lead you, then you forget all this - the examples, the books, everything, because you have vitality, strength to go through. But the moment you depend on leaders you become weak. Once you realize it in your heart, not just intellectually, you are a man, human being, free to walk straight. But we don't want all that. Sir, it is so simple when you think of it all.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 2ND JANUARY 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about the other day, last Sunday? We were talking about conflict, not only outwardly but much more psychologically, inwardly, if I may use the word, spiritually. And we also pointed out, if you will kindly pay attention to it, that we are not giving a lecture. On the contrary, we are talking over together our problems: problems which confront humanity; not only the personal problems but the problems of every man, religious, social, economic, national, and the constant preparation for war, which every nation is indulging, spending vast sums of money. Incredible, to destroy each other. And also we were saying that most of us are accustomed to be lectured, to be talked to, to be told what to do, what to think, not how to think, but what to think. And also we are used to linear thinking. Linear means thinking word by word, horizontally or vertically; our brains are trained to that, and therefore our brains cannot function in other directions.

We talked about the necessity of a life which is not routine, mechanical. And we pointed out that when we live a life of routine, a mechanical life which is more or less tradition, then we gradually atrophy the brain; the brain becomes dull, inactive, it may repeat what it has learnt, knowledge, but such a brain which is conditioned heavily to habit, to tradition, to a routine, loses all its flexibility, its intricate quality, which is to learn. Learning and memorizing are two different things: from childhood we memorize, we go to school, college, university and there we learn

linear, as well as accumulate a lot of information which becomes knowledge; and we function on that knowledge with skill, and gradually we lose the quality of learning. Learning is all the time; learning requires a very alert mind, a subtle mind. Whereas merely accumulating knowledge, however necessary, makes the mind gradually dull. Please see, therefore, if you will, that there is a difference between acquiring knowledge and learning, memory, memorizing and learning. Most of us are good at memorizing, specially in this country.

We were talking once to a very classical monk, very erudite, scholarly, knew his subject extraordinarily well. Which is, that he had gathered tremendous information about his subject, which was religion, and he could not break away from the habit of repetition, what somebody has said. There was no thinking on his part at all, but merely repetition. And when it was pointed out to him most respectfully, he couldn't understand what it meant to learn. So please we are together here to learn, to look at things afresh; to look at our lives as though it were for the first time that we were investigating this very complex process of living; not come to it with all our prejudices, with our conclusions, with our fears and hopes. We come to it to learn about it; like a schoolboy who doesn't know anything about history or mathematics, or biology, he comes to it afresh. So if we could this evening look at our lives, which is the life of humanity, which is the life of everyone including yourself, if we could look at it as though for the first time. We are curious, we want to find out; not accept, not quote what others have said, but look at ourselves afresh, see all our reactions, the process of our thinking, our behaviour, why we

believe, why we have such extraordinary lives. So let us begin together to uncover step by step into why there is so much disorder in the world.

In the world outside there is war, there is corruption, there is dishonesty, politically utterly ruthless, the politicians seeking power, position, prestige, status; the tremendously rich people, and the oppressed who are in revolt in this country. Revolt is going on because they have been oppressed and there is a great deal of discontent, unhappiness, sorrow, pain, an incredible amount of fear. There is no security outwardly: you may have a job but the future of man, that is, the future of your children, the future of your grandchildren, the future of humanity is really in the balance. This is not a cliché: it is a tremendous crisis in our consciousness. And, that is, outwardly there is great disorder.

And inwardly, inside each one of us, in our lives, in our relationship, in our jobs, there is disorder. And we must find out together what is the cause of disorder, and end disorder in ourselves, not out there, not try to bring about order in the world, in the corrupt society, but order in our lives, which is in our relationship with each other. And that relationship which is order can only be understood deeply if we begin to discover what is the cause of disorder. Everything that has a cause must end. Right? If I have a cause for my cancer, for my disease, for some ill health, because there is a cause it will find an answer. Right? Do we understand this? Causation for any action must inevitably end. Our life as a whole has a cause. Right? Do we understand this clearly? I have a cause - if I have - in talking to you. That cause, the motive, the force, the agent, that is making me talk will be valueless

because it has a struggle; what has cause brings about a struggle. And if I have a cause in addressing you, then it is a struggle between you and me, it is a conflict. But the speaker has no cause, he doesn't want to convert you to anything: he has no belief about anything. And he is talking not to express himself, not to fulfil himself, not to have a reputation which he must maintain: it is none of these things. Therefore an action without a cause is eternal. I wonder if you will understand this?

Sir, the universe, that is the stars in the heavens, the black hole, millions and millions of stars and planets and systems, have no cause. Scientists are beginning to discover this, I hope they are. There is no cause for it: therefore it is eternal, endless, which is vast space without any reason, without any cause, without an agent which is making this; therefore it is everlasting to everlasting, it has no time. What has cause has time. If I am jealous - and jealousy has a cause, which is I am attached to my person and in that attachment there is fear, there is possession, domination, control because the cause is my sense of insufficiency in myself, and I am lonely, therefore I begin to attach myself to you, and out of that attachment, which has a cause, jealousy arises. Whereas if I can discover the cause, jealousy can end. Therefore we must together find out the causes of disorder. If we can find the causes of disorder, disorder will end completely. And when there is an end to disorder there is order. That order is a living thing, not a blue print, not something laid down which you follow. So please together let's find out what is the cause of this disorder in our daily life; not an abstraction or an idea of disorder. The fact is not the idea. Right? The fact of disorder is not a concept. That is, I say one

thing and do another; that contradiction is disorder. Right? It is not an abstraction. It is not something invented by the mind and then call it disorder. Disorder exists where there is contradiction in one's life. There is disorder when my life is fragmented, broken up. Are we meeting each other? We are following each other? We are talking about our lives, not an abstraction of a life. We are talking about your daily life in which there is so much confusion and disorder. And some recognize their life is in disorder and try to bring order out of disorder. Right? Order exists only when disorder ends. Like a man in prison, as long as he is in prison he is not free; when he is out of the prison he may be free. Similarly our life is in disorder, there is no question of it; you can't say, "I am not". And that disorder is a fact, if one is aware of it. And we are trying to find out together the causes of this disorder. Is that clear? Why you live in disorder, if you are aware of it. So first, are we aware of it? Do we recognize it, do we see it, or we are mesmerizing ourselves saying, god is order but one day I will reach order, which is a pretension, which is nonsensical. What we are talking about is the fact of disorder in our life. Right, can we go on from there?

So what is the cause, or causes of disorder? Because when that ends there is order without a cause and therefore a life which is eternal. I wonder if you understand this? So what is the cause of our disorder? Essentially, basically, the idea that we are separate from another, which is, myself is different from yourself: that is the basic cause of disorder. Please don't say, "How am I to be free of the self" - we are not talking about freeing the self. If you understand the cause of disorder, understand the nature of the self, then that very comprehension, that very observation, absolves,

dissolves the self. So we are saying the basic cause of disorder is the self, the me, the ego, the personality. We have accepted it because it is part of our tradition, part of our education, that we think we are separate individuals, we must seek our own personal salvation, our own response to god, you know, the whole concept that each one of us is separate, and therefore there is constant battle between each other. That is the basic cause. And other causes are peripheral, outside. You understand? Peripheral. The division of nationalities, that is a cause, because in believing in a nation, in a tribe, you feel you are secure, because the human brain demands security. Right? That is obvious. So it invents a concept of a nation; it is an idea. And in that idea it feels secure. And to protect that security it will kill another, which is called war. War has several reasons, but one of the reasons is this: the desire to be secure. Please look at it, you are not accepting what the speaker is saying, we are observing together the fact; not imagination, not an idea, but the actual living fact.

And also one of the reasons for disorder, is thought itself. I wonder if you understand that? Thought, we are saying, is the cause of disorder. Look at it, please, examine it; don't say, "How can you say that". Examine, find out for yourself, if thought is not one of the major causes of disorder. Thought is the response of memory, memory is knowledge, knowledge is experience; so from experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. So thought has a motive, which is experience and knowledge. Are we following each other somewhat? Please, am I speaking to myself? Or are you coming with me? If you want to understand why human beings live in such a chaotic state you have to examine very closely. And to

examine you must exercise your brains; you must be willing to let go your fanciful ideas and face facts. We are saying one of the causes of this disastrous disorder is the very activity of thought because thought is limited, because thought is based on knowledge and knowledge is never complete about anything: even science is incomplete; your experiences are incomplete; and the knowledge you acquire from those experiences is incomplete. So knowledge always goes with the shadow of ignorance. So thought born of ignorance, knowledge, will invariably create conflict. That is one of the reasons.

The other is: that we human beings are fragmented in ourselves, broken up: I want one thing, and I don't want another; I am violent and I want to live in peace. There is this contradiction going on all the time in our life. That is one of the reasons of disorder. We said the other day that there is no duality at all, there is only 'what is; there is only violence, not non-violence. But we have invented the idea of non-violence and so have created duality in our daily life. Philosophically or theoretically you may say that state of non-duality exists only when you have reached a certain point in you thinking, or in your spiritual evolution. There is no spiritual evolution; there is only 'what is'. To understand 'what is' one must be free totally from the idea of 'what should be'. That is, I am violent, and that is the only state, not, I am trying to become non-violent. The non-violent is non-fact, therefore there is only violence. And to understand that violence, the causation of that violence, I have to give all my energy, investigative process, observation, awareness to it.

So our conditioning is, we have accepted duality. Of course

duality is there - darkness and light, man and woman, childhood, adolescence and man. There are physical differences, but differences do not make duality. So that is one of the reasons why we are in conflict, because we are not facing, or we want to avoid actually what is going on. We never come face to face actually with the fact of what we are: we are always thinking of what we should become. So one of the causes of disorder is this sense of conditioned duality.

And the other cause of disorder is fear. Right? Isn't that so? Shall we discuss, go together into the question of fear? Shall we? Whether one can be free totally, absolutely, free from fear; both biologically and psychologically, both inwardly and outwardly. Not to be afraid; not to have courage, not to be brave, but to be free from fear which gives one tremendous strength; that strength is nothing whatsoever to do with courage, bravery and so on. Freedom from fear has this quality of tremendous vital strength. Most of us are afraid; not only of ultimate death but afraid of so many, many things: afraid of the future, what is going to happen to us when you are older, you might die of old age with a disease, paralysed, and we are afraid of the future. We are the past, the present and the future; we are that. I will go into that perhaps a little later. Because we create our own time, our own future, our own, not imaginary timelessness. So we must investigate together very carefully into the nature of fear.

First of all, are we aware seriously that we have fears? Right? Are we aware of that? And together we are going find out the cause of fear, or the causes of fear. Because when we find the cause, as we pointed out, what has causation can end, can bring

about its end, the effect. So what is fear? Either you are afraid of the past, or of the present, or of the future; that is, of yesterday, today and tomorrow. Therefore we must understand in investigating fear, the whole concept, or the reality of time.

What is time? Please, this is related to fear, this is connected with fear so we must enquire very carefully, not merely intellectually, verbally but actually understand the nature of time. There is time according to the sun, rising at a certain time and setting at a certain time; there is time as having had pain yesterday, continuing today and hoping tomorrow to end it. Time is a movement. Both chronologically and inwardly, psychologically, time is a movement: time to go from here to your home, to cover that distance requires time; to learn a language requires time. Please follow all this closely, if you don't mind, if you want to understand the nature and the extraordinary subtlety of time - if you are interested, if you are serious. That is up to you. Time to learn a skill; time to learn to drive a car. So there is physical time: to get up in the morning, 9.0 o'clock to be in the office, or in the factory, or do some labour, and end it at 5.0 o'clock. That is time. Think of a human being which is you, spending all your life from the moment you have passed your university, or have acquired a skill, for the rest of your life going to the office from 9.0 o'clock till 5.0 o'clock until you retire and die. Right? That is your life. Just think of it! And you might say you have your responsibilities, therefore we have to earn money, So you are slaves to money, to responsibility and to duty. This is your life.

So you have to understand how extraordinarily time is a factor in our life. So there is outward time and inwardly we have created

time. That is, I hope to be something tomorrow; I hope to reach the height of spiritual nonsense; I hope to see you tomorrow. Hope - you understand? The word 'hope' implies time: I am this but give me time to change to be different; I am greedy but I need time to be free from greed. So there is this idea of inward time, a psychological time. This is clear isn't it? Now, is that a fact? Is that so? Or merely an invention to escape from actually facing 'what is'? You are following all this? Right? I am greedy-suppose I am greedy - and I like to be greedy; but also there is in me, which has been conditioned for centuries, "Don't be greedy. It is not right to be greedy, if you want to be a spiritual human being you must not be greedy." I have been conditioned to that, but yet I am greedy. So I say to myself, I will eventually be free of greed. Give me time, either this life, or in a future life, which again is something we have invented. We will go into that later on. I am greedy and I must have time to be free from greed. This is what we are conditioned to through millennia: all the scriptures, everything tells you, you must gradually be free of it. Right? That is, if I allow time to be free from greed I am pursuing greed. Obviously. But to understand the greed, what is the cause of that greed, is the ending of that greed. But if I have time to say, eventually I will be free from greed, that is a continuation of greed. I hope this is clear.

So there is only the ending of greed, not greed trying to become something else. Greed trying to become non-greed is still greed. I wonder if you follow all this? So thought has invented this idea of time: psychologically, spiritually, inwardly. And thought itself is time. Right? Because it is born out of the accumulation of many, many millennia, of knowledge from which it acts, which is time.

So can the mind, can your brain, understand the nature of psychological time, that there is actually no future? I am greedy; not greed is separate from me but I am greed. And to discover the cause of that greed, to understand the causation of that, and to look at it very carefully, is the ending of that greed, not in terms of time, but actually, immediately, instantly end greed. If you are concerned with that we can go into it. That is, the cause of greed, envy, is desire. Right? I desire a new car; I have got an old car and I want a new car. Or I see you driving in a marvellous Mercedes, or a new imported car, and I want to have the same thing: greed. We all know that word what it means, the feeling of it, the desire to possess something that I haven't got. To understand that one must enquire very carefully into what is desire, because desire is part of fear, part of time, part of our contradiction and therefore disorder. They are all interrelated, they are not something separate. They all have a cause and the causes are all interrelated.

So in understanding what is fear, why human beings have lived for timeless ages with fear, we must go into the whole structure, and the nature and the continuity of fear. That requires your attention, your care, your awareness: not say, please tell me how to be free from fear - that is too childish. But if you understand the whole nature of it, how it comes into being, what is the structure of it, what is its movement, then you will see for yourself, if you have given your attention, your care, your observation, then you will be totally free of fear. Don't say, "Will I always be free of fear?" - that is another form of greed. All that you are concerned is with the ending of fear. If another fear arises, find out why it arises, go into it, because that requires constant alertness, observation, awareness.

But if you say, "Please tell me how to end fear altogether at once" - it is possible but that requires an extraordinary skill of thought, skill of observation; that requires an insight into the whole nature of fear, to end it completely so that you have no fear of anything at any time. That insight into the nature of fear is not bought from a book, it cannot be taught to you, which is memorize and apply. But if you learn about it, it is yours, you have it, then you have it in your hand, in your pocket, you can act.

So we are learning together. That is, we said fear is common to all mankind; every human being, from the poorest to the most sophisticated, richest, has this sense of fear. And we know what fear does: cripples the mind, makes you ill physically, contracts you, both physically and psychologically, inwardly, you become tighter, narrow, frightened to look. And so in investigating fear you must also discover, as we said, time. Time may be the factor of fear. And also in investigating time you have to investigate also desire. And desire may also be a factor of fear. So you have to understand, learn afresh, not memorize and repeat, repeat, repeat, that is so childish. But to learn how desire arises, what is the origin of desire; not how to suppress it, not how to escape from it, but the beginning of it. And also one must understand the nature of time, because you are the past, the present and the future. You make your own time: you make your own time by saying "I will do", or "I will be". So you are the past, the present and the future: you are the time-maker. I don't know if you understand this? The beauty of it is, it is all in your hand; not in your gurus, not in your books, not in somebody else, but in your hand.

So, it is half past six, yes. So we will go on, shall we? You are

not tired? No? Why? Have you worked? Have you used your brain during all this hour, to watch, to listen, to learn, to perceive what we are, and work? If you have done it your brain, which is not used to all this, must be tired. But we will continue.

We are saying, to understand fear, its cause and the ending completely of fear, one must understand the nature of time; and also desire. The universe has no time, and that is why it is everlasting from everlasting. It has no cause and therefore it is endless, it is infinite. That which has a cause has always a limited space. You understand? We have no space in us because we do everything because we have causes. So what is desire? And why has man been a slave to desire? Sir, we are investigating, you are not listening to the speaker. Together we are observing the nature of desire, how it comes into being, what extraordinary vitality it has. The desire is will, and we live and act with will: "I will do this", "I must do this". It is part of desire. So we must go together and look at desire, not suppressing it, not trying to conquer it, not trying to rationalize it, but to see the whole movement of desire, which has such deep vitality in our life. Desire to be great, desire to be successful, desire to reach heaven, desire to understand that which is not to be understood. We have so many driving desires: one desire contradicting another desire, one desire stronger than the other desire, and that which is stronger conquering, pursuing, driving. It is a very complex movement. So we are going together, please together, you are not learning it from the speaker, you are learning by observing your own desire, your own urge, your own momentum of this driving force.

Most of us know what is sensation: sensation is the operation of

the senses. I touch a hot thing, or a cold thing, taste something very hot; the touching, the seeing, the hearing, brings about sensation. This is observable, natural, healthy fact, because if there is paralysis then there is no feeling, there is no hearing. Probably most of us are paralysed because we are not learning. This is an incitement, this is not just a statement because most of us live a life of routine, we never observe the beauty of a tree, the flowers, the dirt on the road, everything, we are insensitive. And we have become insensitive to fear, we accept it as a natural thing: the wife afraid of the husband, the husband afraid of the wife, or the children afraid of the father and try to beat up the father, as they try to beat up the teacher. This is happening in the world. So we all know sensation, unless you are paralysed. What is sensation? The seeing, the contact, sensation. Right? This is a fact. One sees a beautiful tree - the glory of the earth is a tree, the beauty of the earth is a tree - the shadow, the trunk, the leaves, the fluttering of it, the shape of it; to look at it, to touch it, that is a sensation. We are afraid of that sensation because we have the idea that all senses must be conquered. Right? This is one of your religious conditionings. And so no senses; you have destroyed the senses because religion has told you "Deny all senses", so what have you become? You never look at a tree; you never look at a woman or a man because your senses begin to function and you have the desire and so on. So look what we have done, what you have done to your mind, to your brain, to your body: your religion has said, "Disregard the body, have a contempt for the body", and you have. Look at yourselves. Right? Right?

So we are saying something totally different from all that:

which is, to understand desire, desire is sensation - I will go into it, I will explain it a little bit. There is seeing the tree, the woman, the man, the car, the politician who is right on the top, or the guru who says, "I know". So perception, seeing, then contact, touching, then out of that sensation. Right? Is this clear? Then what takes place? Thought says, "I wish I had that tree in my garden". Right? Thought says, "I wish I had that car." So thought creates the image - please listen, learn from it, learn, not memorize - then thought creates the image of you in the car and driving that car. When thought creates the image of you driving in that car, that moment is the origin of desire. Is that clear? That is, I see a beautiful sunset, the glory of the evening, and it is a great delight to see something extraordinary, a vast sky with thundering clouds, and light; and it has left a record on the brain. That record wants to be repeated, which is desire. You understand? That is, there is the sensation of that beauty of that sunset, then thought says, "I hope I will see it again tomorrow", or I want to write a poem about it, or I want to tell somebody about. So desire begins, the origin, begins when thought creates the image and imposes that image on sensation, then is the beginning of desire. Is this clear?

Now to learn that thought creates desire, and therefore watch that thought doesn't create the image and be in desire. Just to remain with sensation. You understand? Not to allow thought to creep in. I wonder if you understand this? That is tremendous discipline. Discipline means to learn; it comes from the word disciple: a disciple is one who learns. So we are both teachers and disciples, there is no teacher outside us. I wonder if you see all this? Therefore we are learning. That requires full attention, the

awareness, watching. The origin of desire, the sensation, and the ending of that, stopping there, not allowing thought to come in. It is not an action of will, just the observation how desire arises. That very observation has its own peculiar subtle discipline; discipline in this sense is learning, not conforming to a pattern.

So desire, time, thought are the factors of fear. I have had pain, an extraordinary experience, or extraordinary perception. I hold on to that perception, to that experience, and I am afraid to lose it; which is, thought recollected that experience, thought remembers that experience and is frightened that it may lose it. Right? So thought, time, desire, is the factor of fear. Not how to end thought, or how to end time, or the ending of desire; but you have to learn the movement of fear. You understand, the movement. If you want to be a good engineer - I hope none of you want to be anything - but if you want to be a good engineer, which you must probably to earn a livelihood, you have to learn. A real genius of an engineer may know knowledge but he is learning.

So to learn about fear is the ending of fear. Is this clear? Are we together in this? That means you and I have worked, observed, this evening, very, very closely, the movement of desire, time, thought, which is the origin of fear, which are the causes of fear. And as you have listened, if you have at all listened and paid attention, you are free from fear. Not that you will think about it tomorrow and be free of fear, you have listened, therefore you are free of it now. And that means you have to give all your energy to understand fear. And a man who is free from fear, and the cause of fear, is a totally different human being.

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 3RD JANUARY 1982

What shall we talk about? We were talking yesterday afternoon about the whole movement of fear, how important it is to be completely, wholly, free of that terrible burden that man has carried through millennia. We said it was a movement of desire, time and thought that bred fear. And out of this fear we invent all the gods, all the rituals that accompany this fear, all the pain involved in this fear. We went into it quite in detail. And we ought to talk this afternoon something about beauty. It is again a very complex problem and we need a certain quality of mind, of sensitivity to grasp the enormous significance of beauty, because beauty is truth, beauty is love, beauty is that infinite. So we ought to talk over together this question: what is beauty?

Again if one may remind you that we are together looking into this question. This is not a lecture as it is understood generally, where the speaker has a set of ideas and is rather good with his tongue, glib, and gives you what you should do, what you should not do, or what you should think and so on. That is generally what is considered as a lecture. But here this is not a lecture, far from it. We are together, as two friends who trust each other, who have confidence in each other, who are walking together in a beautiful lane full of trees and flowers; and as two friends concerned not only with the problems of daily life but also this question of beauty. Because vulgarity is increasing in the world; the vulgar, the noise, the dirt, the squalor and the cities that are really frightful. And living in one of these cities far away from all nature, to them

beauty is merely, and perhaps more, than architecture; the quality of a building, the line of a building, the proportion, the gratifying sensory appreciation; going to museums and seeing all the marvellous paintings by the great masters of the Renaissance period. And to them and to most of us, beauty is something out there - in a museum, in a marvellous old cathedral or a temple, or one of the great delicate mosques. And beauty to us, if you are at all aware, which I question, is the gratification of a particular sense; either visual, optical or the hearing, not only with the sensual ear but also going beyond the senses and inward appreciation of a magnificent symphony, or a great song. And also when we see a marvellous mountain, snow capped against the blue sky, the great majesty with deep shadows, valleys, rivers and the feeling of this grandeur, the enormity that is in front of one. And also beauty may be in a poem, or in literature, or in the face of a man or a woman, in a form.

And beauty to us is not only rather rare but we do not have the sensitivity, the quality of being with something that is entirely made by nature; like a marvellous tree full of leaves, the great branches, and if one has ever sat under that tree, that tree tells you a great deal. And also, for us, beauty is something that very few of us appreciate. We are not talking of the beauty of a face or a form, which is also part of beauty. Because if we do not understand beauty we have no love in our heart. Beauty is not pleasure, sensory reaction of gratification, appreciation; beauty is something far greater than all this. And most of us unfortunately have lost the sense, or never had the sense of looking around, being aware of the environment, with all its ugliness, with all its squalor, misery, and

with it goes the feeling of pain, the pain that one can live in such a world which is so full of vulgarity, noise, loud speaking. There is no sense of grace.

And religions throughout the world have denied, or never appreciated beauty. Because beauty has been associated with pleasure and pleasure is sensuous, sexual; and religions, both those who are highly organized and those who are not, lay emphasis on the denial of any sensual appreciation. I hope we are following all this, we are thinking together. You are not just listening to the speaker.

So, what is beauty? It is very important to understand this. What is, to us, the quality of a mind that sees beauty? Not only the beauty of a sunset, or the beauty of a curve of a branch, or the beauty of a simple flower by the road side, or the beauty of an early morning when there is complete silence, when there is only one star shining in the sky. Beauty is not sentiment, it is not a romantic appreciation, a romantic sentimental talk. Beauty is also the way one behaves, the way you treat another, the way you look at somebody, because without that quality of beauty, do what you will, go to all the temples in the world, you will never know what truth is. So it behoves us to enquire, if we are sensitive, that is, if all our senses, not just one or two separate senses are in action, but when the whole of our senses are operating, living, feeling together, feeling this sense of this marvellous world, the universe. Has you ever looked at your wife, and your husband and your children, with that quality of mind in which there is great affection, love, because beauty is love? To look at a person, to look at a tree, to look at that poor beggar going by in the street, to feel that, not

pity, the sense of great compassion, because where there is no compassion there is no intelligence. Where there is intelligence there is right action born out of compassion; and beauty is that compassion.

And so we should enquire together, not only what is beauty, but what is pleasure? For most of us pleasure is very important, not only sexual pleasure, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of power, the pleasure to dominate people, the pleasure of achievement: there are so many different forms of pleasure. To look at a sunset and delight in that, the moment of that sunset and that delight when remembered and pursued then it becomes pleasure. At the moment of seeing a beautiful scene, seeing fast running waters, then there is no pleasure, just pure observation of this movement of water, with tremendous volume behind it, carrying everything before it. But that incident, that perception, is recorded in the brain as delight, as sensory reaction, then thought pursues it and then out of that pursuit pleasure arises. This is so obvious if you examine it closely. For most of us throughout life pleasure becomes extraordinarily important: pleasure in doing rituals, pleasure in worship, pleasure in prayers, however the mind is tortured, pleasure in achievement, in being somebody, or being an ascetic, being a monk who has refused the world and lives a solitary life, to him also that is pleasure.

And if one is aware of this movement of pleasure and the pursuit as most of us are pursuing pleasure, we have never asked what is the other side of pleasure. You understand my question? I hope we are meeting each other, that I am not talking to myself. Is not pleasure the other side of fear? Is pleasure another form of

fear? Please enquire into it carefully. Look into it. Those of us who are constantly chasing pleasure of entertainment, both religious and physical, the football and the mass, the ritual of your puja and cricket. In this country you are fond of cricket as a form of entertainment, pleasure, which is almost the same as doing your puja, your rituals, going to your temple. We want to be entertained, entertained which will be pleasurable, which will gratify our sensations. So we are always caught between either fear or pleasure. This is our life: pleasure to achieve something called the eternal, something called illumination, or as you call it in India, self-realization - I don't know what that means but you talk about it a great deal. So we are caught in these two: fear and pleasure. We are not denying pleasure, we are saying, just observe it, look at it, be aware of the extraordinary subtleties of pleasure and fear, how the human mind is caught in it from the most ancient of times to the present day; which is, reward and punishment. On that we live. We will do anything for a reward and avoid punishment. But you do the right thing if you are going to be punished, you will do the right thing if you are going to be rewarded. You know all this.

So, on these two principles we work. Our daily life is balanced between the two: reward and punishment. And apparently the human mind cannot go beyond it. That is, to do something without a single motive, without fear or deriving pleasure in doing something, which is not duty. Duty is an abominable word, it is the understanding of this very complex process of life, that all of us function on these two principles. And therefore we totally deny the sense of beauty. Beauty is not a reward; beauty is not something that you can achieve through sacrifice, through pain, through

denial, through control.

So we ought to think over together, examine very closely, why our minds, our hearts, are caught in this. Not only sexual pleasure, which is now permissive in the West, and is gradually seeping into this country; and can beauty exist where there is greed, envy, anxiety, agony? Or beauty is when the other is not?

And also we should talk over together this evening the question of sorrow, which is all part of it. Fear, pleasure, pain, grief, sorrow; they are all interrelated, they are not separate states, separate reactions. One translates the reactions as fear, as pleasure, as pain, as sorrow. We are together going to investigate, explore, subtly, hesitantly, carefully, why man suffers. Again this has been our burden from time beyond time, why we human beings, who live on this beautiful earth, why we go through tortures of pain, tortures of suffering: we have never solved that question. We are always talking about social change, how rotten politics are, how poor the world is, vulgar, so much poverty, over population and so on; we are always talking something out there. But we never examine the question of suffering; who suffers, why there is suffering. To understand this question of suffering we must understand ourselves first; that is to know oneself, to understand the very complex entity, the complex movement of oneself. That is, knowing all the subtleties of thought, these feelings, to be aware without any choice what we are.

So we are first going to examine what we are. Not what I say you are, or the philosophers say you are, or your guru, books, psychologists and so on: you can put all those aside. If you do not you are merely repeating what others have said about you,

therefore you will never know what you are. So we are together examining very closely what we are. We are learning about ourselves; not accumulating knowledge about ourselves because ourselves is a living thing, extraordinarily complex. Ourselves are the result of innumerable impressions, pressures, other people's thoughts, other people's opinions, judgements, values; we are secondhand people very deeply, there is nothing original. And to discover the origin requires a great deal of attention, understanding ourselves and pursuing right to the very end of what we are.

So we have discussed fear and the movement of fear as desire, time, thought, which is part of us. We also talked about pleasure, which is part of us. And also we have to discover for ourselves the totality, the wholeness of ourselves. Are we following each other? You sit so readily and nod your head. Have you ever looked at yourself - not in the glass when you are shaving or combing your hair, but looked at yourself; the form that you have, the hands that you have, the way you look, the way you walk, the way you eat. That is also part of the understanding of yourself. The way you talk, the words you use; the way you talk to your superiors and you grovel to the governors, the cheap politicians and all the rest of it. So that is part of it. That is, your consciousness is what you are. Your consciousness is you. Your consciousness is your belief - please follow this, watch your own consciousness, not my description of your consciousness, not my words but use the speaker as your mirror in which you are seeing yourself. And seeing yourself as you are, the mirror becomes unimportant; you can throw away the mirror afterwards. But use the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing yourself because the speaker is

going to describe, but the description is not the actual, the description of a mountain, the painting of a mountain is not the mountain, it is not that cold air, that freshness, the majesty, the deep valleys and the shadows. The description is never the real, the word is not the thing. So please, the speaker is describing and the description is your own observation. So the description is not real, but watching yourself is real.

We said consciousness, that is to be conscious, to be aware, to perceive what you are, what you think, what you do, what you say, is part of that consciousness of which you are. So your consciousness is your belief, your vulgarity, your jealousies, your anxieties, your agonies, the sense of deep hopeless loneliness, the desire to seek security, to have something permanent. So seeking permanency, safety, security, you invent the atman, whatever you call it, the soul, or god, you invent it, and that is part of your consciousness. Your consciousness is put together by thought. Right? You are following this? Your thought has created your gods in which you believe; your thought has created pain, suffering, anxiety, all the neurotic activities, the illusions, the realities; the whole content of your consciousness is not separate from you, you are that. That is, when you are angry, that anger is you, it is not something away from you, you are that anger. But thought says, "I must control it", "I must suppress it", "I must rationalize it" - which is thought then separates itself from anger. So the observer is different from the observed. I hope you are following all this. Are you following all this?

Look sirs, we are dealing with something very, very serious because we are concerned with the degeneration of the world. We

are concerned with that society which is corrupt, in which we are living, and all the illusions of gods, and all the noise you make about the gods. There must be a radical change in the human mind otherwise we are going to destroy ourselves; you may not destroy yourself but your grandchildren, if you care for them. So it is very important to understand all this. So we are saying, which is a fact, your consciousness is the result, and the content of that consciousness is the product of thought. You believe in a particular concept, that concept is put together by thought. Your experience is translated by thought and registered or recorded in the brain. So thought is the source of your consciousness. Thought may think that there is god in you, that there is super, super, consciousness; that saying that there is superconsciousness, is still part of thought. So the content of your consciousness is put together by thought; all of it. And that content is in contradiction with each other: you believe in gods, going to temples, taking vows, and you are a lawyer on the other hand, an engineer; a modern man and a traditional man. Therefore there is contradiction, therefore there is conflict. So your consciousness is in contradiction with each other, the content of your consciousness is in contradiction with each other, therefore there is conflict, therefore there is pain. I hope this is clear.

And part of this consciousness is the inheritance of great suffering of mankind; not only personal suffering but the immense suffering of man who has been through thousands of wars, thousands of actual physical pain, all recorded, all shaping our brain. And suffering, which is fear, pleasure, pain and suffering, they move together, it is one movement, though we call it by

different names, it is one unitary movement. So we are not separating suffering as though it had nothing to do with fear. Fear is part of suffering; pleasure is also part of suffering: suffering is not merely having some disease, some physical pain, paralysis, or lack of limbs, that is part of suffering also, physical suffering. One can bear with it, one can put up with it but there is much deeper suffering: the suffering of a man who is ignorant, who is poor, uneducated. The suffering of those who are highly educated, sophisticated, with great deal of work, they have their sorrow. So sorrow is common to all mankind, it is not Eastern sorrow or Western sorrow, there is only human sorrow. And we have put up with it, we cry, perhaps for a month and then forget it but remember it, and every remembrance of an incident that has caused pain, again you suffer for that. So there is constant pain and suffering: suffering when you lose your son, your brother, somebody on whom you have depended, and suddenly you are faced with loneliness. That is sorrow which we all have; nobody in the world has escaped from sorrow, everyone has sorrow. And we have never been able to resolve it, we have never been able to be totally and completely free from sorrow. And when the mind is in suffering it is distorted, it acts neurotically. Where there is suffering there is no love. So one must enquire if there is an end to sorrow. Perhaps some books have been written about ending sorrow; it is in the books but you have not ended sorrow. So you use books, or some idea to escape from the actuality of sorrow. When you suffer physically there are doctors to cure it, if they can. But when you psychologically suffer inwardly, through loneliness, through failure, through not having ever loved anybody, and then

when you suffer inwardly you seek comfort, some kind of psychological palliative. So we are always escaping, running away from actually 'what is', which is our sorrow.

So could we, at least this evening, not run away, not seek comfort, not seeking some soothing words but actually face sorrow? Have you ever faced anything directly? Have you? Have you faced your jealousy, faced it? Say, "I am jealous" - not "I should not, why am I jealous", or try to find a rationalization of it, which are all escapes from it. But to face jealousy; that means to remain with it, to look at it, to understand it, to go into it. Or when you are aggressive, to comprehend it.

And also part of our consciousness is attachment: attached to a person, attached to some experience, attached to some belief, attached to some tradition. There are all kinds of tentacles of attachment. And we don't see the consequences, or the consequences of attachment, which is jealousy, anxiety, fear of being left, loneliness; these are all the consequences of attachment, whether you are attached to a person, or to an idea, to a concept, to a belief. Most of you do believe in god, god of the West or god of the East, you are attached to that because you want some explanation for all this misery, vulgarity, pain, ache, suffering. You, you are attached to that idea of god. But that god has been created by your thought to escape from reality of your life; and your gods have not solved your problems, your loneliness, your depressions, your aches, your agonies. But we want to escape from the actuality. And now we are saying: please face the actuality of your suffering. Is that suffering - please follow this carefully - is it a word? You understand? By using the word 'suffering', you think

you suffer. You have understood? Yes? We are talking together, aren't we? You understand? The word 'violence' may create violence - you understand? Because to us words are extraordinarily important. We are caught in a network of words. So one must be very clear that the word is not creating the reaction. Therefore one has to understand how the word has shaped our minds. When you say you are a Hindu, that is a word, that has shaped your thoughts, your tradition and so on and so on, the words. So one has to be very clear whether the word anger, jealousy, fear, suffering, that that word creates the feeling, or there is a feeling independent of the word. You understand? Independent, the word is not the actual, but we are caught in the words. God is a word and you are caught in that. So similarly, is suffering a matter of words? Or the feeling, the depth of that feeling is actually independent of the word? It is, if you look at it closely, it is independent of the word. Please, independent in the sense that even the word suffering is not the actuality. So one must be free of the word suffering. To suffer is a word which describes the feeling: the feeling is tears, the sense of desperate loneliness, and also it is part of self-pity.

So all that is the state of suffering, which is not the word. Now can you remain with that suffering without any escape from it; calling it suffering, which means you have already moved away from the actual fact. When you say to me or I say to you, "I am suffering", I have already moved away from the actuality. So can I look, observe that suffering without the word, without escape, without trying to seek comfort, and so on? Which is, no movement of thought, but actually remain with that state called suffering? You understand? To so look at it that the very observer is not

different from the suffering: the observer is the observed, which is, the observer is suffering, not he is separate and looking at suffering. You are following all this? So the observer is the observed. The observer is suffering, is sorrow. You get it? That there is no division between observation and the fact, so that you are completely with it. That means all your energy which you have dissipated by seeking comfort, by shedding tears, by running away from it, all that has been a wastage of energy because to understand sorrow, to live with it, you must bring all your energy to it. If you do, or when you do, then there is no difference between you and suffering, you are suffering, you are sorrow. Then because you have brought all your energy, it is like focussing light on a particular object, when you bring light onto an object you see it very clearly. So in that clarity of attention sorrow ends completely.

It is only a mind that is free from sorrow, totally, that can only know what love is. Without understanding the shock and the pain and the passion of sorrow; that passion is love, not lust, not sensual pleasure. So we will have to go into the question of what love is, because love cannot possibly exist where there is sorrow. Sorrow is part of self-centred activity and love is not. And so we will perhaps talk about love another time because it is nearly half past six.

So we are learning, learning, not memorizing - you understand the difference? Learning requires a certain curiosity, a deep interest and the mind is moving. There is a process of constant activity, whereas memory is static, you may add more to it, expand it, but it has not the same quality as learning. Learning is a movement; there is no end to learning. And therefore learning becomes an extraordinarily beautiful thing if you can see it that way.

So we began by talking about beauty: the beauty of your body, the beauty of your mind, the beauty of the mind that is free from conflict, from pain, the beauty of a mind that is free from sorrow and therefore it has that quality of love. And without that extraordinary perfume, and that very perfume may be truth, probably it is; and where there is truth there is beauty. Right sirs.

MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH JANUARY 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about last Sunday?
We will briefly make a resume of what we talked over together.

We were talking about time: we said that we are the past, the present and the future; we are time-makers, time is in our hand, in our minds, in our heart, we are time-bound. All our capacities, our skills, learning languages, painting and poetry and so on are all based on time. And to us, as we said, the future is very important; what we are, what we hope to be; what we have been, meeting the present, transforming itself, or modifying itself and continuing in the future. This is the whole cycle in which we live. That is, experience of millennia, many, many millennia and acquiring knowledge from that experience, stored up as memory, and thought springing from that memory, and action. This is the cycle, we live perpetually from knowledge to thought, to action, and learning from that action more. So we are always moving within the field of knowledge, which is the result of time. And we said also that as long as we are living our daily life, our life becomes very limited, narrow, bound by time. We said time is also thought and desire. Desire, we went into the nature of desire, how it arose. And we also said time, thought, brought about fear, which is also a process of time. Our brains are conditioned that way. If one has observed oneself it is fairly obvious that one's whole outlook on life is limited, narrow, or expanded through knowledge, but it is still within the field of knowledge. And as knowledge is always limited, because there is no complete knowledge about anything, as

knowledge is always limited, thought is limited. And whatever thought has created - the most wonderful pictures, the marvellous cathedrals, the great temples and the mosques, and the things therein, are all the product of thought; and so they are all limited, incomplete, insufficient.

And we also said, please, this is not a lecture. It is not something that you just listen to whether you like it or not - I hope you like it. It is not a lecture in the ordinary sense of that word. But here we are trying to think together, not about anything, but the capacity, the co-operation necessary to think together, to find out together, to investigate, to explore; as we have explored together the nature of fear, the corrupt society in which we live, the lack of aesthetic observation of the world, the immorality that exists, permissiveness, which is perhaps not too recent but probably it is very old. And also we said together - please we are not laying down any laws, not asking you to believe anything, or to convince you of anything whatsoever, we are not persuading you to form a new ideal, a new appreciation of a concept or a theory. We are dealing with daily facts of life; our misery, our confusion, our lack of relationship with each other, however intimate it be. We talked about human beings that are deeply hurt from childhood, wounded psychologically, how it distorts our action, our point of view and so on.

We also talked about together, amicably as two friends, pain, suffering, whether there is a possibility of ending sorrow, not only one's own narrow sorrow but the sorrow of the world, the global sorrow. And we also said no politician, or scientist, or any leader or any guru has solved any of our problems. On the contrary they

have increased them. So if one realizes that, not intellectually but actually, then we are totally, utterly responsible for ourselves: for our behaviour, for our moral conduct, for our relationship with each other and so on.

Please let me repeat again, if you don't mind, that we are talking over together our problems like two friends having a dialogue. But you can't have a dialogue with so many, therefore it becomes necessary that we repeat this statement over and over again: that we are together, deeply investigating our problems, that you and the speaker are thinking together, exercising our brains, not some kind of romantic sentimental appreciation of the setting of this place, of the trees, or the sunset and the beauty of the clouds.

So we are going to investigate together this evening not only the nature of human beings who do not love, who repeat that word without much significance or depth, but what is compassion, if such a thing exists at all. And also how to bring about - perhaps not how - what is the nature of a mind that demands, perceiving the confusion, the utter degeneracy of the world that is taking place now, what is the quality of a mind that demands a radical change. There have been many, many physical revolutions: the communist revolution, socialist, every type of revolution within the last five thousand years probably. Physical revolution has not solved anything; the upper class are destroyed and the lower class come up. It is a good old game and the pattern is repeated over and over again, as one perceives it in Russia, satellite countries of Russia. But we are talking about fundamental, psychological transformation necessary to bring about a new culture, a new religion, totally disconnected with all the present religious

entertainment. Don't be offended please, just listen to it. We are investigating. When we are investigating there is no taking sides about anything; we are looking carefully at all the problems that we have to face in life. And one of the basic demands of a psychological change is integrity.

Most of us lead a double life, worship all the images that thought has created, be utterly thoughtless on one side, and an engineer, an electronic expert building neutron bombs and so on and so on. So there is a contradiction in most people's lives. Therefore there is dishonesty in it utterly. And we are saying a life of real deep integrity; that is, a life that has no contradiction in itself, a life that is not fragmented, broken up, saying one thing, doing another, promising one thing and never keeping a promise: the constant double talk that one indulges in. So integrity means innocence, a mind that has not been touched by corruption. Could we, as human beings, living in this world, where there is so much corruption, where there is so much disorder, a neurotic world, can we live a totally integrated life? Integration: the wholeness, not fragmented, a life that is whole, complete, integrity means basically a mind that has not touched corruption, that has not had any kind of conflict. But most of our lives are a continuation of conflict. And we talked about that too: whether it is possible to live a life in which there is not a shadow of conflict, living in the present world. You might say that is impossible, such a life cannot be, a life without conflict. But when one begins to investigate, enquire into the whole nature of existence, our lives, not other peoples's lives, not what other people have said about our lives, the psychologists, the philosophers, gurus and so on, it is what we are.

And to investigate that, to go into it very, very deeply so that we become extraordinarily clear, unconfused. Clarity has its own extraordinary strength. And in investigating all this one comes to that point when one has tremendous integral strength, not depending on any leader, or any teacher, or any guru; including the speaker. So we are investigating together the nature of integrity, whether it is possible to live such a life.

Our life can be compared to the ebb and flow of a sea. The tide is going out, the tide is coming in; there is this constant movement of the sea going out and coming back. We have created this world, not the world of nature, not the world of the universe, but we have created the world in which we live; the society, the temples, the gods, we have created them. Having created this society then we react to that society, we are conditioned by that society: through education, through tradition, through every form of compulsion, conformity. So our life is going out and coming in, reacting to the world which we have created and reacting again to ourselves, to the world. It is an ebb and flow. That is our life. We are asking whether this ebb and flow of the outer and the inner, the outer society, the disorder of the society, the confusion, the immorality of this society and that tide coming back to us - you understand - this movement together. The world, the outer world and the inward world, this ebb and flow, we are that; we are asking whether that, the outer and the inner, which is not a fact, there is no outer and inner, there is only this movement, which is called the inner and the outer, whether that movement has ever a stop.

Are we meeting each other? Please, I don't want to talk to myself. I can do it if I have a room to myself, but we are together

here to understand this extraordinary complex life with all its tragedies, miseries, unhappiness, travail of life and we are caught in this. And we are asking: whether this movement, the outer and the inner, can ever stop? And what takes place when it does stop? And that is integrity; to be so completely whole so that there is no dependence on anything, except the postman, that is real freedom. And to live a life like that, having a mind that is never touched by corruption, never touched by this ebb and flow, the outer and the inner. And the investigating of the inner which becomes more and more selfish if one is not aware of this movement of the outer and the inner.

And also if one understands this not verbally but has an insight into this; insight, if one may go into it. First before we go into that, there is an art of listening, how you listen, not only to what the speaker is saying but to listen to the birds, to the whisper of leaves, to the flight of birds, to listen completely. That is an art, because very few of us do listen completely. And if we do listen, not only with the sensual ear but listen deeply to ourselves, to our thoughts, to our feelings, to our sensual urges, that requires not only attention but a sensitiveness. Most of us are incapable of listening so completely because probably you are translating, translating what is being said to what you already know. When you are listening you have no other thought, but the act of listening. You understand? When somebody tells you they love you, you listen with all your heart and mind. That is an art, like the art of seeing, observing. We rarely observe; observe the dirt, the squalor, the misery around us, we put up with everything. So to observe a tree, a friend, observe your husband, or your wife, not with all the

images you have built about her or about him, just to observe so that you see exactly 'what is', not what you think 'what is'.

And also there is the art of learning. There is a difference between memory, acquiring, assimilating, gathering information as memory and also there is learning: learning as though you were seeing something for the first time, seeing yourself for the first time in a mirror so that you see yourself exactly as you are. When one observes so acutely, with a sense of deep awareness, there is only 'what is', not 'what should be'. 'What is' can be transformed, if you are trying 'what should be' there can never be transformation of a mind but only when one understands exactly what is taking place in oneself, in one's thoughts, in one's behaviour and one's attitude.

So there is the art of listening, the art of seeing and the art of learning. And here we are trying to learn together about this very, very complex life that we live. Learn all about it as profoundly as possible, that is to know oneself. And that is a rather complex affair: to observe oneself as one is, not translate what one sees in oneself, deny it, or suppress it, or try to transform it, just to observe. If you have observed the moon, the full moon of yesterday, you were watching it completely, you cannot change it. So in the same way if one watched oneself, one's own nature, one's own fears, anxieties, the invention of the gods which we have put in a temple, or in a church or in a mosque, how one listens to one's wife or husband, to listen, so one sees exactly what one is; and in that perception there is transformation, not changing from this to that. That is if one is greedy our tradition says don't be greedy. It is the striving to be something which one is not. That is lack of integrity. But when there is the perception of 'what is', that is

actually greed, envy, then 'what is' can be transformed, not 'what should be'.

And also we should talk over together the nature of compassion, love. And also we ought to talk over together this evening, if we have time, death: time, desire, thought, fear of the future, which is death. We ought to comprehend, understand, feel, have an insight into the nature of death; the dying, which is the ending. Shall we go into all that?

Apart from all this, how do we use our senses? What are our senses? Or we are only operating with one or two senses? You may appreciate music, delight in it, be enraptured with the lovely sound of a great song, but we are totally blind, have no sensitiveness to architecture, to the beauty of the earth; or if you appreciate the beauty of the earth, you are totally blind to something else. We don't seem to be capable of operating with all our senses completely alive at the same time. I am afraid one of the reasons for this is that all religions throughout the world have said destroy, suppress your senses, because you might see a woman, or a man, and of course that is the greatest danger, for a spiritual life. So tradition, religion, and your own education, has broken up the senses. There is no observation of the movement of the sea with all your senses. Then when there is such depth of perception with all your senses there is no centre as the I, the me, the ego. And because we are only partially employing our senses, then sexuality becomes all important; and this sexuality is called love. So is love desire, pleasure, fear? Which is, jealousy, possessiveness, attachment, dependence, that whole structure of a relationship with man and woman, or the relationship of each other in a family, is

based on this; and is that love? One often wonders if there is love in this country. Don't say, "Does it exist in other countries?" - but we are talking together in this country, you and I. Does love exist in this country? If it does you wouldn't have all this horror going on around you. So we have to ask: what is the nature of love? You cannot cultivate love as you can cultivate some stupid quality.

We are asking ourselves whether we have love in our heart at all? Or we have duty, responsibility, dependence, attachment? Surely, as we said, love is not desire. Or you can put it the other way: is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love attachment? Please we are going to enquire into the whole nature of attachment; and whether any kind of attachment, can end? Because that is death. You may have money, position, land, reputation, power, status, or you may be a most extraordinarily poor, uneducated man, be attached to something; the more intellectual you are, you are attached to your theories, or you invent beliefs, ideals, as the ancient Greeks and the ancient Hindus caught in their perception of theories; others are caught in their experiences or in their belief, in their conclusions, confirmed. And when death comes it is an ending. So we are asking, thinking together, investigating, feeling our way into this extraordinary depth of love and compassion, because without ending, attachment, there is not the other, the perfume of the other. And death surely is an ending. You may believe in reincarnation, as most probably in this country they do, or probably some of you do, probably you have read newspapers and there have been stories that there is reincarnation, if you do believe in that, that you will live next life, which means that you will behave properly this life because you will be rewarded next

life; if you actually believe that, as most of you do perhaps, then are you behaving correctly now? Or is it just a vague fanciful theory, so it doesn't much matter. What matters is not what happens after death, but what happens before death, how you live before death. That is far more important than what happens afterwards. We never go into this, but we are always concerned what happens in the future. We never investigate or look at our lives before death: which is, what is it psychologically the I, the me, which if you believe in reincarnation continues next life, life after life after life until you reach god knows what? So what is the I, the me, that I cling to? Is it my sorrow? Is it my anxiety, my confusion, my talent, my capacity, the sorrow, the pain, the wounds, the agony? That is all me. Please see all this. That is me, that is you, that is our consciousness, that is what we actually are; not some divine spark in us, that is just another theory.

So is it that we cling to all this and are frightened of death? So to understand the nature of death is to live with death. You understand that? That is, death says when one dies, as we all must do, people are discovering how to live longer, I don't know why but people want to live very long in this confusion, in this misery; if you want to understand what is the nature of death, the depth of it, not the word, not the fear of dying, but the depth of it, the greatness of it, the immensity of something unknown, which is death, the ending, can we end... (Short break in tape)

We are trying to understand together, to have an insight into this extraordinary thing called death. Most people are frightened of it; being frightened they seek comfort in theories, in suppositions, in various forms of escape from actuality. We are all going to die

some day or other; I hope not with too much pain, not with some fatal disease but naturally die. We are going into the question of the depth of that word, what is its great strength, the beauty of it, the strength of it, the vitality of it. We were saying, or enquiring, learning about something, that if you are attached to whatever it be, and death is going to take it away from you, what you are attached to, can you end your attachment immediately, instantly? That is death. You can't argue with death, you can't say, "Please give me another day." It is the ending of something you know, or you hold on to, you cling to. So if you are ending every day, you are living with that enormous thing called death. So there is incarnation, not reincarnation, there is incarnation each day when you are ending each day. You understand? You are following this? Suppose I am attached to my wife, or to my husband, to my family, attached, or attached to some fanciful image of my own thoughts; and that has given me great comfort, because life hasn't given me comfort, life hasn't given me pleasure, the immensity. I have lived a stupid life, a confused life, a miserable life. And I am attached to something; and to end without knowing the future, without understanding the cause of that attachment, end it, then there is a new beginning.

Do you understand? Are we meeting together? Even verbally, intellectually, are we together in this thing? Because we are saying where there is a cause there must be an end. If I understand the nature of fear, which is to understand desire, time and thought, which we have explained very carefully last time, or the time before that we met here, if we understand the nature, the origin, the beginning of fear, and the causation of fear, there is an ending to fear. In the same way if we understand the whole complex life,

psychologically, inwardly, and all the causation of that, there is an ending of it. And we are always afraid of the unknown and hold on to the known. I know my life, it is miserable, you know, all the rest of it, but I know it. As you know your life: the fears, the agonies, the utter vulgarity, the insensitiveness, the callousness, no sense of beauty, love, compassion. One knows one's life and we cling to that. You must understand all this because to understand all this means to put our house in order; not the physical house only, but much more, the order in oneself. And that is what we have been doing in talking over together all these problems, we are putting our house in order. Our house is burning now: nobody can put it out except ourselves and so it behoves us to begin to understand about ourselves. How little generosity we have. We never seem to give what little we have to others, both physically as well as inwardly. And as we said, we must understand the great meaning, the depth of life and death.

And then there is the question of immortality; because each one of us wants to live permanently. An author has made a name for himself, he becomes immortal in a book; or a great painter, or a great musician, they leave a mark on the world; immortal painters, ageless and so on. That is not immortal; it is like writing in sand. If one begins to enquire into this question of immortality, that is, to have no death - you understand my question? - to be free of death. Therefore it means dying each day to all that you have collected inwardly. You have collected a great deal, an enormous amount of knowledge, which is necessary at a certain level, but all the knowledge you have collected about meditation, about gods in books, you know, masses of information, so that the mind is never

free to observe or receive something totally new. And death in its great meaning is to empty our consciousness of all its content. Our consciousness is fear, greed, envy, ambitions, you know, all that. We are that. And to end it; not by will, not by decision, or through some form of compulsion, but to understand, to observe minutely, correctly all that is taking place in oneself. And in that there is great beauty, and out of that comes great integrity, which is absolute, unshakeable at any time. And when one understands death one is living, there is something totally new taking place each day.

MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH JANUARY 1982

(Please would you mind not taking photographs. If you must take photographs, take photographs of the trees. Much nicer!)

This is the last talk. We were going to talk over together the question of meditation. We ought to consider also how we meet our problems. We have problems: the meaning of that word is, something thrown at you, like a challenge; how you respond to that challenge, how you respond to a particular problem. As we were saying yesterday, our life is ebb and flow, going out to the world and coming back inwardly. But as the waters go out and come in they remain water. But we human beings have this problem going out, observing the world, and hardly observing ourselves and our reactions to the world. So we never meet completely the challenge or the problem. This evening we propose to challenge you and see how you meet that challenge; with what vigour, with what intensity, whether you respond fully, or very partially.

And we should also consider together meditation, which is really very complex and has great depth of meaning. It demands first that we put our house in order, our house, which is so disorderly. And one of the causes of this disorder is our brain is always chattering, there is never a moment of quietness, it is always going round and round and round, it is perpetually in action, whether we are awake or asleep. When we are awake, if you are not at all mechanical, it is fairly simple to meet challenges and respond to them adequately; but when one is asleep there are no actual challenges, problems, but there are problems which have

not been resolved and the brain tries to resolve them while you are asleep because it cannot function effectively, directly with vitality if during the day we are not resolving the problems, ending the problems. Therefore during sleep the problems are being sorted out, so the brain is always active: it is dreaming, and if you dream it is the continuation of our daily life in a different form. And if we don't dream at all the brain has its own rhythm, its own movement, which requires a life of meditation. So the brain has been conditioned through millennia by a great deal of experience and knowledge. And knowledge, as we pointed out the other day, is limited. So knowledge always goes with ignorance, it is in the shadow of lack of knowledge, incomplete knowledge. So the brain, which they are discovering also, is never functioning as a whole. We are only functioning partially; the right side and the left side of the brain. I won't go into all that, it is not my point for the moment.

What we are trying to talk over together is whether it is possible not to function partially, but whether the brain can function totally, completely, harmoniously. And if it is possible, what action has it in our daily life, because we are concerned not with theories, not with beliefs, not with all kinds of superstitious nonsense but a life, our daily every day life, is it possible to bring complete order without any compulsion, without any pressure, without these two principles acting: reward and punishment? For most of us these two principles are active: reward and punishment. And meditation is not a reward, there is not, at the end of it, some kind of mysterious excitement, mysterious enlightenment. We will go into that, what meditation means, not how to meditate - the 'how' to meditate is nonsense - but the quality of a mind that is meditative.

We are going to enquire into that together.

And also we should enquire together: what is a religious mind? What is religion? Because as we have been talking during the last five talks together, about the problems of our daily life: economic, social, family and all the travail of life, the compulsions, the commitments, fears, anxieties, jealousies, ambition, aggressiveness, you know, the whole complex of our daily life; we have been talking about it together and trying to bring order in that disorder. And we ought to also talk over together what is intelligence. These are all necessary to understand before we begin to talk about meditation.

What is intelligence? There is the intelligence of thought: thought that has built the cathedrals, the churches, the temples, the mosques, that house, the ugliness of modern civilization, the brutality, the total callousness, it is the product of intelligent thought. And is there an intelligence which is not born out of thought? We must enquire into these questions together. We know intelligence, which operates with knowledge, thought, experience and so on, action. Any action based on thought must be limited. That is obvious because, as we have said, knowledge is always limited. Therefore any action born out of knowledge must inevitably be limited, and therefore that limited activity of thought has its own intelligence. To build a bridge you must have extraordinary capacity of engineering, stress of metal, if you want to build a most beautiful bridge, as they are, across the Golden Gate in San Francisco and New York, most marvellous bridges; there you have to enquire, you have to exercise a great deal of intelligence which is born of thought. And we exercise in our daily

life intelligence, limited, and therefore there is always conflict because our thought is limited, our action is limited, our actions are contradictory and so on. So the intelligence of thought must inevitably bring about conflict. You can see it happening in the world. One does not have to go into it in detail. But we are also asking - I hope you are also asking: is there an intelligence which is not born of thought? That is, if you say, "Yes, it is the intelligence of god, it is the intelligence of some super consciousness", it is still born out of thought because all our gods, whether in the West, in the East, or in the Far West, or Near East, all the gods are made up by us, our invention, for our convenience. This is clear. All of you, I am sure, believe in god; I don't know why but you do. But we never realize it is the invention of thought: all the rituals, the pujas, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion; it is really a vast entertainment. And is there a thought, is there intelligence which is not born of thought? Therefore is there an action which is not born out of thought?

You are following all this? Please, as we said, this is not a lecture where you are talked at, where you are being informed about something or other. Here we are together observing. And when we observe very clearly that very observation is action itself.

So we are asking is there an intelligence which is not born out of knowledge, not born out of experience, not born out of tremendous analysis, because all those are limited? So is there an intelligence which is not born out of this? That is also part of meditation: to find out for oneself, not directed by another, not led by a guru by the hand to something, but to find out for yourself if there is an action which is not born out of thought, but is there an

action which is totally intelligent, so that there are no regrets, no fears, it is a total complete activity of intelligence. We are going to go into that too.

And we are also asking, which is also part of meditation: what is a religious mind? All the people who go to all the churches and temples and mosques, are they religious at all? All that noise that goes on every evening here in the name of some invented god, are they religious? So we have to enquire into that seriously. And if we find the truth of it, you do not belong to any church, to any group, to any religion. That requires a mind that is totally free. Freedom, which is another complex subject, can only be when we have understood the nature of authority: why we obey, why we follow, why we go from one guru to another endlessly. Is there not the urge to be led, to have a leader, politically, religiously, a leader in the family and so on, which is authority? We have followed authority of various kinds through all the millennia, and at the end of this period of time we are exactly where we began, perhaps a little more sophisticated, a little more cunning, a little more avaricious, and if we are wealthy, god is our money. So what is a religious mind? Surely it is not that to believe in god is a religious mind. I hope we are meeting this clearly. If belief in god makes you religious, that is, the word religion has not; etymologically there has been no definite meaning, but we all understand when we use the word religion, it is either utter superstition, a lot of words spun together, repetition of some mantra, or some slogan, which is to quieten the mind; and does that make the human brain really profoundly religious? Beliefs, dogma, superstition, ideals, the rituals that thought has invented, all these are the product of

thought: so is thought in itself religious? You are following all this, I hope. Obviously it is not because thought is a material process. Right? Because it is based on experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, contained in the brain cells, right and left, and so on. So thought in itself is not sacred. Whatever thought may invent, super consciousness, super ego, super self-realization, super, super something, it is still part of thought. Thought is not sacred, whatever it creates. It has created the most marvellous things: we have seen some of the great temples, great sculpture, great music.

So, what is a religious mind? Obviously it is a mind that is totally free from all organized institutions, called religions, organizations for prayer, monasteries. And the monk, whether in the West or in the East, taking a vow of celibacy so that he leads a pure life, while he is burning inside he is taking a vow. And as one has observed in the West and in the East, apparently celibacy - please I am not advocating celibacy, or against it, we are examining, we are looking, we are observing, thinking together about all this so that we ourselves find our own life which has integrity, nobility, honesty. Purity is not so great as innocency. That is, innocent means a mind that is not capable of being hurt. You understand? That is an innocent mind. And if you put aside all the scriptures, it doesn't matter what they have said because if you merely repeat what they have said you are merely repeating a lot of words, it is not an original perception of what is truth. You may read all the commentaries of other people, and copy them, repeat them as an intellectual entertainment; that is all right on the one hand, but the words are not reality. So one has to be totally free from all that because truth has no path to it. It is a pathless land,

like a ship that has no rudder. You have to walk out of darkness, out of your own chaos, out of your own confusion, out of the forest of ignorance and come to that by yourself, your own comprehension of perception. That demands great inward vitality, strength and clarity.

Now if we have established order by understanding the nature of disorder, which is contradiction, dishonesty, hypocrisy, all the mischief that we have created in the world and in ourselves, and out of the understanding of that comes order, which is a living thing, which is not something put in a strait jacket. It is a living quality that is order, and order is the highest virtue. So there must be that before we start to enquire what is meditation. So that your brain is active without stimulation. I hope we are understanding each other, are we? You see most of us are asleep: you go to the office, come back home, eight hours work, it is all routine, dull; gradually the brain, naturally, becomes dull. And such a brain meditating has no meaning whatever. But you are all doing that in one way or another.

So we are going to enquire not only into the depth and the profundity of what is truly a religious mind, but also what is meditation? You understand? We have established order in our life, otherwise it is utterly futile to meditate, obviously, because it will become an amusement, it will become a routine, you will be doing this and that: fantasy. Also the brain, which has got such immense capacity, immense, technologically it has done the most extraordinary things. And the astrophysicists are enquiring into the nature of the universe; which is, to find out what is Mars, Saturn; that is they want to enquire and learn, acquire knowledge about the

universe. And the universe is also part of us. We are incapable apparently of delving so profoundly in ourselves so that there is total order, which is the order of the universe. I don't want to go into all that. It is too complicated.

So what is meditation? Is meditation something apart from daily living, spending twenty minutes or half an hour in the morning, afternoon and evening? Apart from our daily activity? Or our daily life itself is a meditation. You understand? Are we meeting each other somewhere, in some corner? I hope that corner isn't too dark. So why should we meditate, what is meditation? It is not obviously practice. Right? Following a particular system, a method. When you follow a system, a method, your brain which is already mechanical, you make it still further mechanical. It is so obvious.

So can we be free of all systems and practice? Because we practise a system, a method, in order to have a reward at the end of it, otherwise you wouldn't do it. Do we see the truth of that? Not systems are right or wrong but do we see that the so-called practice of a system of meditation is utterly meaningless because that makes the brain more and more dull, stupid: do we see that fact? It may bring about certain results, it may calm your body, give you a peaceful night and so on, you may have certain superficial benefits; but as an act of meditation it has no meaning. Are we clear on this? Or hearing the speaker say all this you say, "I will go on practising my method, it has benefitted me", and so you are going back to something which you have consciously or unconsciously understood to be the truth and practise something which is utterly meaningless? You are following all this? And why do we practise? That is one of the most horrible words. Why do we practise? It is

like a pianist practising the wrong note. Right? I hope you see the amusement of it!

So you see throughout the ages man has sought something which is beyond time, which is beyond thought, beyond all experience, something totally the origin of all things. He wanted it, he wanted to enquire, find out. And there were those people who said, "I have found out, I will tell you all about it." They were caught in that trap. And that is what most human beings are doing now: they want something, they are so discontented with life, with all the travail, the meaninglessness of this existence, which is pleasure, pain, anxiety and all the rest of it. So in that state man enquires out of his deep discontent with life if there is something that is immeasurable - not the words, not the experience of it, the actuality of it. And somebody perhaps had such an experience, such a perception and wrote about it, and we, or some, most people read those books, repeat those books, try to practise what he is supposed to have done, how he lived, how he walked, what he ate for breakfast and so on; and we think we are becoming religious. That is, we are seeking reward through punishing ourselves. You are following all this?

And we are enquiring still into a religious mind: the mind that is not functioning, a mind that is functioning where thought is necessary and perceiving an intelligence which is not based on thought. What is that perception? Are we meeting each other? Somebody? Sir we talked the other day about love and compassion. We talked about it: the words are not the reality. Compassion has its own intelligence; it is passion born out of suffering, or rather the ending of suffering. When there is the

ending of suffering totally then that ending brings this quality of compassion. And the intelligence of compassion is not born out of thought. Right? Are you getting some of this?

So with that intelligence we are observing what is meditation: no systems, no practice, no sense of obeying somebody to lead you somewhere else. There must be complete freedom. Then there are various systems of meditation: the Zen from Japan, the meditation of the Hindus, the meditation of the Buddhists, the meditations of the Christians and perhaps the meditations of the mystics. Why are there such divisions? Meditation is meditation: not the Buddhist meditation, Tibetan meditation, some other meditation. The very word meditation means to ponder over, think over - the actual meaning. Now apparently in all meditations there is the observer and the observed, there is the controller and the controlled. The controller is thought controlling his wandering thoughts. Right? That is, there is a division in thinking itself.

Another interesting question is: is thinking individual at all? Or is there only thinking: not Eastern thinking and Western thinking, Buddhist thinking and Hindu thinking, which is absurd obviously, because there is only thinking. But you in the East may put it into different words, and the West may put it into another series of words, but thinking is neither West, nor East, nor individual. I wonder if you understand the depth of this? If you see the beauty of it? Then you are free from this idea of belonging to any particular group, community, to a people.

So there is this controller and the controlled. That is part of the ordinary meditation. The conflict that goes on when you are trying to think about something and other thoughts pass by one after the

other, so there is this contradiction in thinking itself. Right? And this contradiction is part of our confusion, part of our disorder. So is there a difference between the controller and the controlled? Or there is no controller at all, only a movement of thought, which invents a controller, then he begins to control thought. You follow? This is clear, isn't it? I want to meditate, and I see my thoughts wandering all over the place. Then I say to myself, I must control my thoughts. Who is the controller? It is still thought, isn't it? Who has separated himself, calling himself the controller, and thoughts which are wandering by. So in meditation there is no controller at all, only pure observation. Oh, you don't understand all this. Right? That is, to observe without any direction, without any motive, pure observation of the light of an evening on a river, or the light of the moon on the ocean, or the light on the face of a nice person. To observe so that pure observation has nothing personal, nothing individual, it is pure seeing. When there is such perception there is no need for controlling. I wonder if you see this. Because all our life there is always a controller: do this, don't do that. Right? This is right, this is wrong. I must control my passions, I must control my lust. I must control my thoughts. But this is a very dangerous thing if you do not understand what the speaker is saying. One can live a life without one effort of control; because then when you perceive directly there is no need for control. When you perceive that your systems of meditation have no meaning, that very perception ends the system, you don't have to struggle to end the systems. You understand? Are we meeting somewhere together in this. Right?

So there is no concentration. Concentration is the controller

trying to concentrate. So in meditation there is no controller. You understand the significance of this? Which means there is no conflict because all our life is conflict. And we think by meditating we shall end conflict; or by meditating we shall bring about order in our life - which is the other way round. You understand? So concentration is a form of resistance. Right? I want to concentrate on a certain page, on a picture, on an idea, and other thoughts come seeping in, so I have to force myself to concentrate on one particular thing. So there must be resistance. Whereas attention has no resistance; which is to attend with total awareness of things about you. Where there is attention there is no centre as the me; whereas in concentration there is always the centre as the me. See it? Sirs, are we together in this, or are you just looking at the speaker?

So meditation is a state of mind that demands absolute accuracy, absolute integrity; that when you say something you mean it. We went into that question of integrity yesterday. That is to have a mind that is not acting to further reactions, this ebb and flow of action and reaction. It is when that ebb and flow of action and reaction stops there is total integrity, and when there is this quality of attention in which there is no personal attempt to become something. I wonder if you understand this? In our daily life we are always becoming something: if I am a clerk I want to become the manager, if I am the manager I want to be the executive, top boss and so on and so on; in politics, in religion, if I am a disciple I will eventually become the guru, if I am the guru I want to become the top guru: you know, this everlasting attempt to become something. In meditation there is no becoming, nor being. But when there is

order, this intelligence of compassion, then the mind, the whole brain, becomes astonishingly quiet. That is, silence can only be when there is space. Space is not only the distance from here to your home, but the space that thought has created is not space; space requires tremendous sense of the ending of the self, totally. We have very little space in our minds. We can invent space, we can think about space, but the actuality of having vast space, because silence of the mind is limitless space, because in that silence there is no centre which says, "I am silent." You are following all this?

And man has sought something beyond himself, something holy, something sacred, which is not the invention of thought, which is none of the things that have been created in the churches, in the temples, or in the mosques, there is nothing sacred there. But when there is this quality of absolute silence and space there is that which is not measurable by words: and this is meditation. And in that meditation there is something totally utterly sacred which can never be put into words. And that is not an experience because there is no experience to experience. I wonder if you understand all this. There is only that which is immeasurable, nameless, and which cannot be put into words at any time. And our life, our daily life, if one has comprehended all this, is totally transformed: this is meditation.

NEW DELHI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST NOVEMBER, 1981

We are going to talk this evening over many things. We are going to talk about fear basically, whether the mind, whether this life that we lead with a great deal of fear can ever be resolved. Whether man, who has carried this fear for millennia upon millennia, can ever be free fundamentally, deeply, of fear. That is what the subject of this evening is.

But before we go into that question we should consider together what is the quality of a mind that listens? How do you, if I may most politely and respectfully ask, how do you listen? Not only to what the speaker is saying, but also how do you listen to people, to your friends, to your wife, to your husband? Do you ever listen? Or it is merely a passing reaction, a partial listening? Do you ever listen to anybody totally, completely, with all your attention, giving your heart and your mind to what is being said? Or we listen very casually, partially. So first, if one may point out, there is an art of listening. Like a great many other arts in life, the art of listening is very important. If one could listen so completely, not partially, with all your mind, with your nerves, with your heart, with your brain, listen to what is being said, not interpreting it, what is being said, not translating according to what you would like to hear, or, as you are listening, comparing with what you already know, then you actually are not listening, you are just wandering off in the side lines. So could we find out how we listen? How you actually listen. Because that may be the clue to great depth in understanding, not only what your wife, your husband, other people say, but also what

the speaker is saying. The speaker is not saying anything extraordinary. All that he is pointing out is that in listening, not only with the hearing of the ear but at a greater depth, which is not merely an intellection. That is, trying to understand the words and arguing with those words, but listening without any reaction, just to listen as you listen to good music, as you listen to a bird of an evening before they go to bed.

So there is an art to listening. Are you listening now? Or trying to understand what is listening? That is, you say something to me and I listen so completely that there is communication between us totally. There is not only verbal communication but also non-verbal communication. Either it is a gesture, a look, a wave of the hand and so on. There is verbal communication and non-verbal communication. In listening both are necessary. The understanding of the meaning of the words and also capturing the significance that lies beyond the word. Please if you don't mind find out how you listen because that will show how your mind is operating, how you think, how you feel, to go into yourself and watch your own mind operating, functioning.

And also there is an art of seeing; to observe. To observe a tree, a person, to observe the movement of your own thinking; to observe your own reactions, your own loneliness, depression, sorrow, pain; to observe the quality of your mind, whether that quality is merely repetitive, whether having read a great many books it merely repeats what other people have said, or you have discovered it, that you are a secondhand human being - because that is how we live, on what other people have said, and discover whether you can find for yourself something original, something

true. And so in observing it requires a great deal of honesty. Honesty, not to some ideal, or try to be honest, but to see, to observe, or be aware of the movement of your thought, the movement of your own feelings, whether you are lonely, as most of us are. And when that feeling arises what you do. To be aware in observation.

So there is the art of hearing, the art of listening, and there is the art of learning. It is not difficult, all this. If you go into it you will see it for yourself. When we learn, we learn to acquire knowledge, and according to that knowledge act skilfully. When you go to school, college, university, that is the whole process of learning - accumulating information, knowledge, and acting from that knowledge. That is what we are used to. That is, accumulate experience, knowledge, memory, act. And that is what we call learning, like learning a new language. You study it very carefully, listen to the intonation of the speaker and repeat after him, learn the words. So gradually through time you have acquired a great many words, how to use the verbs and make a sentence and so on. That is what we are accustomed to, that is what we call learning, so that we can have a good job, acquire security physically. But there is another kind of learning; because knowledge is never complete about any subject, so thought born of knowledge is always incomplete, because knowledge, being incomplete, lives in the shadow of ignorance. Please, you are listening. You are not repeating afterwards what I am saying. You are listening to what is being said. It is not whether you agree or disagree, but learning the art of listening.

So as we have said, there is a different kind of learning, not

merely accumulating knowledge which is necessary at a certain level in our lives, but to learn clarity. Clarity cannot be learnt. But to observe clarity, what is implied in not having a good clear brain and see its incapacity, and see to what extent it is limited, and learn, watch without accumulation, the whole movement of our existence. I don't know if you understand this.

So there are these three arts: the art of hearing, the art of seeing, the art of learning. The art of learning is to perceive instantly what is being said, whether it is true or false. And to see in the false the truth. So to have a very quick mind, quick brain, a sensitive brain. But if it is loaded with information of what other people, philosophers, teachers, sacred books and your own gurus have said, then that brain is clogged. The speaker used to know a very well known author. He could talk about any subject. He had read a vast amount through the years - he could talk about Vedanta, Indian philosophy, Zen, science, music, painting and the Christian mystics and so on. Full of knowledge. So one day on a walk he was saying, 'I wonder, as my brain is so full of knowledge, whether I can ever have an original experience, an original contact with something untouched by thought.'

So knowledge is important at a certain level, otherwise I couldn't speak, we wouldn't be here; but there is an activity - or, one has to perceive something beyond knowledge, which we will go into when we talk about meditation and so on. So that is the first thing: please find out how your mind is working, how your brain is acting. Whether it is merely reacting or whether the brain which is always partial, it's - all right I will go into it. Our brain is limited. That is, we are only using a very, very small part of the brain. We

are never using the whole of the brain. And that little part of the brain is conditioned by knowledge, conditioned by the desire to be secure and so invent nationalism, which is tribalism and so on. Now to find out whether the whole of the brain can be active, not only just part of it, you have to enquire into the sensory responses. Do you follow all this? Can I go on? Yes, I can go on but are you listening to what is being said?

You see the brain is the centre of all our sensory responses. That is obvious. And that we are only using part of it. And we are asking whether the whole of the brain can operate? It functions only - please just listen, don't accept this, just listen to it, I may be wrong because we have discussed this question with scientists and so on, I may be wrong but find out for yourself that we are acting, thinking, our brain is limited, it is functioning partially and whether the whole of the brain can function fully. It is an important question to ask and to find an answer to it. It can operate only completely when all our senses are in full operation. You understand? That is, only our senses are partial, either we see things very clearly optically, hear clearly, feel very clearly, and so on but they are partial. One of the senses is not fully operating. Or the other sense is fully operating and the other is not. I don't know if you are following all this? Does all this interest you?

So to find out whether the brain can operate completely, wholly, all the senses must operate at the same moment, at the same level, with the same intensity. Then you will find when the total movement of all the senses are moving, there is no centre, let us put it that way. There is no centre. It is only when the partial sensory responses take place there is a centre. That is the beginning

of the ego, the me, the self.

So, I hope you are listening to all this to find out for yourself how your brain works, whether it is partially operating and therefore being conditioned, and whether that conditioning can ever be free, totally free from all conditioning. And that can only take place when the whole of the senses are fully in operation.

So we are going to discuss fear. This is necessary to understand how one's brain, one's mind, one's feelings, are working. Before we discuss together - this is not a lecture as is generally understood, it is a conversation between us, two people, or half a dozen people talking over their problems, human problems. And so you are sharing, not just casually listening, you are sharing in what is being said. So you are observing your own responses, your own fears, your own desires. To understand fear, that is, the root of fear, one has to understand first, desire. What is desire? Most of us through religious training, or religious sanctions, or religiously inclined, suppress our desires. All the monks throughout the world try to suppress their desires, or identify themselves with something greater than desire and so hope to transmute desire; or run away from desire, never looking at a woman but always keeping their eyes closed, or on a book or something or other. You know all this.

So we are trying to understand what desire is, not the object of desire. Right? You may desire a better house, or a better government job, or desire for something or other. We are not discussing the objects of desire but together we are examining what is the root of desire, how does desire arise, what is its place, why human beings have always been driven by desire? So to understand or to comprehend fully the nature of fear we must understand also

how desire arises. Now please listen to it so you are not listening to the speaker but you are listening to yourself, finding out for yourself how desire comes. You have a desire for a sari you see in the window, or a shirt, or a suit, or a car. Desire is very close to envy. You might envy another, you might envy the speaker - having a large audience, a reputation, all that nonsense. So it is very important to understand the source of desire, what tremendous part it plays in our life. Desire is part of ambition. Desire brings about this competitive state, the competition between two nations, competition between two people. Desire is at the root of it. And to go into it very deeply, though the speaker describes it verbally, you are actually observing your own desire, if you are at all aware of your desire. You want to be something - more beautiful, taller, shorter, curly hair, god knows what else.

So it is important to understand how desire arises. The speaker will explain it step by step but you are listening to your own desire, observing it, closely following the movement of that desire. First there is perception, the seeing of a suit or a shirt, or a sari in the window, then touching it, contact, then there is sensation. Right? The seeing, contact, then sensation. Right? This happens. You see a blue shirt in the window, you go inside, feel the texture of it, the sensation. Or you see a car, a beautiful car - I don't know if they have beautiful cars in India - then you touch the surface of it, from that touching you desire the sensation. Then what happens? Thought creates the image of you sitting in that car and driving off. Or seeing that blue shirt in the window, touching it, feeling the texture of it, the sensation, then thought says, 'How nice it would be on me.' So please, follow this carefully. Seeing, contact,

sensation, then thought creating the image. When thought creates the image that is the moment of desire. Are you listening to this - not only listening to the speaker, you are discovering for yourself. You are observing this? That is, desire arises naturally when thought creates the image, not when there is sensation, but only when thought creates that image of you in the car, then the desire says, 'I must have that car', or 'I must have that shirt'.

Now, if one is aware of this process, completely aware, not saying 'I must have that shirt' - or not - aware of the process of desire then at the moment when thought arises with its image, whether that image and thought can be postponed. Do you get it? Have you understood this? No, please, don't say, yes, this is tremendously important. That is, I am aware of that car, me sitting in that car. I have seen it, I have touched it, I have the feeling of the beauty of that car. Then thought arises, me sitting in the car, driving off. At that moment when thought creates the image, desire begins. So is my attention, or awareness, so clear to postpone or not allow thought to arise with its image? That requires a great deal of inward attention. That is the real discipline because I am learning. The word 'discipline' comes from the word 'disciple'. The disciple is learning from the master, from the teacher. But discipline is generally understood as imitation, conformity, enforcing, driving yourself to do something you don't want to do - like a soldier drilling from morning until night until all his brains go out. So there is a kind of learning which in itself becomes order. When you perceive that thought creating the image is the moment of desire, then you have the whole thing in observation. Therefore it is never yielding or suppressing desire.

So that is the first thing about desire when you are examining fear because there is fear in our desires. One may not get it, not have it, one may not fulfil. And also when we are examining together fear we must understand a most fundamental thing which is time. May I go on? You are not tired?

What is time? We live by time. Get up in the morning. Go to the office for the next ten hours, or eight hours, come back weary - we live by time, that is by the watch, chronologically, by sunrise, sunset. And our brains have evolved through time. It is not your particular brain, it is the brain of humanity. I won't go into that for the moment. So time is part of our life: growing from childhood to adolescence, middle age and dying. All that involves time. Learning a language, learning a new skill, requires time. To go from here to your house requires time, that is, to cover the distance from one point to another point. So all that is time, which is according to sunrise, sunset, according to chronology, according to a watch. But also there is another kind of time, this inward time. That is, I hope to be, I hope to be happy. That is in the future. I hope to succeed; I am this, but I will be that. I am unhappy now, but give me time I will get over it. So there is time by the watch, by the day, by the stars, and also there is psychological time. This is not complex, just pointing out, and please listen to it. So time yesterday, today and tomorrow. That is, the past modifying itself in the present and continuing in the future. Right? This is what we are doing all the time. This is called progress. This is called evolution. This is called ascent of man through knowledge. Right? I have learnt, or I have had pain yesterday, physical pain, it has been recorded and there is a fear that it might happen again, that is time.

So there is yesterday's remembrance, modified by the present, continued into the future, psychologically. That is, I am violent today, I hope through time, through an ideal of non-violence, I will achieve non-violence - which is nonsense.

Now, let's take that one example and look at it: I am violent, all human beings have the seed of violence in them. And I don't know how to get over this violence because it is very disturbing. So I invent an idea of non-violence. The fact is I am violent. Right? The non-fact is non-violence. Right? It is a non-fact. So I am moving from the fact of violence to a non-fact, which is illusory. I hope through an idea of non-violence I will be free of violence. This is what you are preaching, all of you have been preached to, repeat over again the idea of non-violence. But the fact is you are violent. It takes time to arrive at non-violence, in the meantime you are sowing violence. I don't know if you are following all this. Whereas if you face the fact without the idea of non-violence you can deal with it. But if you are all the time pretending to be non-violent, because you are trying to be non-violent, which is pretence, whereas actually you are violent. And if you can face that fact and deal with the fact it is much easier than facing non-violence.

So time, desire and time are part of the fact of fear. That is, I have done something last week, I want to cover it up, it is not pleasant. I may have told a lie, I cover it up and I am afraid somebody is going to discover it. So I am afraid. I am afraid not to become a successful sannyasi. I am afraid of not achieving a position which I am craving for. So I have so many urges, so many fears: that I might die, that I am not beautiful, that I have to learn

so much - you know, we have innumerable fears. So we are not discussing the branches of fear. You understand this? We are not discussing the various branches of fear but fear itself. Are you following this? Not what you are afraid of, but what is fear? You understand? So what is fear? Fear of the unknown, fear of something, fear from something. So there is a cause to fear. Right? The cause may be that I have done something wrong and I don't want you to discover it because I am pretending to myself I am a great man, and there is the fear of discovery. I am not talking of what I have done which causes fear but fear itself. You understand the difference? Fear in itself, fear about something. Are you trying to hide behind the light?

You understand the difference? Fear about something, or fear in itself. You can understand fear about something. That is fairly simple. I am frightened of you, you are taller, bigger, more powerful, I am frightened of you. Or I am examining fear itself, not about something, or away from something. You get this? So I am asking: what is fear? Has it something to do with time? Has it something to do with the future? Again about the future: I may not get what I want. Or I am lonely, as most of us know the terrible burden of loneliness. You may have many friends, you may have a name, you may have a good position, but there is always the shadow of loneliness with its despair, and one is frightened of that loneliness. The fear of loneliness prevents us from looking into the depth of that loneliness, what is the reason for that loneliness. You are following? Are we meeting each other? Communicating with each other?

So we are trying to find out together the root of fear. Is it

thought? Is it thought that creates fear? I am but I am not. I am not good but I will be good. Which is again the movement of thought in time. You are following all this? So is thought the origin of fear? That is, I think I am quite secure in whatever I am doing. I think I am quite secure but there is always the shadow lurking that something might happen and I will be insecure. Which is, I am secure financially, or in different ways, but there is a shadow saying 'Look, something might happen to you tomorrow.' So thought may be the origin of fear. Right? Which is thought is time. That is, please follow this - how one demands explanations. One doesn't see instantly the truth of this. You want explanations, you want to be convinced, told over and over again, then you say, 'I have got it'. That is, what is the root of fear? Is it thought? Obviously it is. I might die tomorrow. Thinking about death causes fear. So thought is the origin of fear. And thought is time. That is, I am all right today but tomorrow there might be danger, I might die with a heart attack. So time, which is future, and thought which says, 'I might die.' So time and thought are the same. Time is a movement. Thought is a movement. So time and thought are the beginning of fear.

Please sirs, for god's sake, this is too serious to take photographs. Sir this requires your attention if you want to understand fear and whether the mind can ever be free from fear. So this is very serious because fear is a dreadful thing for all of us. It darkens our lives. It shrivels us. It makes us so shallow, petty, little, living in darkness. So it is a very serious question whether the human mind can ever be free from fear. Man has lived with fear, we are accustomed to fear, we will put up with anything, lack

of water, dirt, squalor. We accept everything, we don't rebel. And we have lived with fear. We have never said, is it possible to be totally, completely free from fear. And the speaker says it is. That is, fear is thought and time.

Now, wait a minute: then you might ask the question: how am I to stop thinking? Because realizing that thinking causes fear, thinking is time, then the natural question is: tell me how to stop thinking. You ask that question naturally. Is that the right question? You may ask a question, it may be a wrong question and therefore you will get the wrong answer. But is that the right question? You are following this? You are watching your own mind, not listening to me only. You are watching your mind, seeing that time, the future and thought, thinking about the future, gets frightened. I might die with a heart attack tomorrow, I get frightened. So fear comes about through time and thought. Time is thought.

So you ask the question: please explain how to stop thinking so that I will have no fear? I am asking: is that the right question? Or you see for yourself the nature of thought, and the movement of time. You see it for yourself. There is nobody to tell you how to stop thinking. But you discover for yourself the movement of thought, thought being, as we explained yesterday, experience, knowledge, memory, action, and from that action learn more which becomes knowledge, so we keep in that cycle. The cycle is fear. You understand this? No, you don't lady, don't agree, this is much too serious.

So, are you listening to your own fear, seeing that fear is time and thought, see the truth of it. You understand? See the truth of it not your idea about it. That is sir, you have explained to me very

carefully the nature of desire, the nature of time and you are saying, after explaining a great deal, that thought is the root of fear. And thought is also time. So time, thought, is the root of fear. You have told me that. I have listened to you very carefully, I have paid great attention to what you have told me. It is no longer yours, it is mine. I have seen thought is the real root of fear. Do I actually see the fact of it, or the idea? You understand the difference? I hear you say this to me. I generally form an abstract of it, which becomes the idea. Right? So either I form an idea which is an abstraction, from what I have heard, or I actually see in myself the nature of fear, how fear arises when thought is in operation, which is time. So please listen to it. I remain with that fact, I don't move away from that fact. I don't try to stop fear. I remain with that, with that truth. Are you doing that? You understand? I have put away the abstraction altogether because ideas don't clear up fear, beliefs don't clear up fear. I can go to the temple day after day, it won't clear. Those are all abstractions. But the fact is I am frightened. I am frightened because of thought, which is time. That is the truth and I remain there. My mind refuses to move away from that fact, which is the truth.

What happens then? Find out! I have very carefully explained the nature of time, the nature of desire and examining the root of fear. The root of fear is thought, not how to stop thought. That is a silly question. But to remain without any movement with that absolute fact. Are you doing this? You understand my question? Are you, if you are serious, are you doing this? That is, you have watched your fear arising and you realize it is thought, and thought has said, tomorrow I might die, and fear arises from that thought.

And not how to stop thought, this movement is you. You understand? This movement of time, thought, desire, fear, is you. But if you try to go beyond yourself you are escaping from the truth, from the fact. So give all your attention to the fact. Then you will see fear completely disappears. I have not told you what to do. That is such a cheap escape. But together we have observed the whole movement of fear. And together we have watched our fears, how they arise, thought, time and I remain totally with that fact, which is you.

So you learn - not learn - you are watching the operation of your own brain, the operation of your own mind. You are discovering for yourself the way you think, the way you feel, your fears, of which you may be totally unaware. And in discussing fear we must also consider together pleasure. Because they are the two sides of the same coin.

We said this whole movement of fear, desire and time and so on is you, that is what your consciousness is. You can't escape from your consciousness, you are that. So remain with that. When you remain with it give all your attention to it, like bringing a strong light upon something which is dark; attention is that, it dispels the whole pattern of fear. And in considering fear we ought also to consider pleasure, because pleasure brings also pain, fear. Most of us through past millennia have sought pleasure - sexually or pleasure of the intellect, or the pleasure of devotion, which is romanticism, or the pleasure of popularity and all that business. We are always seeking pleasure, ultimate pleasure is of course Brahmin, or your invented god. I do not know if you have realized thought has created god. Right? God hasn't created you to live a

miserable life but we have created god, thought has created it and we worship that which thought has created, which becomes rather silly.

So we have to examine pleasure. The pleasure of ambition, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of being an ascetic, the pleasure of sex. What is pleasure? Why has man pursued pleasure? What is the movement of pleasure? You see a beautiful sunset, with the light and the glory of a setting sun, great light across the heavens, the beauty, the delight of something incredible. If you have ever looked at a sunset with all your heart and brain and mind, it is an extraordinary sight, as the sight of an early morning. The other day coming from Germany we saw the sun rise, there was this waning moon and the morning star, clear light on the waters, and the snowcovered hills, and there was great beauty which no painter, no poet, nobody could describe. There was a delight in that. That delight is recorded in the brain. Then that pleasure is remembered and you want that pleasure to be repeated. The repetition is no longer pleasure, it becomes memory as pleasure. It is not the original perception of that waning moon, the clear sky with that low single star and the beauty of that light on the water. That remembrance is pleasure, not at the moment of perception. You are following this? At the moment of seeing there was no pleasure, there was that. But it has been recorded, then there is the remembrance of that and that pleasure is the remembrance. And the demand for that pleasure to be repeated. Sexually this is what we do.

And therefore pleasure is remembrance. I don't know if you follow all this? At the moment when you see the beauty of a hill,

with the snow, with the clear blue sky, at that moment there is no pleasure, there is only that immensity, that grandeur, that majesty; later on pleasure begins when you want it to be repeated, which means the remembrance, thought, time, the same thing as fear. These two sides of the same me, me that has fear and has lived with fear, and I have seen from your explanation the whole movement of it, and also I see thought, remembrance, of that thing which has happened yesterday morning, I want it again. It is exactly the same movement as fear and pleasure. So our minds, our existence are caught between these two, reward and punishment. That is our life. That is me, you, the self, that lives, has its root in this time, thought, pleasure, fear, reward and punishment. Heaven is there if you do the right thing, if you don't you go to Hell! The same thing repeated over and over again.

So is what has been said an abstraction as an idea? Or you yourself see how your mind is working, your brain is operating, that you yourself see the truth that thought, time, is the root of fear? As time and thought is the root of pleasure. So they are both the same. You discover fear is pleasure. Have you seen the truth of this so that when you walk out of this you are free of fear? Then there is freedom, then you have strength, vitality to fight all this ugliness in the world

Right sirs. Don't clap sirs. You are clapping for yourself.

NEW DELHI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 7TH NOVEMBER, 1981

May we continue where we left off last Sunday? We were saying how important it is to be free of fear. We went into the whole movement of fear, desire, thought and time. We went into that very carefully. Because we haven't been free of fear we make our lives a dreadful burden. Out of fear we become very violent; out of fear we invent various kinds of illusions; out of fear we act neurotically, psychotically; out of fear there is no clarity of observation. So it is very, very important, as human beings who have lived on this earth perhaps thirty thousand years, we have carried that burden, destroying our lives, perverting our actions, playing the hypocrite, psychopathic. And so it behoves us to be utterly, seriously, applying this, what we have said, actually, not theoretically, not abstractly.

And also we talked about pleasure as being part of fear. And this evening we ought to talk over together - and the speaker means together - the question of order and disorder in our lives. And also we should talk over together what is love, what is compassion. And also we should concern ourselves about the meaning of death. Tomorrow if we have time we will talk about meditation and the nature of true religion. But this evening we ought to consider together this question of disorder in our lives.

All the sociologists of the world, so-called social engineers, are trying to bring order in society. There is disorder in society, each one doing what he likes, based on fear, pleasure, reward and punishment, seeking, each one, security, physically and

psychologically, inwardly. So we should talk over together what is disorder? Please, as we pointed out on several occasions, this is not a lecture; a so-called lecture where somebody lectures you, tells you what to do, what to think, how to think and so on; but here if you will allow it we are together investigating, exploring into the nature of our disorder. We want order outside, in our society, order in which there is no corruption, where everyone is responsible for his act, where when you give a word you keep that word, where you are responsible for what you are doing outwardly. Society is after all an abstraction, actually it doesn't exist, what exists is man's relationship to man, that is society. To put it very, very simply: society is your particular relationship with another, either that relationship is based on anger, jealousy, exploitation of each other, where each one is ambitious, greedy envious; what we are society is. Not that one should begin the ordering of society, but ordering, bringing about order in oneself.

You may listen to this, may perhaps see the truth of it and agree to the logical proposition that what we are society is. Past generations have created this society, past generations have brought about war and we contribute to it. So we must talk over together the nature of disorder. Why human beings who are so-called educated, sophisticated, excellent in their technology, if they are businessmen they are perhaps fairly corrupt - you know all the rest of it - why human beings, you and I, live in disorder in our daily life. I do not know if you have ever asked yourself that question. And can we this evening, face the fact, look at what is in our life, daily life? If that daily life is corrupt, dishonest, psychopath, accepting authority - authority is a very complex

problem - but not being completely authoritarian, in oneself, having integrity, you mean what you say, not double talk. All that contributes to disorder. Out of disorder you cannot have order. Please see the importance of this. We seek order out of disorder. That is, we live disorderly in our daily activity, whether it is a politician, businessman, or a religious man who pursues some ideal, this constant conflict both outwardly and inwardly, indicates that we live actually a disorderly life. That is a fact. And can that disorder end? Not disorder transformed into order, but disorder end. Then there is order naturally without one seeking order. Is that clear?

We are talking over together, please bear that in mind during this evening and tomorrow evening and wherever you may hear the speaker. We are together, you and the speaker, are investigating, exploring, looking into our lives, why we live in disorder. Is it a habit? Is it that we accept life as it is, the misery, the confusion, the agony, and so on?

So can we end this disorder? That is, conflict between man and man, the competition that is destroying the world, competing in armaments, competing who will be greater than somebody else. This constant competition in our life is part of this conflict, part of this disorder. Can we live a life without any competition? This is important to understand please, because nations are competing for armaments, piling up of armaments, competing economically, perhaps even religiously - one guru has more disciples than the other. So there is this peculiar tendency in man to compete. As we pointed out the other day, the eskimos in North Western Canada never knew what competition was until the Americans introduced

it. And also when we blindly accept authority, it is part of this confusion. The authority of the law is one thing and the authority of an ideal, the authority of a principle in which there is always the struggle, always this dichotomy, the division between 'what is' and 'what should be', the struggle to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. That is also part of conflict, part of disorder, but if you observe what actually is, that is, if we observe that each one of us is envious - please listen to this, give your attention, if you don't mind for a while, consider what is being said - if we are envious, that is the fact, that is 'what is'. The non-sentiment or the reaction that we should not be envious is not a fact. What is a fact is that we are envious. To understand that, to go into it and to hold it as you would hold water in a vessel, to remain with it and not try to transform it. The very desire to transform it is a part of our disorder because we are always running away from actually what is.

So can we have a mind, a heart, that is completely free from conflict? You may hear this and say, that is impossible, life is conflict, as a tree in a forest struggles for the light so we human beings have to struggle, have to fight, have to do all the unhappy, miserable, dishonest things we do. We have accepted that as our norm, as the way of life. We have never questioned it. I do not know if you have noticed that man, though he has developed extraordinary technology and so on, but man throughout the past ages has remained more or less what we are: angry, killing each other, arrogant, despairing, frightened, all that. We have changed very, very little from the ancient man of twenty five, or thirty thousand years ago, we have changed very, very little. It is a tragedy that we live this way. Living this way then we seek god,

we go to temples, mosques, churches, or become a disciple of some guru. Which is all so idiotic, it has lost all its meaning. What is fact is: that we must understand the disorder in our life. And if it is possible to end it, which means one must observe very clearly oneself, observe how your mind works, observe your reactions. This is fairly simple, this is not complicated, to learn the activity of our own mind, to be honest in our observation of our own mind, our own thoughts, our own feelings, not to distort them, but to observe very closely, with attention, with care, then you will find out of that confusion, clarity comes.

You see the difficulty is that we never apply. You have heard this statement this evening, if you have listened. And you treat that as an idea, as an impossibility perhaps, but you never apply, never commit yourself to find out in your own life if there can be order. And as we said, order is not the opposite of disorder. We create the opposite because that way we think we can escape from disorder but the fact is only disorder. And when you move out of that there is clarity of mind, clarity of action. Will you apply all this? Or merely listen, shake your head in agreement, or disagreement, or say it is impossible? But to listen to the truth of it, act, apply, commit yourself, otherwise we are pursuing a dangerous course.

And from disorder we should also talk together of what is suffering. Why man for millions of years, or thirty thousand years, has carried this burden of sorrow. There is not only personal sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, the sorrow that comes through wars. Historically there have been five thousand wars, that is, war every year. And that war has brought about immense sorrow: how many wives, women, mothers have cried. There is the sorrow of

poverty - you know this sorrow in this country where there is overpopulation about which we do almost nothing, we talk about it. There is the sorrow of this poverty, not only physically with little food, few clothes and the rich are richer and the poor seems to get poorer. There is the sorrow of ignorance, not the ignorance of books, of knowledge, but the ignorance of one's own mind, the ignorance that prevents us from acting righteously, honestly, truly. There is the sorrow of personal man or the wife who loses her son, deformed, there are the tears, the agony of loneliness, the despair of something which you have lost upon which you have relied, to which you have been attached. There is the sorrow of not being successful, of not climbing the ladder. And there is the sorrow of ugliness. There is the sorrow of every human being.

These various activities that bring about sorrow are not different: there is only sorrow. That is, there is personal sorrow, there is the global sorrow of mankind which has lived for so long, slaughtering each other, maiming each other, the terrorists the world over are creating such great sorrow, the politicians with their particular theories, either it is Marx or Lenin or some monetary principle, is also bringing great sorrow. And we have never been free of this sorrow, we carry it until we die, we haven't found a solution for it, we have accepted it. And when we do revolt against all this we join some group or other, some system or other, hoping thereby to end sorrow of man. But they have never succeeded through institutions, through foundations, through politics, to end sorrow.

So together this evening if we will, go into this problem. You know what sorrow is. Everyone goes through sorrow of some kind

or another. One has shed tears endlessly. And when there is sorrow we try to escape from it, we go to temples, mosques and churches, sacrificing so much to escape from our own self pity and sorrow. And if you observe your own sorrow, why? Why do we suffer? Is there an end to this suffering? We are talking not of the physical suffering of so many people who are maimed, who are ill with disease, cancerous and so on, but we are talking about sorrow that each one has. That is a fact, a terrible fact. And we have not resolved it ever. So the first thing is - we are talking over together, you are not listening to the speaker, we are together observing this phenomena of suffering - part of this suffering is jealousy in the family, quarrels in the family, specially in this country where the family is very important. Why have we put up with this sorrow? Is there an ending to sorrow? So we will find out together, please, I mean together, you are not just listening to a talk. Because a mind that suffers cannot love; a mind and a heart that is always aching in loneliness cannot have compassion with its extraordinary intelligence. So together let's enquire if it is possible to end not only our personal sorrow but the sorrow of mankind.

We all know what it is to be lonely. You may have friends, you may be very powerful in a country, you may have all the wealth of the world but there is always this fear of being lonely. Perhaps most of you have experienced this quality of mind that feels isolated, that is also a great sorrow. You see when we are lonely we try to escape from it through some form of entertainment whether it be religious or football, we seek through entertainment, through avoidance, the fact that one is desperately lonely, with its enduring sorrow. Now can we together look at that loneliness?

Look at it. Surely you know what it means to be lonely. Not the word, the word is not the fact. Right? The word is never the thing. The word 'loneliness' is never the actual feeling. This tent, the word 'tent' is not the actuality. So don't let us get confused between words and the actual. We are talking about the actual, not the word, not the semantic meaning of the word and arguing about the word but looking at the fact of loneliness, knowing that the word is not that feeling which brings about such despair, such anxiety, such fear. So we are looking not at the word but at the thing itself. The word indicates but the word is not the actual. I hope you understand all this?

So what is it to be lonely? Is not all our activity self-centred? That self-centredness is based on reward and punishment. Each one is looking for himself, his position, his power, his arrogance - you know. He is cultivating this loneliness and that loneliness appears with extraordinary vitality and strength when you are by yourself or amongst a crowd you suddenly realize how extraordinarily isolated you are. And that is another form of sorrow.

So let us together examine what is sorrow. Not intellectually, argumentatively, dialectically but the actual fact that you suffer, either from some disease or from an inward sense of loneliness, or the sorrow of what is happening in the world: the total disregard of all humanity, nobody cares for human beings anymore. They care for ideals, seeking power or asserting some monetary system which brings about great unemployment and so on.

So first of all is it possible to be free of sorrow? Now when we use the word freedom, it is not freedom from something. You understand? We are always wanting to be free from something,

free from every kind of irritation and so on. But we are talking of a freedom that is not from, or away from. Please understand this a little bit carefully because we are concerned with the ending of sorrow, then only there is freedom. But as long as you are suffering for various causes, then to face that, understand it, go into it, explore to its very depths, then at the end of it, if you are capable of attention, listening to all the tones and the subtleties of suffering, when that suffering ends there is freedom. So freedom is not from something; freedom is when there is an end to something. That is, most of us are attached to something: attached to your family, attached to your children, attached to your position, your status, attached, if you are a politician, to your power. You are all attached to something. The idealist is attached to his ideals, or the religious man attached to some invented god, or attached to his particular caste, or particular turban to indicate a certain quality of mind. We are all attached - aren't you? Attachment leads to corruption. Right? You can see it happening right round you. People are incapable who are attached to power or business, or to some kind of religious sect. And it invariably breeds corruption, and you see this happening right under your nose. And we as, human beings, each one, we are attached to something. And the consequences of that attachment are invariably corruption, moral, ethical, aesthetic and so on. Now to end attachment completely, because if you don't, sorrow is inevitable. And when one suffers one hasn't the time or the energy, or the quality to investigate, to remain with it.

While we are discussing suffering we ought to talk about death. What is it to die? We will come back to suffering in a minute. You see somebody - I see my son die from disease, accident, or some

fatal injury. I see him die. And I shed tears out of my loneliness, out of my attachment. And I want to escape from it. So my mind is seeking some form of comfort, a drug, whether that drug be religious or some form of escape. We all do this. Or I say to myself, 'I believe in reincarnation and I will see him next life.' A lovely comforting idea. That is an escape from suffering. And what is death? We are all going to die, young or old. That is inevitable. Are you all prepared to listen to all this? Interested in finding out? Or are you all too tired at the end of a day? Can I go on? Not that I love to hear my own voice but are we together in this problem of death?

Have you ever ended something without a cause, without a sense of reward or punishment, ended something for itself? That is, can you end attachment completely? That is what death is, the ending of one's so-called life. Right? What is that life? We are always asking what is after death. Right? But we are asking what is before death, which is much more important. What is before death, the life that you lead? What is that life that you lead every day of your life? Misery, confusion, the sense of having no love in your heart, or wanting love; the struggle, the conflict, the anxiety, the depression, going to an office from nine o'clock until five o'clock every day of your life until you are sixty or sixty five, and you must go to the office because you are responsible for your family. This is your life, calling yourself by various names according to your sect and tribal division; endless conflict from the moment you are born until you die, and that you call living. And you are frightened to let that go because that is what death is going to do. You cannot argue with death.

And in enquiring into the nature of death we must also enquire, if you are paying attention to what is being said, into the quality of the brain. Our brain which we have now is not yours or mine; it is the brain that has evolved through millions of years. Please do pay attention to this a little bit. This brain has evolved through time, through experience, through knowledge, through various incidents, happenings, through all these centuries upon centuries. It is not your brain. It is the brain that has been cultivated, evolved, to come to this present state. And that brain is functioning partially. That is, if you are a technician it is working in that system partially. If you are a businessman, again partially. Or a religious person who is simply concerned with some fantastic illusions, again partially. Are you aware of all this? Are you aware that your own brain - not yours - that your brain is all the time occupied, occupied with something or other? And that brain has evolved through experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, therefore it is caught in a very limited area of knowledge. And we have never known or acted with a brain that is not functioning partially, but wholly, holistically?

Are you following all this? Verbally but not actually aware how your brain functions. When you are attached to something it is partially functioning. When you are specialized as a surgeon, carpenter, businessman - we have broken life up into various categories - that is also acting partially. To find out whether this brain which has an extraordinary capacity, this brain which is infinite, but we have reduced it to a very small part of living in that, and that we call living. Right? You are following all this? The living which is daily travail, fighting, fighting, struggling.

So we must be more concerned with before rather than after death. Whether the life that we lead can be radically changed. For god's sake listen to all this. The speaker is rather emphatic about all this because we are following a dangerous course. So it is far more important to understand our daily life, what happens rather than what happens after death. If you believe in reincarnation, that is part of your tradition. That tradition says live righteously now and you will be rewarded next life, you will have a better palace, you will have more money, you will have a better position, you will be nearer to god. If you believe in reincarnation what matters is how you behave now, what you do now. But you don't care what happens now as long as your selfish urges are satisfied. So belief in reincarnation has no value at all. What value has it when you are corrupt, dishonest, have no integrity about anything?

So the point is - please listen to this - can you live psychologically with death, not commit suicide, psychologically live with death? That is, to end your attachments, your desires, which is what death is going to do. Biologically your organism is going to come to an end, but psychologically we want to go on. So death is the ending of the self. You understand this? The ending of me, my ambitions, my greed, my violence. So to live with death means to live without violence, to live without attachment. Then you will see, if you do, death and life are not separated. That is, to end is to begin. Oh, you don't understand. The speaker tells you this but you won't do it. You will continue your own ways of selfishness and arrogance and all the rest of it and always live with the fear of death. And the speaker says, the living is more important than the dying, and the dying is to live.

And we must also go into the question of what is love, because they are all interrelated, they all are connected: suffering, pain, pleasure, fear, hurts, envy, all those are tied together, as love is tied to the whole problem. What is love? Do you love somebody? You see how silent you all are! What is love? Does it exist at all in this country? Don't say, 'Does it exist in the West?' That is an avoidance of the question. Do you love? Or are you attached? What does love mean? As we know it now it is associated with the sexual act, it is associated with jealousy, envy, ambition. You go to the office from nine until five, struggle, assert yourself to climb the ladder, come home and tell your wife, if you tell her at all, that you love her. There in the office you are ambitious, greedy, cheating people, bribing people, corrupting there, and come home and say you love. Right? See the total contradiction in this. Please, this is important, go into this, don't go to sleep.

Is there love without attachment? Is love pleasure? Come on sirs enquire with me. Is love desire? Is love the beginning of sorrow? If, or when there is sorrow, pain, grief, ambition on one hand and you on the other you say, 'I love you'. Your ambition destroys love, your jealousy prevents love. So love is not desire, nor pleasure. So is there love without hate, or hate and love go together? So find out, apply, enquire, put your hearts into it to find out because without love you have nothing. You may talk about the Vedas, go to the temple with utter devotion, cheat somebody, bribe somebody, be utterly irresponsible in what you are doing, if there is no love, life becomes empty. You may have all the power, the decorations but without love your life has no meaning.

So what will you do? When you hear that statement, what is

your reaction? With the ending of suffering there is passion, not lust, passion. An integral passion. The meaning of that word 'suffering' is semantically associated with passion. We have no passion for anything, except for our own beastly little concepts and ideas and feelings. Compassion is to have that feeling for all human beings. Have you ever noticed, if you are not tired this evening, have you ever noticed, what we call intelligence, have you ever asked what is intelligence? We are not talking of dialectical intelligence, that is, the argumentative offering one opinion against another, or one conclusion against another historically or non-historically, the clever man, the erudite man, the man who has extraordinary capacity, that capacity, that erudition, that speciality is only partial intelligence. Intelligence is connected with the holistic way of living life. You understand the word 'holistic', which means living integrally, wholly, not partially, not a life that is broken up. And compassion has its own extraordinary intelligence. And it is that intelligence - please listen, for god's sake listen - it is that intelligence that is going to alter society, governments, stop wars; not all this conjuring trick that politicians are playing with armaments. It is this compassion which is born out of love, it is that intelligence, out of that compassion that is going to solve all problems. If you have no love in your heart you are going to face disaster. Please listen to all this. What the speaker is saying is truth, not some illusion, not some fantastic belief. It is your life, don't waste it.

And we are talking about suffering, end it, because out of that ending comes a new beginning which is love, which is compassion and intelligence.

Right sirs. May I get up?

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 2ND MAY 1981

Right from the beginning we should make certain things very clear: this is a serious gathering, this is not an intellectual or emotional entertainment. Also one may point out, we are not trying to do any propaganda for any ideals, for any beliefs, for any conclusions, or any concepts. We are not trying to bring something exotic from India, because I am not a Hindu though I was born there. We are not trying to convince you of anything. Please be quite clear on that point. Together we are going to be aware sensitively, without any prejudice, without any identification, without any choice, to be aware of what is happening in the world, not only externally, outwardly, but also inwardly - what we have become, what society, which human beings have built, has come to. We are going to sensitively, choicelessly be aware of what is happening in this world which human beings have created, a world which is disintegrating, a world where there is tremendous violence, division, nationalities, religious separation, divisions, all culminating in the division of man, human beings.

And if one is aware, not from any particular point of view, but aware objectively, with certain attention and feeling, one cannot help but observe that human beings, we, have brought about a society, a community of people, who are being educated by others, by the specialists, by the technologists, and we are not educating ourselves - not according to some philosopher, ancient or modern, not according to some psychologist, or some committed sectarian, committed to some guru, but rather to educate ourselves and be totally responsible for ourselves, and not dependent on anybody

psychologically. We are dependent on the postman, the market, and so on. But apparently, as one is aware and observes, in our so-called freedom we are destroying ourselves. These are all obvious facts. Morally, ethically, aesthetically, we are becoming more and more vulgar, more and more self-centred, more and more concerned entirely with ourselves, with our feelings, with our problems, with our fulfilments, with our own particular desire to be expressed. And this is called freedom. And in that freedom, when it is denied, as it is in the totalitarian states, there are dissidents, there is a great deal of trouble, as elsewhere.

And the problems are increasing because our society, ourselves, our economic condition, poverty, over population, religious divisions, are bringing about the destruction of man - man and also woman. The crisis is not political; the crisis is not economic, nor religious, but the crisis is in consciousness, in our minds, in our hearts, in our brain. The crisis is there. And the politicians, however capable, and the scientists, the biologists, the microbiologists and so on, they are not going to solve our problems. They have not; perhaps they will increase more and more our problems.

And considering all this, where does one start? Obviously, as the speaker is in this part of the world, here they have one fad after another fad, one fling after another, joining various types of cranky, meaningless - I was going to say rather idiotic - gurus. And here, as elsewhere, we are being told what to do about everything. If you have listened to the radio, as perhaps most of you have, you are told how to have proper sex with your husband, you are told how to think, rather, what to think, how you should become young.

You know the whole instruction that goes on, being told what to do. This is not an exaggeration, this is an obvious fact. If there is any trouble within, we immediately turn to some psychologists, to some priest, to some guru. Or we neglect or accept things as they are. So we have gradually, if not already, lost our integrity, our sense of total responsibility for ourselves. And a culture, the modern culture, which is being exported all over the world - the atom bomb, the computer, the means to destroy other human beings, war. And it is the easiest country to be copied. That's why all over the world America is looked up to, they all want to come here, to make money, like the gurus, fatten up on some idiotic nonsense, and so on.

I am sure, if you examine all this impersonally, not identify yourself with any particular part, the truth of this is obvious. Before we are mature we are already declining.

So, what is then man to do? What are we, you and I, and others, concerned, if we are, as we must be, with this terrible world in which we are living, the dangerous world, where if you disagree you are being killed, or sent to concentration camps, or excommunicated, or driven into solitude, put in prison and so on and so on. What has happened to man? What has happened to you? Why has man become like this after a million years, and more, what is the root cause of all this? What is the origin of this terrible confusion, this total disregard for human beings, for another? What is the cause of our ailment? Most of us deal with the symptoms, some superficial reactions and we try to find a solution for those. But apparently we never ask fundamental, basic questions. We never seem to demand of ourselves fundamental questions. And it

is only, if one may point out, that in asking basic questions one may have the right answer.

And the basic question is, if one examines, that the crisis, and perhaps this crisis has always existed in our human existence, the crisis is in our consciousness. Consciousness is what you think, what you are. Not the momentary responses only, but the consciousness of your particular desire, particular longing, particular fulfilment, identification, fears, pleasures, and the sorrow, the pain, the grief, the lack of love and compassion. All the things that thought has put together in the content of consciousness. All that is what we are - our beliefs, our experiences, our depressions, our immense sense of loneliness and despair, our longing to be loved, to be encouraged, to be held together, all that is our consciousness. Our nationality, our peculiar religion of two thousand years, which is vast propaganda, or five thousand years in the Asiatic world, or three thousand - all that is our consciousness. Whatever thought has put together, both outwardly in the technological world, and what thought has put together psychologically in the inward world, is part of our consciousness. And the crisis is there, not in the development of technology, which is over powering, which is almost destroying the world. The crisis is not in belief, in faith, in some sectarian group, the crisis is not somewhere out there, but it is where you are. The crisis is in your consciousness.

And apparently we don't seem to be able to meet it. Many of us do recognize the crisis, if we are aware of what is happening globally, if you are sensitive, alert, knowing no scientists, politician, ecologist, or biologist, with their extraordinary

experiments they are making, the crisis is in our mind, in our heart, which is our consciousness. And recognizing the crisis - because it is the crisis of everybody, not just yours or mine, it is a global crisis. It is the crisis of humanity. Now we have reached a point where we can totally obliterate each other completely - the atom bomb, the new technology of war, and so on. One wonders if one is aware of all this, not be only concerned with our particular little problems, which is part of our crisis too, our particular loneliness, depression, sorrow, pain, pleasure, which is part of this, our consciousness. But also the global consciousness of man, of a human being, that consciousness is not your consciousness, it is a global consciousness, because everywhere man is suffering, lonely, despair, terribly uncertain, frightened, utter lack of love, compassion, intelligence. It is a common ground upon which all human beings stand together.

So this consciousness with its crisis is not your consciousness. I hope that is very clear, because you suffer, are uncertain, frightened, lonely, and all the things that one goes through in relationship is being followed all over the world, whether they live in Russia, China, or in the East, or here, they go through all this. So this consciousness is not mine or yours. This consciousness is global, it is part of all human beings.

I know for most of us it is very difficult to see this, recognize it and do something about it, because we all think we are so terribly individual, because we have identified ourselves with our bodies, with our reactions, with our nationalities, with our country, so we think we are individuals. Are we? Have you ever asked that question - not superficially, but basically, demanding the question

whether you are actually an individual - which means, indivisible? The meaning of that word is indivisible, not broken up, not fragmented. And that is an individual. Are we? Or are we the result of a million and more years of collective experience, collective knowledge, collective belief and so on? The speaker is not a communist; he is totally a religious person. When he uses the word religion he means by it, not belonging to any religion whatsoever - Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, all the sectarian business. But religion implies, means investigation sceptically, investigating, exploring with doubt, questioning, sceptically into what is truth. That is religion. Not all that nonsense that is going on throughout the world - well-established, respectable, profitable. When we say that you are asking this question, whether we are individuals at all, because our brains have evolved through time, accumulating a great deal of experience, knowledge, and that brain, is it yours? Please ask this question of yourself. Don't please, if one may request, identify yourself with it. Then you cannot possibly ask the question. If you say, "My brain is mine", it is finished, all enquiry comes to an end. But if you are enquiring, if you are sensitively aware of the growth, of the evolution, from the micro to the present condition of the human brain, it has evolved through time, millions and millions of years - Genetically, heredity, and all the rest of it, this brain is not ours, it is the brain of human beings. And that brain which is so extraordinarily capable - look what it has done in the field of technology, look what it has done in the field of nationalities, how it has invented gods, theories, saviours, and so on. I wonder if you are aware of all this.

And that brain operates with the instrument of thought. Thought

is the instrument. And thought has created the technological world, thought has created nationalities, thought has divided human beings - black, white, purple and all the rest of it. Thought has divided the religions - the Christian, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Islam, and so on and so on and so on. Thought has made this world in which we live, the technological world as well as the psychological world. And one asks again, if one is aware of this fact. Thought has created the marvellous cathedrals, the churches, and also thought has created what is put in them - the rituals, the candles, the prayers, the symbols, the saviour, as they are in India, and elsewhere, all over the world. Thought is responsible for war, for Hiroshima, for the present condition of man's confusion, anxiety, uncertainty.

So thought is part of this consciousness. Thought has put together the content of that consciousness. This is irrefutable. Because we said, please we are not doing any propagation of any particular idea, but we are together, please, together, now, becoming aware sensitively, without any choice or identification, look very closely into the content of our own consciousness, of our own being. From there we act, from there we function, from there is the self created, the 'me', that is our consciousness. And thought has put it there. When you say you are a Christian, believe in this or that, in the saviour and so on, thought has been responsible for it. When you do any form of rituals, as in all religions, these nonsensical rituals which have no meaning, it is the result of thought. You may not like to hear all this. These are facts. Thought is responsible. Thought has not created nature, the tree, the tiger, the heavens with their stars. But the astral visitors can explore

space, which is again the movement of thought.

So to understand the crisis in consciousness, in our very being, one must enquire very closely into the nature of thought, because that is the only instrument we have. We may invent intuition, a hunch, and so on, but it is still the basis of thought. Thought is the basis of all this. One wonders if one recognizes this, and sees what thought has done. Thought has created the world in which we live, the society in which we live. The society is an abstraction. Society is an abstraction. What is real is relationship between man and man. And the socialists, the communists, the democrats and so on are trying to change society, the social structure, all over the world. But they are never concerned with the relationship between man and man, man, woman and so on because that relationship makes society. Which is again a fact. If your relationship with another is correct, true, has integrity, your society will then be totally different. But that society which is an abstraction is being changed by machines, not by revolutions, by computers, by the atom bomb, by all the technological inventions that thought has brought about, that is changing society, the structure. But human beings remain as they are - selfish, self-centred, completely concerned with their own dignity, with their own vanity, with their own ambition, with their own fulfilment, with their own desires.

So in order to understand and bring about a radical change in the crisis, or to respond to that crisis correctly, which means accurately, completely, one must enquire very deeply into the nature of thought - why thought has become so extraordinarily important in life. And is there another instrument apart from thought? We are going to go into it very carefully without any

superstition, without any mystification, without any sense of acceptance, having faith and all that nonsense. We are going together to examine what thought is, how it has created this terrible mess and problems and so on. And we are going to enquire also together if thought is not the instrument of the resolution of this crisis, is there another?

Please, as we pointed out, we are exploring together. You are not listening to what the speaker is saying and merely accepting or agreeing, or then not, but joining together to find out. Because the speaker has no authority, he is not a guru - thank god! So there is no relationship, which is so utterly false, between the teacher and the taught. There is only the act of learning, not you teach me and I teach you - which becomes ridiculous. But rather that together, as two human beings, think together, which doesn't mean you agree with me, or I agree with you, but together examine the nature of thought. Because by thought we live, and by thought we destroy each other; so thought has become astonishingly important in our life. Thought divides each one of us in our relationship - man and woman. I do not know if you have gone into it, how thought divides a relationship and so there is everlasting battle in that relationship. We will go into all that. Perhaps not during this first talk but there are also going to be several - six talks, and we will go into all this, if you are interested. The speaker is not persuading you, he is not stimulating you, he is not acting as a drug, but together we will see this crisis and we must resolve this crisis, or respond to this crisis properly, directly, sanely, rationally, not according to our particular narrow belief, or faith, or some kind of idiotic concept.

So we are asking, what is the nature of thought, and why thought has become so devastatingly important? You may say, if there is no thought I am reduced to a vegetable. Thought has its function, it has. And also thought has brought about this terrible atom bomb that is going to destroy human beings, war. Thought has divided the world into nationalities. Thought has divided the Christian from the Muslim, from the Hindu. Having divided it says, "We must love one another". Having divided it says, "There is only one Saviour who alone is responsible for your sorrow" - and all the rest of it. Thought is responsible for all this. And if we really are not sensitively aware of the movement of thought and all its activity, then we shall not be able to meet this crisis. And if we cannot, we are going to destroy each other. This is not a prophecy. You can see it on the wall, written on the wall, unless we are totally blind, totally insensitive, so absorbed in our own petty little self. It is all there, and anyone can see it, to see what is going to happen and what must be done. So that is together, and I mean together, not the speaker is going to tell you and you accept it, it then becomes rather silly - but together find out why thought has become so supreme, and what is the source of thought, what is the origin of thought, what is the beginning of thought.

We have got ten minutes more. Time is an extraordinary thing! To understand time, because time is also thought, so if we understand the nature of thought we shall understand the nature of time. And if there is an ending to thought, that is real meditation, there is an ending to time - not physical time, but time must have a stop. And we are going to discover that for ourselves in all these talks. That is, if you care to listen, care to share, think over

together, then we will find, discover it for ourselves and not be taught by another. If you are taught by another you become a secondhand human being, which we are, we are what everybody has thought from Aristotle, the Greeks, from the ancient Hindus, and the ancient Buddhists and so on and so on, all that is handed down and we are all that. So we are utterly mediocre people. There is nothing original - not in the field of technology, of course there are inventions. And you identify with that invention and you think you are unique. But thought is common to all mankind - black, brown, or whatever colour, or nationality and so on, thought is common. And therefore there is a common bondage between all of us. And unless we understand the extraordinary subtlety of thought with its memory, we shall not be able to meet this crisis. So we will go into it if time will permit, because I have to stop exactly at an hour - five minutes!

We are enquiring into the origin of thought - in five minutes! But we can and we will proceed, if we cannot do it completely this morning we will do it tomorrow morning, and at other times. Thought is born of experience. Thought is born out of that experience which becomes knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory, various types of memories, technological, personal, national, historical and so on, scientific. So experience - listen, discover it for yourself as we talk - experience, knowledge, from knowledge is memory, the remembering of past things, then from memory thought. Then from thought there is action. And that action brings further knowledge. So we are caught in this. That is, experience, which may be personal or global, knowledge which is global, from knowledge which is stored up in the brain as memory,

memory, and from that memory respond, response which is thought. Then thought acts, this way or that way, rightly, wrongly, skilfully or with great subtlety, and from that further knowledge. So in this chain the human brain works, it is caught in this chain, which is a fact, if you observe it very closely. And that's why thought has become so extraordinarily important. And as it is born out of experience, knowledge, and as knowledge can never be complete, whole at any time, so thought is always limited, it is always broken up. And whatever it touches must bring about division. Obviously, right?

So do we see the truth of that? That knowledge can never be complete, and thought then must be incomplete, limited, fragmentary, and whatever it does, whether it creates the United Nations, or invents god, it must always be limited and therefore being incomplete it must bring about disharmony, conflict? If one realizes this completely, not as a theory, idea, but as an actuality, then thought has its place. Because if you have no knowledge of where you are going after this meeting, it would be absurd. So knowledge has a place. But knowledge, psychological knowledge, which is the 'me', which thought has put together, the self, and the self-centred activity different from the relationship with another, and that brings about conflict, confusion, misery.

So if one understands that very, very deeply, then one can begin to enquire: is there a totally different kind of instrument that is not fragmentary, that's whole? Perhaps we will do that tomorrow.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 3RD MAY 1981

I suppose you know why you are here, why you have come on a lovely morning like this. May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday?

If one may again point out that we are not doing any kind of propaganda for any idea, for any belief, for any group or concept and so on. What we are doing together is to observe what is happening in the world, not only in the world outside of us but also inwardly, psychologically, just to observe, not to draw any conclusion from that observation, not to make an abstraction of it into an idea, or observe without any prejudice, or being committed to any particular philosophy, religion, or any psychological conclusions, Freudian and so on. Just to observe. And that requires a certain freedom, certain sensitive awareness. And if one so observes, all over the world there is a great deal of violence, streets are becoming dangerous, there is the national, religious, sectarian divisions, and ultimately there is the nuclear bomb with all its horrible devastation. There is the computer and the robot, which are probably going to take over all the activities of mankind; and there is general, throughout the world, degeneration taking place. And if we observe it closely, what is taking place in the outward world is the result of what is happening to each one of us inwardly. We have created this society - our parents, grandparents, the past generations, and generation after generation, and we are adding to that. This society is not something created by some strange events, but it is created by human beings all throughout the world.

The crisis is not in politics, in governments, whether it is

totalitarian, or so-called democratic, the crisis is not among the scientists, nor among the established respectable religions. We said all this yesterday. The crisis is in our consciousness, which is in our minds, in our hearts, in our behaviour, in our relationship. And the crisis cannot be understood fully, and perhaps met totally unless we understand the nature and the structure of this crisis in consciousness, which is put together by thought. We are repeating what we said yesterday because perhaps there are some people who have come on Sunday morning, so I have to repeat it again.

Please I would like to point out, this is not an entertainment - intellectual, romantic, emotional or sensational. We are rather serious, and if you are at all serious too we can explore together into the nature of this crisis. It is not a crisis somewhere else, it is in our minds, in each one of our minds, in our hearts, in our relationship with each other. And the crisis, as we have said, is in our consciousness. This consciousness is common to all mankind. Wherever you go man is suffering, uncertain, insecure, lonely, neurotic, depressed, elated, chasing one fad after another, specially in this part of the world. And this crisis is brought about by thought. Thought has put together the content of our consciousness. Please, if one may again point out very clearly, that we are not explaining, we are observing together. The speaker is not a teacher. There is no teacher, except in mathematics, or if you want to be a good carpenter, but in the world of psychology there is no teacher and there is no disciple, there is no leader, or a follower. We are together observing the nature of man, what has happened to him, why we are as we are now - violent, neurotic, lonely, terribly uncertain, confused, and to this confusion the philosophers are

adding to it, the religious people are adding to it, the evangelists, the scholars, and so on.

So we are learning, or observing our own state of mind. That's where real education begins, self education. We have learnt so much from others about ourselves. We are always looking for others to lead us, not only outwardly but specially in the psychological realm, inwardly. If there is any trouble, any disturbance, we immediately go after somebody who will help us to clear it away. We are addicted to institutions, we are addicted to organizations, hoping that they will settle our problems, help us to clarify our own minds. So we are always depending on somebody. And dependence will inevitably bring about corruption. So here we are not depending on anybody, including the speaker, specially on the speaker, because there is no intention to persuade you to think in any particular direction, to stimulate you by fanciful words and theories, but rather to observe what is actually going on in the world, and all the confusion within.

And in that observation not to make an abstraction of what is observed into an idea. Please let's be very clear on this point. When we observe that, a tree, the word 'tree' is an abstraction, it is not the tree. Right? I hope that is clear. The word, the explanation, the description, is not the actuality, it is not 'what is'. So we must be very clear on this point from the beginning. When we observe actually what is going on in the world, and deeply in our own consciousness, that observation can remain pure, direct, clear when there is no abstraction of what is observed into an idea. And most of us live with ideas, which are not actualities. Ideas become all important, not what actually is. Philosophers use ideas in various

senses - the Aristotelian, various philosophers have used ideas in their own particular way. But we are not dealing with ideas. We are concerned only with the observation of what is going on, actually, not theoretically, not according to a particular pattern of thought, but what is. And in that observation of 'what is' to make that very clear. An abstraction of 'what is' into an idea brings only further confusion. One hopes this is clear.

As we said, the crisis is in our consciousness. That consciousness is the common ground of all humanity. It is not a particular consciousness, it is not your consciousness, it is the consciousness of man, of the human, because wherever you go, the Far East, the Middle East, or far West, or middle West, all over the world, man, the human being, suffers, has pain, lives in deep uncertainty, loneliness, utter despair, caught in various fanciful religious concepts which have no meaning whatsoever in actuality. So this is common to all mankind. Please do see this very clearly. It is not your consciousness, it is the consciousness of all human beings who go through such travail, such misery, conflict, wanting to identify themselves with something, with the nation, with a religious figure, or a concept.

As we were saying, this consciousness is common to all mankind. Please grasp the significance of this. Because it is very important to understand this because we have separated ourselves as individuals, which we are not actually, we are the result of a million years. In those million years we have been encouraged, we have accepted the idea - the idea - of the individual. Actually when you observe closely, you are not an individual, you are like the rest, psychologically, of mankind. This is a very difficult thing to

perceive because most of us cling to this idea - idea - that we are all separate individuals with our own personal ambitions, greed, envy, suffering, loneliness. But when you observe, this is what everybody is doing. And the concept as an individual makes us much more selfish, self-centred, neurotic, and competitive. So competition is destroying man also. So the world is you, and you are the world. It is a marvellous feeling that, if you really understand it. In that there is great vitality, perception. There is immense beauty in it. Not the mere beauty of a painting, a poem, or a lovely face. But we are the world, and that world is you, me.

And in this part of the world, freedom is misused, like the rest of the world, because each one wants to fulfil, to be, to become. And therefore the content of our consciousness is this constant struggle to be, to become, to succeed, to have power, to have position, to have status. And that you can only have if you have money, or talent, or capacity in a particular direction. So the capacity, talent encourage individuality. But if you observe, that individuality is put together by thought.

And so observing all this, the crisis is in the very nature of thought. We went into that yesterday briefly, and we will go into it again very carefully. The outward world and the inward world is put together by thought. Thought is a material process. Thought has built the atom bomb, the shuttle, the computer, the robot, and all the instruments of war. Thought has also built the marvellous cathedrals, the churches, and all the content of those cathedrals and churches. There is nothing whatsoever sacred in the movement of thought. What thought has created as a symbol which you worship, is not sacred, it is put there by thought. The rituals, all the religious

divisions, and national divisions, are the result of thought. Please look at it very closely. We are not persuading, or condemning, or encouraging, we are just observing. This is a fact.

So the crisis is in the very nature of thought. And as we said yesterday, thought is the result of the origin of the senses, the sensory responses, the experience, meeting with something which is recorded as knowledge, as memory, and from that memory arises thought. This has been the process and the nature of thought for millions and millions of years. All the culture from ancient Egypt, 5,000 BC, and previous to that, is based on thought. And thought has created this confusion outside and inside. Please observe it for yourself, I am not teaching you, I am not explaining, the speaker is merely putting into words in order to communicate what he has observed, but you are observing, not me, not the speaker. We are both observing the nature and the structure of thought. That is, sensory reactions, experience which you meet with something which is an experience, that experience is recorded as knowledge, that knowledge becomes the memory, and that memory acts as thought. So from that action you learn more, accumulate more knowledge. So man has lived for millions and millions of years in this process - experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, in this chain. I wonder if we see this very clearly.

And we have given tremendous importance to knowledge. All the universities, all the scientific knowledge, the knowledge that one has acquired through experience for oneself becomes all important. But knowledge is never complete, never, whether it is scientific knowledge, or the knowledge of a carpenter, the knowledge of a housewife, or the so-called knowledge of the gurus

or the priests. There is no revelation but only thought reveals.

So our crisis is in the very nature of thought. One hopes this is clear. You will then say, how can we act without knowledge, without thought? That is not the point. First observe the nature of thought, very clearly, without any prejudice, without any direction, just that it is like that. So our brains living in this cycle of experience, knowledge, action, memory, more knowledge, have problems because knowledge is limited always, so our brains are trained to resolving problems. It is a problem-resolving brain, it is never free from problems. One hopes you see the distinction between the two. Our brains have been trained to resolve problems, both in the scientific world and in the world of psychology, in the world of relationship. Problems arise, we try to solve them. The solution is always within the field of knowledge.

As we were saying, knowledge is always incomplete. This is a fact. And the brain is accustomed, trained, to solve problems. It is a problem-solving brain. This is rather an important point to observe, with sensitive awareness, that knowledge is never complete under any circumstances.

Let's look at something else, which is, what is beauty? Because there is so little beauty in the world, apart from nature, apart from the hills, groves, and rivers, and the birds, and the things of the earth, why is there so little beauty in our lives? We go to the museums and see the paintings, the sculptures, and the extraordinary things man has made - the poems, the literature, the magnificent architecture, but when we look within there is so little beauty. We want beautiful faces, paint them, cover them, but inwardly - we are observing again, not denying it or accepting it -

there is so little sense of beauty, quietness, dignity. Why? Why has man become like this? Why have human beings who are so clever, so erudite in all other directions, going to the Moon and planting a piece of cloth up there, creating marvellous machinery, why have all of us become what we are - vulgar, noisy, mediocre, full of vanity of little career, arrogant in our little knowledge - why? What has happened to mankind? What has happened to you?

And I think this is the crisis. And we avoid it, we don't want to look at ourselves clearly. And self education is the beginning of wisdom - not in books, not in somebody else, but in the understanding of our own selfish, narrow, distorted activity that is going on day after day, day after day. And, as we said, the crisis is in our heart and mind, in our brain. And as knowledge is always limited, and we are always acting within that field, and so conflict is everlastingly in the arena of knowledge. This must be clearly understood. We try to solve problems - political, religious, personal relationships and so on, and these problems are never solved. You try to solve one problem and the very solution of that problem brings other problems, which is happening in the political world. And so you turn to faith, to belief. I do not know if you have observed that belief brings about atrophy of the brain. Look at it, observe it. The constant assertion, "I believe in god", "I believe in this", "I believe in that", the repetition of that, which is what is happening in the churches, in the cathedrals, in the temples, in the mosques, is gradually atrophying the brain, not giving it nourishment. As a person who is attached to a belief, to a person, to an idea, in that attachment there is conflict, fear, jealousy, anxiety, and that is part of the atrophy of the brain, this constant

repetition. I am an American, I am British, Hindu, and all that nationalistic nonsense. The repetition of that, if you observe, brings about lack of nourishment to the brain, and so the brain becomes more and more dull, as you must have observed those people who repeat, repeat that there is only one saviour, there is only the Buddha, Christ, this or that.

If you watch yourself you will see this attachment to a belief is part of the desire to be secure, and that security, the desire and the demand for psychological security in any form does bring about this atrophying of the brain. From that arises all kinds of neurotic behaviour. Most of us would rather reject this because it is too frightening to observe this. That is the very nature of mediocrity. When you go to some guru, to some priest, to some church, and repeat, repeat, repeat, and your meditation is a form of that repetition - in that repetition there is security, a sense of safety, and so gradually your brain becomes atrophied, shrivelled, it becomes small. Watch this for yourself. I am not teaching you. You can observe it in your life. But this observation of the crisis and the crisis which is in our mind and heart and in our consciousness is always bringing conflict because we are never able to solve any single problem completely without having other problems. So look what is happening to us. Problems after problems, crisis after crisis, one uncertainty after uncertainty.

So can the brain, mind, be ever free from problems? Please ask this. This is a fundamental question one must ask oneself. But the brain is so trained to solve problems, it cannot understand what it means to be free of problems. Being free it can resolve problems, but not the other way round.

So the question is: can this crisis in our consciousness - that crisis is brought about by thought, thought being always incomplete, and thought can never solve problems. It can increase or diversify problems.

If this is very clear then one begins to enquire if there is another instrument which will free the brain of all problems so that it can meet problems. You see the difference? It is only the free mind, free brain that has no problems that can meet problems, and resolve them immediately. But the brain that is trained to the solution of problems, such a brain will always be in conflict. And then the question arises: how is it possible to be free of conflict. That is why we said, thought is the instrument that is creating our problems.

Look at it very closely in another direction. We have problems in relationship between man and woman, or between man and man - homosexuality, in this country, more and more, not that it doesn't exist in other countries, but here it is becoming - you know all about it. Look at it very closely, observe it, not try to change it, try to direct it, say, it must not be this way, or it must be that way, or help me to get over it, but just to observe. You can't change the line of that mountain, or the flight of the bird, or the flow of the water, swift, you just observe it, and see the beauty of it. But if you observe and say, that is not so beautiful as the mountain I saw yesterday, you are not observing, you are merely comparing.

So let's observe very closely this question of relationship. Relationship is life. One cannot exist without relationship. You may deny relationship, you may withdraw from relationship because it is frightening, because in that there is conflict, hurt. So most of us build a wall round ourselves in relationship. So let's

look very closely, observe, not learn. There is nothing to learn, but only to observe. Do you see the beauty of it? Because we always want to learn and put it into the category of knowledge. Then we feel safe. But whereas if you observe without any direction, without any motive, without any interference of thought, just to observe, not only with a naked eye visually, but also with a mind and heart and brain that is free to observe without any prejudice, then you discover for yourself the beauty of relationship. But we have not that beauty. So let's look at it closely.

What is relationship? To be related, not blood relationship, but to be related to another. Are we ever related to another? Except perhaps sexually, or holding hands, but psychologically, inwardly, deeply, are we ever related to anybody at all? Or we want to be so deeply related and we don't know how it could happen. So our relationship with another is full of tears, occasional joy, occasional pleasure, and the repetition of sexual pleasure.

So if you observe, are we related to anybody at all? Or we are related to another through thought, through the image that thought has built about your husband and your wife, the image that you have about her or him? Obviously. So our relationship is between the image you have about her and she has about you. And each one carries this image, and each one goes in his own direction - ambition, greed, envy, competition, seeking power, position. You know what is happening in relationship, each one moving in opposite directions, or perhaps parallel, and never meeting. Because this is the modern civilization, this is what you are offering to the world. And so there is constant struggle, conflict, divorce, changing of so-called mates. You know what is

happening.

So when you observe all this it is rather frightening. And this is called freedom. So when you observe the fact - if you observe the fact very closely without any motive, without any direction, the fact begins to change because you are giving your complete attention to observe. Do you follow this? When you give complete attention to something you bring, as it were, light upon the subject. Then that light clarifies, and that clarification dissolves that which is. Do you understand this? Are we meeting each other? The fact is there is an image which thought has created during twenty, thirty, five days, or ten years, an image, and she, the other has an image, and each one is ambitious, greedy, wanting to fulfil sexually, this way, that way, you know, all the turmoil that goes on in this so-called relationship. And the observation of that, pure observation of that. It is only when you want to escape from it that all the neurotic business begins, and then you have all the psychologists helping you to become more neurotic. Face the problem, look at it, give your total attention to it. When you do give so complete attention, with your heart, with your brain, with your nerves, with everything you have, all your energy to look, then in that attentive observation there is clarification. And that which is clear has no problem. Then relationship becomes something entirely different.

So life, for most of us is becoming an enormous problem, because life is relationship. And if we are not related, as we are not, from that all problems arise. And we have created a society which is born out of the lack of relationship. And the communists, the socialists, the democrats, the politicians, are trying to change the nature, the structure of society. The basic question is to have

right relationship with another. If you have it with one person you have it with everybody, with nature, with all the things of the beauty of the earth.

So one has to go back and enquire very deeply, again why thought has created this havoc in our lives, because it is thought that has put together this image about my wife and myself, and me and another. You cannot escape from this unless you resolve it, look at it - going to church, prayers, those are all too childish, utterly immature, because they have not solved any problem. One must begin very close to go very far. To begin very closely is to observe our relationship with another, whatever it is, with your boss, with your carpenter, if you are a master carpenter, if you are a foreman, if you are a worker, with your husband, life is a movement in relationship. And we have destroyed that relationship by thought. And thought is not love. Love is not pleasure, it is not desire. But we have reduced everything to that. We will go into all that next Saturday and Sunday. The day after tomorrow, Tuesday and Thursday, we will have questions.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 5TH MAY 1981

I am afraid all the questions that have been given cannot all be answered because there are too many of them, and I hope you don't mind if your particular question is now answered. Out of the collection we have chosen some of these and we will go into them.

What is one's approach to a question? If all these questions were given to you, how would you answer them? What would be your approach, how would you listen to the question and what is the response to that question? Is it the answer, or the question itself? How would you deal with a question?

1st QUESTION: You talk about the ill effects of conditioning. Yet many psychologists, philosophers and so on say that only through proper conditioning can man think and act clearly. What's your answer?

Now how would you answer that question if it was put to you? You must have thought about it, how would you respond to that? What would be your approach to it? How do you listen to a question of this kind? Do you, after having read many, or perhaps some philosophers and psychologists and books on all that kind of thing, you are ready to respond from your collected memory and answer that question? Or putting aside what others have said, how would you answer it?

First, isn't it obvious, I think it is, that all human beings throughout the world, after so many millions of years, are conditioned. That's a fact. They are conditioned by their religions, by establishments of governments, by economic conditionings,

climate, food, clothes, by their family, by their education, and so on. All human beings right through the world are conditioned. That's an obvious, acceptable, reasonable fact. And there are those philosophers and psychologists who say that you must accept this conditioning. You have heard about that too. And they assert, some of them, that the conditioning can never be changed. The human conditioning can never be transformed. There can never be a mutation from this conditioning, and so make the best of it. And if you are a clever writer and have the gift of the tongue, you enlarge that, and you become famous. And we poor laymen accept the people who are clever, erudite and go on with their assertions. But if one can put all that aside and look at ourselves, how do we deal with this fact, which is that we are all conditioned? If you live in India, you are conditioned in a particular way, religions, superstition, ignorance, poverty, climate, the food, the lack of space, over population; and as you come along West the same phenomena is going on: the Christians are conditioned after two thousand years by their society, their culture and so on.

Philosophers and psychologists apparently do not investigate themselves. They have theories, they have experimented on pigeons, animals and from that they come to certain conclusions. But they never say, look, I am conditioned, my conditioning is my religion, my society, my family, my name, the tradition, and see if I cannot possibly undo all that and discover if it is at all possible to free the mind from this conditioning. Right? Now can we do that together now? Do you understand my question? Am I making myself clear?

We are conditioned to live in America, you are conditioned by

an affluent society, by this enormous drive for pleasure, entertainment; and the fanciful religions and the romantic East and their gurus and all that. We are unfortunately conditioned. Now can we discover, become aware of this conditioning? I am conditioned - suppose - born in India with all the nonsense that goes on around religion, and they were very, very orthodox at the time the speaker was born, tremendously so-called religious, a Brahmanic class with their tradition and so on. Now if one is aware of that, can one actually free oneself from all that heavy, from two, three, five thousand years of so-called civilization?

That's the problem the questioner asks: can I, the questioner says, can I be free from all this? Who is speaking the truth, the philosophers, the psychologists, the people who assert that you cannot possibly change the conditioning of man; human nature can be modified but it can never radically be transformed. If you accept that, which is very convenient and happy, you can trot along for the rest of your life, living in a small circle of conditioning and say that is inevitable. But if one goes into it much more deeply, if one wants to find out what the conditioning is and whether it is possible to really, very deeply, at the very root of it, this conditioning, be free of all that. That's the question.

Now how does one set about it? I see I am conditioned. What do we mean by that word conditioned? The brain being very, very pliable, subtle, has an extraordinary capacity to absorb, hold, confine itself to a certain limitation, feeling that it is safe in that limitation, which is really the conditioning - I hope you are following, am I going too fast? - and it feels safe in that conditioning, secure, protected, and it is unwilling to let go and

look. Unwilling because of the long habit, the many thousands of years of being confined, limited to a particular experience, knowledge and all the rest of it, so it feels completely secure in that conditioning. And it accepts what the psychologists, the philosophers, other people say: live with it, be happy in it, make the best of it, better bathrooms, better relationship, always a little better, a little more convenient. And all the psychologists help us to be a little more happy, a little more adjustable, a little more accepting what this conditioning involves.

Now if one says, I really want to find out, not what the psychologists and others are saying, but I really want to find out if this conditioning can ever be resolved. First what are the results of this conditioning? What happens to a mind, or to a brain that is conditioned before we can say, I will be free of conditioning? Please, are we meeting each other or shall we go on with this? You are doing it yourself, I am not doing it for myself. This is not group analysis, or group therapy, all that kind of nonsense. But we are trying to find out whether it is possible to free the brain from its heavy conditioning. When one is conditioned, when the brain is conditioned, that conditioning brings various forms of conflict. Right? I am conditioned as a Hindu, suppose, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, or whatever it is. Naturally the brain being so conditioned becomes atrophied. Right? Are we following each other? Have you noticed if you keep on repeating that you are a Christian, that you must behave this way, that you must be like that, that there is only one saviour and so on and so on, this very repetition, this constant acceptance of something unreal, which has no factual actuality, then the brain must inevitably become more

and more atrophied. Right? That's so obvious, you can see them all. When you are constantly repeating, 'I am British', or 'I am Catholic', I am this or that, then naturally the brain will inevitably become mechanical, will inevitably become narrow, and gradually wither, become atrophied. That's what is going on. Right?

That is one of the results of conditioning. There are many other factors of this conditioning, which are, separation, division, where there is division there must be conflict. Right? Please we are examining ourselves, looking at our conditioning and investigating that conditioning. The speaker is not investigating but you are doing the investigation, only I am verbalizing it. Right? Let's be clear on that point. You are not listening to the speaker and so accepting what he is saying but you are actually looking at your own conditioning - if you are aware of it, if you want to go into it, if not it's all right. But if you are enquiring into it you can observe the results and the consequences of this conditioning.

Then the next question is: is it possible to be free of all this? Why, why should one be free of it? Because the very examination and the reason, sanity, points out one cannot live constantly in a narrow little groove. Right? Which emphasizes naturally the egotistic, egocentric activity. Right? So what is one to do? I am conditioned, if I am, and I realize the consequences of it. Then is it possible to be free of all that conditioning? Is it possible bit by bit? You understand? Little by little. That may take me for the rest of my life. I may be free of it just as I am dying. That's not very amusing. It has no meaning. So I ask, is it possible to be aware without any prejudice, without any choice, just be aware of my conditioning? And then is it possible, not allowing time as a factor

to dissolve this conditioning - not allowing time, you understand, am I making myself clear? Time being, I will do it gradually. So is it possible to look at this conditioning without the time element at all?

This is not something cranky, some new fad, something you have to accept but reason points this out. Reason says, you are conditioned, and reason points out that if you take time over it, many years, you have other forms of conditioning going on. So there is only one act that must absolutely dissolve the totality of the conditioning. Right? I am putting this question to you. Look at it first, don't say, is it possible, it is not possible, and brush it aside.

I am born as a Protestant, or a Catholic, or I have a particular conditioning with regard to nationalism, or I am conditioned to the pursuit of only pleasure at any price - which is what is happening in this country, entertainment. Now can I, not allowing time, which is asking a tremendous question, you understand, because our brain which has evolved through time, through millions and millions of years, we have come to this point, which is a great tragedy, because look at ourselves, and the brain has evolved in time, and we are asking something, we are demanding the brain to act totally differently. Are we following each other a bit? Which is reasonable, you understand. The question may be unreasonable, the question being not to allow time, that may be unreasonable, but we see if we allow time there are other forms of factors entering which also condition, so the mind can never be free from conditioning if the mind allows time to interfere with the dissolution of conditioning. Is this clear? So I must be absolutely - the brain must understand this, that it has evolved through time, and it is being

challenged, a crisis is being brought to it, saying you must be free of time. And that says, that is impossible. That is a natural reaction, isn't it?

Can we go on from there? I can go on, but you understand. See what takes place when the future is now. I wonder if you see that. The future is time, isn't it? Tomorrow is time. And if there is no tomorrow, I have to act so completely now, or invite the future now. So that the brain has to face this fact that though it has been trained, educated, conditioned, shaped in the process of time, and now it is facing a challenge which says, think or act totally differently which is not of time. I wonder if you see this. Are we asking this too much? What do you say?

So that is the real question. The philosophers and psychologists and others have said, accept human conditioning, modify it, give time so that it becomes more and more cultured through knowledge, and knowledge becomes all important, knowledge is time, because knowledge means accumulation which means time. I don't know if you follow all this. And we accept all this because it is very convenient, very natural, apparently very natural. And also it is very convenient, comforting that I have many or some years and so on and so on. When the brain is challenged that it is not through time that the condition can be dissolved, then it says, it is impossible and it is stuck there. That's what is happening to you now. I don't know if you observe, if you are aware of the fact. Right? Can we go on from there a little bit? The speaker can go on verbally, explain, but that is of no value unless you yourself actually perceive it, see the truth of this fact that if you allow time, and time is not a factor that can dissolve or uncondition the mind,

when the mind is conditioned the consequences are what we live with: our struggle, conflict, misery and all the rest of it. That is part of our conditioning.

So can the brain be free, able to look at this problem, this challenge, without any fear, without any choice, face it? Then the brain becomes extraordinarily active, doesn't it. I wonder if you see. You have broken the tradition. And then one asks, what is freedom then? You understand? The freedom that we have taken for granted, to do what we like to do, that is what we call freedom, especially in this country, we are all free to do what we like, and immediately if possible. The consequences of that, you know what it is. That's not freedom, obviously. So freedom then means the brain being free of the conditioning and is incapable of thinking in terms of time. Just a minute, go into it slowly.

I need time to learn how to drive a car. I need time to learn a language, a month, six weeks, or three months. I need time to learn any skill. There I need time. But I discover that time psychologically is not necessary. The time has conditioned us. Right? And the question of time, both the physical as well as psychological time; the physical time is necessary to go from here to where one lives; but time as the future, of me getting better and better and better, me trying to become somebody, psychologically, is it a fact? Or is it an illusion which thought has created: I am not happy, but I will be happy; heaven is in that hole and ultimately I will go there. All the evangelistic promises, you know all that is going on in this country.

So can the brain be free of conditioning as time? You understand my question? And the philosophers and the

psychologists say that is impossible. And there have been specialists having written books, published, sell it, they become famous and we, laymen, accept it, we accept the specialists. Right? That is one of our conditionings.

So when you look at all this, sensitively aware of what the others are saying, sensitively aware of one's own conditioning, and seeing that time is a factor that really shapes the brain to a particular conditioning - it has taken two thousand years for Christians to accept all that tremendous propaganda which is going on now; and the Hindus with their propaganda three, four thousand years. It has taken time. The constant repetition: Jesus is the saviour; and they have their own pattern in India, in Japan, in China, repeat, repeat, repeat. Obviously the brain becomes atrophied and probably that is what is happening to humankind. Right?

Sorry one has taken so long about one question.

2nd QUESTION: You speak sometimes of the brain and also of the mind. Is there a difference between them? And if so what is their relationship?

How would you answer this question? You see you are all learning apparently from me, please don't. Don't please learn from another, specially in psychological, spiritual, so-called spiritual matters. You have to be a light to yourself, and that light cannot be lit by any other. So I am not teaching - the speaker is not teaching you. We are observing our own minds, and our own hearts, and our own existence, our daily life as we live it.

So the questioner says, what is the difference between the mind and the brain. What is the relationship between the two? Is there

something separate as the mind apart from the brain? Or there is only the brain which has created the mind, and then tries to establish a relation between the two. Which is a game it can play everlastingly. Do you follow? Right? That is, the brain realizes its limitation because it is conditioned, everlastingly in conflict and all the rest of it. So thought is the instrument of the brain, so it invents a mind, a super mind. Right? Super consciousness, and then tries to establish a relationship between the two. I don't know if you are following the game it plays.

So we are asking, is there a mind which is not brought about by thought as a comforting idea apart from the brain? You are following all this? Most of us I am afraid are so emotional and react so quickly that we don't use reason. Somehow reason seems to be wrong. So we are understanding the limitation of reason first and seeing if we can't go beyond it. Right? Does one see the limitation of reason? However reasonable it is, it is limited, obviously. First we must exercise reason, sanity, not just be emotional about any matter.

So there is the brain which is conditioned, whose instrument is thought. Thought is brought about through various sensations, experiences, knowledge, memory, thought, action. That is the chain the brain lives with, or lives in that chain, within that area. And knowledge can never be complete, knowledge must always go with ignorance, always. There is no complete knowledge about anything. So man realizes this and projects an idea of god - god is omnipotent, you know. I wonder if you are following all this?

So is there a mind apart from the brain? And is the brain infinite? The brain is infinite if it is free from all conditioning. Am

I merely spinning a lot of words, or are we following each other? Are you doing it for yourself? As long as the brain is conditioned in any shape, or at any level, at any depth, it must be limited. And when that limitation, restriction, confinement, condition is totally eliminated, disappears completely the brain is infinite. This is reasonable, isn't it? I wonder if you are following all this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the capacity to perceive wholly, holistic perception, is not possible if the brain is limited. Right? If the brain is prejudiced. Let's put it much more simply: if you are prejudiced your thinking is always limited. Right? And this prejudice is the result of one's conditioning. And that conditioning limits the capacity of the brain. If I am a surgeon for the rest of my life, I have spent ten years in the world of medicine, surgery and I have specialized in that, my brain is limited, it cannot have an holistic perception. Even the scientists who talk about holistic perception, if they are conditioned, which is fear, nationality, jealousy and all the rest of it, as most of them are, their brain is limited. Right? And therefore they are incapable of holistic perception though they write about it. You understand? So the holistic perception is possible only when there is the total elimination of conditioning. And man says that is not possible. You follow? Somebody comes along and says, it is possible if you go very carefully step by step, understand it very deeply.

The brain as it is now is limited by its own conditioning, by its own desire to be completely safe, secure, in relationship, in job, you know, secure. Because it feels it can function only when there is complete security. Right? That is, if I am a first-class surgeon

and I am secure in that the brain functions happily. Do you understand what I am talking about? Of course this is reason. So the brain is limited in its action.

And is it possible to perceive something holistically apart from the brain? This becomes more complex. Have you ever perceived anything wholly? Please investigate it a little bit. To perceive something wholly is to not let the word, the image, the symbol interfere with perception. Right? Let's begin with that. Can we look at a tree, that, without calling it a tree? Right? We can. Because the word tree is not that. We have used the word tree to symbolize, or we have used the word tree to communicate a certain object. And so our brain is conditioned by words. Right? And can one be free of the word to look? That's fairly easy, to look at that without the word, that is fairly easy. But to look at ourselves without the word is much more complex because we live by words. I am an American, I am a Catholic, the word. And the content of that word. The word by itself means nothing, but thought has given the content to that word. I wonder if you see.

So to perceive something holistically, that is to perceive without time, is to have a mind that is global. To see humanity as a whole, not, I am identified with humanity, which is silly. But to see humanity with all its struggle, pain, anxiety, misery, joy, pleasure, travail that human beings go through, as a human whole. I think that is part of the mind, the holistic perception is the mind. I won't go much more deeply, that is enough for the moment.

The relationship between the mind the brain can only take place when the brain is equally infinite, which is when it is free from its conditioning.

3rd QUESTION: I have been deeply hurt in childhood. In spite of trying to understand what happened that hurt remains, what am I to do?

Are you asking me what to do? Or rather let's find out what to do together. Most people from their childhood until now when they grow up and mature, old age, they get hurt. You all must be hurt. Aren't you all hurt? Some are aware of their hurt, others are not. What is it that is hurt? What are the consequences of that hurt? And whether it is possible not to be hurt at all, at any time? Or, when one is hurt, is it possible to be so free of that hurt and discover never to be hurt at all? You understand? Are we all working together, or am I working and you are just listening? I hope not because there is no fun in that.

So together let's examine these three things: what is it that is hurt; and what are the consequences of that hurt; and if one is aware of that hurt, what is one to do; and do we see the consequences of the hurt? Right? First what is it that is hurt? When I say to myself, I am hurt. It happens in childhood, a harsh word, a gesture, a cruel look, and in this modern world as you must know, thousands and thousands of children are leaving their homes, running away, becoming prostitutes because at home they are beaten, ill-treated, scolded, the misery of all that. They are all so deeply hurt. And in school they are hurt because they have been compared with somebody who is more clever, better marks, better position, first-class examination, you don't pass as well as the other, you are hurt.

So this process of hurt goes on right through life, not just in childhood. When you get married your wife says something to hurt

you, or you say something to hurt her. So life becomes a process of deep hurt. See the tragedy of all this that we are doing to ourselves. God!

And the consequence of that hurt is that we build a wall around ourselves never to be hurt more, so get frightened, withdraw, isolated, and from that isolation act which becomes more and more neurotic. And there are all the people trying to help you not to be neurotic. So what is one to do? From childhood you are hurt, the parents are busy, irritated, tired, bad relationship between them, they want to fulfil in sex, or this, or something rotten goes on in their relationship, and they take it out on the children. You have seen all this. The foreman scolds the workman and so on.

Now, what is it that is hurt? Please let's reason together. The speaker is not the Delphic Oracle! There is no Delphic Oracle, even though the church talks about it. So let us reason together. What is it that is hurt? There is the physical hurt - disease, accident, maimed, and so on. That is one thing. That can be met if the brain is intact, naturally, then for thought not to identify with that particular pain and keep on with that pain. You can deal with that fairly easily. But psychologically, inwardly we are hurt. And we are asking what is it that is hurt. You are all hurt. And is it an image that you have built about yourself that is hurt? Because each one of us has an image about oneself, that is a fact: that you are clever, not clever, that you are beautiful, not beautiful, that you must be this and you must not be that. You have gradually through time, through childhood have built this up, that you are American, that you must behave this way, or you are free. You have a certain myth about yourself. And when that image is questioned, is

trodden upon, has a pin put in it, that image gets hurt.

I mean we are reasoning, you are not accepting what the speaker is saying. And so as long as you have that image you are going to be hurt. Now from childhood - please this is real education, if you are interested - from childhood not to create that image. That is real education. Now the question is: I see I am hurt, I know the origin of that hurt, somebody said something, I was beaten, or I was insulted, all kinds of things, so the image gets hurt. The image is me, me who has built it up: I am beautiful, I am right, I am wrong, I must become something, I must become successful, I must fulfil - you follow? That's the image I have about myself. And as long as I have that image, you, somebody, is going to put a pin into it, then I get hurt.

Q: What if someone leaves you that you love? What if it is not just your ego getting hurt, what if it is your heart? Isn't there more to it than that?

K: As long as I have an image about myself there is no holistic perception, or love. Obviously. This is not the moment to go into it. We are dealing with hurt. And can one be aware of that hurt, sensitively, not say, I must not be hurt, be aware of it. And see and find out for oneself if it is possible not to have an image about oneself at all. If I have an image about myself I will be dependent on you, comparing myself with people who have tremendous audience - you follow? Somebody calling me a fool because you think you are a great man, or this or that. So there is always the feeling that I am going to be hurt. And as long as I have that image I am going to be hurt. Now can I live in daily life - please listen - in daily life without a single image? Again the brain has been used to

this fact of having an image: myself, how I look, how I don't look, you follow, the image. Society, education, the priests, the psychologists, the philosophers, have built in me as my image, my knowledge which is my image. So is it possible to live without a single image?

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 7TH MAY 1981

It is such a lovely morning it seems rather a pity to sit here and hear each other groan!

There are several questions that have been put and I don't think it is possible to answer all of them; it would take probably a couple of months, and I am sure you wouldn't like to be sitting here for the next two months. Out of those questions we have chosen some, not according to our pleasure, or a question that is convenient for us, and easily answerable, but rather questions that cover a greater field.

Are the answers to the question different from the question itself? Or the question contains the answer? The answer is not separate from the question. Most of us put a question either to ourselves or to somebody trying to find an answer: a problem and a solution of that problem. We never seem to investigate the problem itself but rather be concerned with the solution of the problem, the resolution of that problem. So our approach to a problem is searching out for an answer, convenient, suitable, agreeable, necessary and so on. But one feels, if I may point out, that in the question itself is the answer. So it is important, it seems to me, how we approach the question, any question, any problem, whether it is a personal problem, a problem of relationship, a universal, global problem, how do we come to it, how do we receive it, how do we look at it. I think in that lies the solution of a problem, not seeking an answer to the problem, but the understanding of the content of the problem itself.

I hope we are together thinking about this. We are sharing together the question, not the speaker is answering the question but rather together we are looking at the question, investigating the question, and out of that perception, sympathetic awareness, sensitive awareness of the question, the answers itself is in it.

1st QUESTION: I realize I act neurotically and I have had psychotherapy, but the neurosis is still basically there, what can I do?

I wonder how many of us are sane, rational, clear headed, objective, not always moving in our own self-centred interest. How many of us are free to look at ourselves. If I am neurotic, that is, odd behaviour, violent, which is neuroticism, always depending on my lawyers, insurance, doctors, government, always relying on others, which are all parts of that neurotic sense of incompleteness - would we admit to that even, would we be aware of ourselves how extraordinarily we are dependent on everybody? And we are not talking of the dependence on a postman, on the man who helps with the petrol - gas - or the policeman and so on, but this feeling that one must depend, one must have identity, independence, the search for identity, which is fulfilment, to have roots in something or other. I wonder - one wonders how deeply we are aware of all this. All that is part of neurosis, part of our peculiar abnormal behaviour, which has become very normal.

Could we look at ourselves as if in a mirror, which doesn't distort, which shows exactly what you are looking at. Could we do that? Not depend on psychotherapy, or any other form of system, belief, or escape, but actually look at ourselves, not withdraw ourselves in order to look, but look at ourselves in our relationship,

in our behaviour, the way we speak, the way we walk, the way we look at the beauty of a hill. Is that at all possible, never distorting what we see?

Isn't it far more important to observe 'what is', rather than 'what should be'? We are all so idealistically inclined that we never see actually what is going on, our eyes are towards the horizon but never very close. And why has the whole world become like this? Please ask these questions. Why do we go to somebody if we are in trouble? Why can't we face that trouble, look at it, not analytically, not find the cause of it. That appears to be a waste of time. But just to look at it. And in that perception the cause, the consequences, the whole movement is revealed. Please do this as we are talking together.

And if one is neurotic - I don't know in what sense one uses the word, perhaps the whole world is neurotic, because they are all preparing for war, conflict, tremendous ambition, competition, trying to deceive somebody, corrupt. The whole world has become like this. Corruption, it seems to me, is not only in the high places, but in the ordinarily daily corruption seems to have become the norm of life. And perhaps that may be the source of this neuroticism. And what can one do, what can I do if I perceive for myself actually that I am neurotic. Not somebody tells me that I am neurotic, but if I find my behaviour is peculiar, utterly self-centred, utterly selfish, but I am very emotional, there is no balance, I perceive all that helping to bring about a quality of mind which is contradictory, which is in conflict, which is never straight. What shall I do? That is what the questioner asked.

Certainly if I had that kind of problem, that kind of neurosis, I

would certainly not go to an analyst, psychotherapy, because the analyst needs also to be analyzed. So what shall I do? That is the question put before all of us.

What is the crisis that makes me aware that I am neurotic? Something must make me aware of it. Either somebody tells me, my wife, my husband, my friend, or I observe what I am doing. I observe whether it is natural - again that word is very difficult, a complex word 'natural' - whether I am a little bit odd in the head. The modern world with all its problems is making people very strange, superficial, wanting to be entertained endlessly. Can I acknowledge my neuroticism and observe it, not try to change it, not try to say, 'I must become sane, I must become normal, I must be something else', but to observe it as it is, which means giving attention. But a neurotic person may not be able to give attention. I may not be capable of giving my whole mind, my whole heart, to look at myself, because one of my neurotic behaviours is that I can't look at myself, I don't like what I see, I get depressed at what I see, or terribly elated. But without elation, and without depression, without any kind of distortion, can I, as a neurotic person, look at myself? Because I am neurotic I can't look at myself so clearly, so I depend on somebody to tell me what to do. You see the problem? I am incapable of looking at myself rationally, sanely, intelligently, with sensitive awareness, and so I have to go to somebody to tell me what to do. I think asking another to tell me what to do is the essence of neuroticism. I know you will probably disagree, but specially in this country - and it is spreading all over the world - we are looking to specialists, to the authority, to tell us what to do.

So I remain neurotic when I am always depending on somebody. So can I look at myself, though I am neurotic, watch myself, watch everything alertly, not in a self-centred way which is full of neuroticism, but just watch. Watch what I am saying. This demands quite a different kind of education. The education that encourages self-education. Right? Am I making myself clear? Are we together sharing all this? Self-education, not the education according to somebody, but observing all the things I am doing, thinking, feeling, and knowing their limitation, and find out whether the mind can ever be free from its limitation.

2nd QUESTION: Why is human behaviour in this country degenerating so rapidly, and what can one do to change it? What can this country give to the rest of the world?

What has this country given to the rest of the world now? The atom bomb, food, Americans are terribly generous, all the materials of war, medicine, hygiene, and the extraordinary accumulation of knowledge about the cosmos, the expanding and contracting universe, how to have refrigerators, television. This is what it has given so far to the world, the 'know-how'. But the world is learning the 'know-how' also, perhaps even better than they are learning here, like Japan. So what are we giving to the world? Actually, apart from all this: we are giving grain, a sense of continuous constant demand for entertainment, football, the whole process of what one sees on the television, day after day. We are spreading a thin layer of knowledge and entertainment. How to destroy each other. Also America is giving grain and all the good things they have done.

So what is culture? Is this part of culture only the American

gives? And all the evangelists, you have heard them, I am quite sure, I listen to them, the speaker listens to them quite often, the utter nonsense that goes on, thousands and thousands listen, giving money, money. And the gurus come over to this country from India with all kinds of ridiculous nonsense, and Americans being rather gullible, if I may point out, accept all that, play with it for a while and drop it. And the gurus get rich and powerful. So what actually, apart from all this, what is it that America can give?

It is a beautiful country, really one of the most beautiful countries in the world. You have hills, mountains, rivers, vast land, deserts, and extraordinary capacity. Religion, not according to the old tradition, which is not religion at all, vast meaningless repetition, religion is the only source from which a new culture can be born. The question then arises: can America - I don't know why you say America - can the world, because America is part of the world - can the world bring about a new religion, totally different from all the superstition, belief, tradition, hierarchical acceptance, saviours, the old beliefs and faiths, brushing all that aside, which is actually not religion at all, can the world bring about a new religion? Not merely America or Europe or India, but the whole world. Because from that alone can a new culture come.

Then the question of what America can give to the world has very little meaning. The world demands a new religion - that word again has been spoilt by the priests. A religion that is not faith, or belief, of authority, but a religion of that which is the utmost sacred. In this country there is no such thing, or the respect of sacredness. You will spit on it. So to find out that which is sacred, nameless, eternal, the truth that has no path to it, to find that out as

a group of people, which means to live a life of great integrity, without any corruption, without being self-centred. Perhaps out of that a religious mind, a new culture can come about. And that is part of our crisis.

3rd QUESTION: You have said that when one is attached there is no love. I understand this, but there are moment of love in which there is no separation, no desire, no thought, and yet these moments often come in connection with a person to whom one is attached. Attachment seems to create a form, a boundary within which there are moments of love. Though attachment is not love, in some mysterious way the two are linked. They seem self-contradictory. Please go into this apparent paradox.

What do you say? You have listened to that question, paid attention to it, what is our response to that? What is attachment? There are various forms of attachment, not only to a person, but to a belief, to this thing called faith, to a piece of furniture, to a small ground, with a property, your house on it, what is the cause of this holding on? Holding on to one's ideas, ideals, conclusions, opinions, prejudices; holding on to some hope, the future, or to some remembrance of things past, clinging to them desperately; what is the cause of this? Without analysis, just to find the reason of this. You understand what I mean?

That is, our brains are trained to analyze. There is a problem, let's analyze it and find a solution. Analysis takes time, but who is the analyzer who is going to analyze? The analyzer is the analyzed - I won't go into that, perhaps you will see that as we go along.

So why is the human mind attached to something or other? To one's body, or to some experience that you have had, and that kind

of holds you, encourages you, guides you, and you depend more and more on something that has happened, gone, dead. Or to some future concept, which gives us so much hope. Why this clinging, this desperate hanging on to something? Please ask yourself. You are not listening to the speaker, that's not important. What is important is through the speaker to watch yourself, to see yourself, if you are attached to something, and is it out of loneliness, which is so deep in most human beings, almost in all human beings, this sense of total isolation. Or is it that clinging, holding on, being attached to something, gives one a great sense of security? When you say, I am an American, British, Indian, you have your roots in that. Roots in an idea, in a concept. America is a concept. And in that attachment there is a tremendous feeling of belonging, and that gives one not only financial security but psychological security. If I am in Italy where Catholicism is very strong and if I say, it is all rubbish, I find myself in a difficult position, I wouldn't get a job, I would be excommunicated, you know all that nonsense that goes on. So is it out of loneliness we are attached, out of demanding, searching, longing for security? Being uncertain, confused, if I cling to something that gives one a feeling of clarity. Don't you know all that?

And if I love my wife or friend or whatever, a girl, or a boy, I am attached, immediately the whole process of remembrances, incidents, words that have been said between us, all that is stored up and one is attached to that, not only physically but psychologically, inwardly, to the memory of sex, pleasure, entertainment, companionship, somebody on whom you can lean, talk to, all that goes on and on and on. Is that why we are attached?

And in this attachment to a person, to a belief, to a concept, to a country, you bring conflict inevitably. If I am saying persistently that I am an America, that I am a Hindu, that I am a Muslim, you worship this symbol and I worship another symbol, we are perpetually in conflict. And if I am attached to a person, I want to possess them, hold it. Don't you know all this? And out of that comes jealousy, anxiety, fear. And in that there is tenderness, love - I don't know if there is love - we will call it for the moment love, a sense of being together. And in that too there is conflict because one goes off to the office - all that goes on, one hasn't to go into all that, it's obvious.

So this questioner asks, sometimes in this attachment there is love, in this attachment not only to a person - the questioner is probably concerned with a person - there is a sense of form, boundary in which there are moments of love. So one must be very clear what that word means, the content of that word, the feeling behind that word, which is a very strong feeling. You are attached to your house, you have built the garden, you have worked, kept it clean, and worked and it gives you a sense of ownership, feeling that you are there. And if you have lived with a woman or a man, as a wife, or a husband, this whole process of being together, the quarrels, the irritations, you know, the conflicts, in spite of that, if that is not broken, you are holding on to each other.

So one has to understand very clearly what it means to be attached, the feeling of being attached. And when one is attached see what happens. Attachment breeds corruption. You may not accept it, don't be shocked by that word, just look at it. If I am attached to my job, to my ideal, to my concept of what truth is, god

is, or whatever it is, attached to it, part of my belief, my blood, my conditioning, if I am so attached corruption is inevitable because I am against everybody else who doesn't belong to that group, sect. I may have tolerance - that is one of our clever tricks. But there is no actual relationship between one who is Catholic, who is a Muslim, a Hindu, or a Buddhist. They may talk about god is love but there is actually no relationship at all. In attachment there is fear of loss.

So I don't quite see where the paradox lies. I may be wrong, the speaker may be wrong, subject to correction. Where there is love there is no attachment. Love is not jealousy, anxiety, fear; love is that quality, the beauty of it, the fullness of it, the enormous vitality, passion behind it, not lust, passion. And one can be together, man, woman, in freedom - not the freedom to do what you like, that is not freedom. This is what is happening in this country: I have been married, I get fed up with my wife and I change her and get a divorce. You know what is happening. So if one has love, which is really an enormous secret gift, not to be cultivated but to see what is not. You understand? Through negation come to the positive. That which is not, to deny not merely verbally but inwardly, actually to deny that which is not, that which is false, and to see actually the false, the illusion, the acceptance. So through negation naturally one comes to the positive. That is, to begin with uncertainty and then you come to absolute certainty. But we generally want to be certain, be assured, secure. Haven't you noticed some of the great writers, literary people, people who are so-called famous in the world, begin with denying everything, and then ultimately end up as a Catholic, Buddhist, or some kind of sectarian person, because they are

frightened of death. You know this.

So the question is: not that there are not moments of love, whatever that word may mean, for the moment, but to see all the implications of attachment, the totality of it, not to persons only but to be attached to anything - to your face, to your body, to your beliefs, to your experience, to your - you follow - that is freedom. And when there is that freedom there is love. When there is love you can do what you will.

4th QUESTION: One cannot live outside of relationship, and yet in all forms of it there is conflict. Why is this so?

Oh lord! I am not appealing to the lord, you understand! Why have we made life into a problem, the living? We are supposed to be highly sophisticated, have evolved through measureless time, have had so many wars, five thousand wars practically in five thousand years, we are educated, we are supposed to be highly developed human beings. And yet this problem hasn't been solved at all, why human beings live perpetually in conflict. Not only in personal relationship but conflict with nature, with animals, everything has become a conflict, a problem, why?

Please let's enquire together, I am not enquiring and you are listening, together we are enquiring. Why as a human being, why are you in conflict? Conflict being contradiction, imitation, conformity, the desire to become something all the time. This tremendous dissatisfaction, the search for the more, more and more and more. Why? Please enquire, sirs. And so the monks all over the world have said, 'The world is a tragedy, is a mess, is a misery, we are going to withdraw from it, and isolate ourselves in the worship of some image, some symbol and so on'. There too they

have conflict. They deny sex, take vows of chastity and burn for the rest of their life with desire. And you go to the moon and stick up a piece of flag, paper, cloth. This is what is happening all over the world. Why? Why is man, you, as a human being - please, you as a human being who are the rest of the world, you are not separate from other human beings because you suffer, are anxious, uncertain, confused, frightened, with occasional beauty and so on, every human being goes through this, so you are the rest of mankind, psychologically. You may have blond hair, white skin, pale skin, dark, black and so on. So you are actually the rest of mankind. So if you ask this question you are not asking it as a selfish question, as a self-centred question wanting to be free of a particular conflict, but you are asking this question as a human being who is the rest of mankind. So this conflict is global, not my conflict. Let's be clear on this point. We are so identified with ourselves, separate from everything else, which is part of our neurosis, part of our illusion, but the actual psychological fact is that we are the rest of mankind. Because mankind goes through every kind of torture, travail, deception, dishonesty, tears, laughter, the rest of the world is going through that and you are part of all that. You are the rest of humanity; you are humanity, not Mr Smith separate in a little corner.

And when you are asking this question, why human beings are in conflict, you are asking a tremendous question. Not why I am in conflict, you are asking why human beings who have lived over five, ten - I don't know - million years and one or two human beings have solved it, the rest of mankind is caught in this travail.

And it is important to understand this, and to ask also whether it

is at all possible to be utterly, totally, absolutely free of conflict. Not occasionally, not when you are looking at the mountain, and the beauty of the hills, the shadows and the heavens, but in daily life, why.

Where there is contradiction there must be conflict. Where there is division there must be conflict. Physical division as one nation opposed to another nation, one set of dogmas against another set of dogmas, one superstition opposed to another superstition, one conclusion opposed to another conclusion, one experience greater than the other experience - this constant division, contradiction, opposition, must invariably create conflict. That's a law. Not my law, it is the law. And we all know this. In the United Nations, you see what is happening in Russia, and Afghanistan, all the horrors that are going on, one ideology opposed to other ideologies. And we have never solved this problem. Is it that we like to live in conflict? You say, well nature is in conflict. That is one of our favourite excuses. You see the bigger animal kill the smaller animal, you see one plant searching for light and the bigger tree shadowing it, there is constant struggle in nature - which the speaker questions. We call it conflict, with our own minds which are full of conflict, misery, we say that nature is in conflict. But nature is not in conflict if you let it alone. You know all that.

I have to stop now - just a minute - because they are changing the tape, we will go on after. Right? I am sorry to keep you waiting.

We are asking why human beings who have lived for millions and millions of years have tolerated, put up with, conflict. Is it habit? We have got used to this conflict, wars, the chicanery that is

going on among the governments. Is it that we are so dull that we never challenge ourselves? And if you are in conflict we invent a thousand escapes from conflict, we have a marvellous network of escapes, from god to football - both are the same when you are escaping, one is not more noble than the other.

And can we find out now, this morning, talking as two friends, friends who are concerned with this issue, resolve it, which means not take time? See our conflict. That is, we are each one of us so self-centred, each one of us is so concerned about himself: his happiness, his fulfilment, his sorrow, his escape, his belief, all this he is clinging to. That is, where there is attachment there must be conflict. It's a fact. If I am attached to my Hinduism, or whatever it is, I am frightened to let go because I don't know what will happen, I want to be certain. And also being uncertain, being self-centred, I want to become something: become nobler, be successful in this world, more money, more pleasure, more insurance, go from one concept of god, a saviour, to another. And being self-centred, and my wife is also self-centred, naturally there must be conflict. This is inevitable. Right? I am seeking my fulfilment through sex, through so many things, and she is also doing the same. So they are two separate entities - at least they think they are separate - with their tremendous urges, reactions, prejudices, brutalities, ambition, be something at any price. How can these two opposing contradictory human beings be free from this toil, from this conflict? They can never be. Never, either in heaven or in other places. How can they? You understand? This is so obvious. But the obvious we generally deny because it is simple, we want something complex, something we can study, analyze, discuss,

play around. We can never see something obvious, simple, and say, 'Look, let's deal with it. Let's find out if one can be really, deeply not self-centred.' All our education, all our religious aspirations, all that encourages this self-centredness. You are going to be saved - you know the whole monstrous religious attitude, organized religious attitude, encourages this. The Indians have it in their particular way, and the Christians and the Buddhists, you know the whole world.

So the fact is: where there is division there must be conflict. If one sees the truth of it, the actuality of it, that is, I want to fulfil my desire, and she does too, so my desire is opposed to her desire. We don't tackle desire. You understand what I am saying. We try to fulfil my desire as opposed to her desire. Whereas the understanding of desire is important, not my fulfilment of my desire. You understand? Have we communicated with to each other? We are concerned with desire, not my desire. Is this all right. So this identity with my particular experience, my particular desire, my particular fear, fear of my particular death, so this identity is with an idea - you understand - or identity with some actual fact, like I have pain, I have a toothache. All right, I have a toothache, get on with it. But not everlasting concern about oneself.

You see the truth of this, that where there is separation there must be conflict - Arab and Jew, what is happening. The earth is ours to live upon, to share, it is our earth, not the Arab world and, you know, for god's sake. And apparently we don't see that. So can we perceive the truth of it, truth, the actual fact, not the theory that separations will bring conflict, the actual feeling, the truth of it.

Can you feel it, see it? Not the intellectual concept of seeing, the intellectual comprehension that division must inevitably create conflict, but the actual fact of it?

If a group of people see it, they are still part of humanity, I mean it is like a tremendous movement in a totally different direction. But apparently we cannot do this. And out of this comes misery, conflict, confusion, problems, endlessly.

You know the speaker has been saying for the last sixty years that truth is a pathless land, which is a fact. There is no path to it, no saviour to it, no leader, no system, nothing but the understanding of the fact that truth has no path. If you see that, and if you see also very clearly for yourself that any form of division must inevitably create conflict, from this questions arises, we live in a society whose laws, governments, religions are all struggling against each other in the world, wanting to be more powerful than anybody else. This is our cycle, this is our culture, and this culture has been like this for a million years. In ancient Egypt, five thousand years they were trying to be supreme over everybody else, and we are carrying that same pattern through life.

So what shall we do? What will you, as a human being, who is actually the rest of mankind, what will you do? You hear something true, which is a fact, a physical fact, the Arab and the Jew, you opposed to somebody else, you with your belief, with your experience, with your knowledge, opposed to somebody else with their knowledge, you follow - conflict. What will you do? If one sees, or when you see the truth that division in any form is destructive, and the world is caught in this destructiveness, what's your relationship with the world? And somebody comes along,

takes your property, or this or that, and so creates conflict, what is your action? Do you understand all this? Are we together in understanding verbally even what we are talking about?

So can you, when you leave this grove be free of conflict? And it is only a person that is free from conflict that can meet conflict. Not the person who is in conflict, he merely perpetuates more conflict, but a human being who is free from conflict he can meet it, deal with it, in any way because he himself is free from this torture.

5th QUESTION: You have said that when one gives complete attention to a problem then the problem flowers and withers away. Can you explain this further?

You aren't tired? You are quite sure? This is not an entertainment. You don't get tired with entertainments. Sorry!

Now there is this problem of conflict, can you watch your conflict and give it complete attention? Please just listen to it for a few minutes. Listen. You have a problem, which is conflict. Can you look at it, not only listen to the problem, the tones, the content, the subtleties of the problem, can you look at it without trying to resolve it, without trying to give it any direction, without any motive? When you have a motive it gives it a direction and therefore you are distorting the problem. So can you sensitively be aware of conflict? Not act upon it because you are part of that conflict. You are conflict. So if you act upon it you further create more conflict. So look at that conflict - the little one and the whole human conflict, the personal and the global, look at it. Listen to its story, don't you tell what the story is, let it tell you the story. Like a child who is sitting on your lap whom you love, is telling you a

story. You don't interrupt the child. You are not rude to it, you want him to tell you all about it. In the same way let this conflict tell you all about it, only you have to have ears to listen to it, not only with hearing of the ear but also hear inwardly the nature of it. Can you so listen to it, giving your whole attention to it, without any effort? When you are with a child who is telling you a story, you are not making an effort and saying, 'I must control myself, I must be more patient'. You are listening because you love that child. In the same way listen, and then you will see the problem flowers, grows, shows its whole content. And when it has shown all its content it passes away, it is finished. You understand? That is, the flowering and the withering of a problem, which doesn't take time. It is only the impatient mind that has time, that says, I must solve this. But a mind that is listening very carefully, sensitively, alert to all its tiny movements, and its very, very subtle movements, when you listen to it, when you give your complete attention to it, and you cannot give complete attention if you have a motive, if you have a direction, if you say, I must do this - then nothing will happen. But if you give your total attention the problem shows itself fully and so dissolves, like a flower, in the morning the bud is there, in the evening it is withered.

I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it? Is it enough?

Q: Yes.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 9TH MAY 1981

It may be necessary to briefly repeat what we have said during the last two talks. We were saying that this is not a propaganda of ideas, some kind of belief, or some philosophical conclusions, nor some religion, as accepted by that word generally; but we are trying to observe together what is happening in the world. It is not a particular point of view that the speaker is putting forward, or a personal recollection, experience, and all that kind of nonsense. We are together, and the speaker means together, observing clearly, without any prejudice, without identifying oneself with any particular part of the world, or with any belief, religious dogma, and so on. To observe the enormous violence that is going on in the world - the wars, the threat of the atomic bomb, the religious divisions, the nationalistic separation with their armaments and so on. It is a very dangerous world we are living in. And most people, I am afraid, do not realize the enormous degradation, degeneration that is going on throughout the world, not only in this part of the world but everywhere. And we are trying to solve these problems politically, economically, socially, or evangelistically, which, of course, brings about more and more confusion, more and more separation, greater division and therefore greater conflict.

And we said, neither politics, nor the established religions, nor the scientific knowledge is going to solve our problems, nor the psychologists, nor the priests, nor the specialists. But the crisis is in our consciousness, that is, in our minds, in our hearts, in our behaviour, in our way of looking at the world from a narrow, limited point of view. That is where the crisis is.

And together we are going to explore, together investigate if it is at all possible for the human mind, which has evolved through millions and millions of years, conditioned by time and evolution, whether such a mind, limited, such a brain conditioned, and this consciousness which is limited, narrow, exclusive apparently, whether that consciousness with its crisis in the present world can ever be changed, can ever bring about a radical mutation in that conditioning.

And we also said, this consciousness with which we have identified ourselves as mine and yours, is utterly erroneous because our consciousness is the consciousness of mankind. Man wherever he is, including the woman, of course, wherever he is - Japan, India, Middle East, Europe, or here - is in constant travail, in conflict, never resolving any problems of fear, pursuing endless pleasure, never resolving the problems of sorrow, pain, grief, loneliness. This loneliness, grief, pain, sorrow, with occasional flashes of joy and love, is common to all mankind. That is an obvious psychological fact which most of us are reluctant to see because we are so identified with our own particular consciousness, with our own particular grief, with our own particular enjoyment and so on. But the actual psychological fact is, if you observe attentively, with sensitive awareness, that throughout the world human beings go through exactly what you are going through - whether they live in the north or the south, east or west. So this consciousness is common to all mankind. I think this should be, if one may point out, clearly understood. There is no contradiction about it, it is not something, a point of view, something the speaker has invented, but psychologically when we

examine very deeply, objectively, not personally, one finds that this is the common ground to all mankind. One may not like to hear this because we all think we are individuals, separate from everybody else, trying to identify ourselves with something, trying to fulfil, trying to become something - all individualistic, narrow, limited. But the psychological fact is that we are not individuals. You are the collective. We are the result of millions and millions of years, our consciousness is the common consciousness of all humanity. Your consciousness is the consciousness of man. And if we do not understand this very clearly one is apt to not continue with the investigation clearly.

The world, wherever one lives, this sense of individuality has been emphasized. Religions have sustained it, education has maintained it. And this supposedly individual freedom has brought about extraordinary chaos in the world, which is a fact. Which again is not a certain conclusion, or a point of view of the speaker, but one can see this clearly. We think we are free because we can choose. And choice implies uncertainty, lack of clarity. Where there is clarity, which can only come about when there is no conflict, such clarity has no choice in it, it is clear. It is only the mind that is obscure, confused, uncertain, that begins to choose. Again, please, investigate this as we go along. And if one may request, we are not laying down the law, we are not leading you anywhere. We are trying - rather, we are actually thinking together, not accepting, not following. In matters of the spirit, in matters of deep psychological investigation one must be free from all sense of following somebody. There is no leader, or a guide, into that realm. One has to watch, observe, see for oneself very clearly what one is

- not according to any philosopher, any psychotherapist, or psychologist, they too are human beings, and they too go through pain, sorrow, anxiety, uncertainty, desperate loneliness and so on. So they too are part of this confusion. They too have this common consciousness.

And if one realizes this actual fact, not imposed upon you by another, or by the speaker, but you, yourself, clearly, objectively, non-personally or emotionally observe, this is the common fact that we are the rest of mankind psychologically. You may have a different body, woman, man, you may be a lighter skin, another darker, slant eyed, and so on, but inwardly, deeply, we go through the same phenomenon as the rest of man. This is logical, this is reasonable, this has sanity, and if one understands this very deeply, perceives this fact, then we are totally responsible for whatever is happening in the world.

Please understand the seriousness of these talks. This is not an entertainment, an amusement, intellectual concepts, a verbal oratory, we are dealing with something terribly serious, because human beings throughout the world are degenerating, destroying themselves.

And as we said, this is the common factor, and therefore we are totally, absolutely responsible for whatever is happening in the world. Because we are nationalistic, wanting to be the first country in the world, we are creating war, competition. And competition is destroying people. So we are talking about something dreadfully serious.

And this consciousness, in which there is the crisis, and nowhere else, is put together by thought. Our consciousness is,

with its content, the product of thought. Which is, thought has accepted the propaganda of two thousand years in the western world, religiously, in the eastern world thought created an image, certain rituals, as in the west, certain symbols, and that thought with all its religious superstitious, dogmatic belief, faith and so on, is put together by thought. Again, this cannot be refuted. This is reasonable - and one can see the limitation of reason, but one must have the capacity to reason very clearly.

So thought has built this world, the psychological as well as the technical world. Thought has brought about the relationship between man and woman. In that relationship there is a great deal of conflict. We have been saying this for a number of years. And we are pursuing, investigating together. Please be clear on this point, if you do not mind. We are together, not the speaker is exploring, explaining, putting into words, but together you and the speaker are exploring why man - supposed to be educated, sophisticated, clever at solving problems - why man has come to this point after so many million years. He is in perpetual conflict within and without. He is confused, neurotic, believing in something that is non-real, holding on to certain concepts, and ideals for which he is willing to kill. This may have been the process of time, evolution, which has brought us up to this point. And philosophers and others say, "You must accept human conditioning, you must accept what you are. You can modify it, you can somewhat superficially change, but deeply, at the very depth of one's existence it is not possible for this conditioning to be radically changed. And therefore modify it, live as best as you can, make the best of this world, however miserable one is, it is

accepted and try to live within that area without too much conflict". But we are saying that this conditioning, this crisis in consciousness can bring about a radical transformation. Please, as we said, do not accept what the speaker is saying but investigate, think it over, observe it.

And the speaker also says, don't follow anybody, specially in the realm of the psyche, neither the Indian gurus, nor the westernized gurus, nor the so-called meditations that these people have invented, taken the old form and put it into new words, and people, being gullible, as a whole, wanting to be secure in some place or other, easily accept all this nonsense. So please the speaker repeats it over and over again, do not be influenced by the speaker, do not agree with the speaker, do not be influenced by him but observe the world actually as it is, observe it without any direction, without any motive, without any prejudice, look at it.

And this consciousness, as we said, is put together by thought. Thought is a material process. Thought has built marvellous architecture, buildings, the most beautiful architecture, paintings, poems, statues. But thought has not created nature, but thought can destroy nature. Thought has not made the tiger, that beautiful dynamic animal. Thought has not made the rivers, the mountains, the heavens, but thought can despoil them. So one must clearly understand the nature of thought because thought has put together the content of our consciousness, and as the crisis is there thought must be very carefully investigated. What is thinking? Because all our action is based on thinking. That is, our action is born out of knowledge, out of experience, out of accumulated knowledge and memory, stored up in the brain. And thought is part of that

memory, part of that knowledge, part of that experience. And as experience and knowledge can never under any circumstances be complete, therefore thought invariably, under all conditions, is limited.

And thought is not sacred. The things that thought has created in the temples, in the mosques, in the cathedrals, in the churches, they are the result of thought, they are nothing sacred. So we are going, as we go along in the next three talks, to find out if there is anything sacred in life, not put there by thought. Thought, as we said, is a material process; even the scientists are beginning to accept that. Of course religious people will not, but they may be the majority, but the majority is generally mediocre. And a religious mind can only find out what is sacred. And to find that out there must be meditation, and that meditation the speaker generally puts at the end of his talks because meditation without the understanding of the world and of oneself has no meaning. Meditation then is merely an escape from 'what is'. And without order in our life, complete, absolute order, meditation is a form of indulgence in some pleasurable and neurotic action.

So one must first look and find out for ourselves if there is right action under all circumstances. Can thought bring about this action, right action? And we mean by that word 'right', a precise, objective, non-personal, non-romantic action that does not bring about more and more conflict. We are going to investigate together if there is such right action. Because now each one thinks fulfilment of one's desire, of one's pleasures without any restraint, without any sense of understanding, that is right action, according to present, modern civilization. But such action, as one has

observed, leads to more and more conflict, more and more chaos, which is what is happening on this unfortunate earth.

So we are asking: what is action and what is right, accurate, precise, an action that does not bring about a conflict? Is there such action at all?

It's a lovely morning. To be under the trees is a beautiful thing - dappled light, you are looking at those mountains, with their purity, and the line so delicate, so defined and pure. And living with all that in this marvellous country, which is being slowly despoiled and ruined, man who should be the most extraordinary, excellent entity, has brought about such chaos in the world. It is a great tragedy of which you are not aware - because we are not aware of our own selves, we are not aware of our actions. We are being lead perpetually by politicians, the priests, the evangelists, the professors, the specialists. We are not self-educated. We are educated according to a pattern, which is no education at all, it is only a part of education. The deeper education is self-education, the understanding of oneself, the knowing of the whole content of oneself. And to observe that content of oneself it is shown in relationship, as we talked about it the other day. In that relationship there is conflict, because that conflict arises when each one thinks he is separate, ambitious, greedy, competitive, and all the rest of it, attached to a belief, to a dogma, to a person, to an ideal, to an experience. And such attachment does breed corruption, which we carefully explained the other day.

And now we are asking if there is right action at all - not superficial, not something immediate, satisfactory, but an action that is not born of time. I'll explain what I mean by that. It may

lead to some kind of mystical, scientific fiction action, talking about that. One must understand what time is. For most of us time is very important, not only sunrise and sunset, yesterday, today and tomorrow, time by the watch, time by the sun, but also the whole concept of psychological time.

Our brain, if you are sensitively aware, our brain has evolved through time, from the one cell up to now. This brain functions in time, it is conditioned by time. Right? That is clear. And time we use as a means of self advancement, time as a means of learning a language, time as a means of accumulated knowledge in order to act skilfully or not. So time is a factor, a very deep conditioned factor in our life. There is hope, the future, which is hope, and time as the past, with all the memories, experiences, and knowledge is of time, whether it is scientific knowledge or the psychological knowledge, or self knowledge, it's all within the area of time.

When one says, "I will be better", "I will not be this but I will be that", that involves time. Please understand. Let's think and observe together. You are not merely listening to the speaker who is advancing a set of ideas which you gather then remember, then say, "I have learnt". We are together looking at it now, attentively.

So time has been the factor of guide, achievement, self knowledge, self advancement. Time is used in the sense, "I am lonely, but I will escape from it, or I will understand it, or I will do something about it". In all that is implied time. And we say, after accumulating knowledge we will act skilfully. I want to be a good carpenter, I apprentice myself to a master carpenter, and learn after many years, like a surgeon, like a businessman, like the priest and so on. Time is knowledge. From that knowledge we act. Or act and

learn from that action, which becomes knowledge again. You are following? There are these two ways of acting: either accumulate knowledge first, like a doctor, ten years learning and so on, then he becomes a doctor, or a surgeon, after studying, learning, accumulating knowledge, act. Or act, and from that action learn, which becomes knowledge. So both are the same. Which is, both are based on the acquisition of knowledge and acting from that knowledge. And knowledge is always incomplete, it is always within the shadow of ignorance. So action must be always limited, and therefore any action born out of an ideal, which is the projection of thought, any action born out of recollection of past knowledge, memory and so on, must also be limited and therefore bringing about conflict, confusion. This is again logical, rational, sane. It is not something, a point of view of the speaker but it is an obvious fact, this is how we act, how we live.

So we are enquiring if there is a totally different way of acting. We must be very clear, if the speaker may repeat, we must be absolutely clear of the function of knowledge. You have accumulated within the last one hundred and fifty years more technological knowledge than ever before, tremendous knowledge, otherwise you couldn't have gone to the Moon, spaceships and so on. You have invented, man has invented all the terrible instruments of war, the atomic bomb which is the main exportation, apart from grain and blue jeans, of America.

And we are asking: is there an action which is not limited, therefore complete, whole so that it does not bring conflict? Please this is important to understand, if you will give your mind, your brain, to attend to find out. As we said, many of you may be

interested in meditation and therefore nothing else but if you are only interested in meditation, such meditation is meaningless if one doesn't live rightly, sanely, rationally. Such meditation, whether it is Zen, or X, Y, Z meditation is merely an escape from actuality, an escape from 'what is', which is our daily life. Our daily life is such misery, such confusion, there is so much conflict. And to try and meditate and come into a kind of mystical experience is only an illusion. Perhaps you like to live in illusions, it is more fanciful, pleasurable, but to see 'what is' and then see if 'what is' can be transformed, that's part of profound meditation.

So we are asking: is there an action which is complete and not limited and therefore confusing? That is the question we are asking. We are not saying there is, or there is not. We are asking a fundamental question, not a superficial, passing demand. We are asking something very, very serious: because man for millions and millions of years has lived in confusion, conflict, misery, never resolving the human conflict, the human suffering. He has escaped from it through religions, through all kinds of fanciful, symbolic worship and prayer.

So please together we are trying to find out if there is an action that is whole, holistic. That word 'holistic' means sane, healthy, rational, and also the word 'whole' means holy, h-o-l-y. All that is implied in that one word, holistic. Is there such an action which doesn't bring conflict, which doesn't bring about more problems? How are we going to find out together? How do you approach a question like this? How do you look, or listen to a question put before you? Either you say, there is no such action, and so you have blocked yourself if you say that. Or you may say, it is

possible. Again the possibility is not actuality. So it is very important, if you want to find out if there is such action, it is very important to find out how you listen to the content of that question. Whether your mind, when that question is put, whether your brain is trying to resolve the problem, trying to find an answer, or actually listens very carefully to the meaning of the word. The word is merely a means of communication, the word is not the thing, it never is - the symbol is not the actuality. So it is very important how you listen to the challenge - whether you are trying to resolve it intellectually, rationally, reasonably. If you are trying to resolve it reasonably you will inevitably come to the conclusion, it is not possible. The process of logic is the activity of thought which is always limited. Therefore your answer to a challenge will be limited, therefore you have found no answer to the question. I hope this is all clear.

So how do you approach the question? Do you approach it with a mind, with a brain that says, "It is a question I don't quite understand, I'll first watch it, listen to it. Not try to find an answer. Let me see the content of that word". That is, is there an action which is not born out of memory, which is time, and I also know that time is necessary, knowledge is necessary to drive a car, to be a carpenter, to be a surgeon, to be anything, knowledge is necessary. But this question, can it be answered by thought which is the movement of memory? Do you understand? Are we together in this? Which means when you try to answer it, right or wrong, impossible or possible, you are depending on memory. Therefore thought is telling you what to answer. And thought being limited, your answer will invariably be limited and therefore productive of

conflict. If this is clear, will you observe, listen to the question without any movement of thought?

I will repeat the question, which is: is there a right action which is not born out of time, which is thought, which is knowledge? There may be no such action, or there may be. So our mind, our brain is free to look. Our brain being sensitive, alert, aware, is listening, paying tremendous attention to the question, not trying to solve it. So when you do that, that is, when you give complete attention, when you are totally sensitively aware, in that attention there is no question of time. But if you say, "I need time to be attentive", that is to learn what it is to be attentive, then you are acting according to knowledge, which is to learn to be attentive. Then you are not attentive. Right? Please see this.

So can you listen to this question with all your being, with all your capacity, attention? When you give that total attention it is like bringing light, putting light upon something that has been obscure. And when you give that attention there is total light on the question. And the question then reveals its own answer. When you see something clearly, that clarity is the answer.

So there is an action - please don't accept it, don't be mystified by it, don't say, there is, there is not, find out for yourself - there is an action which is born out of insight. Insight is not the remembrance of things past, but seeing something directly, purely, without any direction and that seeing, perception, is total action, which is insight. And when you can so look at the movement of thought, which is the content of our consciousness, the content, which is our greed, our envy, our ambition, our nationalism, our beliefs, our experiences, our pleasures, all that is our

consciousness, when you think, I believe in god, that is part of your consciousness, or I don't believe in god, that is part of your consciousness. That consciousness is put together by thought, through experience and so on. Now to look, to observe the totality of that consciousness is to observe attentively one action completely. That is, to have an insight into the movement of action.

Right, sirs, that is enough. I've finished. We will continue tomorrow morning, if you don't mind.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH MAY 1981

One is afraid that one has to repeat some of the things that we have said before, at the last three talks.

What we are talking about is not a particular point of view, it is not that one is doing any kind of propaganda for any ideal, for any person, for any concept. We have been saying that the world is in a crisis, threatened by war, over population, poverty, terrible division between nationalities, and all the absurdities that are going on in the name of religion. But the crisis, as we said, is in the human consciousness, in the mind, in the brain, in the heart, which cannot possibly be solved by politicians, or by the accumulated knowledge of the scientists, nor is it an economic problem, but it has become dangerously a human problem. And apparently very few are inclined, or interested to concern themselves with that crisis in the human mind.

And if you are at all serious, and I hope we are, we must be concerned with the responsibility of all that is taking place in the world, because as we have explained quite often, our consciousness is not the particular consciousness of one person, it is the consciousness of all mankind. Because all human beings suffer wherever they live, they are in conflict, misery, confusion, searching out leaders who are always betraying them, depending on priests who have given a lot of words and meaningless answers. Nor can one depend on the scientists who with their specialization are helping to destroy the world. And as this crisis is in ourselves, and nowhere else, so the responsibility, as we pointed out, becomes very great and very serious. And when this consciousness with

which we have lived for a million years can ever be transformed. There are some who say it cannot, human nature is what it is, modify it, accept it, slightly change it, but fundamentally it cannot possibly be changed. And if one accepts the philosophers and those who think in that manner, then man, human beings, must suffer endlessly, must remain in conflict everlastingly, there must be wars endlessly, as there have been for the last five thousand years, in history, recorded history, practically always a war somewhere on this earth, which is our earth, where we are meant to live and not the American earth, or the English earth, or the Indian, or the Japanese and so on. And this consciousness in which there is this crisis that must be answered, not by any particular specialist, professionals, but by us ordinary, everyday living human beings with their jobs, with their miseries, confusion.

As we said, patience is timeless, impatience is full of time. And one must have patience to listen to ourselves because now we are depending on all the specialists, the professors, those who tell you what to do. We have lost self reliance. We have become more or less slaves to authority, whether it is scientific authority, religious, or economic, or environmental authority. We are losing all over the world our sense of integrity. We are depending on books - books have their place, but to understand ourselves through books, through another, has led us to this confusion, to this crisis. And as we pointed out over and over again, that we are thinking, reasoning, observing together. We are not accepting what the speaker is saying, or rejecting. He is merely acting as a mirror in which we see ourselves. And when we begin to see ourselves as we are then we can throw away, break up the mirror. The mirror has

no value.

So we are saying that the crisis is in our minds and our hearts. And we don't seem to be able to understand that crisis. Understanding brings its own discipline - not the discipline of conformity, not the discipline of imitation, not the discipline to accept something however great or small. Discipline means - the root meaning of that word 'discipline' comes from the word disciple. Disciple is one who learns - not from another however wise, however enlightened, however knowledgeable, but learning from our own self education, learning about ourselves because there is our crisis. We have handed ourselves over to the priests, to the scholars, to the professors, the philosophers, and to the analysts. And unfortunately, recently, handed ourselves over to some guru from India or Asia, which is most unfortunate. They have become rich, exploiting people. It has become a great religion, and as it is now it has become a great business affair, which again is obvious.

So we are saying that one has to observe oneself, learn about oneself, not from anybody because they are not themselves studying themselves. They have theories, some speculative ideas which they have experimented on animals, pigeons, and so on, but they never look at themselves actually as they are with their greed, with their ambition, with their competition, with their aggressiveness, violence and so on. All that we are. And in the understanding of that, actually understanding not merely the verbal description of what we are but the actual understanding of our reactions, our thoughts, our anger, our wounds, our aggressiveness, violence and so on, looking at it. Therefore out of that

understanding, observation, comes this discipline which is constantly learning anew.

Perhaps in this country we have lost the meaning of that word discipline, we have relegated it to the soldier, to some monks and so on. In this country specially, we have lost the meaning of that word. If you are a careerist, in that career there is a certain demand for discipline. If you are a carpenter, the very understanding of the wood, the tools, the nature of design, that observation, that understanding brings its own learning, its own discipline, its own action. But apparently we have lost that because we are all so terribly concerned to get on, to climb the ladder of success, to become something. If you observe all this. And therefore we are becoming more and more superficial. You have got a marvellous country, one of the most beautiful countries in the world, from the highest snow capped mountains, the desert, to the vast rivers, and the deep valleys, and the great trees. It is a marvellous country. And we human beings are destroying all that because we want to get on, god knows where, but get on. We are observing all this ourselves, please, you are not following the speaker. The speaker is not your guru, your leader, you are not his followers. One has to wipe away all that, and examine closely what we are doing as human beings.

And in this consciousness there is disorder. And we are trying to bring order in that by conformity, by acceptance, obedience. We have never understood what is order. And, as the speaker has been in this country for the last sixty years, I have seen every kind of phase, fad, something always new. And we live practically, socially, morally, ethically, in disorder. And without understanding

order in the deepest sense of that word, meditation becomes utterly meaningless. We think that through meditation we will bring order. That is the trick that has been played upon us for a million years. But order begins at home, near.

So we have investigate together what is that order, because our consciousness, as we said, is in total disarray. It is in conflict, it is battling itself against something which it has created. So we are, together, going to enquire into what is order. We are using that word to imply a state of mind, not as an ideal, a state of mind, a state of heart in which there is no conflict whatsoever. Conflict indicates disorder. Choice indicates disorder. A man who chooses is really not actually free, he is confused. Please don't accept what is being said. It is important, one thinks, that one must cultivate or have this sense of scepticism, specially in psychological matters. There must be doubt. And if you observe the Asiatic world, India, and so on, doubt has been one of the precepts in religion. The Hindus and the Buddhists have talked a great deal about doubt. But in the Christian world doubt is denied because that world is based on faith. And if you question, you are either excommunicated, or tortured as they have done in the past, now you are tolerated. There isn't much difference.

So please observe yourself, your environment, your society, and your own thoughts with considerable doubt. And also listen to the speaker with doubt, with questions, demanding, of yourself. You are doubting all that you have thought, observed, learnt. So that a mind, a brain is free to observe. And also doubt must be kept on a leash, like a dog. If you keep a dog on a leash all the time the poor animal withers, you must know when to let it go, run, chase, jump.

Similarly one must hold doubt on a leash, and also one must learn the subtlety when to let it go.

So we are asking, saying, why is it that man has lived in this disorder for millions and millions of years? Why we human beings, wherever we are, why? What is the cause of this disorder? And as we pointed out previously, enquiring into the cause, which is the analytical process, requires time. Please understand this a little bit. If you will kindly give your attention to what is being said.

Analysis has been one of our pet pursuits, not only analysing the heavens, the stars, the expanding and contracting universe, but also we are analysing ourselves constantly. And we have never enquired who is the analyser. The analyser, if you observe carefully, the analyser is the analysed. Thought has separated the analyser as though he is some superior entity, with a great deal of knowledge, experience, and he is capable of analysing. Analysing what? You can analyse the minerals, the nature of the trees, the hydrogen bomb, the various scientific analysis that has produced great benefit and great destruction also.

We are asking, not of those analysis, but we are saying what is it when we are seeking the cause of disorder - do we indulge in analysis? Or there is a different approach to this problem altogether which is not analysis, but pure observation - if you can do it. That is, to break away from the tradition of analysis. Which is, say for example - the speaker doesn't like to use examples, but we will for the moment, because examples are rather deceptive, limited - if I am angry, or greedy, or violent, I want to know the cause of it. Then I begin to analyse, trace it back step by step. And I may find the cause of it. But who is the analyser who says, "I will trace step

by step backwards into the true origin"? Who is that entity that analyses? That entity is still part of thought. That entity is the receptacle, or the vessel of previous experiences, previous examinations, previous analysis, he separates himself from that which is taking place and then he says, "I will analyse". But if you observe carefully, giving your sensitive awareness to it, then you will see that the observer, the analyser is the analysed. Anger is not different from me. I am anger. But I have separated myself from anger and said, "I must control it, I must shape it, I must rationalize it" and so on. One hopes this is clear. If you are not used to this kind of thinking, observing, perhaps we had better go over it again. Because most of us are so accustomed, fall into the habit of analysis.

We are saying that analysis takes time. And in that analysis there are a great many deceptive activities going on. So can you observe what is order, and what is disorder? Just to observe it. That is - you see most unfortunately everything has to be explained. We don't jump to it, see it quickly. It has to be put into so many words, so many explanations. But the word, the explanation, is not the thing. You may paint a picture of the most beautiful mountain, that picture is not the mountain. The flowing waters in paint on a canvas, is not the living waters.

So we are together understanding, trying to find out, what is order, and disorder. We said, there is disorder as long as there is conflict, as long as there are in us the contradictions, the want and not want, the desire and the opposite of that desire. In that we are caught - wanting and not wanting - to put it very, very simply, though it is a very complex problem. It is cultivating the opposites,

in that there is conflict, and that is disorder.

Now to find this out, go into it much deeper, one has to go into the whole question of desire, because human beings have lived with this desire for life, for everything, desire. Are we together in all this? Or the speaker is going on on his own and you are there sitting under the shade of a tree, under the beautiful leaves, enjoying this sun and having a sun bath! You are enjoying the sun bath and all that - this is hardly the place. But if you are really concerned as a human being, and feel responsibility for the whole world not merely for your family, for your children - and one doubts whether you really feel responsible even there. Thousands and thousands of children are running away from home, beaten, tortured. All the ugly things that are going on.

And if this crisis in our consciousness is really a deep fundamental sacred challenge - one is using the word 'sacred' in its real sense - sacred challenge, then we as human beings must respond to it. Or if you cannot we will destroy each other, which is going on now. The competition between powers, the two powers, each wanting to be top of the other. And that is going on even with the smallest country. This is an odd fact, the world is imitating America. I don't know if you have noticed it. Probably it is the easiest country to imitate. Don't be angry with what I am saying, or be irritated, but observe it. What are we giving to the world apart from grain, the materials of war, scientific know-how which other countries are now almost equal in their knowledge, laser destruction, atomic bombs - what else are we Americans giving to the world? Please look at it carefully. And what is the world giving to you? Nothing. Because we are losing the deep substance of our

own depth of understanding. We are losing our freedom, institutions and organizations have taken this over. And all this is adding so much confusion, so much destruction, misery in the world. I don't think we realize what we are doing. And, if one may point out most seriously, to understand all this confusion, this misery, this sorrow, this agony, this loneliness of human beings, we must go into the question of desire.

Man apparently has never been able to understand and go very deeply into this problem: desire. They have learnt to suppress it, or let it run. They have learnt every form of expression of desire - sexual, desire to possess, desire to deny, desire to become powerful, the desire to become a non-entity - you know this whole drive of desire. And the various religions have said, the monks throughout the world must transmute desire by offering themselves, surrendering themselves to a symbol, to a person, to a saviour, to an idea. That's what the monks are all doing throughout the world. But inwardly they are burning with desire. And we too, every human being in the world, is consumed by it. We have never been able to understand and comprehend the nature of desire, not - please listen carefully, what I am saying may be very dangerous unless you understand it very, very deeply. We are saying, mere control of desire is not intelligent, nor the suppression of it, nor the escape from it. But in the understanding of desire, which is a very complex subtle process, in the very understanding of that desire it has its own discipline. Discipline being - please listen - the learning of the whole movement of desire, how desire arises, what is its nature, how it operates. In the fulness of that understanding, order in desire comes.

Now we are going together please, you and the speaker together are going to investigate patiently, step by step, into the nature of desire. When one learns - or rather when one perceives, sees the movement of desire, how it arises, the whole complexity of it, then out of that understanding desire does not create confusion.

So we are enquiring into order, disorder and desire. Desire has created disorder, each one desiring something different from another, pursuing that desire through pleasure, pain, you know, all the rest of it. So we are trying together to understand how desire arises, and when it is controlled, who is the controller, and is the controller different from that which he desires? We are going to go into all that.

I do not know if you have observed anything, the mountains, the hills, the valleys, the beautiful trees, with all your senses. Please as you are sitting under these trees, dappled light, observe, if you can see, the trees, the hills, with all your senses totally awakened. Or you merely observe either visually, or observe through words, or if you have ever observed with all the attention, which means with all the senses totally awakened. When you look at the sea, the blue Pacific, the light, the sparkling waters, and the far reaching waves, do you observe it, or you merely say, how beautiful it is, and you are so anxious to reach your goal? So we hardly ever observe anything with with all our senses fully awakened. That's real sensitivity. And when you so observe with all the senses there is no centre from which you observe. This is not something mysterious, something you got from me - just observe for yourself and you will see. Our senses inform the brain whether it is pleasant or unpleasant, painful or not painful, and so on. So senses are very

important. But those senses are destroyed by drugs, alcohol, tobacco, over indulgence, with impatience. So senses help to observe. That is, first you perceive with your senses, then there is a contact, then there is a sensation. Right? Are we meeting each other? Come on, sirs!

The seeing, the contact, then from that contact sensation. Then - please observe closely for yourself, don't accept what the speaker is saying ever, but look at it for yourself - seeing, touching, the sensation. Then thought creates the image, and at that moment desire is born. Right? It is very simple. Explanation makes it a little complex but it is really quite simple. You see a robe, or a shirt, or trousers, or a dress in the window. Go inside, feel it, the sensation, then thought says, "How nice it would if I was in it", then desire begins. Understood? I am not telling you, you are watching it for yourself. Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought creating the image of you sitting in the car and driving it. So desire begins when thought creates the image and at that moment desire is born. Is it clear for ourselves? You are not accepting the speaker's explanation, they are merely words. They have no significance if you are merely accepting the words, but if you see it for yourself directly then you will understand - please follow this a little bit closely - then you will understand whether the seeing, contact, sensation, whether it can stop there, not create the image. You have understood? Have you captured this a little bit?

In that learning there is discipline. You understand? Not control. One of the factors of our education is that there is a controller separate from that which is controlled. That is how we live, I must control. I must discipline, I must learn. So there is always division

between the controller and the controlled. And we have been trained in that, educated from childhood. But is that a fact? That may, this division between the controller and the controlled may create more and more conflict, which it is doing. That may be totally a wrong approach to life. But if you understand, the controller is the controlled. Right? Anger, violence, for example, violence - we won't go into the nature of violence and all the rest of it - just the meaning of that word of violence, which is spreading all over the world, etc., etc. - there is violence, human beings are violent therefore I realize I am violent, you are violent. And then we say, "I must change it, I must control it, I must become non-violent" - which is one of the pet idiotic illusions. So violence is not separate from me, I am violent. I wonder if you understand that?

So if there is no separation between violence and the thought that I am different from violence, when there is no separation there is only violence. Please follow this a little bit. There is only that state of sensation which you have named as violence. To look at that, to observe that violence without the word, to observe it, not as an observer looking at violence. Move, sirs! To look at it so that the observer is not but only that thing called violence, which is a sensation as anger and so on.

Similarly, to observe the seeing, the contact, the sensation, then thought creating the image, having that dress, or that shirt, or whatever it is, which then creates the desire to possess, to deny, all that. So can the brain stop with seeing, contact, sensation, stop there, and not let thought interfere with its image. That is learning about desire. Have you got it? Has somebody got it?

So that we are freeing the brain, which has been accustomed to control, conflict, strain, all that, we are helping the brain to observe itself totally anew so that it becomes terribly alive, freed from a pattern which it has accepted for a million years. You understand?

So if there is no contradiction in desire, wanting and not wanting, knowing that to succeed one is ruthless and yet the desire to succeed. You follow, this contraction which is so apparently part of our conditioning, when you observe it you can then see without any control, without any influence, without any direction, you can see the nature of desire, and the understanding of it brings its own learning, which is its discipline. Got it?

So from that, which is, desire and time are the factors of disorder. And when you understand it really deeply, profoundly, there is complete order in one's life. Total order. Not occasionally, not a weekends, but throughout our daily life.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 12TH MAY 1981

You are all warm - the vagaries of the climate in California!

Can we start with the questions right away?

1st QUESTION: What is the relationship between intelligence and responsibility?

I wonder - one wonders what the meaning of that word 'intelligence' is. If each one of us had to give a meaning to it according to either a dictionary or one's own perception of what is intelligence, how would we put it into words? According to the dictionary it is, reading between the lines, and also gathering in, gathering in a lot of information, knowledge, and from knowledge, reason and act. A man who is very scholarly, well read, highly educated but he may not be intelligent in his action. So one must be, I think, fairly clear what we mean by that word intelligence.

To see danger and act is part of intelligence. To see psychological dangers and act immediately, that is intelligence. But if we see the danger both outwardly and inwardly and not act, that is not intelligence. To see, for example, I am taking a very simple, ordinary example, that nationality is a danger to the world, and to continue with that feeling of being a nationalist, surely that is an unintelligent way of looking at life. But to see nationality is a danger and act, would that not be intelligent? Likewise to see all the pitfalls, all the subtleties of psychological conflict, all the travail that human beings go through and not end it but keep going on year after year, year after year, that is an act of unintelligence. To see that one is hurt and be free of that hurt, and never to be hurt,

is an act of intelligence, surely.

Would that be clear? Is this clear when we talk about what we mean by intelligence? To see clearly something inwardly, psychologically. And all the traditional approaches to it have not solved our problems, but to see for ourselves very clearly and act, is an act of intelligence.

And also what is the meaning of that word responsibility, to be responsible? Responsible to your children, responsible to your husband, wife and so on, responsible not to destroy nature and so on. And also to be responsible to the whole of mankind. May I go on? That is, psychologically all human beings are more or less similar - they suffer, are anxious and so on, we have gone into that. So we are responsible as human beings for humanity, not only for being personally responsible for one's family but responsible for everything that is happening in the world: the division between the Arab and the Jew, the wars that are going on in South America, the atom bomb and so on. We are responsible for all that. I wonder if we feel that way. Or we say, yes, the problem is between the Jew and the Palestines and leave it at that. That surely is an act of not being intelligent.

And the questioner asked: what is the relationship between intelligence and responsibility. Intelligence is responsibility. In itself it is responsible for everything it does. I wonder if you see. Why do we separate responsibility and intelligence. If one is intelligent one is totally responsible. I wonder if one feels this way. Do we, as human beings, living in a monstrous world where every kind of cruelty is going on, and we know violence is part of human nature, we have accepted it, and wherever one goes violence is

apparently in the human being. And to understand violence and to be free of violence is the responsibility of any intelligent man. Do we feel such responsibility? Or is the questioner merely asking, putting a question just intellectually, verbally, for amusement, for some kind of definition? Do we, as human beings, feel totally, completely responsible for all mankind, for whatever is happening in the world?

2nd QUESTION: How does one tackle the dormant seed of fear within one? You have talked of fear several times, but it is neither possible to face fear nor to uproot it. Is it that there is another factor that operates to dissolve it? Can one do anything about it?

I hope the question is clear. Shall I read it again or is it clear? We were going to talk about it on Saturday but we will do it now.

The questioner asks, is there another factor that will dissolve, uproot the very root of fear. You are waiting for me to answer! Can we go into it together, not wait for me to answer such a question, but together investigate a very, very serious problem, and a very complex problem. This fear has been with man since time immemorial, and apparently they have not solved it. We carry, day after day until you almost die, this burden of fear. Can that fear be totally uprooted? That's the question.

And the questioner says, one has tried several different ways but somehow it doesn't disappear. Is there another factor that will help to uproot it?

Can we, sitting here, look at our fear, not only physical fears of loss, of insecurity, the fear of losing one's children, the fear, that sense of insecurity when there is divorce, there is fear of not achieving something, fulfilling. There are various forms of fear.

Fear of not being loved, fear of loneliness, fear of what happens after death, fear of heaven and hell - you know all that kind of stuff. One is so frightened of so many, many things. Now can we, each one of us, consciously, sensitively be aware of one's own fear. Do we know our own fear? It may be losing a job, not having money, death and so on. Can we look at it first, not try to dissolve it, or conquer it, or go beyond it, but to observe it. Consciously observe, sensitively the fears, or one fear that one has, a dominant fear. And there are dormant fears that are asleep, deep rooted, unconscious, way down in one's own recesses of one's own mind. Can those dormant fears, which lie deeply within one, can they be awakened and looked at now? Or must they, those dormant fears, appear only in a crisis, in a shock, in certain strong challenges? Or can one awaken the whole structure of fear? Not only the conscious fears but also the deep unconscious, those shadowy recesses of one's brain which has collected fears? Are we following all this, or am I talking to myself? Can we do that?

First, can we look at our fear? And how do we look at it? How do we face it? Suppose I am frightened - and I am not - that I cannot be saved except by some divine person, there is a deep rooted fear of two thousand years. Right? I am not even observing that fear, it is part of my tradition, part of my conditioning that I can't do anything but somebody else, an outside agency is going to help me, save me. Save me I don't know from what, but it doesn't matter. And that is part of one's fear. And of course there is the fear of death, that is the ultimate fear, and so on. Can one - can I observe a particular fear that I have, and not guide it, shape it, overcome it, try to rationalize it, it is there? Can I look at it? And

how do I observe it? Perhaps this may be rather important. Do I observe it as an outsider looking in, or do I observe it as part of me? You understand? Fear is not separate from my consciousness. Fear is not separate, something outside of me. Fear is part of me. Obviously. So can I observe that fear without the division of the observer and the observed? You understand? Are we following each other? Please do follow.

Can I observe that fear without the division that thought has created between the entity that says, 'I must face fear' - just to observe fear without that division. Is that possible? You see, our conditioning, our training, our education, our religious ambitions all point out that the two are separate - the 'me' is different from that which is not me. All right? You see we never recognize or accept the fact that violence is not separate from me. I think that may be one of the factors why we are not able to be free of fear because we are always operating on fear. Right? We are always saying to ourselves, I must get rid of it, what am I to do with it, is there a way? All the rationalization, enquiries, as though fear is something separate from the enquirer, from the person who enquires into fear. All right, can we go on, is this clear?

So can we observe fear without that division? That is, the word fear is not fear. And also see whether the word creates the fear - like the word 'communist' to many people it is a frightening word. So can we look at that thing called fear without the word, and also find out if the word is creating the fear. Are we in this together?

Then is there another factor which is not mere observation, but bringing, or having energy which will dissipate that fear, having such tremendous energy that fear doesn't exist? You understand? Is

fear a matter of lack of energy, lack of attention, and if it is a lack of energy how does one come about naturally to have this tremendous vitality, energy that pushes everything, fear away altogether? You understand? We are following each other? All right, please help me. Are we together? Do we understand so far?

So that may be the factor that will dissipate, or that energy will have no sense of fear. You see most of us dissipate our energy in constant occupation with something or other: constant occupation if you are a housewife, if you are a businessman, if you are a scientist, it doesn't matter, a careerist, you are always occupied. And such occupation may be, and is, I think, a dissipation of energy. Like the man who is perpetually occupied about meditation, perpetually occupied with the concern about whether there is god, or, you know, various forms of occupation. Is not such occupation, which is constantly thinking about it, worrying about it, concerned about it, is that not a waste of energy? If one is afraid and you say, 'I must not be afraid, what am I to do', and so on, which is another kind of occupation, and that may be one of the factors of a lack of energy. It is only a mind that is free from occupation of any kind that has tremendous energy. That may be one of the factors that may dissipate fear.

And also another factor is time. Time is fear. I wonder if you understand all this? Time, which is an interval between 'what is' and 'what should be', time between now and the end. We explained that the other day so I don't want to go into it too much. But we can see what a great part time plays in our life. The learning of a language requires time, learning about any technical subject requires time. And we also accept time in the psychological world,

in the area where the psyche functions. That is, the area where thought is constructing, building, changing, operating, reasoning, doubting - you follow - all that is the area of time also. When one says, 'I am afraid, but I will not be afraid', the future is time. So I will be, but I am not, but I will be, may the root of fear. I wonder if you understand this? Right?

Or is there a totally different factor at all? We have enquired, facing fear, actually observing it consciously, sensitively aware and without any choice, without any direction, just to watch it. And we said also the watching is important. How you watch, how you observe, if you are an outsider and observing, then you maintain the duality and then conflict arises. Right? And the other is, time is a factor of fear. And is there an energy that has no fear whatsoever? Are we coming together somewhere? Or is there an energy that sees fear and is completely free of it immediately? I wonder if you understand all this.

So: also there are the unconscious fears, the racial fears that one has inherited from time beyond time. Right? The fears of our past generations which one has inherited, which are dormant, can all these dormant, silent, hidden fears, be revealed completely, not go step by step, one fear after the other? You understand? It is possible only to reveal all the dormant fears, fears that have never been observed, never even come to the surface, can all that be totally awakened and in the very awakening of it is the ending of it. Are we moving together, or am I walking a lonely path?

You see, one of our misfortunes is that we are so clever in investigating, analyzing, we never see things immediately as a whole, a holistic perception of all fear. Please don't go to sleep, just

let's follow each other. That is, can we see psychologically the whole operation of fear in which the very observation of that, observing wholly, completely, absolutely, the dormant fears must, will inevitably come out, and observe. Are we understanding each other? You see most of us are concerned with trimming fear, like you trim trees, so most of us want to trim fears. And we think that is good enough, but we never challenge ourselves whether it is possible to be completely free of fear. One may have done things wrong in the past, that also brings fear. Look at it, face it.

You see most of us do not demand of ourselves to be free; to be free of these burdens which we have inherited from time past, fear and so on, to say, can my brain be ever free of fear. And questioning it, asking it, demanding it, that needs a certain persistency, a certain sense of immediacy. But we are not like that at all.

Has the question been answered? Or are you still waiting for it to be answered? I think we have energy to meet this holistically, see the whole movement of fear: time, the negligence, our laziness, our acceptance of fear as part of life, all that implies a certain inertia. We don't meet this thing completely so we are always living with it. Isn't that enough?

I stop here now before we go onto the next question because they have to change the tape, and we have to sit for several minutes, do what we like.

Q: I wanted to ask you one thing. What are you waiting to hear?

K: What am I waiting to hear? I don't quite follow your question.

Q: You are asking us a question, do you want an answer?

K: No, no. We are answering questions. I am not waiting for anything.

Q: I just wanted to say that energy knows no fear.

K: I didn't say that, sir.

Q: Well, that is what it feels like to me. I say that energy which knows no fear and no time and no obstacle, no frictions, is always here.

K: Is this a speculative question, or statement?

Q: No, sir. I am saying what it feels like to me. I wanted to say also that it seems as if it is not here, whereas if it is something we have to go somewhere else for, or make some effort for, because our minds are always dissipating it.

K: Yes, sir, that is what we said earlier.

Q: I think it is important for us to realize, it seems to me, I am not speaking for anyone else.

K: Yes, sir. I understand.

Q: That we can all find it, if we only look, see how important it is to look at it. The energy of our life.

Q: What is beauty?

K: I thought we were going to be quiet!

Q: May I go on a bit more sir?

K: No, sir.

Q: All right.

K: No, sir. Afterwards. Right? Can we go on with our questions?

3rd QUESTION: How would you define and value the quality of modesty?

The word modesty means self-abnegation. Right? Not to be

assertive. We are examining the word. Not to show oneself off, both physically or psychologically. To be modest, which is implied in that word a certain quality of shyness, reserve, not to be obtrusive. Right? The meaning of that word is all that. Apparently in the world modesty has disappeared. Right? Everybody wants to be assertive, showing off, half naked. You know what is happening in the cinema, the cinema world, and in the television. Apparently we are losing that, or have lost it, or have never had it. Isn't it important to be modest? Not always asserting, aggressive, I say this, and you say. You follow? I want this. Isn't it important to be unobtrusive? The speaker at the moment is not, he is obvious, sitting there. But if that quality of modesty, which disregards totally all reputation, disregards totally the self as being important, then it is surely utter lack of intelligence. Why has the world, specially the American world, lost this sense of modesty? Would you answer it?

Q: It is a sign of mental illness.

K: It is a form of mental illness, it is a form of neurosis, it is a form of self-exhibition.

Q: Modesty is beauty.

K: Modesty is beauty? What are you saying? Sir, please if you all talk. Are we modest? You have to find the word. To be self-restrained, to be somewhat shy, not self-assertive, not trying to say, me first, look at my body first. You know what is happening in this world, especially in this country. I am not criticizing, I am just observing. Everybody wants to be somebody, get into the newspapers, television. You follow? You know what is happening. Isn't modesty part of beauty? Doesn't that require a great sense of

self-abnegation? But when one is wanting to be a great success, to be known, to be a star, famous, sell more books. You know the whole thing. Apparently we have lost that and therefore we have become rather vulgar, insensitive. And if one is not modest you have lost a tremendous lot of life.

4th QUESTION: Show me how to dissolve the 'I', the 'me'.
Without that everything else is futile.

The questioner says, show me. One can point out various ways of denying totally the self, the 'me', the selfishness, the self-centred activity, but apparently man has tried so many different ways - religiously, politically, accepting the State and adjusting, you know, all that, apparently man has not been able to totally deny or put away the whole nature and the structure of the self.

Let's look at it first, why self has become so important, why me first. And many people have tried through meditation, through the repetition of idiotic words, tried to be free of all this self. So why has man given such extraordinary importance to the self, why you - forgive me if I talk to you directly - why do you give importance to the self? Has it become a habit? Is it that we are encouraged from childhood? Is it that all religions have maintained that the self exists but identify that self with something greater? You know all that business. And is it that if one feels that there is no self there is nothing? And one is afraid of being nothing.

So the questioner says, show me, help me how to be free of this torture of the self. It is a torture, it is a battle that is going on outwardly and inwardly. The self can have no relationship with anybody. The self in its very nature is an isolating process. And it may be an abstraction, not actual reality - reality in the sense that

can be touched, looked at objectively. Is it a series of structures put together by thought? Because the self, the 'me', the egotistic action is tearing the world apart. Perhaps we don't see that. That self identifies itself as a Jew, as a Hindu, as a Muslim, as a Christian, as a scientist. And so in the very nature of the self its movement is to be isolated. Are we meeting together?

And the questioner says: what am I to do. I know all this. I have thought a great deal about all this, I have tried different ways, I have meditated, tried to control, tried to deny myself of everything, but it is still there. Have you played with all this, some of you? If you have, then the question is, what is one to do. It may be that there is nothing to be done. Do you understand the question.

Through complete negation there is positive action. I wonder if you understand all this. To negate. But we are afraid to negate because we have identified ourselves with our body, the perpetual concern over the body, yoga, exercise, beauty, facial, you know, long hair, short hair, beard and no beard, go through the various fads that one goes through, all this is sustaining the self. And in meditation the controller is the self. I wonder if you see all this.

So what is one to do? One has tried ten thousand ways, one has tried many, many way to be free of this torture, this isolating process of the 'me'. I don't know if you have tried it, probably not. But to do it demands tremendous alertness, watchfulness, attention. And in the self there is great pleasure. The saints have done that; self control, self torture, but at the end of it all there is this self deeply rooted. And is it ever possible to have no shadow of the self? Which means no isolation; which doesn't mean, 'I am the whole', you follow, all those tricks. To have a sense of honest,

absolute feeling that there is no isolation. Please don't go after the other, which is, 'I am the whole, therefore I am not isolated', which is just another trick of thought. The other day there was a letter in which a man said, 'I am truth, you are part of me, and you don't accept me therefore you are not whole' - you follow? Such nonsense that goes on!

So is it possible to eliminate altogether the feeling of isolation? And that may be love. And that may be the one central factor that totally dissipates the self. But that word love is such a misused word, it has been spat upon, made into such an ugly thing. I love my husband but I fight with him. I love with my wife, but I can't tolerate her, I must have a divorce. You know all that. I love my country, therefore I am ready to kill everybody else. I love god and I will torture anybody who doesn't believe in god. The Catholics have been experts at that. So that word is something very sacred - not the word but the content, the depth and the beauty and the utter reality of it, that is sacred. And if we haven't that, like the questioner says, everything else is futile. Then you might say, how am I to have that love? You can't, it isn't something that you cultivate, day after day being kind, generous, doing social work, going off to some unfortunate country and helping the poor and all that. You see that is one of our strange things, we have lost all reverence. It may be a bourgeois idea. We won't go into that for the moment.

That may be the only factor, the only thing that totally completely dissolves the self. Not, I love everybody. That's again another trick of the brain. I love one therefore I can love all. That's another. But to have the beauty of it in your heart, not in the word,

not in the form. And when there is no sense of isolation then the other perhaps is, and then the self is not. When that is the other is not.

5th QUESTION: You have defined both insight and enlightenment as a clear perception of the whole without the observer. But many of us have had insight without being enlightened, so what is the difference between insight and enlightenment? And what prevents insight from being enlightenment?

I don't know who made this statement. The speaker certainly has not. The speaker has said, has acclaimed what is insight, never what is enlightenment. You can describe enlightenment but the description is not the reality. And any person who says, 'I am enlightened' - you know what that means!

So the question really is: the scientists have insight, but it is partial, the musicians have insight, it is still partial, many of us insight, quick perception of something, a quick perception and action, many of us sometimes have it, but that is all partial. Insight means insight into our daily life and action. I may, as a scientist, have an insight into certain factors of matter, but my life may be shoddy, ambitious, full of anxiety, dependency. Insight means insight into the whole movement of life, not just one part of it.

An insight can only take place when thought is absent as memory. Think it out. It is not the result of calculation, mathematical conclusions. Perception without the past, seeing the thing completely. Like when you see, for example, that all accepted established religion, all, whether it is in India, here or anywhere else, is what it is. When you have an insight of that kind

you are free of all dogma, rituals, beliefs, faith, you don't belong to any group, to any guru. Such insight is possible only when you are really attentive, your whole being wants to find out.

I think we had better stop now, don't you.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 14TH MAY 1981

I suppose I have to answer all these questions. I wonder if we put these questions to ourselves seriously would we be able to answer them all truly, authentically, not quote somebody else but answer them for oneself. And the answer must be true, applicable. And to answer it correctly one must have a certain amount of integrity and a quality of humility that goes with integrity. So let's together ask these questions and find out for ourselves the right and accurate answer. Not according to the speaker but find out for ourselves the truth of the answer, the truth of the question and the answer.

1st QUESTION: Imagination and words are the tools that man uses to function in daily life. Is it really possible to achieve an attention so constant, and alert, that one can always see the fine line between the necessary use of thought and where images lead to illusion and conflict?

I hope this question is not too intellectual and is applicable to our life.

Why does one create images about others, about oneself, have images about others and about oneself, and images that we worship, the symbols that we think are sacred, the whole network of philosophical construction of words, ideas and ideals and so on? Why do we always create images? I do not know if one realizes what an important part images have played in our lives. The temples are filled with them, the churches, the mosques. In the Islamic world the mosque has no images, but beautiful writing, which is a symbol, the same thing. So why does man create images

either by the hand, or by the mind, by the brain? And the questioner wants to know, is it really possible to achieve an attention so constant and alert that one can always see the fine line between the necessary use of thought and where images lead to illusion and conflict.

Do we understand the question? I am not quite sure I understand it myself. I am glad such a question is put. You see we always use words to communicate. There are many means of communication with each other: through words, through a gesture, through a look, through a slight movement of the head; there is always this communication going on and through words and so on. And words have played an extraordinary part in our lives. First of all, is there thought without words, without images, without constructing symbols? Is there a thought without words and so on? You understand my question? Or words are part of thought? And if one observes our whole mode of thinking is a network of words, symbols, ideas. Right? Are we moving together?

And what is the division, the questioner asks, between thought, the necessary use of thought, the necessary use of knowledge, skill, born of knowledge, and the line between that and the image making that leads to various forms of illusions and conflict. Are we understanding the question together? The question seems rather difficult, doesn't it.

Are we asking where is the line between thought and the action of images, symbols? Are we asking what part imagination plays in life? Is not imagination necessary? I am investigating the question? Is not the capacity to imagine the beauty of the hills as a painter, as a poet, with their extraordinary capacity to imagine and put into

words, the painter and so on, is not imagination necessary? And does imagination play a part in our daily life? And if it does, is that imagination put together by thought, a tool which we can use skilfully? You are following? Right? Is it too cold?

A poet, a writer, a painter, a sculptor and so on, they must have imagination, otherwise they can't write, but is imagination necessary in our life, daily life? Or imagination prevents, or fancy prevents the actual perception of what is going on? You understand? Is it not more important to understand what actually is going on in our daily life without all the imaginative idealistic suppositions, 'ifs' and 'whens', actually observe what is going on. Isn't that far more important than having great imagination? If one can observe attentively what is going on, then that very attention throws a light on 'what is'. Throws a light on 'what is', and that light of attention clarifies the problem. Right? Are we meeting, are we thinking together about this, reasoning together? Not accepting what the speaker says, but actually reasoning together to see what place has imagination and where that imagination brings about illusion, which prevents actual understanding of 'what is'. Is this clear?

I am afraid - suppose - and I imagine a state of mind when there is no fear. That imagination becomes very important for me because it offers an escape from actual fear. I live in that. Living in that imagination is an illusion, not actual. And that capacity to imagine some state of mind, or heart, when there is absolutely no fear, it gives me a certain sense of vitality, a certain neurosis, a certain fanciful way of living which is not actual. So perhaps such imagination prevents me from looking directly at fear. And looking

at it with complete attention reveals the whole nature of fear. And from that understanding of that attention fear begins to disappear. But if I have imagination about a state of mind, a state of heart, where there is absolutely - a delightful state where there is no fear, I am a bit loony!

So imagination has a certain value for the poets, artists, for the artists, but art - really art means to place everything in the right place. That's the true meaning of that word 'art: to put everything in its proper place. But the poets, the painters and the artists lead a pretty hectic life, a life of conflict. You know all that goes on with those artists, the great and the so-called artists. So we are concerned with the life of our daily life.

And the questioner asks, is it really possible to achieve an attention so constant and alert, that one can always see the fine line between the necessary use of thought and where images lead to illusion? You understand now the question? Right? Do we understand the question? Where to draw the line between the necessary use of thought and where images lead to conflict and illusion. And is it possible to sustain a constant state of attention, alertness, where thought has its place, which is skill, born of knowledge as a carpenter, plumber, scientist, and a state of mind that is constantly in total attention. That's the question. Right?

So we have to enquire what it is to be aware. We will go into it slowly and come to the point what it means to be completely attentive. Are we ever aware, not only of what is going on in the world but also what is going on inwardly, aware? That is, are we aware, as we sit here, of the trees, the nature of the limbs, the boughs, the beauty of it, are we aware of the hills, the mountains,

the slopes and all that? And that is perhaps fairly easy. But are we also aware of what is going on inwardly - our thoughts, our feelings, our peculiar attitude towards life, convictions? And if we are aware can we be aware without any choice? Are we following each other? To look, to observe, without any choice. Right? Is that possible? It is possible only when we understand how choice has become very important in life. Choice of profession, choice of jobs, choice of so-called woman, man, choosing, choice of so many things. We choose between this material and that material. So choice plays a great part in our life. That's clear, obviously. A better taylor, better shirt, you follow, the whole business of it. Choice at a certain level is necessary, between a good car and bad car. But when there is choice psychologically, inwardly, does it not indicate confusion? Please look at it for a moment. If there is clarity there is no choice. Right? I wonder if you see that. It's only when we are confused, uncertain, we begin to choose. Right? Isn't this logical? But is it very difficult to be clear? Clarity, not about politics and politicians and all that business, but inwardly to be so absolutely clear so that your action is never born out of confusion, out of choice. Is that at all possible? And we are saying that is only possible when thought finds its own right place. Right, are you following all this? Right place in the sense I must know how to drive a car. Knowledge is necessary in order to speak English, French, or Spanish or Italian. Or if there is to be a career I must have knowledge about it. There knowledge is absolutely necessary. And psychologically we feel knowledge is also necessary. To know somebody, to know your wife or your husband, to know. So can you know ever about your wife or your husband? You cannot

know a living thing. Right? I wonder if you understand all this.

So psychologically when we say, 'I must know myself' - please understand this a bit - when we say, I must know myself, one means by it I must accumulate knowledge about myself. Right? Which is the same as the other. Right? To become a good carpenter - I would prefer to be a carpenter rather than a professional, scientist or big shots - to be a good carpenter I must know a great deal about wood, tools and so on; and I carry the same mentality when I say, 'I must know myself', which means I must gather a lot of information about myself. Are you following this? So that I can act rightly, or skilfully, or whatever it is. So can I know myself ever completely according to knowledge? You follow this? Or myself is so subtle, so constantly changing, moving, acting, it is never the same? Right? But I would like it to be always the same. I wonder if you follow all this? So I create an image about myself which is static and I act according to that. So knowing oneself is not accumulating knowledge about oneself, but to be aware of all what is happening with complete attention so that there is no accumulation of knowledge about myself but the movement of myself.

Are we understanding each other? I want to know myself, which is very important. The ancient Greeks talked about it, the ancient Hindus also went into it, the Buddhists, but the religious world of the western world, hasn't gone into this question of 'know yourself'. They have talked about it but they haven't gone very deeply into it. Now we have tried to know about ourselves according to some philosophers, some analysts, psychologists and so on, so we are learning about ourselves from others. Whereas the

others are ourselves. You understand? I wonder if you see this. So to know myself I can only observe it in my relationship to another. There, I perceive all my reactions. Right? All my desires, all my conflicts, I perceive it there. Relationship acts as a mirror in which I see myself actually as I am. If we make that mirror a thing which becomes merely images, imagery, then it leads to illusion. So can one be aware of oneself without any choice, and that awareness moves into attention when there is no border, when there is no limited perception of me watching. You understand?

Has one ever given attention, complete attention to anything? Now, are you now listening to this speaker, poor chap, are you giving complete to what you are hearing? And if you so give your complete attention, which means you hear the word, you understand the fullness of the meaning of that word, and the word is not important but the meaning and the content of the word and giving your complete attention, with your nerves, with your ears, with your eyes, with all your energy, then you will see, if you do, there is no 'me' attending. There is no centre from which you are attending, only there is attention. Have you understood this?

So it is only that there can be constant alertness and attention when one has really understood very, very deeply the nature of thought - which we have explained a dozen times. Sorry to have taken half an hour over this question.

2nd QUESTION: I am a writer and I feel responsibility and an urge to voice my understanding. Yet I know my understanding is imperfect, limited. What is right action for one who sees or understands something and is in a position to be heard but whose understanding isn't total?

Most of us are not writers, most of us are not in a position to be heard by the public, by many. But I have heard certain things from the speaker, or from my own perception, from my own watchfulness of the world and so on, and I see my understanding is limited. And what am I to do in my life when my understanding is imperfect, I must act. Right? I must do, but my understanding of life is very limited. Right? Now is that a fact? Or I say, my understanding is limited - you are following this - is it an actual fact that my understanding is limited? Then if my understanding is limited and I realize actually it is limited, my expression will be as limited, incomplete as my understanding. I have heard the speaker for many years, unfortunately, and I have gathered some things from him and I know it is incomplete, it is not a total comprehension of the whole of life, but it is limited, my understanding. So I know it is limited, I am not pretending it is not limited, I acknowledge to myself that it is limited, so I express myself in a limited way, and I acknowledge it is a limited way. You understand all this? There is no pretension about it.

And if I am a writer and I happen to be famous enough to be heard, by the public, and I realize also my understanding of life is limited, imperfect, not complete, naturally I am going to express myself because I am a writer, I want to be heard. And I also say to myself, and to the audience who are going to read, my understanding is limited. You understand what that word means? The public wants everything complete. Right? They want somebody who says, 'I understand the whole of it.' And if a writer says, 'Look, my understanding of life is limited', his publisher - you know! But a writer, his responsibility lies in absolutely having

integrity. That's where his responsibility is. I don't know if you are following all this. I am not saying the questioner has not integrity but, sir, to be honest, having integrity, there one can be total, complete. To have complete integrity without any pretension, without any double talk, that demands humility, modesty and a certain clarity.

Shall we stop now for about seven minutes for the tape to be changed. Right sir?

3rd QUESTION: What is the role of the question in life?

That is, what is the role of questioning in life. Clear? Do we ever question fundamentally? Or only superficially? Or only when there is some kind of trouble then we begin to question? But that questioning is trying to find an answer to the problem. And the questioner wants to know, what is the role of always questioning. Has it any importance? When do we ever question seriously, apart from a crisis? You understand? When there is a crisis, when there is a trouble, when we are in pain, suffering and then we begin to question. That questioning is perhaps seeking a way out of pain, sorrow, trouble and so on. We do question then. But the questioner also wants to know, what is the role, what part questioning plays in life. Not at moments of crises but the questioning mind. Is it clear?

Do you ever question, investigate which is part of questioning, into your own experiences, into your own desires, into your own opinions, evaluations, convictions, or do you take those for granted and only question when there is actual trouble? You understand my question? Are our minds enquiring, watching, recollected, aware? You understand? Or only superficially? And is not questioning important? Questioning your beliefs, your faith. You know what

would happen if you questioned your faith, specially in the western world? You understand? Your religious faith, if you questioned. The whole thing would collapse. And is one frightened to question? Which is the mind, the brain specially, is always seeking a position of safety where it can be secure. I don't know if you have observed all this for yourself. A child needs to be secure, it needs the mother, the father to love it, so that it feels completely secure, protected. Up to a certain point the mothers and fathers do that, up to a certain point. But they soon get bored with whatever they do, they have their own interests, their own problems, their own travail and gradually the child, the boy or the girl, is neglected, goes off. So one discovers the brain needs security to function. Right? To be a good physicist, to have all the knowledge of physics gives the brain a certain quality of assurance, of safety, protection. Right? And the more you question along that line, the more you learn, the more safe it becomes. Are you following? Come on sirs. We understand all this.

So it is finding safety in knowledge, like a good surgeon, he has operated a hundred times, he knows, and his brain is active along that line, secure - it gives money, position, you know, all that. So it gives the brain a certain quality of limited security. Right? So knowledge becomes important as a means to be safe. And that knowledge, as we have pointed out many times, is always limited, all knowledge is always limited. And therefore the questioning becomes very limited. Right? Naturally.

If one is not a specialized entity, if one observes that security is necessary for the brain, to have food, clothes, you know, a house, it is secure, but having that security, physical security, the brain

demands psychological security - security in relationship, security in ideas, security in faith and so on. We never question those. You are following? Right? We are saying now, to have a mind that is questioning, investigating, never caught in a limited understanding, questioning, in that there is a great deal of intelligence. From that arises intelligence, and that intelligence is security. I wonder if you understand all this. Are we together in all this, or am I just talking? Right? Shall we go on to the next question?

4th QUESTION: Life separates friends through death, and physical separation. Is this separation the end of relationship, leaving nothing more real than memory? Is there love between people only when they are physically present? Or can there be something more than thought when they are absent? Is all relationship momentary with no lasting bond?

Lord! There are so many questions involved in this one question. So let's take one by one.

Life separates friends through death and physical separation. Is this separation the end of relationship, leaving nothing more than memory? That's an actual fact, isn't it? Right? I am separate from my wife, I may go off travelling. My wife remains in India, or in Britain, or here, and I think about her, telephone her, I write to her, and so I keep up communication. Right? It is based on memory. I don't quite see what the problem is there, that's an actual fact, leaving nothing more than memory.

Is there love between people only when they are physically present, or can there be something more than thought when they are absent? This is the real question. Is there love between people only when they are physically present, or can there be something

more than thought when they are absent? My golly!

Now let's go into it. If we understand very deeply and very clearly the nature of thought, which is, if I may repeat again, thought is the outcome of memory, the response of memory. Memory is born out of knowledge, knowledge is out of experience. Right? This is the cycle: experience, knowledge, memory, action and from that action learn more, so have more experience, knowledge, memory, action. It's a circle, a chain in which we are operating. That's how our thinking is going on all the time. So we must be very clear of the nature of thinking. It is a material process. There is nothing whatsoever sacred about it. Right? Please don't accept this. If you accept it then you don't see the whole meaning of it, unless you have gone very deeply into it. Everything thought has created in the world, technologically, computers, and all the rest of that, the atom bomb, all the things in the temples, the mosques, the churches, are put together by thought. Right? So the symbols, the images, these temples contain, there is nothing sacred about it. Right? But thought, having created it, then thought makes it appear sacred. Right? Examine it please, don't accept it, don't get angry, just look at it.

And is the movement of thought love? That is what the questioner is asking. The questioner says, is there love between people only when they are physically present, or can there be something more than thought when they are absent. So if thought is the only movement in relationship, thought with its images about each other, if that is the only relationship that we have, then what place has love? You are following? Is love the image that we have created about each other in that relationship, pleasant, unpleasant,

all the travail of relationship, and in that relationship when there is this conflict, each one acting separately, wanting to fulfil his own desires, his own lust and so on, each one separate and trying to fulfil in his own separate ways - ambition, aggressiveness, greed, you know all that goes on - is there love? And then what is love? Is it put together by thought? Go on, sir, answer all this. Is love desire? Is love the pursuit of self-fulfilment? Is love the pursuit of pleasure? You understand, that is what is happening in the world? And so when that is missing altogether, or perhaps happens rarely, occasionally, then thought is the only means of communicating with each other - telephone, writing letters, thinking about your wife or your friend, you know all that takes place.

So what is one to do? You understand my question? I realize thought has become so extraordinarily important in life, in the business world, in the technological world, in the economic world, and in the world of religion - all the rituals are put together by thought, the dogmas, the faith, everything is based on thought. Thought made through tradition holy. And when one realizes very deeply that thought is not that flame which purifies everything else, how is one to capture it, to hold it, to have it, you understand my question? Are you following me? Now that becomes a problem. Right? And my brain - listen to it carefully - my brain is trained to solve problems. In the technological world it has been trained year after year to solve technical problems - the atom bomb, computers, and so on. And my brain has been educated to solve psychological problems. So I am faced with this question, which is, I know thought is not all that we have said - and I also know without the other life becomes very shallow. So I have a problem. Follow this.

I have a problem. Right? You understand this? So I am ready to solve it. My brain is active to solve it. Whereas love is not a problem to be solved. You understand? The problem is not thought and love, but the problem is this tremendous egotistic, egocentric movement going on all the time. That is the real problem. And so I begin again trying to solve it. I never say, just the problem, let's look at it. I am not going to solve it, let's look at it. I wonder if you are following all this? Don't let me make it into a problem, but let me first look at it, let me look at the whole movement of thought, and also as I don't know the other, perhaps I know it very rarely like a beautiful flower which withers so quickly, I know something of it, but the knowledge of it is not the real thing, so I look, I am aware of thought - rather, not 'I am aware of thought' - thought begins to be aware of itself. You begin to understand this? Are you all asleep?

And the thing is never to make a problem of anything. I wonder. This one thing if we could understand. It is only a mind that has no problems that can solve problems. You have understood? But we have so many problems and we try to solve other problems and so keep on multiplying problems. So we never ask of ourselves, if it is possible to have no problems. But there are problems; but to meet them instantly and finish with them so that the mind, the brain is free from all conflict, problems.

Is all relationship momentarily with no lasting bond? That's part of the question, sorry. I missed that. Is all relationship momentary with no lasting bond? What do you mean by that word 'bond'? Bondage? Depending on each other, holding on to each other? Is that what relationship is, the establishment of a constant lasting

bond? Is that what relationship is? I am asking you sirs. Or is relationship something entirely different in which there is no bondage, in which there is no dependency? Which means deep inward sense of freedom and integrity and you follow, having this love. Then love is not bondage.

5th QUESTION: One sees the fact that the essential response to the conflict in the world is a revolution in consciousness, in each individual, but does this mean that without that total action all other lesser but perhaps helpful actions are useless?

One sees the fact that the essential response to the conflict in the world is a revolution in consciousness, in each individual. As we have explained very carefully, and I hope we can go into again if one is not clear on this point, our consciousness with its content is the common ground of all humanity. Right? Your consciousness, which is your education, your beliefs, your convictions, your values, your greed, your suffering, your pain, your anxiety, uncertainty, joy, pleasure, is common to all mankind. Right? Is that not so? Or are we uncertain about that? Go to India, go to Japan, go over to Russia, Europe or here, every human being goes through great sorrow, every human being has conflict, pain, physical, psychological, is wounded, every human being is uncertain, confused, violent, pleasure-seeking. That is the common consciousness of man. Right? It is not your consciousness, or my consciousness. This is very difficult to see, to see this fact because we are all so trained, educated and we take delight in an illusion called, 'My consciousness is different from everybody else's'. Right? Is this so, or not? You won't accept this.

So the revolution is the crisis and its answer is a total revolution

in consciousness, which is the ending of fear, the understanding of the whole nature of pleasure which man has pursued endlessly, this sense of anxiety, uncertainty, desperate loneliness, sorrow, death; that is the content of our consciousness. That content makes our consciousness. Right? May we go on from there?

And is it possible to be free of its content? And, as we explained on many occasions, the philosophers, the psychologists, all those people say it is not possible, human nature can never radically be transformed because mankind has lived for five, ten million years, and look, he has not changed radically, so accept what is. You understand? Modify it, control it, educate it to be a little better behaved and so on and so on, but remain within the limits of that. You are following all this? So meditation is within the limits of that. Seeking god, truth, is within the limits of that. And somebody comes along, like the speaker, says, no, it is possible to radically transform that consciousness. Which means, first one must realize that you are not separate from the rest of mankind, you are mankind. Therefore you are not an individual. Right? You see, if you see that it is already a revolution. Right? It's already changed the pattern of thought altogether. Which means you are the world, and the world is you. That's just not a theory, not an ideal, an Utopia, but it's an absolute fact. And therefore you become terribly responsible for everything that is happening in the world.

But does this mean that without that total action, that total revolution, all other lesser and perhaps helpful actions are useless? Answer it for yourself! We never face the truth. We never face facts. We try to cover them up, run away from them, but when you realize that the next questions is answered for itself.

6th QUESTION: I am appalled at what is happening in society today. I do not want to be a part of it, yet I realize I am not separate. What is my relationship to society?

What is your relationship to society? Why do you, if one may ask most respectfully, why do you separate yourself from society? Society is an abstraction, is it not? Society is put together by man in his relationship with another. Right? Are you following? But we have said, I am separate from society, and so I act upon society, I want to change society. It is something abstract, it is not an actually. Society is opinion, judgement, the economics, the political activity, all of that is part of what you call society. That society is built by us, by our parents, grandparents, all that is built by us. So we are that. This is so. Is this also another revolution? Society is not separate from me, I am the society. I am not saying - the speaker is not saying this because he is a communist, or any of that kind of thing. The communists have maintained this as a theory, and as a theory they have said, change society, control it, shape it, become a dictator, totalitarian then man will change. You know all that business. Whereas on the contrary man has created it, unless man changes society cannot change. Unless the computers come along with their robots and change the whole structure of the economic society. You follow all this?

So one is not separate from society. One is the world. If one realizes that you would never put this question.

Then the problem is - the question is, what am I to do, how am I to radically transform myself. That's the real question. How am I not to be self-centred everlastingly, all self-centred activity come to an end? We never ask these questions. So at your leisure moments

please ask these questions. When you are not totally occupied with your pleasures, with your occupations, with wanting to be somebody, success, you know all the rest of it, perhaps you will have time to ask this question. Ask it and remain with it, remain with the question, then see what happens. Because if you say, 'I must change myself', who is the man, who is the entity that is demanding change? It is still - you understand all this. So one discovers that the thinker is the thought. There is no thinker apart from thought, there is no experiencer apart from experience, there is no analyzer apart from the analysis, that which is analyzed. So when you realize that there is a totally different movement takes place.

Are you all tired? One last question. Thank the lord!

7th QUESTION: There is a deep root of violence in me. I know it is there behind my other feelings. How do I deal with it?

What is violence? The shooting of people? That's part of violence. The hurting of others? That is part of violence. War is the essence of violence, with its bestiality, cruelty, the appalling things war does. And anger, hate, imitation is violence, conformity is violence. I don't know if you follow all this. And is one aware of all this in oneself, that one is conforming all the time to a pattern, to an ideal, to a concept, imitating, comparing oneself with another, aggression. Is one aware of all this as violence? Or only the killing of somebody with a gun? You understand? Is it not violence when you believe very strongly in something and another believes equally strongly about some belief, and you are trying to convert the other, and the other is trying to convert you, conflict. Is that not violence? This hectic propaganda that is going on in the name of

religion, in the name of everything, is that not violence? You see you limit violence to a very small affair.

So what is one to do, the questioner asks. First, if one may point out, don't create its opposite, which is non-violence. Right? I wonder if you understand. Do you want an explanation of this? That is, I am violent and I have been trained, that is part of my habit to say, 'I must not be violent'. You follow? I am violent, and I have created the ideal of being non-violent, so I have a conflict. You follow? Being violent and not wanting to be violent is a conflict. Right? And that very conflict is violence. I wonder if you see this. Are we communicating?

So the first realization is not to create the opposite. Right? Then I am faced with the fact, not with its opposite. The opposite has its roots in its own opposite. Right? Oh, come on! So I am faced with the reality of violence, not with the idea that I must not be violent, which is an illusion, it is not a fact. The fact is I am violent. You see how we have been trained not to deal with facts. So I realize I am violent, and I have no idea of trying to become non-violent. That's completely gone out of my blood. So I am only dealing with fact. Now how do I look at that fact? As an observer looking at something to be observed? Or, the observer himself is violent? You get the point? I wonder if you do. Are we together in this? Come on, sirs!

The man, the entity or the thought that says, I am violent, and it must be changed, or transformed to something else, and the transformer is part of that violence. There is no separate entity, superior entity who is non-violent, who is peaceful. You understand? That is another invention of thought, to escape from

the basic fact that I am violent.

So please just follow this, give a little attention, you may be tired, but just give a little attention to this. That is, there is no division between the observer and the observed. Right? There is only the fact, there is only the observation of the fact, not, 'I observe the fact'. Right? There is only the pure observation of that reaction, which in the past a word has been given to that reaction which is violence. So I realize the word is not the thing, but the actual movement of that feeling, of that reaction. And I and that reaction are not separate, that there is only reaction. This requires, you understand, very close watching. Then you will see when you come to that point, which is you are giving tremendous attention to the fact, there is attention of the fact, and that attention is like a light put on something, and that dissipates the violence. Have you got it? No, not got it from me: see the fact, see how deceptive we are, it becomes so deceptive, it's so dishonest all this.

So when you allow time to dissolve an issue, that issue increases, multiplies. It's only the mind that sees clearly acts. I've finished.

OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH MAY 1981

This morning we should go into the content of our consciousness. And we said during the last four talks that the crisis is not in politics, economics, social structure and so on, but the crisis is in our consciousness. And that consciousness is the common ground of all mankind, because all men throughout the world, wherever they live, men, women, they go through great anxieties, unhappiness, escape through various forms of amusement, the amusement may be various kinds, including religions which have become meaningless. And this crisis has to be met otherwise mankind is going to degenerate and destroy itself. I think it is obvious for any thinking man, any person who observes, who is not too self-centred, he can see what is happening in the world - the terrorism, violence, wars, and so on and so on. So the crisis is in our consciousness.

And this morning, if we may, together, together, go delicately, sensitively, into the content of our consciousness. The content makes up the consciousness. Without the content consciousness as we know it has no meaning. So we have to together, if we will, seriously, go into this content of our consciousness.

Please if one may point out we are not doing any kind of propaganda, trying to convince you of anything, trying to make you believe in something - new ideals, new Utopia - but together, and the speaker means together, explore the content of this consciousness, both that which is conscious as well as the unconscious, deeply, hidden in one's brain.

I think the first concern, or examination, should be about fear.

What is the beginning of fear; how does fear arise; and how is it to be met, and whether it is possible at all to be totally free of it, both at the conscious level as well as at the deeper layers of one's consciousness where the root of fear is? And fear is the common factor of all mankind. It is not your particular fear. You may be afraid of the dark, of your husband, of something that you have done in the past and so on and so on. This fear exists in every human being, in different forms, whether they live in Asia, India, Europe or here, even in Russia. And mankind, from time immemorial, has carried this burden of fear. Apparently they have never been able to solve the problem of fear - solve in the sense, dissolve it totally, be free from it, liberated from the tremendous burden of it. And this morning together we are going to investigate, examine very closely the nature of fear, the structure, what are the factors that bring about fear, and whether one can both psychologically and physically be completely without any shadow of fear.

One thinks it is important to understand this, if we are serious. And it is a lovely morning, with beautiful sunshine, hills, shadows, and all that, to talk about fear seems rather incongruous. But as we have gathered here for the last two weeks, I think one should give considerable attention to this question.

There are many factors that bring about fear. Either we trim the branches of fear - take one branch, one leaf of fear after another, and examine them; or find out the root of it, not merely the branches, the expression, the action of it, but rather examine very closely the beginning of it, the origin from which fear and the consequences of fear arise. If we will, not as a group therapy which

is rather unnecessary, but if you will take your own particular fear, whatever it be - death, insecurity, the sense of desperate loneliness, the sense of wanting to fulfil, the feeling of insufficiency in oneself, whatever that fear is can we first look at it, not run away from it, not substitute it by another thought, or try to avoid it, go beyond it, or try to conquer it. We are trying this morning to observe the root of it, the cause of it, the origin of it.

Most human beings throughout the world - this is one of the factors - get hurt, both physically as well as psychologically, more inwardly than outwardly. This hurt remains for the rest of one's life unless one completely dissolves it. And that is one of the factors of fear, being hurt from childhood, school, college, university and so on - if you are lucky to go through university, and I don't know why one goes through university. But there is this deep wound which may be conscious, or unconscious. And when one is wounded psychologically, inwardly, the consequences of that hurt are building a wall around oneself - I hope we are following all this together, watching your own hurt, if you are at all sensitively aware of that fact. We are all hurt from childhood in one way or another. The consequences of that hurt is to resist, is to avoid, not to be further hurt. And not to be further hurt implies to build a psychological resistance. And the consequences of that is more isolation, greater fear. That's one of the factors of fear.

The other factor is time. Time being that which has happened, might recur again, and time as future when one has no hope, when one is desperately hopeless. Time plays a great part in our lives. Time as an interval between 'what is' and 'what should be' or 'what might be', and time, an interval between now and the ending of life,

which is death. So time is a factor of fear. One of the factors. Please, we are not intellectually examining verbally. We are actually seeing ourselves, seeing the nature of our own fear, and the fear of being nobody, because everybody wants to be somebody, the fear of not being able to fulfil, not achieving, not becoming. The 'becoming' implies time. So time is a great factor in the structure of fear.

Then there is the factor of bottomless loneliness. Are we aware of this loneliness? One may have a lot of friends, a happy family and so on, but everyone knows, when one is alertly watchful, of this loneliness, from which arises depression, anxiety and fear of being lonely, utterly unrelated to anything. One is sure that one has been through all this, through this loneliness, one knows this. And being aware of this loneliness one tries to escape from it. The escape is the fear. And that escape may be the church, may be god, may be some fantasy, some imagination, some kind of belief, faith and all that, or even intellectual knowledge - to run away from this agonizing, destructive loneliness. And this loneliness is the self-centred activity, the tremendous concern about oneself - this concern to be, to become and to achieve, and so on.

And also one of the factors of this fear is attachment. I hope we are together following all this. You are not, if you don't mind the speaker pointing it out to you respectfully, you are not merely listening to a lot of words, a lot of ideas. Then if you are merely intellectually, verbally accepting these factors of fear then fear will continue. But if we are aware of our own fear sensitively then we will see that fear has many, many causes, many factors. And we are examining together these factors.

Perhaps many of you are not used to this kind of close investigation, examination. So please if you are good enough pay a little attention. It is important to learn the art of listening. We never perhaps listen to anybody except to our own pain, to our own anxiety, to our own sorrow, loneliness and so on. We never listen completely to another. And if we do listen it is a partial listening. Or when we do listen we translate, or interpret what we hear. There is the hearing with the ear, and there is a hearing with attention. So one hopes that you will so kindly listen. We are not teaching you, we are not trying to point out anything, but together looking at this factor of fear. And it is important to learn this art of hearing completely, which means giving your total attention to this question. The speaker may use these words, and the speaker may act as a mirror in which you see the fears, but the speaker and the mirror are not important, they are totally irrelevant. But what is essential, important, is to observe the fear.

And we were saying one of the factors, among others, is this attachment - why human beings are so attached to a belief, to an ideal, to an image of themselves, to some concept, to the verbal structure. And when one is attached, in that attachment, however deep, however momentary, however pleasant, in that possessiveness, which is attachment, there is fear, there is anxiety. So that is one of the factors.

And the major factor is, if you are examining closely, thought is the factor, the major factor. Thought is the remembrance of things past. Thought is the projection of what might be, or might not be. Thought is movement of time. We went into that somewhat in the past talks. Thought is the response of memory, knowledge,

experience. And thought being limited, its actions must be limited, as knowledge is always limited. And therefore knowledge is always in the shadow of ignorance. And thought creates this sense of separateness, isolation, and, if you observe, that thought breeds fear - I might be, and I might not be, I have known past pleasures and I may not have the future pleasure. So in this cycle of the past, modifying itself in the present, and continuing that modification in the future, and out of that future, or in that future there is great uncertainty. And this uncertainty is one of the factors of fear.

These are the many factors of fear. Either you take one factor after another, try to understand each factor, or you take the whole of it, as one unit. It all depends upon your capacity of collecting all the factors immediately and seeing the whole nature and structure of fear. So it depends upon you whether it is to be a perception of fear as a whole, the whole of it, the unconscious fears which have not been examined, and the conscious fears which we are in the act of examining. Either you take one by one, your fears - and that would be endless. You can do this until one dies. But if one takes fear as a whole, then the major factor in all that wholeness is time and thought. We have explained the nature of time and thought. And thought breeds fear. Seeing all that, what is one to do? Not only the conscious fears, but the hidden fears of which one may not be aware. Can those fears, which are not aware, unconscious, deeply concealed in the recesses of one's own consciousness, one's own brain, can those hidden, concealed, very, very subtle fears be totally exposed and looked at?

I hope we are following each other. That is only possible, that is, the conscious as well as the deeper fears of which we are not

aware, it is only possible when you give complete attention. Which implies that you have to face fear, face actually what fear is.

Whether that fear is merely a verbal fear, because the words create fear, because words have their associations, their images, and when you use a certain word, that very word may create fear. I hope you are following.

So one must be aware of the nature of the word, and whether that word is creating the fear. Or, as we have explained, the many factors of fear, can one observe it without the word? Like observing a tree, this oak tree, to look at it without the word, because when you are observing if the word comes in you really are actually not observing. And to observe that, observe the whole nature of fear completely. If you take your particular fear, whatever it is, and observe it with complete attention - perhaps you have never given total attention to anything. We are so inattentive. And it is very difficult for most people to be attentive with their whole being.

And attention implies giving your energy. Attention means the total observation of something with complete energy. And when you so give your complete total attention, therefore with all the energy that one has, fear disappears, not one particular fear, fear completely disappears. One hopes that in listening, you are actually doing this.

And fear is another form of pleasure. Man apparently, throughout the ages has pursued pleasure. One observes in this country more and more an everlasting demand for entertainment, for excitement, for any form of pleasure - sexual, inviting different types of pleasure. And again when you observe very closely, what

is pleasure? The demand for excitement. If you have observed on televisions, in books, and all the rest of it, this sense of increasing constant demand of pleasure, of excitement. When there is actual pleasure, actual pleasure, is one conscious that it is pleasurable? Or is it a moment after? If it is a moment after it is the activity of thought which has remembered that incident as pleasurable. Please examine all this. So thought again plays a part in this pleasurable pursuit. That's why it is very important to understand the nature of thought, why thought has become so utterly important for all people. It breeds fear and it breeds pleasure. They are the two sides of the same coin.

And if we have time this morning, we must go into the question of suffering. What is suffering? What is the great psychological pain, the grief, the anxiety, the tears that one sheds? What is suffering? And again man throughout the ages has not solved this problem. Christianity has shelved it - identified with one person in all the history of Christianity. And the Asiatic world has its own explanation of grief - past actions and the result is misery, conflict, pain, suffering. Those are all explanations. Those are all various forms of escape. All escapes are similar, there are not noble escapes, or ignoble escapes, escapes are similar. And if one does not escape, can one remain immovable with sorrow? Please follow this a little bit, if you will kindly. Because we all go through great sorrows, not only the sorrow of death, the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of isolation, the pain of being something or other, not beautiful and so on, all the trivialities and all the grave issues of life. We all suffer, moderately, superficially or deeply. And without becoming cynical, without verbally, reasonably, rationally

explaining it away, is it possible when one is in deep sorrow, the sorrow that comes about when one has lost somebody, the sorrow of the whole misery of life, can one look at it in the sense remain with it without any movement of thought?

You must have unfortunately had some kind of sorrow. Without analysing, without escaping from it, without rationalizing it, without putting it into a test tube, or reducing it to some chemical response, can you look at it, observe it, remain with it completely - whether it is physical pain, or psychological grief, to remain with it totally without any movement of shadow of escape, which means actually giving all your energy and attention to it. Because at the moment of sorrow you are that sorrow. It is not that you are sorrowful, your whole being is sorrow. I do not know if you understand this. There is no fear apart from you. You are part of fear. You are part of all the factors of fear. So you are all the factors that go to bring about this sorrow which mankind has carried throughout the ages. There is not only the personal sorrow, but also this sorrow of mankind. There is not the momentary sorrow of a person, but the global sorrow. The sorrow of ignorance, sorrow of poverty, the sorrows that war has brought about, the tears, the anxieties, the brutality of all that. Look at all that. To be completely, totally in contact with it, then since you give, in that contact there is this total energy. We dissipate our energy - in argument, in endless talk, in being occupied all the time with something or other. The brain is never free from occupation. Observe the scientists, the businessmen, the housewife, the religious people, the priests, they are all occupied with something or other. That occupation, however pleasant, however disagreeable,

does dissipate the energy that is demanded to meet all these factors of life. Life is also occupation, but when one is occupied endlessly so that the brain is never free, never quiet, and it is only such a mind, a brain that faces the fact silently, faces fear, sorrow, loneliness, despair silently. Then you will see for yourself such action - such silence dissipates it.

I do not know if we have time this morning to talk about death. That's one of the major factors of life. One of the great factors. And humanity, all of us, seem to be incapable of understanding it. Not chemically, not why the human body perishes by its disuse, smoke, drugs, endless forms of indulgence, but the significance of death. Not the physical organism coming to an end, which it will inevitably, like anything that is used wears away, the body when we have so misused it, and the body has its own intelligence which we have destroyed. But we are asking, the nature of death, the significance, the meaning, the depth of it, not the fear of it, not the fear of old age, senility, some disease, accident. But the meaning of it, the depth of it, there may be great beauty in it.

And, as we said, it may not be possible - I don't think it is possible this morning to talk about it, one will tomorrow morning. Tomorrow morning we are going to discuss that and also what is a religious mind; what is reverence, respect, if there is anything sacred which thought has not invented. That which we worship now is the product of thought, and thought is a material process, so there is nothing whatsoever sacred about thought. Thought, which has created the churches and the content of those churches, temples, mosques, there there is nothing sacred because all that has been put together, the rituals, all that goes on is the result of

thought. So we must together examine what is really religion, because religion creates a new culture. One must go into all that tomorrow morning. And also what is meditation. If you don't mind we will stop.

OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH MAY 1981

One would like to point out, if one may, that this is not a gathering for any kind of excitement, for any kind of romantic inspiration, or sentimental business. It is a rather serious gathering - at least the speaker is. As there are so many people who may be newcomers, please be assured that we are not in any way doing propaganda, trying to convince you of anything, or bringing some fantastic, nonsensical, Indian, or eastern philosophy or exotic gods and gurus. We are together, having explored for the last five gatherings here, we have together been concerned with the degeneration of the world, the wars, the threat of nuclear bomb and so on and so on. We have been talking about all that considerably.

And also we have said, the crisis is not in politics, nor in the world of economics, nor in the world of so-called organized religions. The crisis is in our consciousness, in our minds, in our hearts, in our activity. This crisis we have been examining considerably at length, and yesterday morning we talked about fear. We have been talking also about order in our life, where there is so much disorder, where in our daily life there is very little restraint, there is no discipline whatsoever. We use the word discipline in the sense that the word comes from the root disciple, which means to learn, to learn in the manner of living, to learn about what is actually religion, what is meditation and so on. Discipline means learning, not merely accommodating oneself to a certain pattern of behaviour, suppressing one's own desires and so on.

We have been talking about all this in detail. And we have said

that thought has created this world in which we live, with all its disaster, with the wars, with the division of nations, with the proliferation of nuclear bombs and so on and so on.

Yesterday we talked about the beginning of fear. We pointed out and we together - and the speaker means together, not that the speaker is saying something exotic, out of the way, or an isolated point of view - together we examined our own fears, the factors of fear, how fear arises, the many aspects of fear. The aspects can be examined very closely but they are all contained in this fact which is fear. We talked considerably about that yesterday morning.

And also we talked about together, investigated together, considered these things together, one must repeat this constantly because most of us are used to being told what to do. We are accustomed, specially in this country where there is specialization in every field, those specialists have written books and we read all those books and we are never able to think clearly for ourselves. We have become slaves to others. We went into this at the beginning of these talks.

And again one must repeat very clearly, and I hope you will not mind the repetition, but it must be underlined very clearly that we are observing the world as it is, and the world that is so complex in the psychological state of our being. Together we are examining all that.

And this morning, as this is the last talk, this morning we are going further into the examination of our consciousness and its content. The content makes the consciousness, without the content consciousness as we know it does not exist. So we examined very closely one aspect after another of this content of our

consciousness.

We talked yesterday morning together, asking each one of us to observe our own fears, and not to escape from it, not to suppress it, not to hide it away and lock it up. We were saying that we must be able to look at it, face it so that we meet it directly. Because man throughout the ages has carried this burden for millions and millions of years, and we are the result of all that, past fears and the present fears. And if we do not understand the nature of fear deeply and be free of it, fear cannot live with love. We talked about that yesterday.

We also talked about pleasure rather briefly. In this world, specially in the western world, more in America, in this country - please bear in mind we are not criticizing the country or you but we are observing the fact, not my point of view, the speaker's point of view, nor a particular point of view - but when you observe what is taking place in this country, excitement of every form, sexual, and other forms of excitement, the principle of pleasure pursuit, the pursuit of the expression of one's own desire, and the expression of that desire takes the form of pleasure. We talked about it. We went and investigated the nature of desire. Desire is the awakening of the senses. And we are again briefly repeating it. The senses in action, contact, then sensation. And then thought with its image enters into that sensation, and from then begins desire. We talked about it, we explained it very, very carefully, in detail, that fact. Seeing, which is sensation, contact, touching, from that touching sensation, and thought then creates the image, and when thought creates that image then desire begins. And we also pointed out the activities of desire and the contradiction that lies in itself in desire

and so on, from which arises our conflict.

Pleasure has been the pursuit of man throughout the ages in different forms, mostly sexual and psychological which expresses itself in action in the physical world. One can observe this closely if you are willing to examine it yourself. And pleasure, whether it is physical pleasure, or the pleasure of power, pleasure of possession, the pleasure of depending on another, must inevitably carry in its track fear. If you observe this you can see it for yourself.

And we began yesterday talking about suffering of man. Man, of course woman included - when the speaker says, 'Man', please, ladies don't get excited about it, woman is included in it - man throughout the ages, from time immemorial has suffered both physically and specially psychologically, inwardly. Suffering has been the lot of man. The Asiatic world, including India, says that it is the result of past actions, so-called karma. And that explanation seems to satisfy most people. And most people in the world seem to be satisfied with explanations. But explanations, the word is not the actuality. Suffering, the word, is not the actual tremor, the actual shedding of tears, the feeling of great emptiness, loneliness. And suffering, specially in the Christian world, has been relegated to some symbol, and we think by giving our suffering over to somebody our suffering will end, in different forms. But man all over the world suffers. Suffering is anxiety, grief, uncertainty, the sense of deep abiding and apparently unchangeable loneliness. You can observe for yourself, we are together observing. You are not merely listening to the speaker but observing yourself as the speaker is depicting what is actually going on in ourselves. And

can man ever end suffering? Is there an end to sorrow?

One must ask fundamental questions, not superficial demands and cheap answers. One must ask always one's own fundamental, radical questions. And it is a radical question, whether man, you, can ever end sorrow?

How can there be love - we will go into that word which has been so spoilt - how can there be love when there is fear? How can there be that thing when it has become merely a matter of excitement and pleasure? Is love desire? Is love a matter of excitement? Can love exist when there is ambition, aggressiveness? Can there be love when a human being has been hurt from childhood, can there be love when there is sorrow? Or that perfume, that thing, which we have called love, can only be when all this ends. And is it possible - not intellectually, not merely be satisfied with explanations, or reduce sorrow, fear and other things to a scientific matter of chemicals, chemistry, and be satisfied with all that. How can we kill another, either in war, or in violence, if there is love?

Apparently we human beings are caught in a terrible tragedy of habit, tradition, of an activity of a brain that has become atrophic because we are functioning mechanically - we hold on to beliefs, to faith, to constant repetition of endless meaningless rituals in all the churches of the western world, and the rituals in the eastern world. All these rituals are put together by thought. Thought is a material process, as we have explained over and over again. Some scientists are beginning to accept it. And because scientists have such a dominant influence in one's life perhaps then you will also accept it. But if you examine thought, and the origin of thought, what is

thinking, you will find that it is born out of memory, knowledge, experience, and from that experience thought, thought in action, and so on. This is the chain in which the brain works at present. Experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, from that memory action, skilful or not skilful, and from that action you learn more knowledge. So you keep this chain going, which is gradually making the brain atrophied. When you repeat over and over and over the same thing, as they do in rituals, in having strong beliefs, convictions, conclusions, the brain must inevitably become not only atrophied but lack nourishment. And one of the factors of this atrophy is that man puts up with every kind of illusion - religious illusions, psychological non-facts, and so on.

Now we are asking if sorrow can ever end. Not only personal sorrow, but also the sorrow of all mankind. Sorrow is sorrow, it is not yours or mine. The sorrow that has been created through these five thousand years of war. The sorrow that human beings are preparing for wars. The sorrow of endless division between people, as the Catholics, the Protestants, the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Muslims, the Arab and the Jew, the American and the Russian, the Hindu and the Muslim, and so on. This constant division is bringing about great conflict in the world. And we don't seem to realize this. We don't seem to realize the appalling danger we are facing. We want to escape from it all into some form of excitement, knowledge, explanation. But to be sensitively aware of all this, the society that man has created, so we are part of all that, and therefore we are utterly responsible, totally, completely responsible for everything that is happening in the world.

You may not accept all this, but as we said, one must critically,

sceptically, with considerable doubt examine all this, we must exercise our brains to its highest capacity. And if that capacity is made incapable by our personal sorrow, by our personal fears, we reduce fear of all mankind, which all human beings bear, all human beings throughout the world suffer, uncertain, anxious, in conflict, confused, seeking constantly security. This is the common ground of all mankind, whether you live in India, in the Far East, here, Europe, or anywhere, our consciousness is the common consciousness of all mankind. And in that consciousness there is sorrow, fear, pleasure, and occasional flash of love.

And we are trying to see if suffering which distorts thinking can ever end. Please, be good enough to ask that question of yourself. Not the questioner is asking you to put that question to yourself, but it is your sorrow, the sorrow of mankind. No words, no explanation, no escape, can wipe away that sorrow. One has to face it. Either you face it obliquely, casually, with impatience, trying to go beyond it, then if you are, you are not directly confronting it. That is to remain completely, totally with that which is, without any thought interfering, distorting what actually is sorrow. Sorrow is both self pity, self torture, self abnegation. And the various activities of the self trying to fulfil its own desires, failing or succeeding. And all that is part, and more, of sorrow. Can one look at it closely, be totally in contact with it? One can only be totally, completely in contact with it if there is no division between you and the thing you call sorrow. You are not separate from sorrow. You, the observer, thinking that sorrow is different from you, and acting upon sorrow - trying to escape, suppress, analyse, run, go beyond it, or end it, all that points to the division that exists

between you and sorrow. That's the tradition in which we have lived. But the fact is you are sorrow. Not you separate from sorrow. When you are angry, anger is not different from you. When you are violent, that violence is not different from you. When you have created the religious figures, symbols, those creations are part of you. They are not separate from you. Though you may worship them as something separate from you, man has created them, those symbols, images, made by the hand or by the mind.

And as this division brings only conflict, to observe it, to observe that this division exists first of all, that's the tradition, in that tradition we have been educated that the 'me' is separate from sorrow, pain, anxiety, fear and so on, or even pleasure. We have been conditioned to that from childhood. And to break that conditioning and so end conflict, is to observe, be in contact with that sorrow, with that fear, with those desires, without any sense of an observer looking from without within. Like in all relationships with human beings thought has created the division. If you observe in your own relationship with another, however intimate it may be, you will find that you are separate from the other. Obviously. This division inevitably in relationship, or nationally, internationally, must inevitably, that is the law, must bring about conflict. And as we pointed out, in all our relationships this conflict exists, wherever we are.

And we are asking whether being totally in contact with sorrow, without any kind of division, without a shadow of trying to overcome it, or explain it, be totally with it, and when you are so with it you are giving your complete attention to it, and it is this

attention, this total, complete attention, with all your energy, it is that energy that dispels, ends sorrow.

And also we must go into the question on a lovely morning like this, with clear sunshine and the beauty of the light on the leaves, and the shadows, and the mountains and the valleys, we must go into the question also, if you are not afraid, if you are enquiring, into what is death. That is part of existence, to be born and to die - between being born and dying, all the travail of mankind. All the terrible loneliness, disorder, the mounting knowledge about the external world, and the mounting knowledge according to the psychologists, the inner world, which is much more complex than the psychologists explain, between being born and dying, there is every kind of relationship, with all its conflict, in which there are moments of joy and pleasure and so on, between being born and dying there is the mounting danger of wars, uncertainty, the dreadful brutal destruction of nature and of human beings. So it is important that we understand, or enquire into what is the significance of death.

Death is part of life. We have broken up life into various segments, various divisions. Look at it for yourself. As fear, as sorrow, as pity, as business, as politics, as commercialism, as man, woman, sex, pain, grief, anxiety, uncertainty. We have broken up life into fragments. And we look at death as a fragment. And we never take life as a whole without any divisions, without being broken up. Life is a movement, and if we divide life, as we do, then death becomes a terrible thing, a meaningless ending. Please observe this for yourself. One's own life is broken up that way. Me and you, we and they, this belief against that belief, this nation

against that nation, this race against that race, each one trying to succeed, fulfil, pain, anxiety and so on. We have broken up the living on this earth so separately. And so where there is separation there must be conflict. Where there is division there must be the inevitable conflict. And our life from the moment we are born until we die is endless conflict. Out of that conflict every form of neurosis arises. Then all the problems of that, which the psychologists meet. So we continue this way from the moment we are born until we die. And this we call life, this we call living. And to this we cling, this existence that has become of very little meaning, this life has very, very little significance as we live it. What significance has conflict? Progress? Progress towards what? More conflict? Towards a better society? That society is a symbol, it is not actuality - the better society that is created by our relationship with each other. If our relationship is not right, if our relationship with each other is without conflict then we shall have a society, a government in which there will be no conflict, it will be us. If we behave properly why need we have governments? And because we are so corrupt we have governments which are becoming more and more corrupt.

So this is our life from the moment we are born until we die. And to this we cling desperately, because we think with death all this, and perhaps we are entering into something unknown. This we know, we are familiar with this - with the conflict, with the fulfilment of desire, pleasure, we all know this. But we don't know what happens after death. So the Asiatic world, specially India, from the ancient of times, said you will be reborn next life, there is birth after life. Not the birth in a test tube, not the birth of new

experiments in genetics, but life which we live with all its complex travail, if you live rightly now, next life you will have a better chance - instead of being born in a hut you will live in a palace, a better life, both physically and psychologically, you will always be becoming better and better, nobler, until ultimately you reach that highest principle which in India they call Brahman. So reincarnation is the pet theory of all those people - perhaps the whole of the eastern world. And here, in the Christian world, you have your own form of resurrection - you will ultimately sit next to god. But those who believe in reincarnation behave in their usual way - brutal, violent, they actually don't believe in their belief. If they did they would behave righteously, correctly, without any sense of violence, and so on. Here too, in the west we talk about all these things.

So we are asking: what is the significance of death? We must answer that question, not avoid it. We must look at it very closely, whether that death occurs with old age, diseased body, the organism being used in the wrong way, and so on. What is the meaning of death? It is very important to ask this question because this is part of our life. It is not something at the end of life.

Obviously the organism comes to an end through disease, old age, and so on, accident. And we, living as we are, in conflict and misery, confusion, uncertainty, having faith in some fantastic projection of thought, cannot face that fact, what is death, what is the meaning, what is the beauty, what is the significance of it. As we pointed out earlier in these talks, our consciousness is made up of its content. The content is our life, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals, the fears, the sorrows, the anxieties, the wounds, the

division of nationalities, the Christian, the Buddhist and the Hindu, the Islamic world, our consciousness actually is the consciousness of all mankind. So your consciousness is the consciousness of all human beings. You are the entire world. The world is you. You may have different skin, you may belong to different religion, call yourself by a nationalistic name, but actually, psychologically we are talking about, you are like the rest of mankind, driven, uncertain, tremendously anxious, imitating, conforming and so on and so on.

So when there is death the organism dies. And that consciousness of mankind goes on. It is only those who free themselves from those contents of consciousness, they liberate themselves from that, they liberate themselves from the significance of death.

So we must go and enquire very closely what is the meaning of death. Have you ever ended anything without explanation, without resistance, without seeking a reward or punishment, end something? Have you? Have you ever ended completely attachment? That's what it means to die, to end. You can't when death comes, all that is cut off, your attachment to a person. So the significance of death in its most profound sense is the ending. So a wise man doesn't wait for death to end, but ends, brings to an end fear, sorrow, attachment, loneliness. And when there is an ending so completely there is totally a different dimension.

That is only part of the significance of death. Death has an extraordinary sense of beauty. You will be surprised to hear it. Because with death, the ending of something, also is the beginning of something else, which is love. Yes, I'll show it to you. It is good

to be sceptical, it is good to doubt, it is good not to accept anything anybody says, including the speaker, specially the speaker. Doubt your gurus and they will disappear! Doubt your own beliefs, your own longings, your own desires, your own ambitions, your own sectarian spirit. And also you should doubt, question, be sceptical so that you find for yourself what is truth - not depend on anybody - the priests, the rituals, the authority, specially in the world of the spirit, in the world of so-called spirituality. One must be a light to oneself. And you cannot be a light to yourself if you are always depending on somebody else. And this dependence to end it, not in some years, but now. Which is, ending is death. And when you end something, in that ending there is great beauty, not in that which is continuous.

So the whole idea of personal immortality becomes nonsensical when we realize that our consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind.

And also we should go into the question if we have time - time has been given to us this morning - we must also go into the question of what is religion, because as the world is degenerating, if there is no world religion - not Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam - world religion, it is only out of a religious mind, a global religious mind that a new culture can come into being. Not the technological culture which is now the culture of mankind - how to build cars, the computers, the robots, the atom bomb, the instruments of war, battleships, aeroplanes, surgery, how to increase grain, and so on and so on, all depending on technology. And again that technology is based on thought, and thought is incomplete because knowledge can never under any

circumstances be complete.

So one has find out for oneself what is the meaning of religion. The meaning of that word from Greek, Latin and so on - the speaker is not a scholar, god forbid, the speaker, if one may be a little bit personal, does not read all these books, but he looks in a dictionary for the root meaning of words - the word religion comes from 'religare', to bind. Even the etymologists are doubting the origin of that word. But one can see very clearly that the religions that we have in the world at present, whether in the Far East, in India, the Arabic world and the world of Israel, and the world of Christianity, this religion is based upon thought, a longing, the father figure and so on and so on, which are all cliches. But one can see the actual fact - they are based on fear, deep uncertainty, the hope that some day somebody will clear up all this confusion. And as each person is confused he clings to some image, symbol which he hopes will help him to go beyond his own little self. Our religions are now as they are, utterly meaningless. Don't please get angry. Just look at it. We are not trying to advocate a new religion, a new cult, a new set of rituals, which are all nonsense. We are looking into a much deeper issue. And all the things that are in the churches, the cathedrals, in the temples in India, and the Asiatic world, their rituals, their images, are all put together by thought. And thought is never sacred, but thought has made those things that are in the churches, temples and so on, sacred. So thought is worshipping itself. Right? Thought is worshipping that which it has created, or the symbols it has created, or the actual person of whom he doesn't know, makes an image, and worships that image. This is called religion.

And there are all those innumerable gurus, which are now multiplying all over the world like so many mushrooms, they bring something new, at least they think they are. But this old tradition in which is their own ambition, power, money, all that is involved. They are getting richer and richer in this country. You know all this. All this is called religion.

In the Asiatic world, specially in India, both the Buddhists and the Hindus have said, that is one of the tenets, or one of the roots - doubt, question, be sceptical.

Q: Krishnamurti, may I ask you something?

K: Just a minute, no sir.

Q: May we not die to mankind also?

K: Sir, please. Forgive me, if you want to question you should have come on Thursday or Tuesday of last week or the week before, sent in a question, and those questions, as there were so many of them, we have tried to answer some of them. But this, if you will forgive, this is not a question and answer meeting.

So we are enquiring: what is religion? Please enquire together. Is there anything sacred, anything that is timeless, anything that is not bound by thought, something actual, not invented, not put together out of human suffering, out of human fear, out of human confusion, is there something that is beyond all time, beyond all corruption? How will you find this out? Which doesn't belong to any person, to any group, to any community, which is global - how do you enquire and discover that? Obviously, if you are serious, you cannot belong to anything, neither Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, or be a Muslim. One must be free of all that, totally, completely. Freedom not to do what you like, that is too silly, too immature.

Freedom from bondage. That's absolutely necessary. So the brain is always seeking out security, therefore inventing all kinds of images, illusions, in which it hopes to find security.

So if one is really wanting to enquire deeply if there is anything sacred, holy, one must put aside all those things which are not - the religious books, because if you, as is now being done, if you rely on a book, so-called holy books then you become narrow, bigoted, that is what is happening in the world. And also if you want to find out if there is anything sacred there must be absolutely no fear.

Life as it is now, broken up, that life when it is not broken up, when life is treated as a whole, without any division as sorrow, as pain, as anxiety, as fear, pleasure, when there is no breaking up of life into these compartments, which means to live totally a harmonious life without a single shadow of conflict. If that doesn't exist how can you go beyond it?

So that's why the speaker has put religion, meditation, and if perhaps there is something sacred, at the end of the talks because we must first put the house in order - your house. The house is you. If that is not in total complete order, living a harmonious life, how can you know possibly what love is and what compassion is? With that compassion comes love, intelligence. And that intelligence is the complete total security. That must be before you begin to meditate, because it is only through deep meditation that you find out for yourself whether there is something beyond all time, measure, nameless, timeless.

And meditation is not how to meditate - the Zen system, the recent gurus with their systems of meditation, the transcendental nonsense. It is merely coining money, mantra. You know that

word, unfortunately. The actual meaning of that word, it has got great beauty and significance in that word which has been traded for money as a means of meditation, which is nonsense. The word mantra means, the root meaning of it, is to ponder, meditate upon not becoming. And it also means in Sanskrit, end all self-centred activity. That's the real meaning of that word - ponder over, meditate, on not becoming, in this world or in the psychological world, and end all self-centred activity. You understand the meaning of that word, the significance of it? And for that word, mantra, you pay dollars, and you think you are learning meditation. And the people who invented the transcendental nonsense coin money, they have become immensely rich. So that is not meditation.

Any form of systems of meditation, if you practise these systems you become more and more mechanical, more and more dull. Obviously. If you repeat over and over and over again, your brain becomes atrophied. So we have to reject totally all that. It is logical, rational, sane, what we are talking about, nothing abnormal, something exotic brought from strange countries, romantic and all that nonsense. Meditation demands tremendous understanding of yourself, completely, so that you don't create, fall into any illusion. And where there is no understanding of desire and its activity, illusions are inevitable. So one must be very, very clear about all this. You must keep the house, your house in total order, without a shadow of conflict, then only you can talk about meditation, not how to meditate, but what is meditation.

I hope you are not tired, may we go on? To understand what is meditation, which unfortunately from the eastern world is brought

to this country, though you have your own form of contemplation in the Christian world, the word meditation according to the dictionary is to ponder over, think over, observe and so on. But that is merely an explanation, that's a verbal definition. But that is not meditation. The word is not the thing. So meditation begins with being totally aware, sensitively, without any choice of what is happening in the world and with yourself. That is only part of it. When we have looked at all the complexity of our life, how it is broken up, all that observation is part of meditation, so that you have established in your life harmony, in which there is no conflict. Then meditation is to bring about, - not you bring it about - because you have laid the foundation of order, ended sorrow, pain, suffering, psychologically, then the brain, the mind becomes quiet, naturally. You cannot silence the mind. Who is the entity that silences the mind? It is still thought then. So by bringing about a life of harmony, in our daily life, in everyday life, naturally, easily, without any effort, there is the quality of silence in the mind, complete silence. That is absolutely necessary. If that silence doesn't exist then thought can invent what it likes, every form of illusion, delusion, images.

So the silencing of thought means the ending of time, which we went into. And then out of that silence, not your silence or my silence, silence, in which there must be silence - it is difficult to go into all this unless you have done it yourself. You know, sirs, without beauty, not the beauty of a face, although there is a beauty in a face, the beauty of a poem, the beauty in literature, the beauty on a canvas is different from the beauty of the hills, of the rivers, a sheet of water sparkling in the sun, and the flight of a bird, and the

light on a leaf which is quivering with the breeze. That beauty exists only when you are not there. You understand? When you as the selfish entity are not there, the other is. So meditation is the silencing of all that, a natural ending of all that. Out of that ending comes great depth of silence. The brain has its own activity, but silence in spite of that activity of the brain overcomes, or is part of that natural movement of the brain - which means the brain also becomes extraordinarily quiet, if you have gone into all this.

It is only then you will find that which is sacred - not you will find it - it is only then there is that which is eternally sacred. And when that is, then in you is born reverence. People have lost, or have never had reverence. They have reverence to an image, to a symbol, to things that thought has created, but that is not actual reverence. It is born out of fear, out of conflict, out of loneliness and so on. But the actual reverence, not for persons, power, position, and all that, but the actual reverence comes when that which is immeasurably sacred. I have finished.

RAJGHAT, BENARES 1ST TALK WITH STUDENTS 17TH NOVEMBER 1981

K: Is it my turn to sing also? What would you like me to talk about? Tell me.

Q: The process of learning.

K: All right. You want to talk about learning?

A: Yes.

K: Yes? Does it mean yes, or no?

A: Yes.

K: Have you learnt how many birds there are in this campus? Have you learnt about that? Have you watched all those birds? As it gets colder they come down from the Himalayas, and beyond the Himalayas from Russia, quantities of birds come here. Have you learnt, watched them? Some of you have watched them? Do you know the names of the birds? See how many species of birds there are in this campus? Do you hurt them?

A: No.

K: You don't kill them?

A: No.

K: Thank goodness! Have you learnt the various kinds of trees, and plants and flowers that grow in this compound? Have you? No. Have you seen the poor people around here?

A: Yes.

K: What have you learnt from them? By watching them, carrying that heavy burden, and the people on a bicycle carrying heavy loads of milk and other things - have you watched them? Yes?

A: Yes.

K: What have you learnt from it? Tell me, go on. What have you learnt? You asked, let's talk about learning. Right? Have you learnt by watching those poor people day after day going into town with heavy loads and coming back with very little money, have you watched all that? And what do you feel about it? What's your reaction to it? Tell me, please.

Q: Everybody behaves roughly with them.

K: You behave roughly with them? You are rude to them? You don't care for them? One day, many years ago, a woman was carrying a heavy burden, very heavy. She put it on that pillar there to rest. As I was passing by I helped to lift the thing on to her head. It really weighed an enormous amount, it was difficult to lift it. Have you helped anybody like that?

A: Yes.

K: Good! So you are learning by watching the birds, what kind of species there are, and how many kinds there are. You have watched the trees, the plants, the flowers, the grass, the creepers, have you learnt from them? Not to hurt them, not to tear off their leaves - have you done it? So will you learn about it? And also you have watched all those poor people going by every day, taking a very long walk to Benares, four or five miles, with heavy burdens, coming back after they have sold their few things with a few coins, and going back to the village. Have you watched that? Have you learnt from it? That if you have a little, to share that little with them. You understand what I am saying? That is, if you have ten coins, to give them one coin, not keep it all to yourself.

I think about five years ago I was walking along there, one of

the villagers - he didn't know me, I didn't know him - gathered a few leaves and sticks and all that, set it on fire and put a pot with a little rice, an onion in it, two or three drops of oil and was cooking it. I watched him. I watched what he did, gathering leaves, gathering sticks, putting fire to them, and putting the pot with a little rice in it, oil, a large onion, and he cooked it. When it was properly cooked he looked at me and he said, 'Will you share this with me. Take a little'. I couldn't because he said, 'This is my whole meal for the day.' You understand what I am saying?

A: Yes.

K: The whole meal for the day and he was willing to share that little bit of rice with me. You understand how generous that is, what an extraordinary feeling that he would like to give you something. He didn't know me. Have you got that feeling? Feeling of sharing something with another. Or do you want to keep it all to yourself?

So you learn. Please listen. You learn by watching, watching the trees, the birds, the flowers. You learn from watching the poor people, watching their burden, how they are laughing, chattering. And learn to share a little bit of what you have, give a little bit of that to somebody, as that man tried to give me a little bit of his rice, his only meal for the whole day. And you learn by listening. Have you ever listened to the birds?

A: Yes.

K: Have you really listened?

A: Yes.

K: Have you listened to music?

A: Yes, a little.

K: Have you listened to your mother? Careful, here! Have you listened to your father? Casually, with one ear, and forgetting it the next minute. Have you listened to your teacher?

A: Yes. (Laughter)

K: He wants to tell you something. He wants to tell you, perhaps kindly, perhaps rather irritated, but he wants to tell you something. And you are looking out of the window, seeing the lizard on the wall, or seeing a boat going by, or a bird on that branch; you are looking out there on the wall, out of the window, or listening to somebody next to you who wants to tell you something, and the teacher says to you, pay attention, look at your book, don't look out of the window. Right? Does this happen?

A: Yes.

K: Of course it does. That is, you want to look out of the window, which is much more fun, and the poor teacher says, look at your book, concentrate on your book. Now what happens? Suppose I am your teacher - I am not fortunately - I am your teacher, and you are looking out of that window, or looking at that lizard. And I say to you, pay attention to your book. Right? What has happened? You want to look at that lizard, or out of the window, and I, the teacher, says, look at your book because I want to tell you about it. So what has happened? Tell me.

Q: Part of you wants to look out of the window and part to look at the book.

K: So what happens? You want to look at the lizard and I want you to look at the book.

Q: There are two forces working.

K: Yes, two forces are working against each other. Right? So

what will you do? Come on, answer it.

Q: Look at the book but think of the lizard outside.

K: You keep looking at the book but your mind is on the lizard. Right? So what happens? Your mind is on the lizard, but you are looking at the book. What takes place in your mind? Come on.

Q: We will not understand anything.

K: You will not understand anything. Right? And also what happens? Go on, further, examine it.

Q: I become angry with the teacher.

K: You become angry with the teacher - why?

Q: Because he is making me do something I don't want to.

K: That's it. He is making you do something which you don't want to do. You want to look at the lizard or out of the window, and I am forcing you to look at the book. Right? So you get angry with me. Or you daren't show your anger to me because I'll slap you. So you keep the anger, but your mind isn't on the book, your mind is on the lizard, or on the window, looking out at those trees. So what is happening to your mind? Aren't you in conflict?

A: Yes.

K: Right? Have you understood that? You are in conflict: I want you, as a teacher, to look at the book and you are looking out of the window. You like to look out of the window much more than looking at the book, so you are in conflict with me, and you are in conflict with yourself, aren't you? Do you understand this?

A: Yes.

K: No, if you don't understand, don't say, yes, I'll explain it more. That is, I want to look at the book, as a teacher, I want you to look at the book, but you are not looking at the book, your mind is

on that. So there is conflict, there is struggle, there is annoyance, there is anger. Right? Now, wait a minute, listen to this. I am your teacher, you have to study mathematics, geography, whatever you study, what shall I do? Tell me, what shall I do? You are interested in looking out of the window at the lizard, or talking amongst yourselves, and I want you to look at the book, so what shall I do? You understand my question? Tell me.

Q: If the teacher scolds we can't learn anything, but if he says politely, look at the book, we look.

K: If the teacher scolds you, the boy says, you won't learn anything; but if the teacher gently reminds you politely, without scolding, perhaps - perhaps - you might look at the book. Right?

Now I don't want you to look at the book, I am your teacher, but I want to teach you something entirely different: not the book, not to look out of the window, but I want to teach you something else. Right? Now listen, I'll tell you. I have a book in front of me which you must look at also, but your eyes, your ears, are outside with the lizard, or listening to that bird. Right? You get this? So my concern is to make you aware, attentive. That's my concern. I wonder if you understand this. Have you understood this? I am not interested in you looking at the book, but I am interested that you should pay attention, that you should listen - listen to that bird, listen to the noise in the trees, perhaps listen to that lizard making a peculiar sound. I want you to learn how to attend, how to pay attention. That's all I am concerned with. Have you understood that? So I would say to you, look at that lizard, don't bother about the book, look at that lizard very carefully, see how many legs it has, what kind of colour it is, so that you pay attention to what you are

looking at. Then there is that attention, which is that you look at that lizard, listen to those birds, look at the leaf, the sunshine on the leaf very attentively, then you can pay attention to the book without conflict. Have you understood this? Be careful, don't say, yes, be quite clear. What is more important: to look at the book, or look at the lizard? What is important in that?

Q: Paying attention and look at the lizard and the book.

K: So what is important to you? To learn to pay attention. Right? That is, to learn how to listen. If you know how to listen carefully then you will listen to the teacher. Right? I wonder if you understand this? You have understood?

A: Yes.

K: Will you do that?

A: Yes.

K: You asked me to talk about learning, learning from books, learning by watching, watching the poor people, watching the birds, watching the trees, listening to the song of birds. You begin to be alert, you begin to be sensitive. You understand? Then if the teacher says nicely - and also remember the teacher is tired, probably he has quarrelled with his wife, probably he hasn't had enough rest, so he himself is disturbed, irritated, and you are there not paying attention, so he scolds you. So it is a mutual relationship. You understand? Do you understand that? Now, just a minute. You and I have a mutual relationship. That is, I am telling you something, you are polite enough to listen to what I am saying. Right? So there is a mutual communication. But if I am angry and you are bored there is no communication. Whereas if both of us are learning how to look at a bird, how to look at a tree, how to watch

those poor people, then we have a common communication, and you learn from each other. Right? Is this clear?

A: Yes.

K: Right. Now there is also learning from a book. Right? Most of you learn from a book, don't you. Now what does that mean? Tell me. Go on, tell me. You are reading history about the kings, wars, and all that nonsense, and you are learning. The teacher says - what's your king here, not Henry VIII? You are learning from a book. Now when you learn what takes place? Come on! I am a teacher of geography - oh, no, I don't like geography. All right, I am a teacher of history - which I don't like very much either but I'll take that! So I am a teacher of history. I tell you first chapter, how India, three thousand years ago had that king, that prime minister, and the wars. Right? And you read that and what do you do when you read it, and when you listen, what happens to you?

Q: We imagine.

K: You imagine. Then what else? Go on.

Q: We compare.

K: Yes, go on, explain more. Go on. Think, think, don't go to sleep, use your brains. What happens?

Q: We try to imagine ourselves in that place.

K: That girl said that. You imagine to be the king. Naturally, it's much more fun than being an ordinary human being. What is happening when you read a book, when you listen to the teacher, what takes place? You are going to have an examination, aren't you, at the end of the term. What takes place? You memorize, don't you?

A: Yes.

K: That's what takes place, doesn't it. That is, I tell you all about the Indian history, you listen, you read, and memorize. Right. Don't you?

A: Yes.

K: So your learning is to memorize. You follow that? And that's what you call learning. You have a lot of facts about Indian history, or a lot of prejudice in Indian history, and you memorize that, at the end of the term you have an examination about history. Right? Your answers depend on your good memory. Right?

So when you listen, when you read about history, of which you don't know, you memorize. Right? I wonder, shall I make it difficult for you? I think you'll understand. Memorize. From that memory you respond. I ask you as an examination paper, I ask you what happened in the 7th century. Who was the king, who was his minister, how many wars did he have. What happens? You, who have memorized, reply. Right? You reply by recalling what you have learnt from your memory. Right? Or when I ask you a question about the 15th century, who was the king, you have forgotten it. Right? But you try to remember, try to say, what happened, because you have heard it so often but you have forgotten it. So you say, I don't know. You are following all this? So you can't answer that question. Or - I want to make it a little more difficult - your memory is part of your thinking, isn't it? Right? You are clear? You think, your memory, then out of that memory you begin to think. Now, look, you know where you live in Benares. Right? It takes so much time to get there. Right? So your memory, thought tells you the direction, the house, the number of the house, the street you live in. Right? Are you

following all this? You aren't asleep, are you? You can go to sleep, have a good sleep. It's all right. I don't mind.

So you learn from a book, from the teacher, store it up in your brain as memory, then when you are asked a question you reply. Or you don't remember. Right? So memory, thought, reply. You get this? This is how we operate all our life. We learn something, store it in the brain, in the brain is the memory, and that memory responds when asked. You have got it? This is what we do from childhood until we die - gather a lot of information, which is memory, which is knowledge, that knowledge is stored in the brain as memory, that memory is part of thought, and then thought says, yes, I live in such-and-such-a-place. You have got this? You are quite clear? Good.

Now this is what you do all your life. Don't you? Right? This is called learning. Accumulate a lot of knowledge, a lot of information about your king of the 6th century, and then reply. You keep this machinery going from the moment you are born until you die. This is what is called learning. Right, sir? Have you got this?

There is a different kind of learning - I won't go into that, it's too difficult for you. The more you have memory, knowledge, the more you think you are a very clever person, better job, better this, better that. Right? So knowledge has become very important to people. You understand? Do you understand? So I had better stop there because I don't want to talk about something that is very, very complicated and rather subtle. You are too young for that. I hope you don't mind my saying that you are young.

What else would you like to talk about? Do any of you write

poems?

A: Yes.

K: Yes?

A: Yes.

K: I'm glad. Do any of you read English poems?

A: Yes.

K: Yes? Which do you like? Who is the poet you like most?

Q: Wordsworth.

K: Wordsworth. Which poem do you know of Wordsworth? I am not cross examining you, this is not an examination. Have you read Wordsworth's poem on Immortality?

Q: The Daffodils.

K: Oh, the thousands daffodils by the lake side. Good. Whom else do you know?

Q: Robert Louis Stevenson.

K: Have you read his Treasure Island?

A: Yes.

K: I read that book three times. Have you read Huckleberry Finn?

A: Yes.

K: Do you like it?

A: Yes.

K: So do I. Have you read Keats?

A: Yes.

Q: Browning.

K: Which poems do you like of Keats?

Q: Ode to a Nightingale.

K: Ode to a Nightingale. My heart aches, drowsy numbness - do

you know it? If you have read it you must know it. All right. What else have you read? Do you read any novels?

A: Yes.

K: Which ones?

Q: Enid Blyton.

K: I don't. Have you read the old Bible? I am not a Christian, I read books, I read the Old Testament, it is beautiful language, very simple, very clear, beautiful words they used. You should read that, the Old Testament. What else?

All right, what would you like to talk about?

Q: Sorrow.

K: The old people are asking, or the young people are asking? Go ahead, sir.

Q: Let's talk about sorrow.

K: Do you feel sorrow when a bird falls to the ground?

A: Yes.

K: Do you feel sorrow when a tree is cut down?

A: Yes.

K: Do you feel sorrow when all those poor people go off day after day, day after day, up and down that road carrying burdens, buying a little oil in a small bottle - do you feel sorrow?

A: Yes.

K: Do you feel sorrow when you sit comfortably with clean clothes, and those people never have clean clothes, do you feel sorrow? Silence!

So what is sorrow? My son dies, I feel sorrow, I shed tears, I feel terrible about it. But I don't feel terrible about it, I don't shed tears, when I see those poor people going by. Right? Why?

Q: It is a sort of sympathy one feels for them.

K: All right. Is sympathy for others and sorrow different?

Q: We only feel sorrow when it happens to ourselves.

K: Quite right! We feel sorrow only when it happens to us.

Right? But if happens to you I don't care. Right? So is sorrow personal? This is too difficult. Is sorrow universal, global? You know how many wars there have been from historical times - you know what historical times are. Historical times are those time in which history has been kept. You understand? Written history. Written history has been kept about five thousand years. That is, four thousand five hundred BC the Egyptians, the ancient Egyptians had the calendar, the first calendar, and before that, that's about five thousand years, there have been wars practically every year. You understand? People killing each other, maiming each other, burning their house, doing terrible things. That has been going on for five thousand years, practically a war a year. Right? Do you feel sorrow for all those people who have been killed? No, of course you don't. But you only feel sorrow if my brother gets killed in the war. Is that it? If my wife dies. So you think there is only sorrow if it affects you. But five thousand years of war has affected humanity. Right? Millions and millions have cried. Their brothers have come home with one leg or one arm, blind. You understand? This is war. And don't you feel sorry for all those people? Sorrow for all those people who have one arm? I was taken to a hospital where very, very few people were allowed to come in, I knew the doctor and he took me in. I have never seen a more horrible sight in my life. People only - I won't go into it - it's terrible. They are the result of war, without leg, without arms,

without eyes. You understand? So don't you feel enormously sorrowful for all those people? Or only when it affects me? Don't you feel sorrow when you go to Benares, see all dirt, the noise, don't you feel sorrowful? Or have you got used to it?

Q: We don't have a direct contact with what happened five thousand years ago.

K: Do you see war films?

A: Yes.

K: Then you are directly in contact.

Q: It doesn't touch our heart.

K: So you really don't care. You really don't care what happens to others. Right? Be honest. You really don't care what happens to those poor people.

Q: We do care but we don't know what to do about it.

K: You do care but you say you don't know what to do. Right? Is that it? What do you want to do?

Q: I want to help them in some way.

K: You want to help them in some way. How? Sitting here and talking about helping them?

Q: We aren't the culprits.

K: Aren't you culprits? You support war when you buy a stamp, when you pay tax. When your father pays tax and still has enough money to send you here - we are all involved in war. It's not just the politicians who are doing it, they are horrible people, they are, but we are all involved in it.

What time is it? How long have I talked?

Q: Fifty minutes.

K: I have talked fifty minutes. Is that enough?

Will you do something? Do you know what meditation is? That is, to sit quietly for two or three minutes. Shall we do it? Would you like to do it?

A: Yes.

K: Then sit quietly. Comfortably, don't sit like that, sit comfortably. And shut your eyes - just listen to what I have to say first - sit quietly, shut your eyes, when you shut your eyes don't let your eyes move. You understand? They move because they are looking at something else. So sit quietly, don't move your eyes and find out what you are thinking, what you are thinking about. That's all.

All right, sirs. We meet again the day after tomorrow.

RAJGHAT 2ND TALK WITH STUDENTS 19TH NOVEMBER 1981

K: What shall we talk about?

S: Could we discuss sensitivity and what it means to be sensitive?

K: Are you happy here?

Students: Yes.

K: All of you really happy?

Students: Yes, sir.

K: Good! Do your teachers beat you?

Students: No.

K: No?

Students: No.

K: No, good! Do they scold you?

Students: Yes.

K: Do they scold you?

Students: Sometimes.

K: So they beat you?

Students: No.

K: They don't physically beat you, but they scold you, which is verbally beating you. Isn't it? Yes? So do you like that?

Students: No.

K: No. So how shall we stop it?

S: By not doing wrong things.

K: By not doing what you are not supposed to do - is that it?

First of all, I would like, if I may, to congratulate you about your play last night, which was beautifully done. That arena - you

know what arena is? - in the Roman times, in ancient Roman times they had lions released and they killed people there, or they fought. Where there is a space and all the people sitting round it, that space is called an arena. So you have got a beautiful arena, a beautiful setting, and I was enchanted by it, really, I was so delighted to see it. You understand what I am saying? And the setting, the scenario, the dress, the grouping of the groups in one corner and groups in another, it was beautifully done. So may I congratulate you. I hope you don't mind my congratulating you!

You see in a school of this kind we oughtn't to be unkind to each other, we oughtn't to scold. How shall we stop being scolded? How will the teachers stop scolding you? Because you don't do everything that should be done. Right? Quite naturally, you are quite young, full of play, naturally you don't pay much attention to what the teacher is saying. But the poor teacher also has a difficulty because you are not paying attention so he gets irritated, and scolds you. So how shall both of us stop it, you and the teacher stop scolding? You behave improperly, and the teacher with patience not to scold you. It is dreadful being scolded all the time. I think that is one of the reasons why we become insensitive. If I keep on scolding you, telling you how naughty you are, gradually you don't pay attention to me at all, you turn a deaf ear. You understand what I am saying? So can we stop scolding in this place? Let all of us behave properly. Of course we are very young, and therefore we are rather mischievous, naughty, playful, not too attentive, so the teacher, the poor teacher has to say something harsh to you, and so you don't like it, it hurts you and that is one reason why we get insensitive. Do you realize from when you are

very young, like this, we get very easily hurt, don't we? Agreed? Do you get hurt? Not physically, not bodily, but inside. Don't you get hurt?

Now if I scold you, or are rough with you, and say something harsh you get hurt. That is the beginning of being insensitive. Do you get that? Do you understand that? The moment you get hurt you are building a wall not to get hurt more. So that is the beginning of becoming gradually insensitive. Right?

And also if you have fear you are also becoming insensitive. Aren't you all afraid of something? Yes? What are you afraid of? Tell me.

S: Darkness.

K: You are afraid of darkness - why? Talk to me, let's talk about it. Why?

S: Because you don't know what you might come up against in the darkness.

K: Are you afraid of the dark outside your room, or inside your room?

Students: Outside.

K: So you are afraid of the dark outside. You don't know what you are coming up against - there are the bushes, the trees, somebody might be there, so you get nervous. Right? Nervous, getting a shock, that's not fear. Would you call that fear? I go out in the dark, I don't know where the steps are, so I am a little cautious. Right? Go slowly, step by step and find out. But that is not fear, is it? You are protecting yourself against falling. Right? That's not fear. Discuss with me, talk to me about it. Would you call that fear? If you are afraid of darkness in the room - are you?

S: No.

K: Oh, then you are perfectly all right. What are you afraid of?
Your parents?

Students: Sometimes.

K: Yes? What does that mean? Sometimes. Why? Tell me please. Apparently you are afraid of your parents - I am quite sure of it. Whether they beat you, scold you, tell you, don't do this, do that - right? Be like this, don't do that - keep on at you. Right? So the parents make you insensitive. Right? Do you see that? Do you see that? By telling you all the time, don't do this, do that, your hair is not right, you don't put on your dress properly, so you gradually shrink, don't you? Is that right? So there again you become insensitive.

So we are finding out what makes you insensitive. First you get hurt, then at home you are scolded, or even perhaps the mother or the father slaps you, which is dreadful, and at school you are also scolded. Right? So gradually you build a wall round yourself, don't you? Do you know what building a wall around yourself means? Not physically, but inwardly you shrink, and so you become insensitive. Right? That's one part of it.

And what is sensitivity? What is it to be sensitive? I'll tell you. I'll tell you all these things, will you do all of what I say, I am not going to scold you? Will you do what I say? Discuss with me, if I am wrong, tell me I am wrong. If I am right, tell me. But if you sit silently I don't know if you think I am telling something nonsensical, or something real. Right?

Do you hear that train?

Students: Yes.

K: That is, what, tell me, go on, tell me. When you hear that train crossing that bridge and whistling, are you aware of it? Or you have got so used to it?

Students: We have got used to it.

K: So if you get used to anything you become insensitive. You are used to puja at home. Right? Some of you at least, some parents indulge in this nonsense called puja. Right? Repeat, repeat, repeat, day after day. They don't know what it means, it is generally in Sanskrit or something or other, you repeat. So anything that is repetitive makes you insensitive. Have you understood this? Right? So find out if you do anything over and over again without thinking. You get what I am saying? Do you do anything without thinking about it?

Now wait a minute: how do you clean your teeth?

S: With a brush.

K: You clean your teeth with a brush, putting toothpaste on it and brushing and thinking about something else. Right? Right?

Students: Yes.

K: Listen. You brush your teeth looking out of the window, thinking about something else, you are not paying attention to what you are doing. Right? What you are doing becomes a habit, without thinking. I wonder if you understand what I am saying.

Students: Yes.

K: So anything that you repeat without thinking makes you insensitive. Got it?

Students: Yes.

K: You comb your hair, thinking about something else, and you are not aware, watchful of what you are doing. Right? Will you pay

attention to what you are doing? That is, when you comb your hair watch it, that you are combing your hair, watch how you comb your hair. I do this every morning. I am very, very watchful of what I am doing so that I don't fall into a habit. You understand? The moment I fall into a habit, routine, doing the thing over and over again, I become careless, indifferent, insensitive. Got it?

Now do you see the flowers outside?

Students: Yes.

K: Do you?

Students: Yes.

K: No, don't say, 'yes', have you seen them, actually looked at them, or you look at them as you pass by? What do you do? Do you actually look at them?

Students: Yes

K: Do you watch their colour, the shape of the flower, the smell of the flower?

Students: Yes.

K: Right. Or - this is rather difficult, will you follow me a little bit? - or you have smelt the flower so often that you smell it remembering that you have smelt it before? I wonder if you understand this?

Students: Yes.

K: If I am your teacher - thank god I am not! - if I am your teacher I see you every day. Right? Every day for a couple of hours I see you, I recognise you, I know how you are going to behave more or less because I have watched you; whether you study properly, whether you are looking out of the window, whether you are pulling somebody's hair, I watch you. And as a teacher I almost

know you. You understand? I know what you are going to say, I know what your reactions are, so I don't pay much attention. I know you. You understand? I have become insensitive to you. You understand what I am saying?

S: Yes.

K: So as a teacher, can I look at you afresh? This is very difficult. You understand what I am saying? Can you look at me, if I am your teacher - let's put it round the other way - I come to your class, I don't know how I am dressed, whether I am clean, neat, fresh clothes, tidy, or I come sloppy, how do you look at me? If I am your teacher how do you regard me? S: With my past experience.

K: Yes, you look at me with your past experience. Can you look at me as your teacher as if for the first time you are seeing me?

Students: Yes.

K: I look at you as though I have seen you dozens of times, and you look at me as though you have seen me dozens of times. Right? So what happens? What is your relationship to me, and my relationship to you?

S: We take each other for granted.

K: That's it. You take each other for granted. What does that mean?

S: You know what the reactions of the other person are going to be.

K: You take me for granted, and I take you for granted - what does that phrase mean, granted? She used that phrase - we take each other for granted - what does that mean?

S: We become mechanical to each other.

K: Is that what happens? Investigate, sir, think about it. Is that what happens? When I take you for granted, and you take me for granted, what does that mean?

S: You become insensitive.

K: No, don't use the word 'insensitive'. Sorry! I take for granted my mother is going to cook. Right? I take it for granted my parents are going to send me money. I take for granted the servant is going to make the bed. So what happens when I take people for granted?

S: There's a certain carelessness.

K: That's is, a certain carelessness, indifference. Right? So when you take people for granted you become insensitive, don't you? I wonder if you understand all this? So let's find out.

What is your relationship with regard to the teacher, and what is the teacher's relationship to you? You know what relationship means, don't you? Do you? You are related to your parents - most unfortunately. You are related to your brother, to your mother - what is your relationship to the teacher and what is his relationship to you? Tell me. There are all the teachers there! What's your relationship to them?

S: We are concerned with each other.

K: You contaminate each other?

S: No, we are concerned.

K: I prefer contamination! Tell me please. Concerned for each other-is that what you are saying? Is that an actuality? Are you concerned about the teacher? Of course not! And is the teacher concerned about you? Q: We are.

K: Don't tell them, I want them to tell me. Is the teacher concerned about you? Don't be shy.

S: I don't know.

K: What do you mean, you don't know? What is the teacher concerned about? That you study. Right? I am your mathematics teacher, I am concerned that you learn from the book, and from what I know about mathematics. Right? Is he concerned about anything else? Tell me, sirs.

S: No, he is not concerned about me.

K: So as he is not concerned about you, except that you pass some beastly mathematics, he doesn't say, 'How are you? Did you sleep well? Have you any troubles? Have you any problems? Is your health all right?' - you know, enquire. You understand what I am saying? That would be concern, wouldn't it? Right? Do you agree? And your concern then also is to say, 'I hope you have no problems, I hope you didn't quarrel with your wife, or you didn't beat her up' - all that is conversation between two people. You understand?

Now another thing: you have eaten in that hall, haven't you, every day, you have your meals in that big hall. Right? Yes, or no?

Students: Yes.

K: Good! Have you seen what the kitchen is like? The cook?

Students: Yes.

K: What do you think of it? Don't look at her.

S: It is better than other schools, but it needs more improvement.

K: When you ask, as I have asked some of the ministers in the government, this country is very corrupt, they say, 'Yes, but so are the other countries'. So he is avoiding the question - you understand? When I ask him, 'It is very corrupt this country', he

says, 'Not so corrupt as Czechoslovakia or Indonesia'. That question is the same, isn't it? 'This is not as good as it should be but it is better than the others'. You understand? Now go this afternoon, before lunch, look at the kitchen, go inside and look at it. I have been there. It is dirty. Right? Right?

Students: Yes.

K: Filthy. The cooks are dirty, the floor is dirty, the walls are dirty, all the posts they touch, they have left their marks, dirty. So what will you do? Now just a minute. You see dirt and you don't do anything. Right? Doesn't that make you insensitive? Right? So what will you do? Absolute silence! That means you see dirt, accept it and become insensitive to dirt and carry on. Right? So what I am going to do is to paint all that place white. Right? The floor, make it clean, cement it, level it - you know, so that it is always clean. Right? Now will you help?

Students: Yes.

K: No, paint the doors white, the walls white so that the kitchen is one of the most important places, where you can have good clean food.

S: What about the cooks?

K: What about the cooks? What will you do with them?

S: Dress them in white.

K: Absolutely, dress them in white. Or take them to the Ganga and dip them!

S: What pollutes them there?

K: So if you demand cleanliness you will have it, but you don't care. You understand? If you, who are the majority here, ten to one probably, if you say, look, sirs, we must have that kitchen

absolutely clean - go on strike! And you will see tomorrow that kitchen will be clean! Agree? Will you do it?

Students: Yes.

K: You asked, how to be sensitive: don't accept anything that is dirty, for god's sake. And also to be sensitive, will you look after a tree, plant it, dig manure, plant a tree and look after it? Will you?

S: Sir, it is good that we look after it, it will bear fruit.

K: Suppose if it doesn't bear fruit, will you also look after it? I have planted dozens and dozens of trees in California, dug three feet deep, three feet wide, collected soil, leaf mould and planted it. They are still surviving, they are orange trees. I have milked cows. Will you do all that - if the cows allow it!

So to become sensitive you have to watch very carefully that you don't fall into a habit. You have fallen into a habit with regard to that kitchen: you see it every day and it is dirty. Right? You have become insensitive to it. You see those poor people walking every day, carrying heavy loads, you have got used to it, so you become insensitive. So don't get used to anything. You understand? Suppose I am a bad teacher, I don't know how to teach, you put up with it, you don't go on strike. So you see. A professor from Oxford in England, a friend of mine, came to this country and went to several schools and colleges. He said to me at the end of it, he said 'My god, they don't know how to teach'. You understand? And you accept it.

Now I will show you something. Is it time for me to stop? You are not bored?

Students: No.

K: Three cheers! You know what is mathematics?

Students: Yes.

K: Tell me what it is. You all study mathematics, don't you, unfortunately, or fortunately.

S: Unfortunately!

K: Do you know what mathematics is?

S: The magic of numbers.

K: The magic of numbers. All right. Two plus two doesn't make five, it makes four. Right? What does that mean? Or three multiplied by eight equals twenty-four. What does that mean, all that: two by two, ten by three, twelve by four, what does that mean to you? Not just forty-eight, thirty-six, four and so on. What does it mean to you? You are all learning mathematics, aren't you? Think about it, think, find out, don't let me tell you, find out. You have got brains, use them. I see you are not interested. Doesn't it mean order? Two plus two is four, twelve multiplied by three is thirty-six and so on. Doesn't it show you it is extraordinarily orderly? Right? Extraordinary rhythmic, like a dance, a flow. Right? You agree? So mathematics means order. Right? Now there is not only order in the universe, that is, the sun rising, the sun setting at exactly the same time according to seasons. You follow? There is tremendous order in the universe. You have seen Orion, the stars - doesn't anybody tell you about all this? No? Good lord! It rises - I won't go into it.

So mathematics, the real deep study of mathematics, is discovering order in the universe, in numbers, and also discovering if you have order in yourself. You understand? Or you are confused, you are contradictory, disorderly. Right? Do you see the relationship between mathematics and yourself - do you? You see

how difficult it is for them to think. You learn from books, don't you? Why don't you learn looking at the birds, looking at the stars, learn, watch, see? Nobody encourages you, nobody tells you about it. What shall we do? Sirs, you are all responsible for the school, what will you do? Because your minds merely looking at books, learning from books makes you secondhand. You understand, secondhand? Like going to a shop and buying secondhand things, you have all become secondhand, there is no firsthand. You don't say, 'Well sir, I looked at Orion, those stars, the Pleiades, it looks so beautiful' - you follow? So what shall we do? You see how insensitive we become to all this. I am not scolding you so don't go to sleep. I, as an occasional visitor here, and I say, for god's sake, what kind of school is this when you are merely learning from books? I will tell you. I went to school in England, I never passed one exam. You understand? Not one examination. So I was sent to various universities, I couldn't pass. Then they sent me to France, a place called the Sorbonne, where your Prime Minister has just been, and I knew French, and there too I couldn't pass. So Dr Besant - you have heard of Dr Besant - who was looking after me, she had adopted me, she said, 'That's enough. You have been to all these schools, you never pass, so enough.' But you see, I watched, I watched the trees, the ants, the flies, the birds, I watched and listened to very, very famous people, like - you have heard of Bernard Shaw? I used to meet him quite often, I listened to him, I listened to various scientists, painters, poets, and you learn, you absorb so much. But if you merely stick to books - you follow?

S: (Inaudible)

K: I am going to show you, sir. You know, I saw a report in one

of the highly respected newspapers in England that - listen to this, listen to this - that when you sing to the tree it begins to move. You understand what I am saying? Do you understand what I am saying? That when you are friendly with the tree, when you sing to the tree, a particular tree it begins to sway, the whole tree. Find out which tree in this campus moves when you sing to it. Find out when you say something harsh it becomes very still. And when you talk to it very gently the leaves flutter, dance with you. Do you understand all this? Will you do it? You may sound cuckoo, singing to a tree, but a tree is one of the most beautiful things on earth. I don't know if you have sat under one, probably here during this season it is too cold to have your lessons outside. And also they have found scientifically that when you are milking a cow if there is music in the shed it gives more. I have told this to Upasaniji, he is going to do it, play music to the cows. You see, learn from outside, not just from books.

Is that enough? Do you know what meditation is? Probably you don't. All you know about meditation is to repeat. Right?

S: No.

K: No? What is meditation then? Tell me. You see meditation means to have a very quiet, still mind, not a chattering mind; to have a really quiet body, quiet mind so that your mind becomes very religious. All this nonsense that is going on in the name of religion is rubbish, but to have a very, very quiet body, to have a very quiet mind, and to keep your eyes quiet, still, so that your whole being is totally harmonious. And in that state other things, greater things, take place. That's real meditation. Not to say, I must be quiet, keep my body very quiet, force it - naturally quiet. So

shall we do it for a few minutes? Right.

(Pause) Right, sirs. I hope you all have a nice holiday.

RAJGHAT, BENARES 1ST PUBLIC TALK 25TH NOVEMBER 1981

I am sorry to be sitting on a platform, but sitting on a platform doesn't give me any authority. It is just for convenience.

First of all, if I may point out, the speaker in no way is instructing you, or trying to convince you of anything: to any belief, to any ideal, to any conclusion. But we are talking over together the many human problems. Human problems are common throughout the world, they are not specially restricted to this country. The human problems are very complex and need a great deal of study, understanding and enquiry. And together, you and the speaker, are going to examine freely, objectively, without any personal bias, into what is happening in the world. Together, you are not merely listening to a series of talks, just a verbal communication, but rather together these four days we are going to look very carefully, objectively, into the society in which we live, the politics, the corruption throughout the world, and more so in this country, and into all the religious superstitions - mostly gibberish nonsense. And together let us look into it.

You are not just listening to the speaker, translating some words, some ideas, but what the speaker is saying, he is talking about you as a human being, not as an Indian, but as a human being who is going through a great deal of trouble, who is unhappy, miserable - you know all that is going on in this world, ridden with sorrow, anxiety, loneliness, a sense of utter despair when you observe all this. That is the condition of human beings right throughout the world, whether you go to America, Europe, or

even Russia, or China, this is the state of man. And we are together looking at it, examining it, not from any particular point of view, or from any conclusion or ideal. We are looking at things as they are, what is going on, not 'what should happen', which is nonsense, that is just a supposition, an ideal, but examine exactly what is going on: that which is, not that which should be, because that which should be has no meaning, because 'what is' must be transformed, must be changed, must bring about a radical transformation.

That is what we are concerned with, not with ideals, not with beliefs, not with some religious conclusions but we are together going to examine the whole human problem. That is the first statement I would like to make: that together we are going to examine. And what the speaker is saying is a description, is a verbal communication, a statement of what is going on, which probably most people know but it must be stated. And how you translate what you see depends on one's conditioning, it depends on one's opinions, or historical conclusions. If one could put aside all those conclusions, opinions, evaluations, and just observe, as you would observe that tree. You can cut down that tree but just to see it as it is.

Let's find out together what we mean by intelligence. According to the dictionary meaning, it is able to collect, recollect, gather a great deal of information about any subject, or about one's own life, and after gathering as much information as possible, objectively, not merely subjectively, but from the outside move inwardly, and to be able after having gathered all this objective as well as inward information, to act skilfully on that is intelligence. That is, look at the world as it is: the wars, the gathering of the

instruments of war, the atom bomb, the neutron bombs, which all the scientists throughout the world are sustaining it, multiplying it, encouraging it. All the people who are against it, 250,000 people have just met in Europe to demonstrate against this neutron bomb. And on the other hand you have all the countries encouraging neutron bombs. So they are all preparing for war because of nationalism, which is really glorified tribalism, the economic division, the political corruption, not only in this country, this is the state all over the world, perhaps it is more so in this unfortunate country. And there is tremendous religious division - the Catholic group, the Protestant group, the Hindu group, the Chinese and so on, this constant division, not only socially but family against family.

This is the state of the world. Neither the politicians, nor the scientists, nor the philosophers, nor the economic experts, have been able to solve our human condition. This is also an obvious fact. And we have always looked for leaders; a great statesman, or a great religious leader, or expert in economics who will save us all from our misery. And all the leaders throughout the world have led us where we are. And I don't see why we depend on leaders at all. Do please consider what the speaker is saying. Don't just reject it. Let us together find out what to do about all this, not theoretically, not as some idealistic conclusion according to which one will act, but taking things as they are: the national, religious, sectarian, the absurd divisions that are going on throughout the world; the conflict between each other, and in ourselves, not knowing what to do we depend on others, on the Upanishads, the Gita, or the Bible, or some preacher or some guru, so that we have become incapable

of becoming totally responsible for ourselves. We depend on others. That has been one of the miseries in this country. You have had guru after guru, saint after saint, whatever the saints may be, probably neurotic, and we have had political, religious, every kind of leader, and we have blindly or reasonably, or satisfactorily followed them. And when you observe all this, we see what we have become - unfortunate, unintelligent, in conflict with each other, corruption, preparing for war for which we are all responsible, because when you buy a stamp, when you telephone, or when you pay a tax we are supporting war.

Apparently this country, which has talked a great deal about non-violence, which is nonsense, has bought millions and millions worth of armaments from abroad. And the other part of the world is also preparing the same thing. You understand all this? So having described the state of the world, and the state of the world is produced by man, by you, by the speaker, by each one of us because society is human relationship, not some abstraction, not something that you have to do something out there. But it is a human relationship that has produced this society, this society which is so mad, so corrupt.

So having described all this, and I am quite sure most of us have also looked at the world with clarity, objectively, then what is one to do? Now, not in ten year's time. What, as a human being, is our responsibility? And you can only be responsible totally when you do not depend on politicians, leaders, gurus and all that, when you feel totally responsible for your actions - which we don't. Religiously we have some kind of conclusions, karma. We say, well, past life, or blame environment, or blame the politicians and

so on. We never under any circumstances take responsibility so that we act correctly.

Now what shall we do? Will each one of us undertake to be totally honest, absolutely say what you mean and stick to it, be totally integrated? Because if we cannot we are going to bring about great disaster. Can we face our responsibility? Not theoretically, not in any sense of abstract thinking, but actually will each one of us undertake to be absolutely, deeply, profoundly responsible for all our actions? That is the first thing.

When we listen to each other, as we are doing now, can we undertake for ourselves to live with such integrity that we become incorruptible? Because if we could then a group in this part of the world, or in this part of the country, another group, you understand, that is the only salvation for this country. Not your present religion which is nonsense, a mass of superstitions, nonsense. But to have a religious mind, which is totally different from belonging to some religion, to some sect, to have a religious mind. We are going to enquire together what is that religious mind. Because only religion in the right sense of that word, which we will go into presently, it is only religion, not the religion of the Hindus, or the Christians, or the Buddhists, but the real discovery or the understanding what truth is, which depends on each one of us, not on some so-called enlightened people.

So we are together going to examine what is a religious mind. As we said, only religion - we will explain what that word means presently - only religion has brought about at any historical time a new culture, totally independent of the old superstitious, ritualistic, repetitive nonsense, totally different. And we are going to enquire

into that. Religion, the word religion etymologically, that is the root, the meaning of that word is not very clear. Each one has his own religion, or pretends to have his own religion, or depends on some tradition, some orthodoxy. But the word religion comes from the root to bind, to bind oneself to something greater. The greater can be invented by thought, but that is not great. I don't know if you are following all this? To have that sense of diligence, to the discovery, or to come upon that which is eternally true, that is really religion. A sense of total dedication, commitment, to uncover that which is beyond time, beyond thought, which is not an experience.

So we are going to enquire together whether human beings, you or another, will be able to come upon that truth, because all our culture is disintegrating throughout the world, degenerating. And the threat of war, the threat of the computer. I do not know if you understand what the computers are doing to our minds. I will go into it. Whether our minds, which includes the brain, whether our brains are capable as they are now to discover, or come upon something that is timeless. Are you, if I may ask most respectfully, depending on the speaker to tell you what to do? Or are we capable of thinking out together what to do, what kind of freedom, which is absolutely necessary, to find that which is beyond time.

So we have to enquire first into what is, not only religion, but what is thought, what is thinking? Because all our activities, all our imaginations, all the things written down in the Upanishads, or whatever the religious books are, are put together by thought. The architecture, all the extraordinary technology that is going on in the world, and all the temples and those things that are contained in the

temples, whether it is the Hindu temple, the mosque, the church, are the result of thought. All the rituals are invented by thought. The puja, the worship, everything is based on thought. Nobody can deny that. So we have to enquire together what is thinking, what is thought, upon which we depend? All our relationship is based on thought. All our political structure is based on thought. The economic structure is also the result of thought. Our national divisions are the result of thought. You see we have always enquired about the external things but we have never asked ourselves what is thinking? What is the root and the consequences of thinking? Not what you think about, but the movement of thinking. Thinking itself, not the result of thinking, or thinking about something which is different from the enquiry into what is thinking itself. Right? Are we together in this question? Yes?

I wonder if you have ever asked yourselves: what is thinking? When you are asked a question which is very familiar the response is immediate. We say, 'What is your name?', you answer it immediately because you have repeated it so often it comes out very quickly. But when you are asked a more complex question you take time, time between the question and the answer. During that time you investigate, you think, you ask, you enquire. Either you look at a book or ask somebody, or your own memory, reviving the memory and giving the answer. So there is a time interval between the question and the answer. This is obvious. And also when we are asked some question one is never honest to say, 'I don't know.'

So that there are these three conditions of thought. That is familiar, then the time interval between the question and the

answer, and to say, 'I don't know.' You don't know about god, do you? You believe in god, I don't know why but you believe in god. And you have never enquired whether we have not made god, our thinking has made god and if the god exists he must want us to lead a rotten life. Right? You see we never say, 'I don't know.' That is much more honest, it makes your mind clear. So we have to go into this question of what is thinking, what is thought, the beginning of thought, the movement. If one is at all aware, or observing, or enquiring into the nature of thought, to see the first movement of thought. We must be very clear on this point: the description is never the fact. Right? And most of us are just stuck in description, in explanations or in commentaries, but never deal with what actually is. Or translate 'what is' into 'what should be'. 'What should be' is never the fact, so the ideal is never the fact, but only 'what is'. We will go into all this presently.

So first we must enquire into what is thinking, which is the central factor of our life. All the business you do, all the worship, the images that thought has created either by the hand or by the mind, which thought then worships. You understand? I wonder if you understand? Are you all going to sleep, or are we together? You understand? Thought has created the image you have put in the temple - temple, church, mosque, or whatever it is. Thought has created it, invented it. Then thought worships that which it has created. And that, you call that sacred. So we have to enquire whether thought is sacred? Or it is a material process. You understand the difference? Either thought is a material process and therefore whatever it does, whether it creates gods, nirvana, anything it creates beyond its measure is still thought, a material

process. Or thought is the only instrument that man has and whatever it does must be correct? So we are going to enquire into what is thinking.

Thinking is common to all mankind. Right? Thought is not my thought, there is only thought. Thought is neither oriental or occidental, East or West, there is only thinking. Right?

Now we will explain what thinking is, but the explanation is not the actual awareness of how thought arises in yourself. The speaker can go into it, describe it, explain it, but that explanation is not your own understanding of the origin of thinking. If that is clear that the description is not your actual discovery, but through explanation, through verbal communication, you yourself discover it. That is far more important than the speaker explaining. Right? Are we clear on this matter?

Sir, the speaker has been accused of collecting a lot of teachings. He has written a great many books, unfortunately. He has talked a great deal throughout the world for the last sixty years. So they have invented a word called 'his teachings'. (Laughter) Just a minute. The teachings are not something out there in a book. What the teaching is, or are, says, 'Look at yourself, go into yourself, enquire what there is, understand it, go beyond it.' And so on. So you are not understanding the teachings but you are understanding yourself. Only the teachings are a means of pointing, explaining, but you have to do, not the teachings but the understanding of yourself. Is that clear? So don't, please don't try to understand what the speaker is saying, but understand that what he is saying is acting as a mirror in which you are looking at yourself. When you are looking at yourself very carefully then the mirror is

not important, you throw it away. Right? So that is what we are doing.

What is thinking upon which you all depend for your livelihood, in our relationship, in our search for something beyond itself? So it is very important to understand the nature of thought. First of all the speaker has discussed this matter with a great many scientists of the West, who have gone into the question of the brain. We are only using a very small part of the whole brain. You can observe this in yourself if you have gone into it, that is part of meditation, to find out for yourself whether the whole brain is operating, or only one part - and a very small part. That is one of the questions. Thought is the response of memory. Memory has been stored through knowledge. Knowledge is gathered through experience. That is, experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, then thought, then action; from that action you learn more, that is accumulate more experience, more knowledge and so store more memory in the brain, and then act; from that action learn more. So this whole process is based on this movement: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. This is our pattern of living, which is thought. Is that clear? There is no dispute about this. We gather a lot of information through experience, or through others who have experienced, stored up this knowledge in our brain, from which thought arises, and action. Man has done this for the last million years, caught in this cycle, which is the movement of thought. Right? And within this area we have choice, we can go within this area from one corner to the other and say, 'This is our choice, this is our movement of freedom', but it is always within this limited area of knowledge. Right? So we are always

functioning within the field of the known. Right? And knowledge is always accompanied by ignorance because there is no complete knowledge about anything. Right? So we are always in this contradictory state: knowledge and ignorance. So thought is never - thought is incomplete, broken up, for this reason that knowledge can never be complete, so thought is never complete, it is limited, conditioned. And thought has created a thousand problems for us.

So knowledge is necessary, otherwise you wouldn't be able to go from here to your house. Knowledge is necessary when we are communicating with each other in English, or in whatever language it be. Knowledge is necessary to do so many things, to cook, to wash dishes - perhaps none of you wash dishes, probably not - to do any kind of skill, thought is necessary. But psychologically, inwardly, is thought necessary? Do you understand my question? Please one must understand this question very deeply, not what the speaker is saying. The speaker is only indicating, he is acting as a mirror for you to look at yourself, to look and find out the origin, the beginning of thought. And you will see how thought is operating all the time in our life: when we meditate it is thought, when we seek truth it is thought, or the suppression of thought. And who is the suppressor, which is still thought. And so man through millennia upon millennia has been caught in this pattern. So in this pattern there is never freedom because knowledge can never bring freedom, because knowledge is always limited. I wonder if you see all this? And you need absolute freedom to find that which is eternal. Obviously. Freedom from all attachment, which means from all knowledge. I wonder if you see it?

So knowledge has become necessary in a certain direction, and knowledge is the most dangerous thing that we have inwardly. You understand this? We are now accumulating a great deal of knowledge, about the universe, about the nature of everything, you follow, scientifically, analytically, archaeologically and so on and so on, we are collecting infinite knowledge. And that knowledge may be preventing us from acting as a total complete human being. So that is one of our problems. That is, the computer, of which I am sure you have heard, can outstrip man in thinking. It can outlearn man. It can correct itself. It can learn to play with master chess players and beat them after the fourth game, or fifth game. They are now working out, because we have talked with some people who are super experts in this computer business, in California and other places, they are now trying to find out, and they are creating it, it is coming within the next few years, the ultimate intelligent machine. You understand all this? The mother computer can create its son. The son is better than the mother. And the son's son is still better than the father. So they are now inventing, discovering ultimate intelligent machines, which is the computer, which will beat man in every way. It can write music, not like great musicians, it can invent gods, it can invent philosophy. Please don't laugh, it is taking place now, not in the future, it is happening now. So if the machine can outstrip man then what is man, what are you? You understand?

You have accumulated a great deal of knowledge. The machine, the computer can have far greater knowledge than anybody. The size of a finger nail can contain the whole of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the whole of it. You understand? So what is man? Man

has lived so far by the activity of brain, keeping it active because he has struggled to survive, to accumulate knowledge skilfully to be secure, to have safety. Now the machine is taking all that over and what are you? The machine, the computer with the robot is building motor cars. The computer tells the robot what to do and the robot does it, turn on the screws or whatever it does. And when the robot makes a mistake the computer corrects it and the robot goes on. You understand all this? So what has become of man? What is the future of man? If the machine can take over all the operations that thought does now, and do it far swifter, learn much more quickly, compete - follow? - and everything that man can do, except of course look at the beautiful evening star alone in the sky and see the beauty of it, the extraordinary quietness, the steadiness, the immensity of that. Of course the computer can't feel all that, but it may. They are working at it furiously.

So what is going to happen to our mind, to our brain? It is part of thinking. Please follow all this. Our brains have lived so far by struggling to survive through knowledge. And when the machine takes all that over what is going to happen to it? There are only two possibilities: either he commits himself totally to entertainment, outwardly, football, sports, every form of demonstration, or religious entertainment, going to the temple, you know, playing with all that stuff. Or he turns inwardly, because the brain has infinite capacity, it is really infinite. That capacity is now used technologically, which the machine is going to take over. That capacity has been in the gathering of information, knowledge, scientific, political, social, religious, you know. And that brain has been occupied. Suddenly that brain's capacity is being taken over

by the machine. And that capacity taken over by the machine is going to whither the brain. You understand? If I don't use my brain all the time it will whither. So if the brain is not being active, working, thinking, which the machine can do far better than the brain can, then what is going to happen to the human brain? Either the entertainment, or the enquiry into himself which is infinite. You understand? I hope you understand all this. Right?

So we have said that thought is the expression, or the reaction of memory. Memory is the result of knowledge, which is experience. In this cycle man has been caught. In this area it can invent gods, it can - you follow - anything. And the machine has taken that over. So either I enquire into myself, which is infinite movement, or plunge into entertainment. And most religions are entertainment. All the rituals, the pujas, it is just a form of entertainment. So we have to enquire what is religion? Which is, we have to enquire whether we can put our house in order - our house, not the house, the house inside us, the structure, the struggles, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the respiration, the aggression, the suffering, the pain, all that is such a tremendous disorder in us. And from that confusion, disorder, we try to bring about order out there, politically, economically, socially, all that, without having order inside. So to expect order out there without order here is impossible. Right? See, please see the logic of it. We want, you want in this country, which is degenerating so fast - anarchy, total disorder is there, corruption, bribery, every form of dirty tricks that one can play from top to bottom, our house which we have created is in total disorder - and we are always asking for order out there; please, the politicians, create order. And we never say the order

must come first here, in our house. And then only will you have order out there. Right?

This is logic, please, simple, sane, intelligent logic. But you see we never want order here, we want order there. And we have lived that way. All the past generation upon generation have lived that way. We are the result of all the disorders of thousands and thousands of years. And can there be order in us? And is it possible to bring - not to bring order, but to understand what is disorder? If one understands in the sense realize our disorder, see what its nature is, how it comes about and so on, in the very awareness, in the very comprehension of it, into the very insight of it, comes order. You can't create order when your mind is in disorder. So please follow this a minute, give your attention if you don't mind. We now think order is the opposite of disorder. Right? But if we understand disorder, which is the fact, not order, then the very unravelling of it, the very investigating of it, tearing it apart to find what disorder is, out of that comes order. Order is not a blueprint, it is a living thing, as disorder is. But they are totally separate. Out of disorder order is not possible. What is possible is the ending of disorder, then there is perfect order.

So we are going to enquire: what is disorder? How does it come about? Why human beings, highly educated, highly technologically capable, have conquered the earth, and space, done everything that is most extraordinary, and yet he lives in a total, complete mess in his life. So what is disorder? Come on sirs! Why your own life, if one may take that, why your life is in disorder? What is disorder? Any state of contradiction. Right? Contradiction indicates disorder. Imitation indicates disorder. Conformity is a state of disorder.

Right? That is, where there is division between - please listen - between 'what is' and 'what should be' is a conflict. Right? Where there is conflict there must be disorder. Like two sets of people calling one Hindu, the other group Muslim, the division must inevitably create disorder. Right?

So there is only disorder, not we are seeking order. You see the difference? I am in disorder - if I am. I don't understand what is order, how can I? So it is out of my perception. I am only concerned with disorder. Look, I will put it round the other way. In this country you have talked a great deal about non-violence. Right? Right? Of course. You have spread that philosophy all over the world, politically non-violence, etc., etc. Non-violence is an absurd idea, it doesn't exist. What exists actually is violence. And the ideal of non-violence is not a fact. What is fact, what is actual is violence. But we have invented non-violence as an escape from violence. You are following all this? Please play with me a little bit, would you? So when I am pursuing non-violence, when I am actually violent, there is hypocrisy, there is dishonesty, there is lack of integrity. The integrity is to face the fact, say, 'Yes, I am violent'. Not pretend to eventually become non-violent. If you are saying, 'Eventually I will become non-violent', that eventually is the extension of violence. I don't know if you know all this.

So I am only concerned with 'what is', which is violence. Then what is violence? Obviously to physically hurt somebody, physically to attack somebody, you know, anger and all the rest of it. Or violence is a state of contradiction in which I live. Why is there contradiction? Contradiction exists only when I do not accept 'what is' but always wanting to be 'what is not'. So I have invented

duality. I don't know if you follow all this. I am never concerned with 'what is' but I am always concerned with 'what is not', this ridiculous duality in me. And I preach about duality, talk about duality, you know write philosophically and all the rest of it. But the fact is I am violent, that is the only reality. Now what is violence? Not only verbally, not only hurting somebody, war is a violence. It is the greatest disaster that can happen to man, the brutality of it, the terrible things that are taking place when there is a war, and the division between people - Hindus, Muslims, Christians - you follow? - the Arab and the Jew. So where there is division there is war, there must be conflict. And if I am only dealing with facts, with what is actually happening, there is no duality, I wonder if you understand all this?

Violence is in the nature of man, he is part of it, it is inherited from the animal, and so on, I won't go into all that. And can there be an end to violence in us? That is, the end to disorder in us so that we live in complete total order. Then our society will be in order. It is not the other way round. The Communists have tried, saying, create the environment rightly then man will be right. But they have not succeeded. No revolution has succeeded. When they say, change the exterior, laws, the structure of society, all that, but they have never said, 'Is it possible to bring about order in oneself?', which means don't follow anybody. You are all followers, secondhand people. Therefore you are always seeking leaders, and you have had a thousand leaders - religious and otherwise. And at the end of all this, where are you? In the same mess as you began. So can we totally disregard, absolutely, leaders and we become leaders ourselves in ourselves. We are both the

teacher and the taught. You understand all this? Which means we are learning, not from somebody but we are learning not merely from books - books are nothing, the computer is the complete book - learning from observing, from listening, from seeing the beauty of the earth, seeing the beauty of the trees, the clouds, the single star of an evening, listening to the birds so that we become extraordinarily sensitive.

Now all your religions say suppress senses. Right? Suppress the reaction of the senses. We are saying quite the contrary, which means the awakening of all the senses, not one particular sense, so that there is total reaction of all the senses when you see the tree. When you look at that tree with all your senses there is no centre from which you are looking. When there is a centre, which is the ego, the me, the self, and all that, the super self, the super consciousness, it is still the self, when there is that self you cannot look at the beauty of a tree.

So to bring about naturally, without the effort, or search for the order, we must understand what is disorder, which we have gone into slightly. Which is, to understand our relationship, not only to nature, the trees, the rivers, the birds, the relationship to all the beautiful extraordinary world in which we live, but also to understand the relationship between each other, man and woman. Do you understand your relationship with your wife? With your husband? Or your relationship to some extraordinary guru who is slightly neurotic? Have you ever looked at your relationship to your children? To your wife, to your husband, to your politicians? Because if we don't understand relationship that brings about disorder, which is conflict between man and woman or between

each other. So one must understand to have total order in the house - house, not the house, which is the house in which I live all the time, which is myself, if there is no order there I will never have order with the universe because the universe is living in total order. I don't know if you follow all this? The sun rises, the sun sets, the seasons, the extraordinary things that are happening in the universe, all without cause and therefore with order.

And we live in disorder because we have causes. The cause is either reward or punishment, that is the basic cause of our life. I will do things when I am rewarded or when I am punished. Right? When the train, engineer or the engine driver arrives seven hours, or ten hours late at every - you know all this - that is disorder, it is utterly totally irresponsible. And nobody says anything to him. But if you frighten him he becomes orderly. Or you reward him. Right? If the guru rewards the disciple or punishes him, it is the same thing. So we depend on others to bring about order in our life, and that very dependence is disorder. Because we are then not responsible for whatever we are doing. So if we have time - we will talk some more and finish it.

We have to go into this question of relationship. The way we live in a family, married, husband, wife, children, their education. I don't know if you realize what is happening in this country about education. It is getting worse and worse and worse. The so-called educated need education. So we must understand this extraordinary complex problem of human relationship, which is the basis of our disorder. And we try to escape from relationship of any kind by becoming monks, or escape into being a hermit, into this or that. We have never resolved this question of relationship in which there

must be perfect order. So what is relationship? Come on sirs, think it out. We are talking it over together as two friends. Right? I am not preaching to you, I am not telling you what to do. That would be terrible. But together we are looking at it. Have we relationship with anybody? Or our relationship is like two parallel lines never meeting, except perhaps in bed. So our relationship however close, or however intimate, is running like two parallel lines and therefore there must be conflict, where there is division there must be conflict. And so our house is in disorder. You may escape to the Himalayas, or to a cave and become a monk or this or that, but you are always in relationship with something, you can't help it, you can't avoid it. It is there, it is part of life. And you can never escape from it. So we have to understand it, go into it, which we are trying to do now.

What is relationship? Can a married man pursue his particular ambition, his aggressiveness, his own desires, and she follow her own desires, problems. Follow? Two people running together, separate, parallel, never, never meeting. Is that relationship? Please sirs, go into it, don't sit, answer it, find out. The man goes to the office for ten hours a day, or eight hours a day, think of it! Fifty or sixty years of his life in an office, doing something which he doesn't like, or if he likes he becomes more and more proficient, more and more ambitious, climbing the ladder of success in one direction, comes home and tries to be quiet, gentle. You follow? And the wife pursues her own ambitions, her own ends. You see all this. You see it in every family on earth. And how can there be order in the house?

That is, thought in relationship - please follow this - thought in

relationship can only bring about disorder, because thought creates the image about her, and she creates the image about you. Right? And these two images have relationship, which is just having a relationship in the air somewhere. Now to see that, to be aware of that, and not create the images. You understand all this? Oh, no, you don't. You have never even thought about all these things. You see sirs we have become so used to something that is dreadful. We have become used to conflict, we put up with conflict, we have explanations about conflict - quote the Gita, Upanishads, or some book or other, but we have never said, 'Can I live completely a life without conflict?' And you can find out the truth of that matter in relationship, which is never to create an image about her, or her about you. You know that requires - what does it require? You are not even thinking. Sir, if I say, 'I love you', you create an image about it, or do you say, 'Why do you love me? Do you want something from me? Do you want my money, my body, my companionship, my encouragement?' Is that love? You are all married, or unmarried, or girl friends, or whatever you have, do you love anybody? That is, to ask from the other person nothing; neither the body, nor the emotions, something from her, nor intellectual romantic dependence on each other. So we have to enquire whether love has a cause. If love has a cause then it is not love. Right sirs. I know you agree, you say, 'Yes, quite right', but you don't live it. You see the logic of it, you see the analysis of it, verbally you accept it, but you say, 'Let me find out if I can live without a single conflict.' Which can only come about when you don't depend on punishment or reward, when you are absolutely integral, completely honest with oneself. But that is far from most

people because we are always wanting something from somebody. The religious people are wanting heaven, or whatever it is, through somebody, or sacrifice themselves for something, take vows and all that. They think that is a religious life, to have constant conflict inside, the burning desire. Sirs, do you realize we are tortured human beings.

Now sirs, and ladies, you have heard the speaker for an hour and twenty minutes, or more, what is the actual state of your mind, now, not tomorrow? Just heard the words, the description, the analysis and the logical conclusion and remained there? Or one has become aware of oneself, aware of one's own condition, and whether you accept that condition - the condition of suffering, pain, sorrow, fear, anxiety and so on. That is our conditioning, whether you are living in India, in this country, or in Europe or America, that is the conditioning of all human beings. And specially here in this country where there is such disaster, anarchy almost going on, it is our responsibility to see that all this ends in ourselves first, not out there, that we say what we mean, have profound, immovable integrity.

RAJGHAT, BENARES 2ND PUBLIC TALK 26TH NOVEMBER 1981

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? As we said yesterday morning, we are not giving a lecture, being talked at, or being instructed. This is a conversation between two friends, two friends who have a certain affection for each other, certain care for each other, and will not betray each other, who have certain deep common interests. And so they are conversing amicably, with a sense of deep communication with each other. And as most of us are accustomed to being talked at, or being told what to do; or you listen casually, not seriously, just a passing incident in one's life, like two ships passing at night. But if we are at all serious as two friends who have known each other for some time, we have walked along the same road, perhaps hand in hand, who have lived a life that is very complex, sad, miserable, unfortunate. So there are two friends sitting under a tree on a lovely day, cool morning with the dew on the grass, talking over together, and that is the relationship which you and the speaker have. We may not meet actually, physically, there are too many of us, but we are walking along a road, a path, looking at the trees, the birds, the flowers, the scent of the air, the beauty of the morning and talking seriously about their lives - not superficially, not casually but concerned with the disillusion of their problems. So that is our relationship. And the speaker means what he says. It is not just a rhetorical to create an impression, because we are dealing with much too serious problems of life.

So having said that, having established a certain communication

between ourselves, unfortunately it has to be verbal but between the words, between the lines, between the content of the words, if one is at all aware, there is a much deeper, more profound relationship.

I think we ought to consider what a problem is. We all have problems: sexual, intellectual, mathematical, problems of relationship, problems which humanity has created through conflict, through wars, through nationalism, through so-called religions. We all have problems. What is a problem? A problem - the speaker is not inventing a meaning - but if you look into a dictionary which is the common meaning of all common usage, problem means something thrown at you, something that you have got to face. A problem is a challenge, minor or greater. A problem that isn't resolved demands that you face, understand, resolve, act. That is what problem means: something thrown at you, something unexpected, either at the conscious level or at the unconscious level, which is a challenge, superficial or deep.

Now that is what we mean by a problem. How do you, how does one approach a problem? Because how you approach a problem is more important than the problem itself. You understand? I'll explain. If I approach it, suppose I have a problem, if I approach it with fear, with a desire to resolve it, go beyond it, or if I approach it traditionally, fight against it, wanting to go beyond it, that is generally how we approach a problem. Either the desire to resolve it, to go beyond it, or escape from it, or totally neglect it, or put up with it. Approach - the word approach means coming near. I approach you. I approximate. I come as close as possible. The approach. The word, the meaning of that word is to

come near. That is, how do I, having a problem, approach the problem? Do I come near it, close to it? Or do I run away from it? Or I have the desire to go beyond it? So as long as I have a motive, the motive dictates my approach. Are we making this clear? Are we following each other? Please.

If we do not approach it freely we are always directing the problem according to our conditioning. Suppose I am conditioned to suppress the problem, then my approach is conditioned and therefore the problem is distorted. Whereas if I approach the problem without a motive I then come very close to it, then the problem is important. Then in the problem is the answer, not away from the problem. You follow? We are going to go into it presently, in a few minutes.

So it is very important how we approach a problem. The political problem, the religious problems, the problems of intimate relationship, there are so many problems. We are burdened with problems, even the problem of meditation, it becomes a problem. We never look at the problem. Why should we live with problems. Problems, if we have not understood and dissolved, distort all our lives. So it is very important to understand, to be aware, how we approach a problem.

And the next is: to observe the problem and not to find a resolution of the problem. That is in the problem itself is the answer. That depends how you approach it, that depends how you look at it. So the approach is very important: to be aware of your conditioning when you approach it, and to be free of that conditioning to look at the problem. Now how do you perceive a problem? Please, we are thinking together. We are talking over our

problems, we are looking at them, we are not analyzing them, but looking at them. That is, what is perception, what is seeing a problem? How do you see that tree? Look at it for the moment. How do you see? With what eyesight do you look at it? Is it merely an optical observation? That is, just looking at the tree partially, partly, only with the optical reaction, as we generally do. Which is to observe the shape, the form, the design, the light on the leaf. And do you, when you observe a tree, not name it, not say, 'That is a tree' and walk by? Or do you look at the tree with all your senses, or only with part of your senses? You understand what I am saying? Are we coming with each other? Because it is very important to understand, if I may point out, how you approach that tree. Is it merely verbal and therefore by calling it, naming it a tree, that word is not the thing and therefore can you look at it without the word? Please don't spend too much time on it, we have got a lot to talk about.

So are we aware how we approach it? Are we aware how we look at it, how we observe it? Do we observe it partially, with only one sense, that is, the optical sense? Or do we see it, hear it, smell it, feel it, see the design of it, take the whole of it in? You are following all this? Or, you look at it as though you are different from it. Of course, when I look at it I am not the tree, fortunately, or unfortunately. But can I look at it without the word, with all my senses responding to the totality of that beauty. Right? So perception means not only observing with all the senses, but also to see, to observe, or be aware that there is a division between you and that which you observe. Probably you haven't thought anything about all this, probably it is all Greek to you, or Chinese, or

something else.

Please this is important to understand a little bit because we are going to discuss presently, the approach to fear and the perceiving the whole content of fear, how you approach this burden which man has carried for millennia, how you approach it, and how you perceive it. So I am first saying it is easy to perceive something outside of you, like a tree, like the river, or the blue sky, without naming, merely observing. And can you look at yourself, the whole content of your consciousness - I am moving it a little bit - the whole content of your mind, your being, your work, your thought, your feeling, your depression, all that, to look at it so that there is no division between fear and you? Can we go on? Or are you asleep?

If there is no division there is no conflict. That is, there is conflict between the Arab and the Jew, there is conflict between the Muslim and Hindu, there is conflict between Christianity and Buddhism and so on. Wherever there is division there must be conflict: that is a law. So in us there is a division: the observer, and the thing that is being observed. Right? The observer approaches that which is fear, greed, or sorrow as though it was something different from him which he has to resolve, which he has to suppress, understand, go beyond, all the struggle that comes into it. So where there is a division there must be conflict. Right?

Now we are going to discuss, look into fear, approach fear. And then how you look at fear, how you perceive fear. The meaning of that word perceive means to comprehend, to look at it without any distortion. To look at fear without any reaction to escape, run away, suppress, explanation, or even analysis. I wonder if you

follow all this? Now we are going to discuss as two friends what is fear. Most of us are afraid of something or other. You may be afraid of your wife or your husband, afraid of losing a job, afraid of not having security in old age, afraid of public opinion, which is the most silly form of fear, afraid of so many things we are: darkness, death and so on. Now we are going to think over, examine together, not what we are afraid of but what is fear in itself? You are following? Not what I am afraid of. I might be afraid of you, or I am afraid of death. We are not talking about the object of fear. But let us talk over together the nature of fear, how fear arises, how you approach the problem. You understand? I will explain.

I am afraid of fear, I am afraid. What is my approach to it? Is there a motive behind my approach to the problem of fear? Obviously most of us have a motive. That is to go beyond it, to suppress it, to avoid it, to neglect it, I am used to fear for the last fifty years so I put up with it. So we are not discussing the object of fear but the origin of it. Right? How I approach the problem, how I look at the problem. My approach, if there is a motive I cannot come near it. That is clear. Any kind of motive I cannot see it clearly, I cannot come near it. And the other is, how do I look at fear? Is that fear separate from me? Therefore I am an outsider looking inside, or an insider looking out. So it is important to understand how I perceive fear. Is fear different from me? Obviously not. Anger is not different from me. But education, through education, through religion, through all the scriptures, bla, bla, all that makes me separate from that. I must fight it. I must get over it. But I have never asked if that thing called fear is separate

from me. Actually it is not. Therefore my perception is that the observer is the observed. Right? No, you are asleep.

Envy is not different from me. I am envy. I may think it is different from me but the actual fact is that I am part of that. I am part of the anger. I am part of greed, envy, suffering, pain, so pain, suffering, greed, envy, anxiety, loneliness is me. I am all that. Right? First see it logically. Logically it is so. And seeing it logically, I may make an abstraction of what I see which becomes the idea. Do you see this? The word idea means, it derives from Greek and Latin and French and so on, means form, the form, the design. Then to look, the word idea means that. The form, the design, to look, to observe and the semblance of the fact. The original meaning of that word is this. But we observe, make an abstraction of it into an idea and carry that idea out. You are following all this? No, you are not getting it. Have I lost you? Or are we together still? You see how we do it. I am afraid - if I am - I am afraid and I want to run away from it, which becomes the idea that I should escape from it; make an abstraction of it, which becomes our idea about it and then work about that idea, which prevents us from observing very closely what is fear. So please when we are discussing about fear don't make an abstraction of it but look at it, be very close to it. Don't make a semblance of it. You understand all this? Right sirs? Which means, I approach it without any motive. I look at it, I observe it as something not different from me. Right? So you understand the combination. That is, I approach it very closely and I can only approach it very closely if I don't have a motive, because motive distorts. And I observe it as part of me, I am that, there is no division between me and that, I am that,

therefore my observation is the observer is the observed, it is not different from me. If that is clear then we can go into the question: what is fear?

You are all afraid I am quite sure about something or other, of your guru, sure to be! Which you call devotion. Afraid of losing so many things. So what is fear? Go on, we are talking over together, I am not telling you what it is, I am asking you only to come very close to it. Because you can only see it very closely if you are very near. What is fear? Is it time? That is, time as a movement of the past, the present modified and continued. You understand this? I am the past, the present and also the future. Yes? I am the result of the past, a thousand million years, and I am also the present impressions, the present social conditions, the present climate. I am all that, and also the future. Right? I am the past, modified in the present, continued in the future, that is time. Right? And also there is time by the watch, by the sun rising at a certain time, at a certain part of the year, setting at a certain time. There is time by the morning, the afternoon, the evening. Time to learn, a language, a skill and so on. Right? Time to learn a language, the time I need to learn to have a skill, drive a car, become a carpenter and so on, or an engineer, or even some terrible politician. But there is time outwardly, physically, to cover the distance from here to there, and also there is time inwardly, hope. I hope to come there, I hope to achieve or become non-violent, which is absurd. I hope to gain, I hope to avoid pain, punishment, I hope to have a reward. So there is not only time outwardly, physically, but also there is time inwardly. That is, I am not this but I will become that, which means time. The physical time is actual, right, it is there, it is

eleven o'clock or twelve o'clock, or whatever time it is now. But inwardly we have assumed there is time: that is, I am not good but I will be good. That is time, to cover the distance where I am now, where I will be. Now we are questioning that time, not the time by the sun, by the watch, by the distance, but time, is there time inwardly? Do you understand my question? So if there is time inwardly there is fear. You have understood this? That is, I have a job, but I might lose that job, which is the future, which is time. I have been ill, I hope not to be ill. I have had pain, I hope I will never have pain again. That is the remembrance of the pain, and the continuation of that memory, hoping there will be no pain. You are following all this?

So there is time inwardly, at least we think there is time but outward time is necessary. So we are questioning whether fear is not time? That is, I am afraid to lose my job in the future, which is time. I am afraid of having been ill and pain, not to have it again. Right? So there is this constant hope, constant remembrance and avoidance, which is part of time. So we are asking: is not time part of fear? You are following? So time is fear. Right? Don't accept this verbally, please, look at it. Look into yourself, be aware of yourself, of your fear and look how that fear arises. The remembrance of something past, recorded in the brain as remembrance, as an incident and afraid that it might happen again. Right? We are saying time is a factor of fear. Right?

And also another factor of fear is thought. That is, I think about my pain, which I have had last week, it is recorded in the brain and I think I might have that pain again tomorrow. So there is the operation of thought which says, 'I have had the pain, I hope not to

have the pain'. So thought and time is fear. Gosh, it takes a long time to explain something, doesn't it? You have understood, not understood verbally, you have observed yourself, in yourself deeply that you see that fear is a remembrance, which is thought and also time, the future. I am secure now, I may be insecure tomorrow, fear arises. I believe in Communism and you come along and show it to me that it is nonsense, I am afraid. You follow? So time plus thought equals fear.

Now, just see the truth of it in yourself, not listening to me, to the speaker, and verbalizing it, remembering, but actually see that is a fact, not an abstraction as an idea. So you have to be aware whether it is by hearing you have made up an idea, an abstraction of what you have heard into an idea or actually facing the fact of fear, which is time and thought. I wonder if you have understood all this?

Now what is important is how you perceive the whole movement of fear. Either you perceive by negating it. You understand what I mean? Or you perceive it without the division as me and fear, but you are fear. So you remain with that fear. Yes, sirs, you are not getting my meaning.

You see there are two ways of negating fear: by totally denying it, by saying, 'I have no fear', which is absurd, or you are negating it by perceiving the observer is the observed, therefore no action. I wonder if you see this thing. Why are you all so silent? Either you have comprehended what is being said, or you don't understand it. We want to negate fear, don't we? All of us do. Negate in the sense get over it, run away from it, destroy it, to find some ways of comforting ourselves against it, which is all a form of negation.

Therefore your negation is acting upon it. Right? Then there is a totally different form of negation, which is the beginning of a new movement, which is, the observer is the observed, fear is me. The observer is fear. And therefore he cannot do anything about it, therefore negation, a totally different kind of negation which means a totally different beginning. Right sirs?

Have you done it? As we were talking as two friends walking along that lovely path, with a lot of trees, flowers and birds, trees and bushes, we have talked. Have you realized this fact that when you act upon it you strengthen it. By acting upon it is to run away, suppress, analyze, find the cause, all that. You are trying to negate something which is not you. But when you realize you are that, and therefore you cannot act - I am brown, or white or pink, or whatever colour, I can't do anything about it, therefore there is non-action, and therefore a totally different movement taking place. I have said it, it is up to you if you don't understand it.

Then there is the question of pleasure. Is pleasure different from fear? We always pursue pleasure. Right? By wearing those strange medallions and beads, it is a great pleasure to you, obviously, otherwise you wouldn't put them on. That makes you feel you are different from all the rest of us. So is that pleasure different from fear? Or fear is pleasure? It is like two sides of the same coin, when you understand the nature of pleasure, which is also time and thought, isn't it? I have had remembrance of something very beautiful and it is recorded, remembered, and I want that pleasure repeated. I remember the fear of an incident, record it and I want to avoid it. So both, they are the movements of the same kind only I call it pleasure and I call it fear. Right? Is this clear, more or less?

Then we must also go into the question of suffering. Can suffering end? Is there an end to sorrow? Mankind has done everything possible to transcend sorrow. It has worshipped sorrow, it has run away from sorrow, it has held sorrow to one's heart, it has tried to seek comfort away from sorrow, it has pursued the path of happiness, holding on to it, clinging to it in order to avoid suffering. Man has suffered, human beings have suffered right through the world. They have had ten thousand wars. Think of the men and women who have been maimed, killed and the tears that have been shed, the agony of the mothers, wives, and all those people who have lost their sons, their husbands, their friends through wars, through millennia upon millennia, and we still continue, multiplying armaments for protecting our nation. The tribal worship. So there is the immense sorrow of mankind. The poor man along that road will never know a good clean bath, clean clothes, ride in an aeroplane - you know, all the pleasures that one has, he will never have. And there is that sorrow. There is the sorrow of a man who is very learned and those who are not very learned. There is the sorrow of ignorance. There is the sorrow of loneliness, because most people are lonely. They may have a lot of friends, a lot of ideas, a lot of scholarship, but they are also terribly lonely people. You know what that loneliness is if you are at all aware of yourself, a sense of total isolation. You may have a wife, children, a great many friends but there comes a day or an event that makes you feel utterly isolated, lonely. That is tremendous sorrow. Then there is the sorrow of death. The sorrow of someone you have lost. So there is the sorrow which has been gathering, which has been collecting through millennia of mankind.

Then there is the sorrow of one's own personal degeneration, personal loss, personal lack of capacity, intelligence, action. You are following all this? I am only pointing out, or showing in a mirror what is happening. So we are asking whether that sorrow can ever end? Or you come to sorrow with sorrow and die with sorrow? You understand all this? And we are asking, as two friends walking along the path, a nice lovely path, is there an end to it? Logically, rationally, or intellectually, we can find many reasons for sorrow, many explanations, according to the Buddhist, the Hindu, Christian or the Islam. But the explanations, the causes, the authorities that explain commentaries away, sorrow still remains with us. So is it possible to end that sorrow? Because if you do not end sorrow there is no love, there is no compassion. So one has to go into it deeply and see if it can ever end.

The speaker says there is an end to sorrow, a total end to sorrow, which doesn't mean he does not care, indifferent, callous, but with the ending of sorrow there is the beginning of love. And you naturally ask the speaker: how? How is sorrow to end? When you say 'how' you want a system, a method, a process. Right? That is why you ask, 'Tell me how to get there. I will follow the path, the road.' So you want direction, you want to be told. Right? When you say, 'How am I to end sorrow?', that is the question. That demand, that enquiry says, 'Show me'. When you ask how, you are putting the wrong question, if I may point out because you are only concerned with getting over it. Your approach to it is: tell me to get over it. So you have never come near it. You understand? If I want to look at that tree I must come near it to see the beauty of it, the design, the shade, the leaf, the colour of the leaf, the shape of the

leaf, whether it has flowers, whether it has no flowers, what is its size, I must come near it. But we never come near sorrow. We say, 'I have cried', 'My son is dead', or my brother, or whatever it is, we never come near it because we are always avoiding it, running away from it.

So how you approach sorrow matters enormously. Whether you approach it with a motive of escape, seeking comfort, avoiding it, or you approach and come very, very close to it. Find out what you do, whether you come very close to it. You cannot come close to it if there is self-pity, if there is the desire to somehow find the cause, the explanation. You follow? Avoid it. So if you come to it, if you approach it with a motive you will never understand it. So it matters very much how you approach it, come near it, and how you see it, how you perceive sorrow. Is it the word sorrow that makes you feel sorrow? Or is it a fact? And if it is a fact and you want to come close to it. That is, sorrow is you. You are not different from sorrow. That is the first thing to see: that you are not different from sorrow. You are sorrow. You are anxiety, loneliness, pleasure, pain, fear, the sense of isolation. You are all that. So you come very close to it, you are it, therefore you remain with it. Oh, you don't see it!

Sir, when you want to look at that tree you come to it, you look at every leaf, every shape of that tree, you take time. You are looking, looking, looking, and it tells you all its beauty. You don't tell the tree your story, it tells you, if you watch it. In the same way if you come near it, hold it, look at it, not run away from it, see what it is trying to tell you, its depth, its beauty, its immensity, then if you remain with it entirely, with that single movement of

thought, then sorrow ends. That is not a reward. Don't play tricks. Just remember it and then repeat it! That is what your brains are accustomed to: to memorize what has been said by the speaker in a book, or now, and then say, 'How shall I carry that out?' Because you are it, you are all that and therefore you cannot escape from yourself, therefore you look at it. How you look at it is that there is no division between the observer and the observed, you are that, therefore there is no division. When there is no division you remain entirely with it. Are you doing that now? Don't say, please. It is one of the most - it requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of intensity, clarity, not only the verbal clarity but the clarity of the mind that sees instantly the truth.

Then out of that ending of sorrow comes love. I wonder if you love anything. Do you? Do you love anything? Your wife, your children, your so-called country, do you love the earth, love the beauty of a tree, the beauty of a person? Or we are so terribly self-centred we never have any perception of anything at all? Where there is no love there is destruction, degeneration. And love brings compassion. Compassion is not doing some social work.

Compassion has its own intelligence. But you don't know anything of all that. All that you know is your desires, your ambitions, your deceptions, your dishonesty. When you really ask most profound questions which stir up man you become negligent. Look at your sirs, when I ask you a question of that kind, whether you love somebody, your faces are blank. Right?

And this is the result of your religion, of your devotion to your nonsensical guru, your devotion to your leaders - not devotion, you are frightened, therefore you follow. At the end of all this millennia

upon millennia we are what we are now, just think of the tragedy of all this. That is the tragedy of yourself, you understand sir? So find out, if one may ask, walking along that path as a friend, ask: do you know what love means, love that does not demand a thing from another. Ask yourselves sirs. It doesn't demand a thing from your wife, from your husband, nothing, physically, emotionally, intellectually, not to demand a thing from another. Not to follow another, not to have a concept and pursue that concept. Because love is not jealousy, love has no power in the ordinary sense of that word. Love doesn't seek position, status, power. But it has its own capacity, its own skill, its own intelligence. Right sirs.

We meet next Saturday I believe, for questions and answers. Next Sunday will be the last talk. We will discuss together next Sunday: what is religion? What is a religious mind? What is something that is beyond all thought? What is meditation and so on? We will go into all that. Right sirs.

RAJGHAT 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 28TH NOVEMBER 1981

There are about a hundred questions, and we cannot possibly answer all of them, and if we did it would take probably the whole month of December, so you wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be here. So we have chosen - a few people have chosen the questions, and if your particular question is not answered please don't get angry or impatient, or that we are trying to evade your particular question.

I wonder why we ask questions. We must ask questions, we must doubt, be very sceptical, question, but why do we question and from whom does one expect answers? You have put here several questions, who is going to answer them? If you put the right question naturally there will be the right answer. If there are questions that are merely intellectual, theoretical, something based on some hypotheses then such questions have no value; but if one asks serious questions then the questioner and the speaker are responsible together - it is not that you are putting questions to me and then I answer you, I am not the Delphic Oracle! Nobody is. But one should ask oneself, I think, why we put questions and from whom we expect an answer. So we are going to answer these questions, investigating the question itself, and in the investigation of that question we will find the answer, not that you put the question and then you expect an answer, but rather together we are going to examine the question. And in the examination of that question we will find the answer in the question. I hope this is clear.

And also if one may remind you most respectfully, we should listen to the question, not wait for an answer, listen to the question itself, and it matters a great deal, if one may point out, how you listen. Whether you listen with an expectation, with a motive, waiting impatiently for the answer, or you are listening not only between the words, the sound of the word - please listen to all this - the sound of the word, each word has a certain content, a certain significance, and the sentence, the sound, the quality, the question itself makes the hearing more acute. And in listening you learn much more than the answer itself. I wonder if you are following all this? So please if one may suggest that you really listen to the question.

QUESTION: What does it mean to enquire? Is enquiry itself a process of thought?

How do we enquire, what is the state of the mind that enquires? What is it it is enquiring, and who is it that is enquiring? To enquire means to investigate, to explore. And to explore very deeply, if the brain is conditioned, your exploration, your enquiry will be limited. Naturally. It's like an animal being tethered to a post, the rope may be long or short, but it is tethered. If the brain is conditioned, as most people's brains are, then the enquiry will be very limited. But the enquiry demands that we be free to look, it is necessary if we are to enquire, which means really part of that enquiry is subtly doubtful, questioning, asking, scepticism. Right? Are we going to together with hesitant scepticism to enquire into this question, explore into this question? Which is: is enquiry a process of thought? That is, we are enquiring into the process, say for example of death - we haven't touched that subject - we are

enquiring together into the nature of death, what does it mean? Now one can approach this question either with fear, or with avoidance, or seeking comfort. Now when we approach it in that manner our enquiry is naturally very limited because the motive dictates the enquiry. So can we be free in our enquiry of our prejudices, our desire for comfort, our commitment to some form of belief, and with a fresh mind enquire who is the enquirer and what is it that is being enquired. Is this all right, are we going along together?

Who is the enquirer? I want to investigate into death, the nature of death, what does it mean. So before I can enquire into death I must find out who is the enquirer, who is asking these questions. Who is it that is asking these questions: we say, 'I'. Who is the 'I'? I, the self, is put together by thought. Now you are stuck! The 'me', myself, my form, my name, all the characteristics, tendencies, the desires, the ambitions, the struggles, the pain, the loneliness, suffering, all that is me. Right? The 'me' is the past, the present and the future. The past is all my inherited tendencies, the memories, the experiences, the education, or non-education, all that is the past which is knowledge. Right? Knowledge is always the past. The past, that knowledge, meets the present, modifies itself and proceeds further. All that is me; even the super-self, super-consciousness, all that blah, blah, blah, is still me. Right? So that me is put together by thought - past memories meeting the present incidents, challenges, being modified and proceeding further, which is the future, so all that is me. The 'me' is enquiring. Right? The 'me' is the thought. Of course. I know you will object to this because the 'me' you think is something far superior, some

extraordinary entity derived straight from god, or whatever it is, but it is still a movement of thought. So thought is enquiring about itself. You follow? You understand this? Thought is enquiring about death. What is important is to understand the enquirer, not about death, because if the enquirer is very clear, objective, impersonal, free, non-attached, then the enquiry can be extraordinary, but if the enquirer is attached, conditioned, has a motive, his enquiry will inevitably be limited about death.

So it is important to understand who is the enquirer. We have gone into that a little bit, we said, still thought. Now can thought examine itself? Can you? Can thought look at itself? Go on sir. That is, we explained the other day, and bearing in mind that explanations are not the fact, the word is not the thing, the word 'tree' is not the actual, living, beautiful, designed tree. So the word, the explanation, the description, is not the actual, but we were saying the other day that experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action - that is thought. And we are enquiring whether thought can look at itself. Can you be aware when thought arises? Of course one can. But who is the entity that is being aware of thought arising? You are following all this? It is still thought. Is this clear? You see we have divided thought into the thinker and thought. Right? Right, sir?

So the difficulty in this enquiry is we have never been able to go beyond thought. Our whole way of living is based on thought, that is the only instrument we have, apart from emotional, romantic, but it is still thought is feeling, is the romantic sentimentality, it is all involved with thought. We have never been able to enquire if there is something beyond thought which can directly understand. No,

this is too difficult. I wonder if you have ever asked yourself whether there is action without thought. That is, our action is based on thought, whether that action is based on an ideal which is again the invention of thought, whether it is based on past memory, which is still thought, whether it is a projected concept in the future according to which one acts it is still thought, so all that we know of action is the reaction of thought. That's clear. We have never asked if there is an action which is not based on thought. That's our enquiry, which is death. I wonder if you see this. You are all asleep, I, afraid.

Is there an action, to put it differently, which is not based on knowledge? You understand? Our action at present is based on knowledge. That's quite clear. Is there an action which is not? To enquire into that one must be entirely free from the past, obviously. Can one? Can you be free of your tradition, can you be free of your gurus, can you be free from all the subtle influences of thought, so that you discover for yourself an action which is not based on thought? I have answered the question. I am not evading it. It is for you to do it. That is to be aware that your actions are based on thought, you may call it love but it is still thought. And to find out for oneself whether there is action totally free from all knowledge, which is thought. Right? Which means, time as memory, time as thought, time as the future, time as the present, time as the future, has altogether disappeared. This requires - you have got it?

QUESTION: You have said, let us think together, does it mean collective thinking? If not, how can two people of different backgrounds think together?

Does it mean collective thinking? Listen to the question

carefully please. I'll read it again because you have not listened it, you are just waiting for somebody to say something about it. You are not actually listening to the question. Please do. You have said, let us think together, does it mean collective thinking, if not how can two people of different backgrounds think together? The speaker has said over and over again, let us think together. And the questioner asks, does it mean collective thinking, which is opposed to individual thinking? You understand? When you say, is it collective thinking, naturally it means is there individual thinking. Right? Is thinking collective, or individual, or it is neither? Come on sirs. Let's have some fun! Is thinking personal, individual, collective, or there is only thinking? Your thinking is the result of your past: your past conditioning, if you are a scientist it is the accumulated knowledge of the past scientists, if you are a religious crank, as most of you are, with your peculiar robes, then your thinking is based on your desire, on your fear, on your superstition, and so on. So we are saying - and the businessman thinks according to his background, which is to make money and all the rest of it, or the politician - there is only thinking, not collective thinking or individual thinking, or Eastern thinking and Western thinking. There is only the act of thinking.

The questioner asks: if not, can two people of different backgrounds think together. We are talking of thinking, not of your background. Right? If this is clear, there is only thinking, even the poorest, uneducated man thinks, even the most highly sophisticated intellectual thinks. He doesn't say, 'It is my thinking' he is thinking. Right? So can we not think together, not collective, individual, having different backgrounds, but the act of thinking, not about

something, but to watch together that tree. Right? To watch together. That means both of us pay attention to what we are seeing. We may describe it differently, you may say that light on that leaf is not quite so bright as it was yesterday, or there is too much fog, too much dirt, but the act of seeing, observing is together. The description may vary, the reactions may vary, but the act of perceiving we can do that together. The act of thinking, not according to my background or your background, the act of thinking itself can be done together. We can both observe what is happening in the world - wars, the politicians making a mess of the world - are there any politicians here? I hope not! Making a mess of the world and we are helping to help them to make the world worse, and so on. So we can think together about war, how appallingly dangerous it all is, you may want to avoid it, but thinking together means communicating with each other without any barrier, you listen to what the speaker is saying, and the speaker listens to what you are saying, and that we can do together very happily. It is not complicated: if you want to communicate something to me I listen to you because I am interested in what you are talking about, and you listen to the speaker if you are interested. Where there is interest there is communication, where there is care, affection, love, there is communication.

QUESTION: What is the nature of evil? Do you think it is possible to live in the present day world without compromising with evil in some form or another?

I don't know - the speaker doesn't know what you call evil. Each person translates that word according to his fancy, to his ideas, to his concepts, saying evil is the opposite of the good. Right? Each

person has a definite idea, concept, gives a different meaning to that word. Now let's look at it carefully.

Is there an opposite to the good? Think it out, let's go into it carefully. We say the opposite is evil. We are asking: is evil the opposite of the good? Or is there an opposite to the good? If there is an opposite to the good, then the opposite must be born out of the good. I wonder if you understand all this? Can we go on? That is, is there an opposite at all? You follow? That is, I am frightened, and the opposite of fear is supposed to be courage. Right? When there is no fear, is it courage? So I am asking: is good the opposite of evil? Or where there is good there is no evil.

So we have to enquire first, what is goodness. Perhaps you may think that it is an old fashioned word, being good, but it is not. What does goodness mean? Let's enquire into that, sir, don't just go to sleep while I am talking, for god's sake. What is it to be good, a good human being? The word 'good' implies being whole, not fragmented, not broken up, that is, saying one thing, doing something else, feeling something, saying quite the opposite to that, or the thinker separate from thought. Where there is fragmentation in one's action, in one's thinking, there is no goodness. Goodness implies the feeling, or the act or acting from whole being, not from fragmentation. Anything that is fragmented has its opposite. Goodness has no opposite. So one questions altogether whether there is an opposite at all, except there is man, woman, light and darkness, but the idea of the opposite; that is, violence, the opposite of that is non-violence. The opposite is a projection of violence. I don't know if you see all this. Right? That is, I do not know how to get rid of violence, and so I invent the

idea of non-violence, use that word as a lever to free myself from violence, but I am still violent. So there is only violence, not non-violence. Is this all right? You see we are all brought up from childhood with the idea of opposites, like a long corridor of opposites, our life is, battling from one thing to the other. We are questioning whether there is an opposite at all. Hate is not the opposite of love, there is only hate or love, but we make it an opposite and thereby hope to help ourselves from a difficult condition, or a difficult problem by looking for an answer. Right? Is this clear.

So we are not saying that there is not evil, war is evil, killing another is evil, being terrorists, all the decoys in this country - it is an evil act. Right? But that which is not good is not the opposite of the good. I wonder if you see this?

QUESTION: For living beyond the shadow of time we must discard psychological memory, yet it is necessary to have memory of our skills for daily living. The two types of memory are the contents of the same brain, and each has close association with the other. How is it possible then to retain the essential memory and discard the psychological?

The questioner begins by asking: for living beyond time, the shadow of time, we must discard the psychological memory. How do you know? How do you know, or are aware that you must discard psychological memory to live beyond time, how do you know? Or you have heard somebody, like the speaker, say it and you are repeating it. Please, sir, this is important to understand, the first part of the question. You hear something from another and you take it for granted that it is so, so you become secondhand

people. Right? That's what we are. And we are very proud of it, we never say, throw all this out and find out what it is to live firsthand. So when you start with a hypothesis of which you don't know, a theory, then the question becomes rather superficial. Right?

The questioner says further: it is necessary to have memory of our skills for our daily living. The two types of memory, the content of the same brain, and each has its association with the other, how is it possible to retain essential memories, and discard the psychological ones? We will go into that. The speaker has been saying for many years, that we are only functioning with a partial brain, which is conditioned, as Hindus, as Christians, as Buddhists or as Communists, Socialists, Labourite and so on and so on, it is conditioned. And therefore what is conditioned must always be partial. And the brain specialists are discovering that the right part of the brain, this side of the brain is associated with the practical, the daily activities, the remembrances and so on, it is concerned with the daily activity of life; and the left side is theoretical, thinking abstractly, the left side is not practical as the right side and so on. I won't go into details of it, but you comprehend that. Which is, the right the practical, the left non-practical, theoretical, abstract. So the scientists are saying, the right and the left are two separate functions, and of course they are subtly associated with each other, they are not absolute divisions. Right? Left and right.

So out of that arises a very interesting question, if you are interested in it, which we have discussed with some of the brain specialists and others, whether the whole brain can be active at the same moment, not one moment theoretical, the next moment practical, but the whole of the brain in a flow, in a movement. I

don't know if you are interested in this. Are you? Don't agree with me so easily, please. The brain functions obviously according to the senses; the senses are taste, smell, hearing and so on, touching, it is communicated through the nose and to the brain. And I am not a brain specialist, I have discussed this a great deal with others who are supposed to be, and also my own enquiry into myself - not `enquiry', I won't use that word. Observing it.

The question is: can the brain which has been so conditioned by knowledge, which is partial, can that brain which has been so conditioned free itself and act as a whole, practical as well as theoretical? It is not theoretical, a total perception, not partial perception. Is this clear? Am I making the question clear? A total perception with all your senses active. Or part of the brain active, which is partial and therefore limited, and therefore creating all the human problems. It is possible for the whole of the brain to be active together, whole, when all the senses are active, not one sense more active than the other. That is, sir, when you look at the waters of that river in the early morning where there is not a breath of air, not a ripple, and the sunlight is on that water, the early morning golden light making a path on that water, can you look at it with all your senses? Where there is such an observation there is no centre; it is only when you observe partially that there is the centre formed. That is, wherever there is a partial observation there must be a limited area. Right? That limited area is the `me'. Whereas if you observe that light on that water and the early morning with the glory of that clear light on that water, with all your senses there is no centre because you are observing totally with all your attention. So there is a possibility, if one is attentive, when one is really

serious, it is possible to have only memories that are absolutely necessary for daily living, and not have psychological memories accumulated day after day, day after day, which is the real factor of degeneration.

QUESTION: In the West children are brought up to be separate independent individualists, and this makes them less affectionate. (In this country it is all so very different, is that it?) In the East (I thought so! I haven't read these questions before, this is the first time I am reading them) - in the East they are brought up to share everything with the family. They are more affectionate but this makes them more dependent, more attached. Which of these is a healthier more natural way of bringing up a child?

Need I read that question again? Are we individuals? That's the basic question. Right? The questioner is asking: in the West children are brought up to think of themselves as separate, non-collective human beings; here apparently in the East they are brought up in the family and the family is more important than the individual, but the individual is equally important living in the family, and therefore he is more attached to the family, and so on. Which all means the emphasis either in one direction or the other is the importance of the individual. Right? Now we must question, doubt, enquire, into this problem whether we are individuals at all. All your tradition says you are individuals, separate souls, all struggling, struggling, struggling. Right? Personal illumination, personal realization, personal gods, personal salvation, personal achievement, individual success in heaven or on the earth, in both the West and the East the importance is given to the individual, both psychologically as well as religiously as well as physically,

outwardly. Now we are asking is that so? Are you an individual? You may have a different form, you are taller, perhaps darker, there are black people, white people, brown people, yellow people, woman, man, some have beards, some have no beards, some have grey hair, some have different names and so on, does that make you into an individual? Go on sir, enquire into all this, you see you never doubt anything, you take it all for granted: that we are individuals, that we have separate souls, that we have etc., etc.

Is your consciousness separate, which is individual consciousness? You understand? I am only changing the words. Is your consciousness different from another? Your consciousness is made up of the things which thought has put there - fear, belief, whether you are a socialist, or a labourite, capitalist, or a communist, what you believe, your conclusions, your pains, your loneliness, your desperation, your depressions, anxiety, pain, sorrow, loneliness, is the same for all mankind. Right? All mankind goes through this, whether they live in this country, Russia, America or China. Right? They all go through this with greater emphasis on one or the other. That's the ground on which we all stand. Right? So is there an individual? Sir, this is a most important question, don't so easily say, no, and shake your head and say you are free of individuality. Try to find out. You may have a different kind of education than the man in the West, but he suffers as you, he is insecure as you, he follows some superstition, as you, only the figures of superstition vary - you have three hundred thousand gods here but there is only one god there, but still god. So we all stand on the same ground; it is the ground of all humanity.

So are you an individual? So if you are an individual either you are living in an illusion, in a fanciful world called individualism, or the other is untrue. You follow? Either this individual is true, or the other is not true, which is that we are all similar in our consciousness, or the similarity, perhaps various modifications and so on, is the truth, and the other is illusion. Truth has no opposite: this is so or this is not so. Go into for yourself, sir.

So thinking is common to all mankind; consciousness is common - perhaps not common, we won't use that word `common', that gives it a totally different meaning - is similar, the same flow of the river of sorrow, the same flow of the river of anxiety, insecurity, loneliness, despair, terrible things that we are. You understand? We as individuals have a cause, we are the result of causes. Obviously. Climate, food, your education, your Upanishads, your Gita, your blah, blah, and there, the Bible and Jesus and so on. They are all the same with different names. Oh god, sir, it is all so childish. So where there is a cause it must end. You understand? Sir, global interrelationship between all the people will only prevent war. Right? But if you are a nationalist and the other fellow is a nationalist, you are going to have wars because nationalism, which is glorified tribalism, brings about separation, the Muslim and the Hindu, Pakistan and India, such division is going to bring war. And the war people are delighted because they play with the game of killing people. You know all this. So can you, as a human being, recognizing the responsibility of the human which is to have global interrelationship with all mankind, not as Hindus, Muslims, Christians and all that, as human beings, then you will prevent war. But if you stick to individuality,

and that is expressed in nationalism - I don't know if you follow all this? - if you stick to your individualism as your god, your own invention of god, and the other fellow does the same, you are going to have religious wars. So when you see all this, apprehend, perceive all this, individual has no meaning at all.

QUESTION: In spite of your warning that the practice of a technique of meditation makes the mind dull and mechanical, it appears to me that your teaching of listening and seeing and learning also involves struggle in the mind to drop its activities. May I request you to enlighten me on this question?

Don't ask me, don't request me, just look at the question itself. Sir, apart from meditation, which perhaps we will go into tomorrow morning, if there is time, what does practice do? What is practice? I'll tell you, sir: you go to the office every day from nine to five - I don't know why you do it but you do. No, no, don't laugh, that's part of your life. And that's a routine, isn't it? Get up in the morning, shave, rush off to have breakfast, rush off to the office, and there you sit at a desk and write, write, whatever you do, or work in a factory. So that becomes a routine, doesn't it? That becomes mechanical, that becomes a practice, a habit. You accept that as the normal way of life, and somebody comes along and says: any system, any practice in meditation will also become mechanical, repetitive, makes the mind dull. Here you accept it and it is also making your mind dull in the office, in the factory. Right? If I am the carpenter, and I all day look at the wood, feel the wood, the right instruments, my mind obviously becomes wooden. A scientist who spends all day long in research inventing, accumulating knowledge - any specialization must inevitably make

the mind dull. Obviously. No? You meditate, don't you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, this is fairly simple, isn't it? If you are all the time accumulating knowledge and theorizing about knowledge you are specializing. You understand, sir? Don't you know this? If I sing, nothing but sing all day, however marvellously, I have specialized in that, my voice becomes marvellous but I know nothing about life, may no nothing about life, because my specialization keeps me in a narrow groove.

Now if this is so, which appears to be so, and the questioner says also, listening, seeing, learning, also involves struggle in the mind to drop its activities. Sir, we have made life into a marvellous machine of struggle. Right? We are struggling for everything, for god, for meditation, for love, struggle, struggle, struggle. Right? And you say, listening, seeing, learning is also a struggle. I say, no. Why do we make life into a struggle? Sir, answer these questions, put it to yourself: whether you can live without any conflict in life. Don't say, no. We are used to conflict. Right? To reach god, enlightenment, nirvana, or self-blah, blah, you must struggle, struggle, take vows, take all the peculiar words that you have.

We are asking: is there a way of living which is not lazy, which is not comforting, which is not merely routine, routine, is there a way of living daily life without a single shadow of conflict?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Those, the gentleman says, those who are in deep sleep - perhaps all of you are! We are talking about daily living, not when you are fast asleep. Even when you are fast asleep the brain is still active, still dreaming. Have you ever even asked, enquired to find

out if it is possible to live a life, a daily life, without a single sense of conflict, without a single sense of a problem, without this terrible sense of 'I must control'? Go on, sir, enquire. The speaker says, not theoretically, don't accept it, the speaker says, yes it is possible: not escape, not go off into the Himalayas, or become a hermit, living here on this earth, meeting people, married, if you are, and doing everything that one has to, to live without conflict. Find out, sirs. Why is there conflict in our life? Is it not because we are all trying to become something? Right? If I am not good, I will be good. This idea of perpetual movement of becoming something, ultimately becoming enlightened, which is nonsense.

So what is it that is becoming? You understand my question? Who is it that is becoming? The 'me'? And what is the 'me'? My name, my form, my memory, my education, my attachments, my bank account, if I have one, and so on and so on. Right? Why can't we face all this? Why can't we look at it instead of imagining all kinds of things. So as long as there is a desire to become there must be conflict. Right? Then you will say, 'If I don't become, what will happen? If I don't succeed in the office, what will happen to me?' Go on, sir, answer it yourself, I don't have to answer it. If you don't become something in the office, you won't have more money, better cars, better toilets and so on and so on. Right? And if you don't become something inwardly you will never reach whatever you want to reach. So this struggle is going on all the time, for the rich man, for the poor man.

So can you find out for yourself whether it is possible to live happily on this earth without all this monstrous divisions and mess? Sir, meditation is something immense, it cannot come

through struggle. Right? Through practise, through a system, because your mind then becomes routine, mechanical, by listening, seeing, learning you can also make that mechanical. Anything you can make mechanical. But to see for oneself, aware of one's brain, mind, how it is becoming mechanical. The very perception of the danger ends the danger. That is, when you stand on a precipice the very danger demands that you act. Right? When you see a cobra near you, you act. But we don't see the danger of this mechanical process of living. Right? Why don't you see the danger? Why don't you see the danger of having a leader, religious leaders? Look at you all! Because you want somebody to tell you what to do - in meditation, how to lead a spiritual life, what to do in politics, what to do in business - you follow? Told, educated, go to Harvard to become a business manager, go to this place. You understand? You are all being told what to do. And the speaker refuses to tell you what to do so you think he is evading. Whereas he is saying something: look at the facts, just look at it - why you put on those robes, why somebody does it, just look. And when you look very carefully, observe without any prejudice, then the story is told by that which you are observing. Then as the story ends the observation ends.

QUESTION: You often say that thought is a material process, what does this mean?

All right. What is material? Go on, sir, what is material? Matter. Right? Is that so, agree? Look sir, thought, as we explained, is contained in the cells of the memory of the brain, it is a fact. This is what the scientist - I am not a scientist, I have been saying this for many years - the scientists are saying that - the brain cells hold

the memory and so the cells themselves are material. Right? So it is a material process, therefore there is nothing sacred about thought. But you can treat matter as sacred: a rock is a sacred thing, a tree is a sacred thing, the fish that live in that river are a sacred thing. You can make anything sacred but that which makes things sacred is still a material process. The idols, whether they are in the Christian church or in the Hindu, or the writing in the Muslim world, are the result of thought, therefore it is a material process the whole thing. Only when thought naturally, without conflict, without struggle comes to an end, which is time, then there is a possibility of that which is eternal. So you say, 'Tell me how to end thought; tell me the system, the practice, I'll do it for the rest of my life.' So you are back again to the same old thing. But if you see, if you are aware, give attention to what you are thinking, and follow it through, that requires very careful slowing down the whole movement of thought; not suppression, control, just the slowing down of thought. We will talk about meditation.

QUESTION: You urge people to look inward and ask fundamental questions, don't you think yoga, meditation and so on prepares one's mind to look within?

First of all, sirs and ladies, I am not persuading you, or urging you to do anything - nothing. All that he is saying is: look! Look in the mirror as you do when you shave or comb your hair, look at yourself as you are: look. Look at the world, look at the society which we have made, look at all the politicians, what they are doing: just look first. But we don't look; we have prejudices, you follow, all our conditionings which prevents us from looking, therefore looking is not important but why you are asking the

question, why you are conditioned. You follow? Then naturally you discover what you are, you don't have to look inward, it is all there. But to look at the outer, which will give you a criteria, and from that criteria look at yourself so that there is no illusion about yourself. I wonder if you understand all this?

Now the questioner says: doesn't meditation, yoga and so on help you to prepare yourself to look inward? You have had it for ten thousand years, haven't you, you have been preparing. And you are still preparing, and where are you at the end of it, in spite of your robes, in spite of your meditation, in spite of your real gods? Why don't you ask those questions, sir? Sir, illumination or enlightenment doesn't demand preparation. Take that! Because preparation involves time, many lives, or many years. Right? That's your tradition. You accept it so you say, well, I must life after life, life after life struggle to achieve ultimately this enlightenment which will give me complete happiness.

Q: How can it happen if there is no situation?

K: Oh, then drown yourself and see! Sir, please do listen to this seriously, if you are interested, I am not persuading you to listen, if you don't want to listen, don't listen. Our minds are conditioned to time, our brains themselves have evolved through time. It's not your brain, or my brain, it is the brain - evolved through time and so it sees everything in terms of time: I am not, but I will be, I am violent but I will not be violent. So by its very conditioning it thinks in terms of time as a process, preparation for enlightenment, preparation as when you want to have a good job you prepare through examinations and so on and so on. So our whole way of thinking, looking at life is to prepare for something. I question this

preparation. Is enlightenment, the ultimate comprehension of that extraordinary thing called truth, is that to be approached through preparation? Which means what? Preparing yourself for what? Preparing yourself not to be greedy, not to have desires, not to have sex, not to have one meal a day. You are preparing, which means what? You want to reach truth and you are preparing for it, which means truth is a fixed point. Right? And you are preparing to go towards the fixed point which means you don't begin with freedom, you begin with preparing, struggling, controlling. But you also know unconsciously or consciously that freedom is essential for truth. So why don't you ask yourself, begin yourself by being free now, not ultimately - free from attachment, free from your robes, free from your fears. You follow, sir, why don't you begin there, freedom first? Because it is only when you are completely free the other is.

So preparation according to myself is not necessary at all. What is necessary is to begin with freedom, and that freedom goes with intelligence, not to do what you like. That freedom is responsibility, integrity.

We have talked for nearly an hour and forty-five minutes - an hour and thirty minutes - sorry!

QUESTION: What is the basis for your getting pessimistic about the growth of computers?

I am not, the speaker has never been pessimistic or optimistic, he is just showing something to you: that the computers can take over all that man has done, almost, except the computers can't look at the beautiful tree, or the evening star, single, alone in the sky, or the morning light on the waters. When a machine can take over all

that you are doing, thinking, learning much quicker than you, what's going to happen to you, as a human being? Sir, some of the people who are concerned with computers, really serious people, are really concerned with this: what is man, what is going to happen to him - while you sit here and meditate - you follow? So either man commits himself to entertainment, which you are doing now, religious entertainment, or football entertainment, or different forms of entertainment. I do not know if you have noticed on television in Europe and in America, sports are becoming more and more important, taking a great deal of time on the television, the new gods are the football players, earn millions and millions. You don't know all this? So either human beings will go around that line of entertainment, or concern themselves with something much deeper. And that is what computers are challenging you. And to look at that challenge, to understand it, to see what is implied it is not pessimism, you have to meet this challenge. Right, sirs.

Q: How does one meet a challenge?

K: How does one meet the challenge - all right. We are back again! I'll reply, madam. How does one meet this challenge, the challenge that the computer plus the robot are going to take over building a car. They are doing it in Japan, and the workers wear white gloves. You understand? And the computer, as we said, is going to outstrip man, in quickness. They are trying to invent, and they are, the ultimate intelligent machine computer. That's the challenge, what is man? Man is all that the computer can do except certain things. That is, your brain has been active for thousands and thousands of years, going to the office, struggling, maintaining her, struggling, which is to keep it active, active in different ways,

surgery, medicine, carpentry, it is active. Now that computer is going to take that activity over. Either your brain withers because it is not active, or it becomes active totally in a different direction. I wonder if you follow all this. The activity which we have had is instinctive, and the machine is going to take over your thinking, not entirely, ninety-five per cent of it is going to be taken over by a machine. So your brain unless it is kept, like any organ, like the arm, it is kept active, it will live - if it is kept steady in that position it will wither. So the brain will wither unless it is kept active. So either it is kept active through entertainment, sitting on a platform cheering the idiots playing, or the cinema, or this or that, or the religious nonsense. It is all the same, all entertainments are the same whether you call it religious or football, it is entertainment. So how will you keep the brain active? That's your challenge? To keep it active one has to enquire into something much deeper than the machine.

RAJGHAT, BENARES 3RD PUBLIC TALK 29TH NOVEMBER 1981

This is the last talk of the series.

We have talked about various problems of life. We have talked about the corruption in this country, not that it does not exist in other countries; we have talked about relationship between human beings in which there is hardly any relationship at all for there is no love. And we have also talked about fear and the ending of fear, pleasure, pain, sorrow; and with most of us there is very little of love, and last of all, least of all compassion. And I think we ought to talk over together again the problem of death.

I do not know if you are interested in these problems, how deeply you want to go into them. Though some of you may have casual interest, or some of you may be serious, we ought to consider this question of death, whether it be for the young or for the old, death by accident, death by disease, death by old age, senility. Probably we are already senile when we are educated. No smiles! Probably you don't understand the word senility - it is just as well! And man has always been afraid of this unknown problem, the very complex problem of death. Why human beings have always put death at the end of life. Why human beings, after millennia upon millennia, have considered death as something terrifying. Volumes have been written about it. Psychologists have said to prepare for death. And we human beings in the modern age would rather not talk about it, would rather avoid the question altogether. But if we are serious and concerned with the whole problem of living, existence, and all the travail that is involved in

daily life, we ought to consider seriously this question of death, which may also help us to understand the nature of meditation.

So what is death? Why man, human beings throughout the world, have been afraid of this terrible so-called catastrophe? Why human beings have not considered what happens before death rather than what happens after death. Most of us are concerned what takes place when we die, but we never consider what happens before we die. You understand my question? Isn't that far more important than what happens after death? Is it not far more important, essential and necessary whether the life that we lead, confused, uncertain, insecure, full of aches and pains and travail of life, whether that is not far more essential to comprehend than what happens after death. And perhaps then living becomes more important than the dying, then perhaps death and life go together. Are we communicating with each other? Or are you merely agreeing to something that you don't understand?

Which is more important, to understand what happens before death, which is our daily life, what we think, what we feel, how we act, what is our thinking, the nature of thought, is it not far more essential to understand that rather than enquire what happens after death? We shall find out what happens after death, we shall go into it, but shouldn't we consider the way of our life: how vulgar it has become with all these absurd costumes that you are wearing. What is your relationship not only with society but with each other; and also why we live the way we do, deceit, dishonesty, lack of integrity and so on. If that is not considered and transformed basically, then what does death mean? The dying? And what is it that dies? The physical body, the form, the name, and all the

attachments to which we are accustomed: the attachment to the family, to your beliefs, to your conclusions, to your gods, to your gurus, to your rituals, you are attached to all that. And death means the ending of all that.

So we ought to go into the question together: what is an ending? To end. We never end anything, we are always wanting to continue. When you end an attachment - please, we are not talking theoretically, or in abstraction, but actually, to end, say for instance your attachment to your guru, the attachment to some kind of belief, when you end it what takes place? Do you understand my question? Have you ever ended anything without any motive, without any conflict, to end? Because without ending there is no new beginning. That is so obvious. If I don't, for example, end my attachment to either this particular property, or attachment to a person, or an attachment to a belief, concept, an ideal, there is a constant continuity of what has been. And therefore what has been becomes mechanical. It is only when I, suppose, end my attachment completely, inwardly, completely end it, only then there is a new beginning, not in continuity. In continuity time is involved: I have been, I will be, I am. That is the process of time. In that process there is nothing new. I am continuing what I have, what I have been, which is modified in the present and continues in the future. It is a cycle. In that cycle there is nothing new taking place. There are variations, but it is not something totally new. Whereas if you end something, if you end your belief, your conclusions, your theories, end everything that you have known, then there is a new beginning. And is death a new beginning? Or the continuation of the old? You understand my question?

Please, do pay a little attention. Do consider what the speaker is saying. Because we are facing a great crisis in the world, of which perhaps most of you are not aware. We are facing the atomic bomb, nuclear bomb and all kinds of horrors are there. And we have continued in a certain pattern of existence all of the known days. You have your peculiar culture and you want to perpetuate that culture - if you ever had it, which I question. We want never to end anything. We want a series of movements which is recognizable, which as a sense of continuity, a sense of security and therefore we are afraid to end anything. End a habit, which means we are afraid of something that we have not already recognized, calculated, known.

If this is clear then what is death? The organism through misuse, through conflict, through disease, through malnutrition and so on will naturally come to an end, whether it dies very young, or fifty years, or a hundred and fifty years, it must inevitably come to an end. You can't help it, you can't say, 'Well, postpone it' however much our little brains may want to continue our absurdities. And death means both organically, the brain cells in themselves because of lack of oxygen, and so on, all that ends. That is a fact. Now who is it that dies? The organism, or the psychological inward structure that we have built through forty years, fifty years, or a hundred years? You are following all this? Who is it that dies apart from the organism? Is it thought that has built the whole structure of the 'me' and consciously or unconsciously we are afraid of that structure of the psyche coming to an end?

I do hope you are following, not the words, not the description, but actually discover for ourselves what we are. That is, we have

never investigated what we are. The ancient Greeks, about the fourth or third century BC, or fifth century, have said, 'Know thyself'. I am sure all the literature in this country in different ways have said, 'Know yourself'. What is the 'yourself', the self? Don't invent. Don't follow some psychologist, or what the so-called religious literature has said. Find out what is the self, you. It is that you that is clinging to the present and saying 'I don't want to die'. Right? That is clear. So it is important to understand yourself. To understand it, to look at it, to see the nature of the self as you would critically examine something under a microscope, or look at that tree with obvious design, the outlines, the beauty of the light, the green, the shadows, all that. To look. So similarly, can you look at yourself? Because without knowing yourself profoundly, and discovering whether that self is merely - please listen - a series of words, a series of memories, a conditioning according to the various cultures, society, social conditions, economic conditions and so on, whether that self is an actuality or a structure of words. You are following this? Find out sirs, don't agree with me. I am asking a question with which you can't agree or disagree. But you have to find out whether you, that is your form, your name, the things you have learned, the language that you know, the accumulated experience during forty, fifty, thirty, or whatever number of years, all that is not a structure of layers of words and memories. You understand this? Or you are something more than that? When you say, 'I am more than that' - the 'more' is the product of thought also. Right? You are following all this? I want to find some intelligent face with whom I can talk.

So the meaning of the self, the ego, the psyche, is not only the

past remembrances, the past memories, those memories may be a thousand years, past structure of various contributory experiences, the 'me' is essentially the product of experience and thought.

Whether you say, 'I am the Atman' - I am this or that, it is still the product of thought. Right? However much you may dislike the idea that you are merely a process of thought, the actuality is that you are. However much you may invent the super, super consciousness, it is still the process of thought. So are you, as a human being, merely, apart from the outer form, merely a structure put together by thought? Yes, sir! If you are, as you are, which is an actuality, then what place has thought and death? You understand? What is the relationship between thought and death, what is the relationship between the living, which is the movement of thought, in different directions, different skills, different specialities and so on, and death? You've got it? Are we communicating with each other? Good.

Now we have to go into something much deeper, which is: our consciousness - you understand by that word consciousness, to be conscious of, to be aware of the content of one's consciousness. The word consciousness from the Greek - I won't go into the etymological meaning - is to recognize, to comprehend. So our consciousness, which is you, is that consciousness different from another? If you say, 'It is my consciousness', which is my struggle, my particular idiosyncrasies, my particular form of expression, my particular form of existence, if you say, 'My consciousness is the result of my thinking, my pain, my loneliness, my relationship, which is a conflict' and so on and so on, is that consciousness different from another. Please go into this very carefully together.

Please, as we said the other day, we are walking together on a path, in beauty, in friendship, with a sense of great affection, together walking on that path, discussing this problem as two friends, this is not a lecture, this is not a 'telling you what to think' or how to think but together we are investigating this question, which is very complex. Therefore one must have a subtle mind, clear thinking, to apply, not just theoretically spin a lot of words. So please bear that in mind when we are talking over together this problem. It is not my problem it is a human problem, it is not your problem, it is the problem of mankind.

So we are asking: is your consciousness, which is what you think, what you feel, all that, your desires, your ambitions, your greed, your violence, is that consciousness different from another? It is not because every human being throughout the world under whatever skies, and whatever the beauty of the land, they all go through what you are going through: sorrow, pain, anxiety, loneliness, depression, arrogance, vanity, the utter sense of hopelessness, just like you. So your consciousness is not yours. Yes sir. It is the consciousness of all mankind. That means, please realize what it means, that you are not an individual, though we are trained, conditioned, religiously, through education, that we are separate entities, separate individuals, trying to reach some other form of thought, some other form of existence. We are not individuals, therefore there is not personal salvation, personal enlightenment. This is a very difficult thing to swallow, to really understand the full significance of this.

So when you die - please go into it, listen carefully - when you die are you, the psyche, dying, or the consciousness continues of

all human beings? Have you understood this? Look sir, I die, I am going to die, ten years, another five years, whatever it is, is my consciousness, that is what I think, what I feel, what I have learnt, unlearnt, all the things human beings have collected, for a thousands years, not I have collected, but human beings have collected through millennia upon millennia, I am the result of all that. And my consciousness is similar to the consciousness of the American living far away, who goes through more or less what I have been through, pain, uncertainty, no security, the threat of war, shedding tears, like me, like you. And when I die the consciousness of all humanity continues, but, this is the point, please listen carefully, but if there is a transformation in that consciousness then there is a totally different relationship between that person who is out of that consciousness to the consciousness of all mankind. Have you understood it? No, no sir, please don't agree, it is not a question of agreeing or logically seeing, but the actual experiencing of it, the actual realization that you are not an individual and when you die, unless there is a mutation in your consciousness, the consciousness of humanity continues. But if you, who are part of that consciousness step out of that consciousness you are no longer fearful, uncertain, seeking security, and not finding it, the ending of sorrow, all that, if the brain is not finished with it you are merely contributing to the furtherance of the consciousness. Have you got it?

Please this is not just romantic nonsense, something you would like to have, something that would give hope. When you examine it logically, and most of us avoid, put aside our reason when we begin to think religiously, this demands logical examination, no

sense of sentiment, romanticism but careful examination, then you discover that this is the common ground on which all humanity stands, because all humanity suffers, like you. And that consciousness, which is the ground upon which all of us stand, unless there is a movement away from that consciousness you are merely contributing further to that consciousness. And therefore death means - you answer it. I have put the question: so what does death mean? The ending of a physical substance, but thought as a material process, because thought is material, that continues in consciousness.

Now realizing all this let us talk about meditation. That is, if you want to. Which means we have to enquire what is a religious mind? What is a mind that has understood the nature, the true nature of religion? So we have to ask what do we mean by religion? The word religion etymologically is very uncertain. The real meaning of that word the dictionary does not tell you. All it tells you is, when you have looked it up in various dictionaries, the best, will tell you it is to bind, legare, to bind. So that is what the dictionary meaning is. We will leave that aside. We more or less know when we use the word religion, the speaker is using that word in the sense of all the religions that exist now, Christian, Hindu, Buddhism, Islam, all that is organized, the result of propaganda of two, five thousand years, all the rituals, which have lost totally their meaning, a lot of gibberish, all the tradition connected with it - the speaker says that is not religion. Putting on these strange robes doesn't mean you are religious. So the speaker is using that word religion not in the orthodox sense.

So far religion has been the worship of an idol, whether the

Christian idol, or Hindu idol - the Buddhists have no idol but they have created their own idols - the Mohammedans have their own scripture which becomes the form of an idol. So mankind has turned to worship idols. We are saying that is not religion because that is invented by thought. Thought either made by hand or by the mind, it is still an idol. Therefore when you worship the idol it is worshipping yourself which is the result of thinking. You are following? So we are using very carefully the word religion. Don't translate it into something else which suits you. It is a simple word with a tremendous content in it, but the content which mankind has put into it is illusion, it has no reality. Reality can only be in living. You can't say, 'I believe in god' and do devilish work. You can't say, 'We are all for peace' and prepare for war. So if you want to have peace, live peacefully. That is, don't hurt another, don't exploit another, don't kill another, don't become corrupt, have a great sense of integrity.

So having examined that word very carefully, we can go much more into it but we haven't time, then what is a religious mind? You understand? That which we call religion is not; all the priests, all the circus that goes on in the name of it is sheer rubbish, whether in the East or West, or North or South. So having described what it is not, I don't know if you have realized something, when you say what is not actually inside and discard it totally, then there is a positive action. The very denial is the positive. I wonder if you see this. Through negation comes the positive. Not saying, 'I am thinking positively'. Right?

So to find out, or to discover, to come upon - that's better - to come upon, approach what is a religious mind, we must enquire

then what is meditation? The word meditation means to ponder over. I meditate about a problem. I think over a problem. Or, I ponder over a complex mathematical problem. The meaning of that word is to think over, ponder over, consider, give thought, give attention. That is the meaning of the word meditation, according to various dictionaries, which is the common usage of language. So we are asking, not how to meditate - please see the difference - not how to meditate but what is meditation? Because if you say how to meditate then it becomes very simple; sit in a posture, hold your breath, follow a system, practise this, don't do that - that is not meditation, that is just repetition. Right? That is just continuing the same pattern repeated over and over and over again. Right? So that is not meditation. The system, the breathing, doing yoga, continuing in the same pattern, whether that word be some Koan, or Amen or some other Sanskrit word you use and repeat. That will invariably make the mind dull, obviously. When I keep on repeating, repeating, some kind of word I am mesmerizing myself and so naturally the brain becomes dull. That is what has happened to this country: religion has spoilt, destroyed our thinking capacity because you have followed, obeyed, never questioned, never doubted. Right?

So we are now enquiring into what is meditation? Is meditation apart from life, apart from daily living? That is, give twenty minutes in the morning, go out and do all the mischief you can, then in the afternoon sit quietly. You follow? And then continue in the evening. In the meantime be corrupt, be corrupted, dishonest. Is that meditation? Please enquire carefully. Or, is meditation part of living? Not one part of the day I meditate, the other part of the day

I am raising hell.

So is meditation something other than the understanding, bringing about transformation in the very daily life of one human being? You understand my question? So we are going together into the question of what is it to have a religious mind. And what is it to meditate. And how does meditation relate to daily life? You understand? Now if I don't put order in my daily life, that is inwardly, I cannot have order outwardly. That is very clear. Society is my relationship with another, or with many. Society is made up like that. If I am greedy, ambitious, and you are greedy, ambitious, you are corrupt, I am corrupt, we produce a society, that which you have now in this country. That is a fact. So can I - I am meditating now. Please follow, I am meditating, I am not seeking god. God is another invention of my thought. I wonder if you understand all this? If there is god then god must wish man to have a rotten life. Right? But we human beings, have created god in our image. I wonder if you see all this.

So before - not before - meditation is putting my house in order. My house, not the room, the house in which the mind lives. If the mind is not clear, has integrity, consideration, love, how can I possibly meditate? It has no meaning. So my first concern in meditation is whether I can put my house in order. Logically, please see the logic of it first, the reason of it. Then if you understand the logical conclusions then I must begin with myself, my house. So I am seeking security, security outwardly, security inwardly. Right? That is what all of us are doing. We sacrifice the inward security to the outward security. Right? We are more concerned with the outward security. So we want somebody to

guarantee outward security: the government, the business world, if I am a worker the business world must see that I have security. This is what is happening. So we want outward security, and the Communists and the so-called Marxists say have that first, then the human character, the human mind will change. Which means, change the outer, the circumstances, the State, the society, the government, change all that then man will naturally be good. And you have seen the experiment in Russia and all the other parts of Eastern Europe, that doesn't work because man wants freedom. You can't suppress him. And because he is free in the Western world and in India and Asia, parts of Asia, his freedom is to choose. He says, 'I am free because I can choose.' But his freedom is within the field - please listen carefully - within the field of knowledge. You have understood this? So he says, within that field I can choose. Go from one corner to another, North, South, East or West, and he thinks he is free.

So there must be freedom of order, which is intelligence. I wonder if you are understanding all this? So can meditation put the house in order? Or first put the house in order then that very order is meditation? You understand? No, you don't understand, don't agree with something you don't understand. Sirs, are we aware without any direction, aware that we live in disorder? Are we aware of it? Aware in the senses, I know, I live in disorder, my room, the ordinary room, is in disorder, my relationship is in disorder, my struggle, the very conflict indicates disorder. Am I aware of all that? Or the speaker is telling you and then you become aware of it. See the difference. Then you are not aware of it yourself. Somebody is telling you to be aware. I wonder if you

see all this. So when you are aware of the fact that you yourself have seen that your house is in disorder and out of that awareness see what are the causes of disorder, when you discover the causes of disorder, the causes, then what has a cause can end. I wonder if you see this?

May I go a little bit further? Don't say 'Yes'. This is not a game we are playing. For god's sake! We have been saying that the universe has no cause. If it had a cause it would end. Anything that has a cause must either continue or end. Continue in the sense of repetition. Cause, effect - no listen - cause, effect, the effect becomes the cause, the cause becomes the effect, it is like a chain. But the universe has not a cause and therefore it is infinite. Right? Whereas human beings have a cause. Which is, their cause is their action is based on either reward or punishment which is a cause - I do this because I am rewarded, or I don't do this because I am punished. You know. This is the common factor in all of us: I will change if you reward me; or, if you punish me I will change. Therefore our existence has a cause, therefore - please follow it - therefore our existence because it has a cause can come to an end, which is death. You are following all this?

So can the house be put in order without conflict, without determination, 'I must have', which again brings conflict? Or the house can be kept in order, the inward house, by perception, only perception. That is, to see 'what is', not 'what should be', to see 'what is' and remain with it. I wonder if you understand this? Look sir: I am in sorrow, suppose I am in sorrow, that is part of my house. The sorrow which has come about for various reasons, my son is dead, my brother is dead, the husband, whoever it is, dead,

sorrow, and never to escape from it, never to rationalize it because then you are away, you are moving away from the fact of sorrow. That is, when you rationalize it, when you say past life, when you try to analyze it, that is moving away from 'what is'. If thought doesn't move away from 'what is' then you hold it. Right? Like a vessel that holds water, that sorrow is the water and your mind is the vessel and it is holding it. Not moving away from it, which means you have given complete attention to that which you are holding. I wonder if you are following? You are following this sir?

Then when you give total attention, which is total perception, then that which you are holding has no meaning any more. I wonder if you understand. Please just verbally understand it. But when you begin to realize the depth of it, the beauty of such a thing, then you are putting - the mind itself is putting order in itself. You are not separate from the mind, you are that. So when you hold it without any movement the mind itself is in order.

Now, suppose you have put the house in order, which you have not unfortunately, if you had we would have a different society, different government, different relationship with each other. But since you have not that is up to you. But suppose, if you have put your house in order, complete order by understanding totally what is disorder, not understanding what is order, by understanding what is disorder, out of that comprehension, realization, awareness and giving your total attention to the various contributory causes of that disorder, then order comes without you seeking order. Then what is meditation? You understand?

Are you working as hard as the speaker is working? No, you are not, obviously. Oh gosh! Then what is meditation? Can you look at

that tree without the word, without the remembrance that it is called a tree, only observe without any movement of the past interfering with your observation? Have you ever tried this? No, of course not. Just look now sir. There is that tree in front of you. Look at it, if I may suggest, without the word, without the naming, the species, just to observe the whole tree. Can you do it? Similarly, can you look at yourself without the word, without all the past remembrances throwing themselves and so preventing your observation of yourself as you are? You understand? Is this too much in one talk? Please. Are you following what I am saying? No, sir, it is not a moment for a conversation, sorry.

Can you look at yourself, which is meditation, please we are meditating now, can you look at yourself without the process of recognition taking place? That is, can you look at yourself without the observer, who is the past, and looking at the present? You understand? What am I to do? Sir, let me go on, you listen if you can catch it, if you can't it's up to you.

Is truth something that is related to the past? Is truth something that you can capture and hold? Or truth is something that is nameless, timeless, and to come to it, to approach it, there is no path to it. Right? If there is a path to it, it is a fixed point. But truth is a living thing, it is not something dead, static, it is living, dynamic, full of something extraordinary. So as long as the brain is conditioned in the field of knowledge, that is - may I go into it a little bit - that is, our brain is conditioned by experience, experience brings about knowledge, that knowledge is stored in the brain, in the cells of the brain, which then is memory, that memory acts as thought, from thought there is action. In this cycle we are

caught, if you observe yourself you can see the fact. Whether your experience or a thousand years experience it is stored, which becomes knowledge - scientific knowledge, technological knowledge, the knowledge of relationship, knowledge. From that knowledge there is memory, knowledge is memory, memory then responds as thought to a challenge, of course: you ask me a question, I reply from memory. And that memory, its reaction is thought, then thought acts, from that action you learn. So you are back again in this cycle. That is, experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, from action you learn, modify, past knowledge, you are caught in the cycle. Right? That is how the brain functions. Because in that there is complete security, which is mechanical. I don't know if you are following?

So meditation is enquiring, asking, questioning, whether there is an action which is not based on this chain, on this momentum, in this process. Ask yourself this question sir: is there an action which is not based on knowledge? Ask it, find out. Because all our action is based on knowledge, which is thought. And therefore as thought is limited because knowledge is limited, there is no complete knowledge about anything, you can't, therefore thought is limited. Right? Please see that. So is there an action which is not limited? Understood my question? I will give you an example, if I may, which is: most people are nationalistic, their patriotism, their flag and all that nonsense. And the brain has become accustomed to that. And we see the importance of global relationship. Right? Because it is coming, it is taking place now but we still stick to our nationalism. Global relationship is becoming more important, it has to take place, but our brain refuses to respond to that because we

are conditioned, we are trained, our education says some dirty little flag, paper, to salute it, to worship it and all that kind of nonsense. So the brain refuses and yet it sees the necessity of the other, so there is a conflict. Now to end that conflict don't be a national. You understand? So our brain refuses to move from that which it has known.

Meditation is to understand the whole movement of the known, and to see whether it is possible to move away from it. Sir, you understand, that requires sensitivity. That means the senses must be awakened, not just one part of them. So meditation is to put the house in order. Meditation is to understand the nature of knowledge, knowledge of the books, the Vedas, Upanishads, and all that stuff, to understand the nature of knowledge and to see how dangerous it is becoming because it is repetitive. And to see, to observe this knowledge and hold that knowledge so completely that itself begins to - it is like holding water, it soon drips away. But you have to hold it, you have to see where knowledge is necessary, where knowledge is not necessary.

Then what is meditation? We are still pursuing, please. Which is to have mind a that has put its house in order, has seen the very complex nature of knowledge, and to find out whether there is an action, a way of living without the whole burden of knowledge. And then also to enquire what is attention? And what is concentration? Because that is part of meditation.

Concentration any person can do. Right? From school you are taught that, concentrate on a book, when you really want to look out of the window the teacher comes along and bangs you on the head, or tells you to concentrate on the book. So you learn very

quickly to concentrate on the book. Which means you focus all your energy on a particular point, on a particular page, on a particular skill; if you are a scientist you concentrate on that, or if you are a businessman, concentrate on making money, cheating, you know the whole business of it. No, you all cheat, don't laugh. We are not insulting the business man. You are so ready to laugh at somebody, you are not ready to laugh at yourself. So we more or less know the consequences of concentration, forcing thought to come to a certain point. That is to resist all intrusion of other thoughts, to give thought a particular point upon which it can dwell constantly.

And the other is attention. Attention is not concentration. Attention - now just a minute. Can you attend completely on that tree, attend, which means to look with all your energy, with all your nervous energy, capacity, with all that look? And when you do so look with your total attention there is no centre from which you are looking. Right? Do experiment with this. Look at it. Somebody. Yes, look at your wife, or your husband, or these strange people sitting in front of me, look at them, giving your complete attention. In that attention there is no point from which you are looking, you are taking the whole thing in. You understand? No, you haven't done this.

So attention is far more important than concentration because concentration is merely focusing on one point; attention has no borders because it has no centre so as to have a border. You understand? That which has a centre has a diameter, but when there is no centre there is no periphery. Attention is that.

Then you have to enquire into what is silence? The mind -

please follow all this - the mind has put the house in order, has understood the nature of knowledge. Knowledge is necessary to go home, to drive a car, to speak, to do that, but psychological knowledge is not necessary. Psychological knowledge is the 'me', the accumulated experiences and so on. So also I have to understand attention, concentration. Then I am asking: such a mind is completely silent. Either that silence is illusory, put together by thought, determined to be silent. Or silence has no cause. I wonder if you follow this? So the mind has been through all this, not ideationally but actually, then what is silence? There is that whistle of the train, the silence between that whistle and another whistle, the silence between two notes, two noises, between two sounds, the silence between two thoughts, all that is still within the realm of cognition. But when the mind is completely silent it is not aware that it is silent. It must be otherwise be merely playing tricks. I wonder if you understand?

So is there a silence without any cause, and therefore that silence has no end? That which has a cause can end, but a silence that has no cause has no ending. It doesn't say, 'Can I maintain it?' I wonder if you follow all this? Because that silence is absolutely necessary, because in that silence there is no movement of thought. In that silence only that which is sacred, that which is nameless, which is not measurable by thought is. And that which is, is the most sacred. This is meditation. Right sirs.

RISHI VALLEY 1ST TALK WITH STUDENTS

10TH DECEMBER 1981

K: What would you like to talk about?

Q: I would like to ask you a question.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: I have been staying in the school for eight years now, and you have said that the complete development of the human being is the most important thing but...

K: The school has not provided it.

Q:... the school has not provided the ambience for this development.

K: The school has not provided the proper education, proper development of the human mind. That is the question, isn't it? Any other question?

Q: Sir, you say knowledge is limited, where do you draw the line and say this is the limit of knowledge?

K: Any more questions? The school has not provided the proper, not only ambience, environment, but also has not helped each human being, each one of you, to cultivate the whole of your being. Right, Sir? And the other question is: where does one draw the line between knowledge and the freedom from knowledge? Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Any more questions?

Q: Sir, why do we place so much importance to words?

K: Why do we give so much importance to words. By Jove!
Anything else?

Q: Is there a passion which does not die after some time?

K: All right I have got it. Is there a passion which doesn't wither away after a while? Right? I'll answer all those questions presently.

May I ask you a question? Are you all happy here?

Q: Yes.

Q: No.

K: Just a minute, don't be so eager. Are you all happy? Wait a minute, I'll tell you what I mean by happiness. Do you look at the birds? Do you look at all the trees, the plants, the flowers, those hills which are the oldest hills in the world, one of the oldest? Do you look at the moon in the evening? Do you? Not quite! Do you look at the evening star when there is no other star in the sky? Do you? Or you are only concerned with books? Would you answer that question? Are you only concerned with the books that your teacher, your educator puts before you? Or do you look at all this world - a most extraordinary world it is, the beauty of the skies in the evening? Do you? Does each one of you look at it? Or you are too occupied with your books, with your worries, with your play, with your amusement? I am asking a question, would the older boys be good enough to answer that question? And girls.

Q: Many of the senior boys are fully occupied.

K: Yes, occupied with books. So you neglect all this. And you call that happiness, you call that being happy when you are only concerned with books. Have you ever considered what happens to your brain when you are only concerned with books? Have you? Have you ever given thought to the state of your brain, mind, your capacity to observe when you are only concerned with what is printed in a book? Don't your teachers tell you to look at the birds,

to look at trees?

Q: We may look at them but we don't do anything further about it, and then we go back to our books.

K: So books have become very important, why?

Q: There seems to be no other way, we have to pass examinations.

K: So you are only concerned with examinations.

Q: I have to get a job when I grow big.

K: You have to get a job and so you have to pass examinations. And do you know how many people are after that one job that you want? You understand my question? I pass from this school to college, university, and I pass some kind of examination with a few alphabets after my name, do you know how many people are at? For one job there are about ten thousand people for one job. Right? Are you aware of this? Yes sir?

Q: What shall we do if we don't pass examinations?

K: I didn't say you shouldn't pass examinations. I said are you aware of it. Are you aware that after you have passed your examinations - BA, MA, PhD, whatever it is - there are so many other people after that job, after any job. Are you aware of this? Are you? Yes?

Q: In order to compete against them you have to do well and perform well in exams.

K: I am asking a different question, lady. I am asking, are you aware after you have passed your exams, that when you seek one job, your particular job, your particular work, there are thousands after that work - are you aware of it? What do you say? Yes, sir? Do you know how dangerous it is, that you may not get the job you

want? So what are you going to do? You leave here, if you are lucky you go to college, then after that university, then you search for a job - your uncle, or your father, or some kind of distant relative pulls wires, and you may get a job if you are lucky. But if you don't, what will you do? Most people don't. You understand what I am saying? Then what will you do? Come on sir. You see, you don't think far enough. You just think of passing some beastly examination, and then lost. Right? Then what will you do? What good have your examinations been if you don't get a job?

Q: We have to study hard to avoid that possibility.

K: So you are studying hard to avoid that possibility. What about the other people who don't get a job?

Q: For them exams are useless.

K: If you don't get a job will the examinations be useless? Not for them, for you.

Q: It will be useless for me too because I am doing the exams for the job.

K: My god! This is the school that you are producing. You are only concerned about yourself, aren't you? Right? Right, sir?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Be honest.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Good. You are only concerned about yourself. As long as you get a job, you hope to be secure, enough money, married, children and a house. And that's all you are concerned about, aren't you? Be honest.

Q: Honestly I am not. I am not concerned about those things but that is generally what happens.

K: So what are you concerned about?

Q: There is so much misery in the world.

K: So you are concerned with misery, are you? What are you going to do about it?

Q: I am conscious of it but I am not sure what I can do about it.

K: Where do you start to understand the misery of the world? Is the world outside there different from you?

Q: Sir, I think if you want to do something about what is happening outside, then you have to do something about yourself.

K: Do you start with yourself? Or those are just words?

Q: I think, sir, it is more words.

K: Just words. So you add some more words to the words you already know. What kind of school is this? Would you tell me?

Q: It is like any other school and then...

K: It is like any other school, and what else?

Q: It is situated in a beautiful valley.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I asked you a question at the beginning. Are you happy here? Because it is very important to be happy while you are very young, isn't it?

Q: It depends on what you call happiness.

K: I explained, sir. What do you call happiness?

Q: For me it is something that is just passing.

K: Yes. So are you so happy?

So I will ask also, if I may, what would you like me to talk about. You have put three questions: what place has knowledge, and the division between knowledge and freedom, and so on. What would you like me to talk about? What are you interested in?

Books? Exams? Is that all that you are interested in? Would you kindly tell me.

Q: I don't know what I am interested in because at times I am interested in something, I study, and then after some time I find that I don't feel interested. So I don't really know what I am interested in.

K: How will you find out? Are you waiting for somebody to tell you?

Q: I am not waiting for somebody to tell me.

K: Therefore how will you find out what you are really deeply interested in?

Q: He also asked a question, is there a passion that doesn't die away.

K: What do you call passion? What is passion to you? Passion to paint? Passion to be a first-class carpenter, first-class scientist? Not just pass some little examination that says you are a scientist but to have passion behind it, vitality, energy, drive. Have you passion for anything? To be very well dressed? Passion to be the most really religious man? Do you have any passion? Good heavens!

And you also asked a question about the division in knowledge. What is knowledge? Have you ever asked yourself what is knowledge? Somebody raised that question. What is knowledge? Not only learning from books, but also watching: watching the movement of the leaves, watching the hills, watching the trees grow, how the birds fly. By watching, not by learning from a book. So what is knowledge? I wish you would discuss it with me, will you. What to you is knowledge?

Q: Knowledge is experience.

K: All right, knowledge comes from experience. Does it? Right. Now what is experience? You drive along in a car, rather fast and you have an accident. I hope you don't, but people do. And that is an experience, isn't it? Right? You have an experience when you go to a hospital, being sick. Right? You have an experience when there is a thunderstorm. Right? You have an experience when you learn something new. Right? You have an experience when you see or feel something that you have never felt before. Right? So all these are various forms of experiences. What do you learn from those experiences? To avoid an accident? Right? To observe the light on the leaf and watch it very carefully. So all that, all those experiences leave a record which is called knowledge. Right? Would you agree to that? All of you, do you agree to that?

Q: Yes.

K: Then what happens? You have knowledge of an accident, you have knowledge of a hospital where you have been sick, you have knowledge of seeing something totally new; so what happens after that knowledge? You have learnt, or been taught mathematics; you have learnt from the books, you have listened to your educator, and you have gathered information. Right? And that you call knowledge. That knowledge is stored in the brain, isn't it? Right? Agree? And what happens after that?

Q: You apply that knowledge.

K: How do you apply that knowledge? I have learnt, I have been apprentice to a carpenter, a master carpenter, he has taught me how to use the instruments, to feel the quality of the wood, and so on. For a few years I have studied, I have learnt. And that

learning becomes the knowledge and I am going to use that knowledge. Right? Right? Now what happens between knowledge, before action? Think with me, learn from me, don't just answer it, learn. I have seen, experienced, I see from experience there is knowledge, but before that knowledge is put into action what takes place?

Q: Thought operates.

K: Thought operates. You follow, look what happens: experience, knowledge, thought and action. Right? Have you got that? I have an experience, from that experience I gather a great deal of knowledge, then I think how to put that knowledge into action. So experience, knowledge, memory, then thought, then action. From that action you learn more. Right? All that is the process of knowledge, thought and action. That's clear? You have learnt in the school, if you have, a great deal of information as knowledge about engineering; you go to college, there you learn more about engineering, mathematics, pressure and so on; then you go to university, there you are also getting more and more knowledge; and then you get a job, if you are lucky, then you operate skilfully or not skilfully according to the knowledge that you have acquired. Is that clear? Have you understood that?

Now just a minute: I have explained, I have put into words what actually goes on in the brain. Now do you see that for yourself, the fact of that, or you have made an idea of it? You understand?

Q: I don't understand.

K: No, you don't. All right. First of all do you see the difference between the word and the thing? The word 'microphone' is not the microphone. Have you understood that? No, no, don't say, yes,

unless you completely understand this. The word is not the thing.

Q: The properties of matter, you can see, is not the thing.

K: Come over here. Come and sit down, sir.

Q: The properties which we see...

K: Be simple with me. Not, the property you see. You see that clock, you see that pillar, you see that tree. Go on. The word 'clock' is not the actual thing.

Q: But we are saying...

K: Have you understood what I said?

Q: How can you say it is not the thing?

K: Not how can I, the word clock, is not the actual clock, the thing. The word is not the thing. The word 'father' is not actually your father.

Q: That word only creates a picture of what it is.

K: First see the word is not the thing.

Q: It is synonymous with the thing, it is almost synonymous with the thing.

K: But first, sir, see, it may be synthesis, it may be this, but see the difference how our mind works. The word, say, clock, you immediately imagine that. Right? We don't separate the word from the thing. Right?

Q: Sir, we are always caught up in this.

K: What's your name?

Q: Sapan.

K: Sapan. All right. The word 'Sapan' is not you.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Though that indicates you. That describes you. But the description is not you. I describe the mountain, I paint the

mountain, I write a poem about the mountain, but the poem, the description, the picture is not the actual mountain. Got it?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: You are sure?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Quite?

Q: Then the question arises, what is the mountain, what am I?

K: I am not asking what you are.

Q: But I am.

K: You may be a cuckoo! But I am asking you a very simple question. The word mountain is not the actual rock, the tree, all that. Do you agree to that?

Q: Yes.

K: Good, I am glad. So next is: the knowledge that you have acquired through experience, knowledge, memory, thought, all that is part of you, isn't it? Right? Right? Now the question was asked: is there freedom or division between knowledge and non-knowledge. This is rather difficult. Now you have acquired a great deal of knowledge from books, what other people have said. Agreed? And you repeat that for the rest of your life, don't you. Getting a little more or a little less but you keep on repeating that. Right? So what happens to you, to your brain?

Q: It is not your own.

K: Which means what?

Q: It comes from my parents.

K: Go on sir, enquire. What does that mean? That you are all secondhand human beings. Right? Right? He doesn't like to say that. He doesn't like to acknowledge that he is a secondhand human

being.

Q: If I have to discard all the knowledge that is given to me it would take ages.

K: I don't quite follow.

Q: If I have to pick up all the knowledge it would take ages.

K: Of course, sir. Probably it would take many thousand years. But see the point that as long as we are learning about something from others, say for example, if you want to be a scientist, you have to study all the previous scientists and their discoveries, all this knowledge is stored up in books, by your study, it is there in your mind. You can't start right from the beginning to discover what science is, others have discovered it, and so you learn about it, and you repeat what other people have said. Right? Right? Do you agree to all that? Do you? Don't be shy. That is what you are doing old boys.

Q: What is wrong with doing that?

K: Oh, what is wrong with doing that. You are like a machine, aren't you if you keep on repeating, repeating what other people have said. It is just like a machine going round and round and round.

Q: I certainly don't have the feeling that I am a machine.

K: Of course not. You don't have the feeling that you are a machine. But you are. You don't like to think you are a machine. Probably you are studying, I don't know what you are studying, suppose you are studying mathematics, and that's your subject in which you are going to pass your examinations, and you become a professor in mathematics in some unfortunate university, and what happens? You repeat what you have learnt. Right? And you tell the

other students to repeat what they have learnt. So gradually your mind, your brain becomes mechanical, like a machine going round and round and round. You may discover something in going round and round, but it is still round and round. Agree?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Are you quite sure?

Q: When I become a mathematics professor I won't be doing mathematics all the time.

K: No, of course not.

Q: I will be doing interesting things as well.

K: You will be doing other interesting things? Which means you are not interested in mathematics! So you realize what you are doing with your life? It's your life: school, college, university, passing some exams, adding some alphabets after your name, and for the rest of your life you do this.

Q: What is the alternative?

K: Do you want to find out? Do you want to learn about it? Do you? Seriously? Will you give as much time as you have done to study mathematics or to your study? Or is it just a passing interest? You want the alternative. I'll tell you what the alternative is. But you must give time to it, won't you. Right? Will you? So you are just asking what is the alternative because it doesn't matter. What matters is exams, title, job.

Q: Sir, but even that alternative is again you are going to do the same thing. Once you say that you want an alternative you are still in the field of knowledge.

K: That's right. Quite right. The field of knowledge. So you move from one knowledge to the other. Knowledge is the same. So

do you want to find out how to live a life where knowledge is necessary, where knowledge is not necessary? Knowledge is necessary if you are a carpenter; knowledge is necessary if you want to drive a car; knowledge is necessary if you want to be a businessman, or an engineer, or some crook. Right? Knowledge is all necessary there. Now find out, find out where knowledge is not necessary, or may not be necessary. Find out. Exercise your brain to find out. Do you understand my question?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: All my life I have worked in this field. I go from one corner to the other and I think I am free, but it is still in the same field. Right? I realize that. That's not freedom. It is like a donkey tied to a tether, it thinks it is very, very free because it has got that length of rope, but it is not free. Right? So I have to ask if there is freedom first. Which means freedom from this. Right?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Now how will you find out?

Q: But there isn't any freedom from that. The prime thing is to pass exams, get a job and feel secure. Where is freedom from this?

K: That's what I am asking, sir, there is no freedom from this. As long as you want that there is no freedom from it. You understand? As long as I want a job, good money, house, family, I am stuck there. If I want freedom I have to enquire. I have to say, what is freedom, from what?

Q: You have to enquire into what you want to get freedom from.

K: That's right. First freedom from. Now I am violent. I want to be free from violence. That's one. I want to be free from pain. I

want to be free from public opinion. Which none of you want. Right? Right, sir? Public opinion matters very much to you, doesn't it? What? Agree? But you don't want to be free from that, do you? You are frightened what people might say about you. Have you heard of Bernard Shaw? The writer. He is dead. He had over his mantelpiece, 'People say, let them say'. You understand? You have understood?

Q: Yes sir.

K: Do you understand that?

Q: That is again an escape from what people are saying.

K: No, no, old boy. You know people say all kinds of things. All right. People say all kinds of things about me. Who cares? They might say good things, they might say bad things, they might say things to hurt you; let them say what they want, who cares? But you all do.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Why?

Q: The world which I have figured for myself, public opinion is also an important factor, apart from job and security.

K: So are you frightened of public opinion? Of course you are. You don't even know about it.

Q: What happens after death?

K: Oh! (Laughter) Why are we all laughing? Because a little boy asks what happens after death. We will talk about it another time, but now we are talking of what happens before death, not after.

Q: Sir, some people say who have been dying, and are supposed dead, when they come back they say they went through a tunnel,

and at the other end they found their friends shouting at them.

K: Look, don't talk about death now, we will do it another time. Let's talk about what happens before we die, shall we? Right?

Have you ever looked at yourself, apart from the mirror, I don't mean that. Have you looked at yourself? Have you?

Q: Yes, sir, but all the time I have always been forming images about myself that I am this, and I am that, and it does not get me anywhere.

K: Agreed. Now why do you have images about yourself? Listen to my question. Can you look at yourself without any image? Or look at yourself who are the maker of images? Or can you look at the image that you have made about yourself? This applies to all of us. Can you look at yourself, which is your image, look at it? Can you look at your image that you have made of yourself?

Q: It is strongly embedded in me.

K: So you are the image, are you? Right? Right, sir? Do you agree to that? Silence! You make a statement that your image is strongly embedded; and I say look at that strongly embedded image, can you? I see you are not used to thinking things out for yourself. Right?

Q: Everything seems to go blank.

K: I know. Why? How old are you?

Q: Fifteen.

K: Remain fifteen, nice, don't grow old. We have talked for an hour, is that enough? Is that enough?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes! The boy says, yes. What do you say?

Q: You have not answered a single question.

K: Of course not. I have not answered a single question, that boy says. Why? I am not escaping, I am not avoiding. I can answer all your questions but I haven't answered them because I want you to think it out for yourself. I can help you to think it out, but you see you are used to asking a question and somebody answers it, so you have stopped questioning yourself. Right? But whereas if I say, look, you have asked a question like passion, like knowledge, enquire into it, look into it, exercise your mind to understand it, not what I say but find out. That way you have a good brain. But if I say, well, passion is this, or the end of knowledge, and so on, if I explain it all very carefully, which I will, I am not frightened of explanation, but at the end of it what will you do? You will repeat that explanation. Right? Whereas if you and I can think together, explore together, find out, learn, but you are not doing that. Your minds, your brains, are used to being told what to do, how to think. But I don't want to do that. I want, if we can, to help each other to find out, to learn about things anew, fresh.

Is that enough, an hour? Is that enough, sir?

Q: We can continue.

K: Poor chap, he says, you can continue, in a meek voice! I think that is enough for this morning. Will you sit quietly for two or three minutes. Absolutely quiet. Keep your eyes closed. Don't let your body move, twist, fingers, just sit absolutely quiet.

(Long pause) - All right sirs.

RISHI VALLEY 2ND TALK WITH STUDENTS 15TH DECEMBER 1981

K: What would you like me to talk about?

Q: Sir, can we go on where we left off last time?

K: Where did we leave off?

Q: You said there was an alternative to the way we were living, and you said that you wouldn't provide the answers and that we would have to look for them ourselves with your help.

K: All right sir.

First, may I talk a little bit about what I want to talk about and then we can talk about what you want? I would like to ask a question: what do we mean by learning? We learn mostly from books, printed word, or instructed, or told, or informed by the educator, who is already chock full of his own particular subject. We learn through hearing, seeing; and also we learn, if I may use the word, through our heart, which is affection, sympathy, generosity. So there are several ways of learning about life, which is a very complex process. And most schools, and most educational institutions are concerned only with book knowledge. And that knowledge limits our minds, our brains. And we are only using part of our brain, not the whole of our brain. If you are interested in it we can go into the idea, or into the reality of what it is to live or to act with a holistic mind, holistic brain. That is, with the whole of your brain, not with only one small part of it. The small part of it is the accumulated knowledge called learning from experience, from books, from incidents, from observation and so on.

So learning apparently as it is now being taught or learnt is

limited to a particular subject, to a particular field, scientific, biological and so on. So is there a learning which is not restricted to a particular point of view? Is there a learning which is not only with the eyes but also with the hearing, not only with the sensual ears but listening much more deeply? And learning from your heart, if I can use that word, or that sense, which is as I said generosity, sympathy, a great deal of affection, consideration, kindness, a great sense of love. When all the three are in complete harmony, working together, that is holistic, or the operation of the whole of the brain.

Because most of us are very selfish, concerned with ourselves, concerned about our exams, concerned about our future, concerned about our own particular little problems, concerned about our own success and so on. Most of us are very, very self-centred. You understand that word, self-centred? That is, very selfish. And apparently we seem to find it terribly difficult to move out of that area. Surely education is not only concerned with the so-called academic side but also it is concerned with the whole development of man, which is your heart, your hearing, your seeing, and learning about yourself: learning what you are. And through that learning go beyond yourself. This is surely part of our education, not merely fix your eyes on a book; there is this vast beautiful valley, this country, seeing what is happening in this country; corruption seems to be the way of life, where tribalism is growing more and more, separatism, the south against the north, the east against the west, and so on. Learning about what the government is, learning about the way you act, the way you think, the way you live. So all that is part of our learning. And nobody can teach you

how to learn about yourself. The psychologists, the psychiatrists and the philosophers, have pointed out, what you think, you are. So if we follow them, you are following not what you are but what they think you are. I hope this is clear.

So education is really basically to learn about yourself and your relationship to the world, your relationship to your brother, to your wife, to your husband, to your sister, to your neighbour and so on. Because if we don't learn to understand our relationship with each other we cannot possibly create a new society. And that is part of our education. And also it is part of our education to see that we are good human beings. We explained what that word means. So this is the whole process of learning about the world and oneself, and the relationship between yourself and the world.

Now, I will ask you a question to continue with what we were talking about the other day.

Q: I just wanted to ask one thing: you said that it is important to learn through sympathy and affection. I don't understand that.

K: He is asking: it is important to learn about sympathy, affection, generosity and all that, and he says, 'I don't understand what you mean by it'. Is it so very difficult to be generous? You have to learn about it? If you have a shirt, an extra shirt, will you give it to somebody?

Q: No.

K: No, sir! Quite right. There is all this vast poverty around you, and you seem to be fairly well off, or your parents are well off, and you have got an extra shirt, or extra skirt, will you give it to somebody who is poorer than you? Have you ever done it? That is, to give it to somebody without asking anything in return, that is

generosity.

Q: I have, sir, but I have noticed one thing: it is only at certain times that we are prompted to do this.

K: He is only generous at certain times.

Q: He says he is only prompted to do it at certain periods.

K: He is not generous all the time, he is generous when it suits him.

Q: I wouldn't say that either.

K: You won't say that either. Then when are you generous? We are not restricting this to him alone: when are you generous? Are you generous at any time?

Q: When you are happy.

K: When you are happy you are generous. Is that it? When are you happy? So are you saying we are only generous when it suits us, really? Right? When it is convenient for us; when you have some old clothes to give away you are very generous.

Q: No.

K: Are you saying no? When are you then generous? When are you feeling affectionate, kind, generous, sympathetic? Or do you never feel it? Or only occasionally?

Q: Only occasionally.

K: Why, sir? When you say, occasionally, what do you mean by that word? Rarely. Is it?

Q: I would say that.

K: You would say that. That is once a year.

Q: No time, sir.

K: When do you feel generous?

Q: When I am moved by something.

K: When you are moved by something. It is a strange phenomenon, isn't it? Sir, last night you saw that beautiful dance, were you moved by it? Moved in the sense you felt the movement of it, you felt you could almost dance yourself? You followed the rhythm. What made you do that? You saw the beauty of it, the rhythm, the posture, the vitality, the strength of it, and it appealed to you, your sense of the aesthetic, the beauty was aroused. Right? At the moment would you have given anything? You forgot yourself, didn't you?

Q: I very nearly did.

K: Sir, can you be generous without a motive? To give somebody something without a motive?

Q: I don't think so.

K: No. So you are not generous, it is only when it suits you. Not you, sir, I am talking generally, to the whole lot of us. So we neglect totally all that side, the beauty of the land.

Sirs, may I ask you a question, all of you? You know this country is in a state of corruption, corruption is the way of life here. Right? Do you all agree to that? Right? What are you going to do about it? Will you join that corruption?

Q: I really don't know, sir.

K: You don't know. But I am asking you, what will you do. Now think about it sir. Isn't it part of your education to find out your relationship to this country, which is politically, religiously, economically in a state of corruption?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, yes, I know all that. What will you do about it? What is your responsibility about it?

Q: I don't even know that I shall do anything about it.

K: Can you do anything about politics which is corrupt?

Q: I don't know.

K: You can't. Can you stop the corruption of the other people?

You can't, can you?

Q: No.

K: So will you be responsible not to be corrupt yourself?

Q: I can do that.

K: You can do that. So you are responsible not to be corrupted.

Q: That way you become selfish again.

K: Ah! That way, the girl says, you become selfish again.

Would that be selfishness to say I will not be part of this corruption?

Q: You start thinking about yourself again.

K: No. You may think about yourself, but surely when you see corruption around you, not to join that corruption is not selfishness.

Q: But that is not going to get rid of corruption.

K: Of course not, but you at least are not corrupt. Right? That's something, isn't it?

Q: You won't know what is right and what is not.

K: What do you mean what is right?

Q: I mean you know the actions are not right.

K: Yes, sir, just listen. You know what corruption is, do you know what that word means?

Q: I know what it means today.

K: The word comes from Latin, which means to break, rompere is to break. You understand? Break something to pieces.

Corruption exists as long as you act fragmentarily. Do you

understand what I have said? No, careful. As long as you act contradictorily for yourself, say one thing and do another. That's corruption. Promise and not keep that promise, that is corruption. Think one thing and do something else, that is corruption. Which means you are fragmented, broken up, self-contradictory. Right? That is corruption. Corruption is that, and also corruption as it is understood is to bribe, cheat, be dishonest, all that is corruption. Now will you join that group who are corrupt?

Q: I wouldn't like to join them but I don't know.

Q: At this stage one is reminded of an old saying: if you can't beat them, join them. (Laughter)

K: I know this. If you can't beat them, join them. If you can't lift it, paint it. Now I am asking you a very serious question, sir, because we are all facing that in this country, where corruption is the way of life. Will you, as an educated person, sympathetic, generous, will you join that? Don't say, no, or yes. Think about it, look at it, go into it. Because, sir, do you realize one person can do a tremendous lot. You have heard of Hitler, haven't you? Look, one man, what he did. He was a crazy man, but look what he did. So if you are incorruptible, absolutely, then you will stand against the whole current, won't you? Can you?

Q: Sir...

K: Don't answer something else, sir. I am asking you.

Q: That life may be wrong. If you are going to withstand that, it is going to be a lonely life.

K: Lead a lonely life. Stick to what you think is right. This is right, not to join the corrupt world.

Q: Sir, that current of corruption is very strong in this country.

K: I know that, sir, we have agreed to that. What will you do about it? Will you stand up against it? Isn't that part of your education to find out if you can withstand all that ugliness? Do you realize, sir, the gurus are corrupt, religion is corrupt, politics is corrupt, our relationship is corrupt, and you are being educated to join all that? Do sirs, please answer me. You are all very good at discussing, arguing, tell me.

Q: Sir, I can resist corruption or not, but I consider one thing that I won't be corrupt. That is, I won't do a job which will make me corrupt. I will take up a job where I won't be corrupt. I'll find it.

K: Will you, as you grow up, will you stand up against all that?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Sir, listen, if you say, 'Yes, sir', you mean it and stick to it. You may starve, you may have no job.

Q: He said that he will do a job like farming, with no corruption, and not join the corrupt gang.

K: So will you become a farmer?

Q: Yes.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: We can't all become farmers.

K: Of course not. We are all so afraid to go against the current, to stand alone. Right? Why?

Q: Because deep down in every human being...

K: No, not in every human being, about you.

Q: OK. It was me I was talking about.

K: Yes.

Q: Deep down in me I have got a feeling that I want to be part of the whole.

K: Part of the gang?

Q: Yes.

Q: You feel quite secure in that position.

Q: I feel that if you want to go against the crowd you have to have a lot of mental strength.

K: Exactly. You need a lot a strength to stand up against all this. Will you learn about it, how to have strength to stand against all this? You see you really want to go with the current. Right? So you are all cowards. Yes, sir. Right sir?

You asked the other day if there was an alternative to exams, jobs, and all that. Do you want an alternative? You started that question, some of you, do you want an alternative? Do you want to find out?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? Suppose we get a hundred acres and will you learn how to farm, be trained in that, and a few of you join together and start farming on your own, will you? You understand my question? We are thinking of getting a hundred acres, somewhere, where those of you who do not want to join the gang, or the corrupt business, can go there, learn all about farming and go out and buy a piece of land, perhaps two or three of you together and start farming - would you undertake that?

Q: Right now I am financially dependent on my mother.

K: You are. So tell your father, have the courage, the guts to say to your father, 'I don't want to go and join this stupid business, I want to go and farm, with a few of us'. Will you do that? The other day you asked what is the alternative. Are you frightened of that too?

Q: I don't want to become a farmer, it doesn't sound very hopeful.

Q: He is a lawyer!

K: And becoming a lawyer is very hopeful? Do you know how many people there are who want to become lawyers? You asked for an alternative the other day, and there is this alternative, something else other than the usual passing exam, jobs and stuck for the rest of your life.

Q: There is no security in the job, there is not enough security in farming as a family job.

K: What are you talking about?

Q: Ask the farmer today.

K: It all depends. If two or three of you joined together and bought so many acres, or a hundred acres, you could get a marvellous living out of it.

Q: Excuse me. Speaking for myself, I have a natural sort of inclination - well, what I am saying is that this life seems too good to be true, and naturally I am cautious.

K: What do you mean too good to be true?

Q: I am getting all that I want.

Q: He means here.

K: Farming.

Q: The life seems too good to be true, so naturally I get cautious.

K: What?

Q: He seems to imply that if he took to farming his life would be too good to be true, he has no challenge.

K: There is plenty of challenge.

Q: No, I don't mean that.

Q: What do you mean?

Q: You said that you could get some land and farm of it.

K: A group of you.

Q: A group of us.

K: You understand? Get the idea first. A group of you, with your parent's help, after being trained to be good farmers, you know, modern farmers, buy a piece of land for yourself, with the help of your parents - they will give it to you - and work at that. You are completely secure there.

Q: Yes, sir, that is what I am saying. So I am a human being, naturally I am cautious of that because we have come to a stage where everything we are offered has got something else, some strings attached to it.

K: There is no string attached to this.

Q: There may not be to this. I am sceptical because my experience has always been that there is some string attached.

K: There is no string attached, it is your land. You are all frightened, old boys, that is what it is. Frightened to move along a different line.

Q: I dislike farming.

K: You dislike farming, why?

Q: I don't like it.

K: What do you mean, you don't like it?

Q: You can become a dancer, you can become a musician, you can become an artist, you don't have to become a lawyer because your father is a lawyer.

K: Sir, you can become a photographer, a top photographer, if

you want to. An artist, dancer, anything you want to make of your life you can.

Q: But I want to become a lawyer.

K: Well, go ahead. Join the corruption. (Laughter)

Q: Sir, it is possible to become a politician, or lawyer and not be corrupt.

K: Can one become a politician and not be corrupt?

Q: He says it is possible to become a lawyer and politician...

K: Oh, yes, anything is possible, but will you be? Go on, sir.

Q: The first thing my father will do is to put me in an asylum!
(Laughter)

K: Perhaps, behind the asylum you may be the most sane man. You understand, sir, how mad the world is: preparing for war, right, that's madness, isn't it? Right? It's madness to live in a small community resisting all the other communities. Tribalism is wrong, isn't it? Nationalism is wrong, it is corrupt, destructive. Right? No? You see you don't think along these lines. You are just bookish; your father was a lawyer, you are going to be a lawyer, your father was a politician, you want to be a politician. You don't say, let's find out a different way of living.

Q: It is a new experience for us.

K: It is a new experience. All right. Murdering is a new experience.

Q: That's only one form.

K: I see. So how do you know law isn't corrupt as it is now? You want to go through that to find out?

Q: Possibly.

K: Possibly. Wait. Will you get drunk to find out what

drunkenness is? Will you take drugs?

Q: No.

K: Exactly. So you take what you want to do, what pleases you because your father, your grandfather, your great grandfather, was a butcher, a lawyer, or something or other, you join them.

Q: There is a very interesting joke about the model of a lawyer: get on with honour, get honoured.

K: Oh, lord. Go on sir, you were asking another question the other day, what was it?

Q: The alternative.

K: We said, that sir. We are offering you an alternative, something else to do rather than just following the usual traditional rut for educated people, so-called educated people.

Q: Couldn't I be a lawyer as well as a photographer?

K: Oh, you can do a lot of things together, but where is your heart in all that? I can be a photographer, a dancer, a lawyer, a politician, what is your main interest? Why do any of these things? Why be a lawyer? Seek injustice, or making money?

Q: Both.

K: Both. Sir, I used to know a man, he came to see me once, an oldish man, a white beard, he was some kind of judge in this country. Listen to what I am saying please. After one of the talks he came to see me. He said, 'I used to be a judge and passing sentences on what is right.' So one morning he woke up and said, 'I really don't know what is right, what is justice. I must go into it'. So he went off into the woods leaving the family - the good old tradition - and he meditated for eleven years to find out what is justice, what is truth. Will you do that? Of course not, you haven't

got the guts to do anything.

Q: But...

K: Wait a minute, let me finish my story. Eleven years after he came to one of the talks and he came to see me afterwards and he said, 'You know for eleven years I have been mesmerizing myself not being able to find out what is truth.' He was an old man. You understand, to have the courage to say after all these years, 'I haven't found it.' You understand?

What else would you like to ask questions about?

Q: What is right action?

K: What do you mean by the word 'right' and 'action'? Just think it out, sir, think it out first, don't just say anything that comes to your head, think it out what do you mean by 'right'?

Q: Right now what I think right is a comparison.

K: Quite, so is that right? Wait, listen carefully: something comparing. You compare this with that, and you think that is right. Now this may be wrong and you compare with that, and your comparison may also be wrong. So that may be not right. So eliminate comparison. Right? Right?

Q: The world is made up of comparisons.

K: I know that. I know the world is made up, sir, I am eighty six, I have lived in the world, so don't tell me the world is made up of comparisons. I am asking you.

Q: Sir but always my thought is marred by comparison.

K: Sir, to compare, what does that mean? You are missing it, I won't move from it. I am asking you, what is right? It must be right under all circumstances. Right? It can't vary according to circumstances. Correct? It must be right under all pressure. Right?

It must be so accurate whether it is in this climate or another climate, it is right under all circumstances. Right? So what is that? When you use right doesn't it mean precise, accurate, true - not true according to some ideas of some people but true according to your own perception, and that perception being accurate, logical, sane, rational, that you would call, and much more, right.

Now what do you mean by 'action'? Go on sir, what do you mean by action?

Q: Everything that I do.

K: Everything that you do is action, right?

Q: It seems so.

K: So what you do, does it depend on some future idea? Go on, sir, answer. Go on.

Q: It depends on past ideas.

K: Yes, so if your action is based on past or future ideas, is that action? You know what action means? The doing. The doing not according to the past, or the future, but the doing. Right? Which is what is happening now. So is your action based on belief? Is your action the result of some tradition? Is your action dependent on your father, mother? Is your action based on what other people say?

Q: As far as I can see it is not a right action.

K: Of course not. So right action is action that is accurate, objective, non-personal. Right? That does not vary according to circumstances. And action is the doing without the pressure of the past or the future. Find out what it means to live that way.

Q: The mind has got memories, and the past is always showing.

K: You come up here. What were you saying?

Q: We are memories, sir, we remember things.

K: So you are memory. Careful! Stick to it. You have said something accurate, stick to it. That is, all of you, your thinking, your action, your behaviour, your relationship is based on memory. You are memory. You are not spiritual, you are not divine, you are not something, something superior. You are entirely memory. You understand that? You understand? Hold it, hold it. Memory means the past. Right? Is there an action not based on the past, which is memory? Think it out. Think it out very carefully. Our action is based on memory; memory of the past, clouding the present, and the future. That memory is essentially the result of past thoughts, past. Now is there an action which is not the outcome of the past?

Q: I think memory shouldn't come in between.

K: Don't say, 'should', 'should not', find out, go into it, investigate it, discover for yourself if there is an action which is not based on memory. Find out. Don't ask somebody to tell you what it is, but find out for yourself if there is such action. Or there may be no such action, so find out, spend time, think about it, worry about it, ask your teacher, probably he doesn't know either. So go into it.

Q: Sir, can thought be absent?

K: Thought is memory. Thought is the response of memory. Right? Listen, listen, first find out. You have got it? Thought is experience, knowledge, memory, the response of memory is thought and action. Now I am asking is there an action which is not based on this?

Q: How about thinking?

K: Thinking itself is the past.

Q: What about learning?

K: I am helping you to learn about this. Find out, take time, take trouble, think, go into it, see if there is such a thing as action without all the burden of the past. You understand, this is education because it will make you much more subtle. You understand? Are all of you asleep?

Q: One more thing you said was, end comparison. What do you mean by that?

K: Have you been to museums?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. Have you seen paintings? Can you look at one painting without comparing it with another painting?

Q: I think I have no memory of it, sir.

K: No, I am asking a question. Just listen.

Q: I have never done that.

K: Do it.

Q: I can't do it.

K: How do you know, have you tried it?

Q: I don't know, sir.

K: Have you tried it? You are a lawyer, you have made a statement which you haven't tried, there is corruption! That is corruption, saying something without examination, without understanding, without going into it.

So you compare yourself with your brother, who is shorter, or taller, or brighter, more intelligent, why do you do that? Why do you compare yourself with another who may be more clever, why?

Q: You want to know where you are.

K: Why? No, sir, go into it a little more.

Q: It will make me work harder.

K: Oh, you think it will make you work harder because you want to be like that? He may be an idiot.

Q: I don't think he is.

K: Wait. Sir, you are all too quick, you don't get the meaning of all this? When you compare yourself with your brother who is brighter, in comparison you think you are not as clever as he is, isn't it. But if you didn't compare what would happen? Would you be clever? Would you be dull?

Q: You are what you are, sir.

K: That's just it: you are what you are. Right? You have said it, stick to it. You are what you are. Move from there, not because your brother is smarter.

Q: But yes, I do compare, why do we compare?

K: I am asking you. Because it is part of our tradition, your school, college, university, go to business, climb, climb, climb. So all that indicates you are not what you are. You have never found out for yourself what you are. You are always imitating somebody else. Right? Right, sir? So you become a secondhand human being, don't you?

Q: How do I find out what I am?

K: That is a different question. I'll tell you, but first realize by comparing yourself with somebody you never find out what you are. Right? Then ask the question, what are you? Go on, tell me, what are you? BSc?

Q: I don't think so. I mean you can answer that, but what do you mean by what are you? You are asking me to compare with something else.

K: No. You said it, what you are, you are what you are.

Q: I mean you can't say what you are.

K: Wait, wait. You said, you are what you are. What are you? Not only you, everybody: what are you? Your name, your form, the way you look: go on, I am telling you, tell me.

Q: Your thoughts.

K: Your thoughts.

Q: Your images.

K: Your images about yourself.

Q: My beliefs.

K: That's right, your beliefs. Go on!

Q: I think I am not myself at all.

K: Stick to it. You have said something good, for goodness sake find out, don't just say something and then go off. You are all these things, aren't you. So you are all these things, aren't you? So are you all these things? Obviously you are. Right? Your name, your form, the way you are physically, what you have learnt, your BA, MA, whatever it is, MAD! Right? You are all that, aren't you, that's what you are. You are all that.

Q: I am not what I am. Or is it that I am not what I am supposed to be?

K: What you are supposed to be is also part of that. You see, you are your name, your form, passing an examination, BA, MA, or whatever it is, you are the tradition, the beliefs, you are all that.

Q: What am I then?

K: You are that. Not, 'what am I then', you are that.

Q: If I am that, so what?

K: I am not saying, so what. You are that.

Q: I want to know.

K: Now, what a minute. Is it possible for your to go beyond all that?

Q: It is very difficult.

K: Why do you say, very difficult?

Q: I mean I can't live without all that because I don't know where I am staying, where I am going.

K: You mean by comparing you feel secure? Right? Are you? By comparing one lawyer against another lawyer, is that security?

Q: Not for you, sir. At times when you compare you might be insecure.

K: Of course you are. Where you are insecure you compare, if you are secure you don't compare. Right? If you are the greatest photographer, as this gentleman is in India, he is secure, he knows he is top of his profession.

Q: Sir but we have to live at times we are very insecure, so he has to live up to that.

K: No. He is good at his profession. If you are a master carpenter and you are top of that, you are secure.

Q: Everybody can't be top of his profession.

K: So what are you good at then? What do you want to do then?

Q: Try to be the top.

K: You can never be the top, old boy. If you keep on trying you will never be the top. But if you are good at something, you understand, not compare. Wait a minute. If you say, I'd love to be a carpenter - not you, you all want to be somebody on top - I want to be a good first-class carpenter, a master carpenter because I love that. I won't compare myself because I love what I am doing.

Q: If I want to be a lawyer...

K: Old man, don't be a lawyer.

Q: To do something excellently you have to be interested in it.

K: That's right.

Q: So how will you find out what interests you, there are so many things in this world, sir.

K: I know there are so many things in this world, but find out what you are interested in. Put your thought sir to it. Don't say, I am interested in gardening, interested in being a farmer, interested in becoming a rich man, in becoming whatever you want. Find out what it is you deeply want.

Q: I think deeply I want to be secure.

K: What? Secure physically?

Q: Physically.

K: Think it out, think it out. First physically.

Q: Yes.

K: You must have that, you must have clothes, food and shelter, that is absolutely necessary. Then finished with that. What is your interest? What are you interested in? This applies to all of you, for god's sake, listen. What are you interested in?

Q: To have...

K: Not interested in, what would you like to do for the rest of your life? Everything is open to you: become a lawyer, politician, a religious bug, a marvellous painter, poet, anything, what is it you want to do? You see, your teachers don't help you in this. Right? Ask, demand, find out together, discuss it.

Q: Only a few are willing, sir.

K: I am asking you now, old boy.

Q: I don't know what I am interested in. I just want to be young.

K: Oh, no. I may as a young boy wanting to be a pilot. Right? As I grow a little older I throw that out. Then I say I want to be a businessman. So I keep on until I am dying and I never find out, because you have never asked what you love to do. Not compare because it gives more money, or my father wants it or that, what is it that you really love to do out of your heart?

Q: Sir, what I want to do people will call me a fool.

K: Let them call you a fool, who cares! If you love something to do it doesn't matter what people say. Look, I am doing what I love to do. Right? And I don't care what people say, it doesn't matter because I love this. Do find out, you are young, find out, give your attention to it, ask.

Q: Sir, I am interested in doing something, very interested but at the same time I can't do it because of responsibility.

K: You have responsibilities at your age? Have you responsibilities?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: What? Feeding your mother, feeding your father, feeding your brothers, feeding your uncle? Do you understand what that word 'responsibility' means? You plant a tree, you are responsible that the tree is protected, watered, looked after, cared for. Right? Have you such a responsibility? Or is it just an idea that you are responsible?

Q: They have to spend a lot of money here and they expect something; so if I do something different they are going to be hurt.

K: Yes. Your mother and father produce you, so they are responsible for you. But it doesn't mean you should do exactly what they want you to do. You have a responsibility for yourself,

the way you life.

Q: How can I go against them when they have done so much for me?

K: Oh, really, are you serious in saying this? When they have done so much for you how can you go against them? Right? Aren't you going against them now?

Q: No.

K: Ah, careful! Aren't you going against them when you are listening to what the speaker is saying? That's just a trick of words saying, I am responsible because they have spent so much on me. And you are doing something exactly that they don't want you to do. Don't play those kind of tricks, sir.

All right, that's enough sir, isn't it, right? Right sir? Will you sit quietly now for a few minutes? Really quiet. Close your eyes, keep absolutely quiet.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 29TH JULY 1981

It is a lovely morning for a change. And I hope you had the pleasure of looking at the long shadows of the morning.

We have had many, many questions. We didn't count them but there must have been over a hundred. And out of those we have chosen some, not because they are easy to answer, or what we like to answer, but we have chosen some that may be representative of some of the questions that have been put. There have been, if I may point out, rather absurd questions, but there are these questions which we have gathered together and put for this morning.

When one asks a question, is the answer more important than the question itself? When one looks to an answer one overlooks the question. In the question itself, if we examine it deeply, is the answer. In the question itself. And how one approaches the question is all important, not try to find a rather clever, or not clever, or an answer that is worthwhile or personal. So please bear in mind that we are together, and I must emphasize again, that we are together examining the question. And out of that question, in the investigation of that question, the answer is inevitable. There are ten of them this morning. I don't know if we can answer all of them but we will try.

1st QUESTION: What do you mean by insight? Does it differ from intuition?

What do we mean by intuition? Having a hunch, having a feeling that is the right thing. And intuition is also having been sensitive, capturing something which may be conditioned, which

may be personal, which may be a desire, wish fulfilment. And we must be clear and hesitant in using that word intuition, because it may be one's own unconscious desire, one's own longing for something to happen, or sudden feeling that it is the right thing to do. But I think insight is different. May we go into it together?

The scientists, the physicists, the technological people have an insight into some invention. They see something new. Is that insight partial or is an insight whole? You understand? We are meeting, I hope, together. I may have an insight as I am an engineer into the structure of a bridge. And I operate according to that insight. That insight being more powerful, I adjust all my knowledge to conform, or adjust, to that knowledge - right? - to that insight. But is that insight partial? A poet, a painter, a musician, may have an insight, but it is still partial. When we use the word 'insight' we mean insight into the whole movement of life, not one part of it - right? So let us together find out what we mean by insight, how does it take place? - if you are interested in it. Because that may be the solution for our problems, specially psychological issues that are such a tremendous travail in all our lives. So together let's find out what we mean by insight.

Is - I am questioning it, so please question it also - is insight an action of memory? One has accumulated a great deal of knowledge, psychologically or physically, and that knowledge may, being limited, see something very clearly. But that knowledge being always in the field of ignorance because there is no complete knowledge about anything, including oneself, and when there is an insight from that limited knowledge that insight must also be limited. So insight, we mean by that word, it is not the outcome of

knowledge - knowledge being you can examine, say for example, all the comparative religions, the various sects, the various rituals and so on, you can examine them, study them, and come to a conclusion. Whereas that conclusion may be rational, sane, logical but it is based on the activity of thought. And therefore it is limited. And that conclusion naturally must be limited. That's clear.

Whereas insight has nothing whatever to do with knowledge, it has nothing to do with remembrance, but you have an insight say into all the comparative religions, with all their rituals, sanctions, dogmas, beliefs and so on, if you have an insight into all that you will see they are all similar - right? They are all based on thought and therefore all religions are limited. There is an immediate perception, not a logical conclusion, an action but the total perception of all the religious activities in the world, having an insight implies you see that they are essentially limited because they are put together, invented by thought.

Similarly to have an insight into one's relationship, which is much more difficult. Relationship, as it is now based on images, hopes, pleasures, fears and so on, essentially based on the images that thought during a period of time, it may be a day or ten years, has built it. To have an insight into that, that is, relationship is based on images, to have an insight into that is to dispel the images. I hope you are following some of this.

Suppose I am married, or have a girl friend, my relationship actually is based on my particular like and dislike, my particular attraction, sexual or otherwise, the environmental influences, the biological demands and I establish a relationship with another person based on that. Obviously. And is it possible to have an

insight into the whole movement of relationship - not come to a conclusion that I have images, I must break them, how to break them and so on and so on and so on, but to have an insight into it, which means to see basically what it is, fundamentally what it is. And if one has that deep insight the action which comes out of that insight is much more logical, much more sane and has a quality of something original, love. I hope you are following all this. Right?

That is, to take a very simple example: all nationalism is glorified tribalism - right? All nationalism - American, Russian and all the rest of it is glorified tribalism - right? The moment you see that, that it is a very limited, narrow, feeling which divides man, to have an insight into that is to be free from all the tribalism - right? Are you following all this? Or if you have an insight into the question of obedience and following, whether the obedience to a guru, to a priest, to a law and so on, to have a deep insight into this quality of following and obedience, will you obey, follow anybody? Naturally you will obey laws, whether they are good or bad we are not discussing, how far you can go, how far you cannot go, that is not our problem for the moment, but the whole concept of following and obeying - obey a doctor, obey a surgeon and if I am not too neurotic and the policeman isn't too brutal, I will obey him. But the whole psychological desire in which lies the security of following, if I follow somebody I feel safe, whether it is a psychiatrist, or a priest, or my wife or husband, or whatever it is, one feels safe - right? Now if you have an insight into that, that is a mind, a brain that is conditioned to follow, the feeling of following and the urge to follow completely drops away instantly.

So insight is not brought about through will, through desire,

through memory, it is immediate perception and therefore action. When we talk about perception, is it possible to observe without the word - please do it as we are talking and you will see - is it possible to observe a tree, a person, the speaker, to observe without the word, the word indicating all the memories, the reputation, the remembrances, the word implying all that. Knowing the word is not the thing, can you observe without the word? Right? And when you observe, is the observer different from the observed? One observes that tree. There the observer, I hope, is different from the tree - right? The observer is not the tree. That would be rather neurotic to say, "I am the tree". But to observe the tree without calling it the tree, without the name. The name and all the things associated with that name, is the tradition, the memory, the past, which says, "That is the tree". To look at it without all that in operation - right? Please do it as we are talking about it. And can one observe oneself without the word, without all the associations connected with that word, to look at it? And when you do observe in such a manner, is the observer different from the observed? Wait, I'll show it to you.

The feeling of anger arises in me: is that anger different from me? Or I am anger? But what thought has done is, a moment later one says, "I have been angry", which means I am separate from that anger - are you following all this? Whereas the actual fact is when there is anger there is only anger, that feeling. There is no observer different from the observed. That division arises only after. Out of that division comes all our conflict - right? So is it possible to observe without the word, without all the memories associated with that word? Then only the observer is the observed

and that eliminates altogether the division which brings about conflict. To have an insight into that is to end the division - right?

2nd QUESTION: How can the idea of, "You are the world and you are totally responsible for the whole of mankind" be justified on a rational, objective, sane basis.

I am not sure, one is not sure it can be rationalized on a sane, objective basis. But we will examine first before we say it can't.

First of all the earth on which we live is our earth - right? It is not the British earth, the French earth or the German, Russian, Indian, Chinese, it is our earth on which we are all living. That is a fact. But thought has divided racially, geographically, culturally, economically. That division is causing havoc in the world - obviously. There is no denial of that. That is rational, objective, sane. Right? And we have been saying human beings, living on this earth, which is our earth, all ours, not the isolated, divided communities, it is our earth on which we are all living, though politically, economically we have divided it - for security, for various forms of patriotic, illusory reasons which eventually brings about war.

We have also said that human consciousness is - please go into this with me, you may disagree, you may say it is all nonsense, but please listen to it and see if it is not rational, objective, sane - all our human consciousness is similar - right? We all, wherever, on whatever part of the earth we live, we all go through a great deal of suffering, a great deal of pain, great anxiety, uncertainty, fear. And we have occasionally or perhaps often, pleasure. This is the common ground on which all human beings stand - right? This is an irrefutable fact. We may try to dodge it, we may try to say it is

not, that I am an individual and so on and so on, but when you look at it objectively, non-personally, not as British, French and so on, in examination you will find that our consciousness is like the consciousness of all human beings, psychologically. You may be tall, you may be fair, you may have brown hair, I may be black or white, or pink or whatever it is, but inwardly, psychologically we are all having a terrible time. We all have a great sense of desperate loneliness. You may have children, a husband, and all the rest of it, but when you are alone you have this feeling that you have no relationship with anything, totally isolated. I am sure most of us have had that feeling. And we are saying this is the common ground on which all humanity stands. And whatever happens in the field of this consciousness we are responsible. That is: if I am violent, I am adding violence to that consciousness which is common to all of us. If I am not violent, I am not adding to it, I am bringing a totally new factor to that consciousness. So I am profoundly responsible: either to contribute to that violence, to that confusion, to that terrible division, or as I recognize deeply in my heart, in my blood, in the depths of my being, that I am the rest of the world, I am mankind, I am the world, the world is not separate from me, then I become totally responsible, obviously, which is rational, objective, sane. The other is insanity, to call oneself a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian and all the rest of it - they are just labels.

So when one has that feeling, that reality, the truth of it, that every human being living on this earth is responsible not only for himself, but responsible for everything that is happening. Now how will one translate that in daily life? How will you translate it? - if

you have that feeling, not an intellectual conclusion, as an ideal and so on, then it has no reality. But if the truth is that you are standing on the ground which is common to all mankind, and you feel totally responsible, then what is your action towards society, towards the world in which you are actually living? The world as it is now is full of violence - right? And only a very, very few people escape from it because they are carefully guarded, protected and all the rest of it. One realizes, suppose I realize I am totally responsible, what is my action then? Shall I join a group of terrorists? Obviously not. Obviously competitiveness between nations is destroying the world - the most powerful, the less powerful, and the less powerful trying to become more powerful, which is competition. Not only nationally, which is destroying the world, shall I realize that I am the rest of mankind and I am totally responsible, shall I be competitive? Please answer these questions. When I feel responsible for this naturally I cease to be competitive. And also the world, the religious world as well as the economic world, social world, is based on hierarchical principle - right? And shall I also have this concept of hierarchical outlook? Right? Obviously not, because that again is the one who says, "I know", the other says, "I do not know". The one who says "I know" is now taking a superior position, economically, socially, religiously and has a status. And if you want that status go after it, but you are contributing to the confusion of the world.

So there are actual, objective, sane actions when you perceive, when you realize in your heart of hearts, in the depth of your being that you are the rest of mankind and that we are all standing on the same ground.

3rd QUESTION: You use the term 'psychological time'. This is difficult to comprehend. Why do you say that psychological time is the source of conflict and sorrow?

Let us consider together what is time. Time by the watch, time by the sun setting, sun rising, time as yesterday, today, tomorrow - that tomorrow may be a hundred years and yesterday may be another hundred years backwards, and the time today is that we are sitting here listening. That is time physically, in the acquisition of knowledge, in so-called evolution; to learn a language time is necessary, to become a physicist time is necessary, to drive a car time is necessary - right? That is obvious. Is it that we carry this idea of time, which we have established naturally, logically because I need time to learn a technique, is it that we have carried over this principle of time into the psychological world? You are meeting my point. You understand? Are we meeting each other? Or am I talking to myself? Right.

I am asking the question: one realizes time is necessary in acquiring a skill. Is it that principle we have carried over into the psychological area? Or psychologically time exists for itself? Not that we have carried it over but time as a process of evolution psychologically, time in itself exists. You follow this?

Please let us be quite clear on this point: is there psychologically, in itself, intrinsic in itself, time? Or we have carried over from the time element that is necessary in learning a skill to the psychological world? So there are the two problems. That is: psychologically does time exist per se? Or we have introduced it because we have been conditioned to that therefore we react to the psychological world in the same manner? Clear?

So it is obvious that we need time to learn a skill. Clear? Now we are asking: is time inherent in the psychological structure, psychological nature? Or thought has brought the element of time into it? Are we following each other? Is it too difficult? Right? May I go on?

Wait sirs, let's go slowly into it. I hope you are also working, not just listening. (Inaudible comment) We are coming to that sir, one moment. We will come to that sir, please. It is all right sir, take time! (Laughter) Have patience.

Patience has no time. Impatience has time. Right? When you are patient you are silent, listening. But if you are impatient and say "Let's get on with it", time element comes in. Obviously. So please let's look at this sensitively, not say, "You are right", "I am wrong" and so on, but sensitively let's approach this question. Has thought introduced into the psychological realm the whole idea of time? Or in the very nature of the psyche time is? First of all psychologically thought, which is part of the psyche, thought has introduced time: I am this, I will be that. I am angry, I will get over it. I am not successful but I will be. All that movement is time. The distance covered from what I am to what I shall be. The space between me as I am and as I will be. So time is what is, the space to be covered to achieve that. So the whole process of that is time. I do not know myself, I must learn about myself, educate myself. The same thing is operating as in the world of skill - I am going to learn about myself, which admits time - right? So I am asking - we are asking: time is a factor of thought, thought is the response of experience, knowledge, memory stored up in the brain. And that memory responds which is thought. Again this is an obvious fact.

If you had no experience, no knowledge, you would be in a state of amnesia, or whatever you like to call it. But because we have accumulated a great deal of knowledge, psychologically, and that is stored up in the brain as memory and thought.

So this whole process of accumulating knowledge about oneself, learning about oneself, and gradually building information about oneself, all that implies time. That is: psychological time and time by the day and by the watch. Chronological time and psychological time. Again that is a fact. Now apart from that, is inherent in the psyche this element of time? That is: being and becoming. Right? I am only putting it in different ways. Is there inherent in me, which is the psyche, this question of time at all? Please don't jump to a conclusion. That is: in me there is a timeless state? I am not saying that at all. That is the old tradition. We are not saying that, we are just asking.

Is the me free of time? Right? Obviously not. The me, my family, my nation, my character, my capacity, my loneliness, my despair, my whole travail in existence, is me. The me that is going to die, the me that lives. Going to the office, to the laboratory, factory, whatever you are doing. And all that is the activity of thought, including the me. The me is my form, my name, the image I have about myself, if I have one, the things I have done, the things I want to do, etc. etc. - all that is me, which is my consciousness. The content of that consciousness is put there by thought which is time right?

So there is psychological time, which is the movement of thought, fear, pleasure, pain, suffering, joy, so-called love, all that is the movement of thought; thought being memory, space, time,

the achievement of it. Now we are saying - please bear with me - we are saying that the psychological time is the factor of conflict and sorrow. That, the questioner says, why do you say that? As we have been pointing out during the talks, that thought is the root of fear. Thought is the root of pleasure. I have had pleasure yesterday, the remembrance and the desire to continue tomorrow. That is the movement of thought. And sorrow: sorrow, as we said, is the essence of isolation. Sorrow is the outcome of self-centred egotistic activity. We are only putting it differently. So thought is responsible for this. And thought creates, is time itself, of course. So is it possible to have, to be free of psychological time, because that divides? And where there is division there must be conflict - like the Jew and the Arab, like the capitalist and the totalitarian - division between me and another, with my wife and the husband and so on and so on. Wherever there is division there must be conflict, that is law. It is not my law, it is there.

So thought, time, space, psychologically is the source of conflict and sorrow. After examining it, is it possible for thought - please listen to this - for thought to realize its own place, which is in the world of technique and it has no place psychologically? Please don't reject it, just look at it. Psychologically time exists when I have an image about myself and you tread on that image, that brings wounds, that hurts. That is the element of time. Now if I have no image about myself it is finished. Is that possible, living in this world, married and all the rest of it? That is to have psychologically no tomorrow. It is not when Dante talks about all those who enter Inferno that there is no hope, it is not that at all. You know what I am saying? Why do we have hope? I am not

saying you shouldn't or should. Why do we have hope? See what happens? I have a hope to be a great man or whatever it is, my hope. And I am working for that. And I am a failure, generally I am. Then I get bitter, angry, violent, cynical. And violent, cynical, bitter, I am adding to the confusion of the total consciousness, to that, I am maintaining that - right? So if I have an insight into this, the image disappears entirely.

You might ask the speaker: are you glibly talking about it and you have your own private, secret image? I know you are terribly interested in that. This question has been asked, I don't know how often, in India, in Europe and in America, and each time that question is asked I am aware, not easily answered, which is when I say there is no image about myself - either you say, "That is nonsense", or you say, "It doesn't matter to me. As long as I have an image about myself" - right? You understand? It doesn't matter if you have no image about yourself, who cares? But what is important is to find out how to live - not how - to find out if it is possible to live in this terrible world, dangerous world, criminal world, to have no image. Find out. Don't say, "It is not possible". Or say, "It is possible". But to study the image that you have and have an insight into it, and end it immediately.

We have only answered three questions in an hour. Oh Lord!

4th QUESTION: How does one draw the dividing line between knowledge which must be retained, and which is to be abandoned? What is it that makes the decision?

I will read it again carefully. How does one draw the dividing line between knowledge which must be retained, and that which must be abandoned? What is it that makes this decision? You have

understood the question?

The questioner is asking where does knowledge, which is necessary, to be a skilful engineer, carpenter, plumber, or if you want to be a politician - I hope none of us do - and the line between that and the recording - please listen - the recording of personal knowledge, personal hurts, personal ambitions, where apparently we have sustained knowledge and therefore harmful. So where do you draw the line between that and this? Is it clear? And the questioner says: and what is it that makes this decision: to keep it there and not to keep it here?

Do you see one of the factors in this question: how we all depend on decisions. I will decide to go there. I won't go there. Decide. What is that decision based on? Just look at it carefully please. My arm, my past knowledge, past pleasure, past pain, past remembrance of things which says, "Don't do that anymore", or "Do it". That is, in decision there is the element of will - right? Will is the accumulated, concentrated form of desire - right? Right? Desire, which says, "I must do that", but I call it will. So will is the accumulated, concentration of desire. We have been into the question of desire, I don't want to go into it now because it is - shall I go into it? Eh? No. Thank God!

Q: Why are we sitting here now?

K: I don't know why you are sitting here sir, but we are talking about decision. We are saying there is a great element in decision, will. And on that tradition we are conditioned. I am questioning, the speaker is questioning that action at all. You understand? Because will is a divisive factor, a dividing factor: I will do this, and my wife says I will not do that - right? So will is essentially

desire and has in it the element of division - me and not me, and so on. I must succeed and so on.

So is there a way of living - please listen to this - without the operation of will at all? Right? A way of living in which there is no conflict, and conflict exists as long as I exercise will, obviously. I wonder if you are clear. Now let's find out if that is possible.

The questioner asks: how does one draw the line between the accumulating factor of knowledge necessary to act skilfully, and the non-recording factor of the psyche? Not recording my hurts, my insults, the flattery, all the bullying and all that, not recording any of that. How does one draw the line between the two? You don't draw the line. The moment you have drawn the line you have separated, and therefore you are going to cause conflict between the knowledge and non-recording, then you ask "How am I not to record?" I am insulted, personally the speaker has been insulted by professionals, so please don't join the professionals! How not to record the insult, or the flattery, it is the same thing. The two are the two sides of the same coin - you understand? Flattery and insult. You insult me. My brain instantly records it. I get hurt. In the field of technology I must record. But here why should I record? You insult me. All right. Why should that insult be carried over, day after day, when I meet you and I say, "You have insulted me". From that insult I retaliate. Now is it possible not to record at all any psychological factors? You understand? You understand my question? My wife - if I have one, thank God I haven't got any - if I have one, she says something brutal after I have come back from the office because she has had a tiresome day herself with rambunctious children, so she says something violent. Instantly

because I am tired I want some kind of peace in the house, so I record it. Now I am asking myself: I am tired, I have worked, I come into the house, she says something brutal and is it possible not to record that incident at all? Otherwise I am building an image about her and she is building an image about me, so the images have relationship, not us. You understand sirs? It is an obvious fact.

So is it possible not to record? The recording process is to strengthen, to give vitality to a centre which is the me - right? Obviously. So is it possible not to do it? And it is only possible, however tired one is, to be attentive at that moment, when the wife or I am brutal. Because as we explained the other day with regard to meditation, where there is attention there is no recording. It is only when you are self-centred, and that very self-centredness is concentration, then there is recording. Right?

So to see the truth of this you need knowledge on this level, and here you don't need knowledge at all. See the truth of it, what freedom it brings you. That is real freedom. Right? If you have an insight into it, you don't draw the line, nor decide. There is no recording.

Do we go on? Enough?

5th QUESTION: Intellectually we understand that the observer is the observed. But what is necessary to perceive this so that it goes beyond the intellectual level?

The question is: what is necessary to go beyond this intellectual acceptance that the observer is the observed? First of all do we even intellectually accept it? Question yourself please. Do you even intellectually, that is verbally, logically, discerning and

saying, "Yes, it is so, logically. Because it has been pointed out, objectively, logically." And you say, "Yes" - is that so? Do you even intellectually accept that? Or it is just a lot of words floating around? But if you do accept it intellectually, what does that acceptance mean? When you say, "I intellectually agree with you", what does it mean? It means absolutely nothing. It is just a form of convenient social acceptance, saying, "Yes, you are quite right but you may be wrong". So intellectually we don't even accept it. If we do it is again very superficial, and therefore of no value. But the fact is that the observer is the observed. That is the truth. That is: I am lonely, with all the implications of tremendous feeling of isolation, having no relationship with anything. I am completely absorbed with fear in the sense of detachment from everything. That depresses me tremendously. And my natural instinct is to run away from it, suppress it, run after meeting people, football, religion and all that. But the escape from the fact brings about the division. I am lonely, I must not be lonely - right? The escape from 'what is' gives me not only conflict, because it is divisive, it helps me not to understand this thing called loneliness - right?

Is loneliness separate from me? When I say, "God, I am lonely", is that feeling of desperate, anxious, fear of loneliness, is that something separate from me? Or I am that? Right? You understand? My self-centred activity, my ambition, my image about myself and so on, all that has brought about this sense of isolation, which I call loneliness. That loneliness is not separate from me. If it is separate from me I can act about it, run away - right? Suppress it and so on. But if it is me - please understand this - if it is me that is the state of loneliness, what is one to do? You

understand my question? I am lonely, you know all the feeling of it. You may be married, have children and so on but you are basically terribly lonely. If that loneliness is something separate from me, then I am in conflict with that loneliness - right? I fight it, I try to fill it by knowledge, by excitement, by this or that, but if it is me I can't do anything about it. You understand? See, just stop there for a minute.

Before I am accustomed to do something about it. Now I realize I am that. Because I cannot do anything about it, it ends conflict but the thing remains - right? I can't do anything about it so it is there. So can I - please listen to this - can my thought remain with it completely, not run away from it, remain with that loneliness with all its anxiety, fear, all the complexity of that loneliness, totally without any movement, look at it. When you look at it, if you look at it as an observer looking in, then again the problem arises. But the fact is that loneliness is you so we have to look at it without the observer, as a whole. When you do that completely, loneliness disappears totally, never to come back.

Right sirs, I have answered five questions, that is enough.

SAANEN 2ND QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 30TH JULY 1981

Again there are many questions. Every day they are piling up and we cannot possibly answer all those questions. It would probably take a couple of months, but I am sure you wouldn't like to sit here, nor I, for a couple of months answering these questions.

As we said yesterday, the answers are not important, but the questions are. Whether we put those questions seriously or flippantly or casually - if the questions are put seriously, a problem that is really disturbing one's mind and one's heart then those questions are worthwhile answering, or enquiring into those questions. So please we have chosen some of the questions, not according to what we like or dislike but which may be worthwhile discussing, going into generally. And in reading these questions we are together examining, not only the questions but the outcome of those questions and whether it affects our daily life, which is what matters.

1st QUESTION: I have a son whom I dearly love. Can I prevent the world from corrupting him? How can I give him a right education?

I hope the question interests you.

They are discovering, the scientists, and those who are concerned with babies and children, that babies are very alert, learn, watchful. And they can know, or realize or sense when the mother is liked or disliked by others. They are testing all this out especially in America. And from the moment he is born, or she is born, the parents are already conditioning him. The parents, their

relatives, the people around him, are already shaping his mind, his brain. And so from the moment he is born conditioning takes place. And as he grows older this conditioning is strengthened by the society he lives in, by the parents, by other boys and girls and so on. And in schools, colleges, university - if they are lucky enough to go to universities - the conditioning academically goes on. Knowledge has become extraordinarily important, to act skilfully, to earn a good livelihood in daily life. And most of the parents, educators are concerned that their children, the students, the college graduates and so on, pass academically with high marks. They neglect, both the parents, the educators, totally the whole psychological world of the student. So when we ask, what is right education, is it not, not only academically, to have a good brain, to know the world in which we live, the whole technological development, learn all about it skilfully so that he can have a good job and so on. The parents are concerned that he should quickly marry and settle down. Get a job, with a wife, and screwed down for the rest of his life. That is what the parents are concerned with.

And society is concerned that he should be a good citizen, accept more or less things as they are, both religiously, politically, economically and status quo should remain. The Conservatists politically on the right only want to conserve, and the Liberals and Labour, left, want to change things. So the battle goes on between the political parties and the poor child who has grown in this chaotic world doesn't quite know what to do, what to think, and slips into something quite easy, which is to have a family, job, and for the rest of one's life for fifty, sixty years go to the office and back and forth. Right? This is what we call education. This is what

is happening actually in the world, whether in America, or here or in India or Asia. And apparently the vast majority of human beings throughout the world seem satisfied with things as they are. Or dissatisfied because they have no money, want a better position, more power, money - and when you get money, power, position, the world is quite safe, though there are terrorists whose function is to terrorize.

Now what is right education? Knowing all this is going on around the child, around the student as he grows up, that the mother and the father are concerned with themselves, with their careers, with their ambitions, with their separate successes, and so where does the child come into all this? Obviously as in Asia, as one has watched, the babies are cuddled, held by the mother closely. They have no nursing homes, nor batteries of children in a hospital. There, being very, very poor, the children have to remain with the mother, there is no Social Security, therefore they must have more children, more children are necessary to earn a livelihood when they are old because there is no Social Security in the East. So the pattern is repeated over and over and over again.

Now the questioner asks: the parent loves his child and what is right education? You cannot possibly keep the child at home and educate him because he will meet other children and the group instinct is so strong they will condition him in spite of you. You may talk, urge, point out all the conditioning, the absurdities, the cruelties but the spirit of the gang, the group, the other children have far greater influence as one observes on your particular child. Right? These are all facts. If one is aware of all this, wars, brutality, the emphasis on acquiring knowledge academically and

each one wanting to find out a job in which he will be comfortable, give him some assurance, and the whole process of all that is modern education.

One is quite sure that you know all about this. If you have looked at the world, if you have looked at your own children, at what is happening, this is the pattern, the mode of modern society. Is that right education? Which is: to emphasize and cultivate academic knowledge, technological knowledge, how to be an engineer, psychologist, doctor and so on, and there end. Or the cultivation of the whole of the human being, not only the academic side but also understanding the depth of the psychological world. Is this possible to do in a school - both? Not only attend to the academics but also help the student to understand his whole psychological nature, the conflicts, the confusion, the fears, the anxieties. And if it is a boy, he enters the army, specially in Europe, not in America or England, for two years, trained to kill, prepare for war and the parents say, "I dearly love my child". That is, you are preparing for the child to be ready to kill and be killed. This is modern civilization. They talk about beauty, love, god, and the hierarchical structure of society, all preparing for war. And this has been going on for five, ten thousand years, and we, ordinary citizens, accept all this. And we say, "What can we do?" What can one, or a group of people do when the whole monstrous structure is geared to war? Probably you cannot do anything; but to be aware of this, to be aware that wars are caused by national divisions, racial divisions, economic divisions, communal divisions, divisions brought about by ideals, beliefs and so on, to be aware of all this. And if one is aware, that very awareness is bringing about its own

action. It isn't that you have to do something - join a political party, or this or that, but if one is really, deeply concerned, if one really loves one's children. But I am afraid that is not possible because most parents in the world are very selfish. They want to fulfil themselves. You know all that is happening. The woman has to go out and earn money because she wants a better carpet, better refrigerator, or whatever it is, and the husband wants to climb the ladder of success, so they are absorbed in themselves and the child has very little part in their lives. So the educators take them over and condition them to the desired pattern.

But being aware of all this, not intellectually, but deep in one's heart, in one's feeling, if one really loves one's child, is it possible to educate him, or have a school where he is educated not only academically but much more psychologically, to understand his whole being, to be free of his own problems, to face the problems and end them, not carry on day after day, day after day. So that demands educators who understand all this, who understand what the world is, what society has become, what the culture of which we are all so very proud, which has become so utterly destructive and an educator who realizes his utter total responsibility to bring about a good human being. We are using the word 'good' in the sense of holistic, or whole human being, not a divided, broken up human being, fragmented and therefore perpetually in conflict with himself. That demands a teacher who understands all this. But unfortunately throughout the world the teachers are the least respected, the least paid. The teachers are the most important people in the world because they are bringing about a new generation of people, therefore they must be respected, paid well,

looked after as in the old Asiatic world where the teacher was the most important person in society. Such teachers perhaps do exist in some of the schools in which we are connected, but it is a tremendous task because the parents don't want something whole. Society doesn't want it. So if those who are really concerned with education and the right kind of education, if they can come together, put all their resources into this.

One of the parents in a group discussion said, "Why should I sacrifice myself, give up my drinking, smoking, pot, drugging, for my child?", you understand? So they are not concerned, and so we perpetuate this terrible society in which we live.

So right education is the cultivation of the whole of the brain, not part of it. When that cultivation of the whole of the brain comes about there is holistic action in which there is no conflict. And such a human being is a good, compassionate human being. And it is up to you, if you want such a school.

2nd QUESTION: If there are no individuals how can individual effort be made to be serious, attentive, alert? And where in this is the individual's responsibility for his actions?

I hope you have understood the question. Let's be very clear what is an individual, if there is such an individual. And if there is no such thing as individuality then what is that so-called individual to do? That is the question. Which is, right action, seriousness, deeply concerned and responsible. That is the question. We all accept that we are all separate individuals, both in the West and in the East. This is the tradition, this is what we have been educated to accept, from childhood. And also it is very, very, very carefully cultivated by religions, maybe unconscious, but it is cultivated by

religions, by the educators, by the woman and the man and the child. This is the pattern that we have accepted. Now we are asking: is that pattern in which the so-called individual functions, is that individual actual? Or he thinks he is an individual: actuality and the thought that says, "I am an individual" - you see the difference? Are we clear on this? The actuality and thought that creates an actuality which it thinks is real. You have understood these two points? Right?

Now, are we individuals? Let's be objective, not emotional, not romantic, sentimental, are we individuals? Or we are the result of thousands and thousands and thousands of years of collective, of a brain that has evolved through time, which has gathered innumerable experiences, has faced many wars, suffered, anxious, uncertain. If you say you are an individual and that is happening to you that has happened to every individual throughout the world - right? To every human being, whether he lives in Russia under tyranny, whether he lives in the so-called democratic world, or in the rather disordered world of the East. Fortunately it is somewhat disordered and inefficient - fortunately because the moment you get very efficient, very orderly, you fall into the groove and there you stay, which doesn't mean we are advocating inefficiency.

Are we individuals? Or our whole consciousness, which says, "I am an individual", our whole consciousness which we think is the individual, is that consciousness separate from you or from another? You understand? You say as an individual that your consciousness is separate from the other - is that so? We are questioning it, we are not saying it is, it is not, is that so? Or your consciousness is similar, modified but similar to the consciousness

of every human being in the world - right? He suffers, goes through a terrible time, tortured, poverty, penury and so on and so on, just like you - right? Are we aware of this? That is a fact. You might not like it, you might say, "Well I prefer my own individuality. I have a different character from somebody else, character is shaped by your conditioning", and so on and so on. They say exactly the same thing in India, "Oh, I am different because my name is different, my form is different, my characteristics are different. I have certain tendencies" or this, that and the other. "I belong to a certain class of people" - you know the whole rational explanation for maintaining individuality. But when you look at it very carefully, patiently, observing what is actually going on, human consciousness is similar, modified by their different cultures, outwardly, on the skin of the consciousness as it were, but inwardly the same current, it is the same ground on which every human being stands. This is logical, objective, sane.

So you are not an individual. That is very difficult to accept. It is like being brought up as a Catholic or a Protestant, or a Buddhist and so on, it is very difficult for them to see that religions have been invented, put together by thought, you have been programmed like a computer and you repeat. And it is very difficult to point out and deeply accept that all religions are put together by thought, and thought is never sacred. Whatever the symbols, the pictures, the images, thought has created, those symbols are never sacred because thought itself is a very small affair. Right? So similarly it is very difficult for us to accept that we are not individuals.

And if you are not an individual is it not possible to be much

more serious, much more concerned with the whole of humanity, of which you are? From that feeling of wholeness of mankind, right action comes. When you feel utterly, totally responsible for your action as a human being who is the rest of humanity, out of that feeling comes right behaviour. It is not individual behaviour. When there is this feeling that you are the whole of humanity, not intellectually but the feeling in your heart, in the depth of your being, then how can you kill another? How can you then be self-centred? And if you are an individual, which is an illusion as far as the speaker is concerned, then you act as a human being, separate, fragmented, broken up. And out of that fragmentation you act and therefore breed more conflict. This is what is happening. Look what they are doing politically in the world, for god's sake, see all this. Each country concerned with itself, competing with other countries. And it is the job of the politicians to sustain this because otherwise they would lose their jobs.

So it is only when you feel utterly, totally responsible for the whole of mankind, in that feeling is love, and when there is love you will not do a thing to destroy another human being. And that is right action, right behaviour, right thinking.

3rd QUESTION: We know that asking how to maintain awareness is a wrong question, since awareness is moment to moment, but does the capacity of awareness develop, getting stronger and stronger in endurance? And is this what you mean by the awakening of intelligence? If so does this not imply process?

It's hot! First of all let's understand what we mean by awareness. Don't let's complicate it, for god's sake let's keep it simple. What does awareness mean: to be aware where you are at the moment

where you are, sitting there, aware of the tent, the shape of the tent, the various divisions that hold the tent up, to see the proportions of the tent, and generally the environment that is around the tent - the mountains, the hills, the green pastures, the running waters and the blue sky, if there is a blue sky. To be aware of all that outwardly. And also to be aware of the person you are sitting next to, the dress, the colour, the look on his face and so on. All this can be observed at a glance - right? To be aware of all this. And the questioner says: awareness is from moment to moment. Is that so? The speaker is supposed to have said it. Is that so? Why should one be aware all the time? You understand - that is what is implied, endurance, to last. Why should it last? Is it because you feel that state of attention, which is part of awareness, is a state that brings you a certain quality of energy, a sense of joy, a sense of feeling without a border. You understand? Is that why you want to maintain, sustain, cultivate awareness?

Then if that is your motive, that is, you want to maintain your awareness, sustain it, enhance it, make it as long as possible, there is a motive behind that and therefore awareness becomes then a matter of choice. You understand? If I have a motive to be aware then I choose the right moments to be aware. Or I desire to have this awareness endure. But is that awareness? If I look at the tent because I like the shape of it, I don't like the shape of it, I wish it were cooler, I wish this or that, I am not then aware, observing the actual fact. So awareness is something that is not cultivable. Either you observe, or you don't observe.

Once the speaker was standing waiting for a bus in a long queue in London. A man with a bowler hat walked past the long queue,

got in front. And the man next to him took his hat off his head and passed it down. (Laughter) And the man had to go back! But if the man was aware he wouldn't have done it. But most of us are so concerned with our own problems, with our own - you know, all the muck that we have collected for generations, with that we are concerned. And intelligence is something entirely different. It is a title of a book - The Awakening of Intelligence, but is intelligence to be slowly awakened? Is it a process? Now process implies time - right? I must sleep, I gradually wake up. It may be a waking up immediately which may have a split second interval, which is time, or it may take a long time. Process implies time. That is one thing.

What is intelligence? When you say he is an intelligent man, what do you mean by that? Intelligence according to a dictionary meaning is to have the capacity - please listen - to read between the lines, to read between the words and also it means gathering information by observing, by learning, by information around you and acting according to that information, reading between the lines - all that is implied by intelligence in the sense that thought is operating. That is, thought is reading between the lines, between the words, the hidden meaning. And also thought is gathering information by watching, seeing, hearing, optically reading and so on, it is gathering it. Out of that gathering, reading between the lines, acting, is so-called intelligence - right? That is to be very clever, to be sharp, to discuss opinions, holding on to your opinions because you etc. etc. All that is generally called intelligence - right? We, the speaker, is questioning that, whether that is intelligence. Or intelligence is something entirely different. Are we together in this? The speaker is not laying down anything. He is

not being dogmatic but together we are enquiring. We have accepted intelligence as we have just now described. And also we say it is intelligence to go off to Asia and meditate from somebody or other. You follow? All these patterns have been repeated over and over again and we call that intelligence.

Now we are asking what is the depth of intelligence? The depth. That is very superficial - you understand? Gathering information, reading between the lines, watching, learning and cultivating that intelligence of thought, which is common to all mankind, we say that intelligence is really destroying humanity because it is competitive, because it has been reduced to individual intelligence, it has been reduced Einstein this or that. So that intelligence, which is the product of thought, that has become competitive, aggressive and so it is gradually destroying human beings. And we are saying that is not intelligence. There must be another quality of intelligence - right?

Now we are going to enquire together into that quality of intelligence. Not by listening, enquiring you are going to get that intelligence but if one has the capacity to patiently enquire into it, the very enquiry is that intelligence. You understand? Have you understood this? I see you haven't. Oh I am so tired of all this blasted explanation!

We say humanity has accepted that as intelligence. We are not discussing that. We are pointing out its dangerous nature. Now we are beginning to enquire into what is the very root of intelligence, the depth of it, the extraordinary vitality of it, the tremendous energy that is involved in that intelligence. And in that intelligence there is love, compassion. We are enquiring into that. Now to

enquire the mind, the brain must be free from its tether, from its prejudices, from its conclusions, from its limited, narrow tradition - all tradition is narrow. So the brain that begins to enquire into what is the depth and the quality of a mind, a brain that is compassionate, love - to enquire, to penetrate that, penetrate rather than enquire, penetrate is to have a brain that is completely free otherwise it cannot penetrate. Obviously. If I am tethered to my belief, tied to my family, tied to a conclusion, the brain is limited, it functions in a very narrow, limited way. Whereas if the brain is free from its anchorage, from its attachment, then it can penetrate, because a mind that is free can only penetrate - right? Obviously. That brain that is free is already intelligent. That intelligence cannot be cultivated. You understand? The very truth of freedom is intelligence, because love is not jealousy, love has no hate, love doesn't belong to one group or one family - love and compassion is not individual compassion for somebody. It is love and compassion and intelligence go together. And from that comes right action.

Now if one has really understood, not intellectually but in your heart of hearts then you are intelligent.

4th QUESTION: I have studied, been to Asia, discussed with people there, I have tried to penetrate beyond the superficiality of religions into something I feel in my bones although I am a logical man, something profoundly mysterious and sacred. And yet I don't seem to apprehend it. Can you help me?

It depends with whom you have tried to discuss. Shall we go on with this question? You are not tired?

One wonders why you go to Asia at all, except for trade. Perhaps people who go there for religious purposes are also trading

- you give me something, I will give you something. One questions why go to the East at all. Is truth there and not here? Is truth to be found through people, through a guru, through a path, through a system, through a prophet, through a saviour? Or truth has no path? There is a marvellous story in India of a boy who leaves home in search of truth. He goes to various teachers, to various parts of that country, walking endlessly, every teacher asserting something or other. And after many years as an old man he comes back to his house after searching, searching, searching, asking, meditating, taking certain postures, breathing rightly, fasting, no sex, and all that. At the end of the time he comes home to his old house. As he opens the door there it is! The truth is just there. You understand? You might say, "It wouldn't have been there if he hadn't wandered all over the place." That's a cunning remark but you miss the beauty of that story if you don't see that truth is not to be sought after. Truth is not something to be attained, to be experienced, to be held. It is there for those who can see it, but as most of us are everlastingly seeking, moving from one fad to another fad, from one excitement to another excitement, sacrificing - you know all the absurdities that go on, we think that time will help us to come to this. Time will not.

So the question is: I am a logical man, something profoundly mysterious, sacred I feel exists. I cannot apprehend it. I can understand it, I can logically see it, but I cannot have it in my heart, in my mind, in my eyes, in my smile. The questioner says, "Help me". If one may point out something, don't ask for help from anybody, because the whole history of man is in you, the whole travail, the mystery - if there is a mystery. Everything man has

struggled, sought, found, denied, illusion, all that is part of your consciousness. When you ask for help, forgive me if I point this out, most respectfully, not cynically, if you ask for help you are asking something from outside, from another. How do you know the other has that quality of truth? Unless you have it you will never know whether he has it or not.

So the first thing is, please, I am saying this with great affection, care, please don't ask for help. Then if you do the priests, the gurus, the interpreters, all of them pour on you and you are smothered. Whereas if you look at the problem, the problem is this: man throughout the ages has sought something sacred, something that is not corrupted by time, by slow time, by all the travails of thought. He has sought it, longed for it, sacrificed, tortured himself physically, fasted for weeks, and he has not found it. So somebody comes along and says, "I'll show it to you, I'll help you." Then you are lost. Whereas if you say: is there something sacred? The mystery only exists because it is mysterious, but if you uncover it, it is no longer a mystery. Truth isn't a mystery, it is something far beyond all concept of mystery.

So is it possible for a man - listen to the question first - for a man who has studied a great deal, various aspects of religion, of the East and the West, accumulated a great deal of knowledge both in the scientific world, the Left and the Right, the Marx, etc. etc. read all that. There are lots of people who have read that and their brains are crowded. We used to know an author and he used to say to me that, "I know all the Asiatic religious thought, the Christian thought, 'The Cloud of the Unknown', the various mystics of Europe, and so my brain is full of other people's knowledge. And

can I ever experience something totally original?" - you understand? The cry of such a human being who is desperately wanting something - not wanting - seeing something, this is not enough. Then what do they do? They take to drugs hoping to experience that something original. It is not a chemical product that is going to produce that originality.

So, what is one to do? What am I to do - I am asking as though an outsider - I am asking, what am I to do, knowing I am a serious man, I am human, I can laugh, I can shed tears, but I am a serious man. And I have superficially enquired into all the aspects of religion, and I recognise their superficiality, therefore I have discarded them, whether the superficiality of the gurus, the churches, the temples, the mosques, all the preachers in the world, because if I see one actual state of religious aspect of superficiality I have seen the whole lot of them. I don't have to go through them all. So what am I to do? Is there anything to be done? Who is the doer? And what is it that is being done? Are you following all this? Please follow all this, step my step, if you are interested in it. If you can discard all your superficiality with your garlands, pictures, you know, all that nonsense, if you can discard all that and stand alone, because one has to be alone. The word 'alone' means all one. Solitude is one thing, all alone is one. Solitude has in it the quality of loneliness, you can walk alone in the forest and be alone, or you can walk in the forest feeling that you are in solitude. That feeling is totally different from the feeling you are alone. Now what am I to do? I have meditated. I have followed different systems, slightly and I recognize their superficiality. I must tell you another story, if you don't mind.

We were speaking in Bombay, enormous crowd and so on. And the next day a man came to see the speaker. He was an old man, white haired, white beard. He told me the following story: he was one of the important judges in India, an advocat, a judge, highly placed, family, children, respected and all that stuff. And one morning he said to himself: "I pass judgement over others, criminals, swindlers, robbers, business robbers, political robbers and so on. I pass judgement, but I don't know what truth is so how can I pass judgement if I don't know what truth is?" This man who came to see me was telling me. And so he withdrew. That is one of the old traditions in India, highly regarded, respected, he withdrew from his family, went into the forest to meditate. This is the tradition in India still that when a man renounces the world he must be clothed, respected, fed, wherever he wanders in India. It is not an organized society of monks. He is alone. So he withdraws into a forest and he said that for twenty five years he meditated. And after hearing the speaker the other evening he said, "I have come to see you. I have come to say how deeply I have hypnotized myself, how in this hypnosis I have deceived myself." For a man who has meditated for twenty five years, to acknowledge that he has deceived himself - you understand the nature of a human being that says that. Not just these monks.

So what am I, who have a certain amount of leisure, serious, not following anybody - because if you follow anybody that is the end of it. Please see all this that I am saying. It is the end of your penetration into that which is eternal. You have to be completely a light to yourself, not depend on anybody. Their initiations, their garlands, nobody. Otherwise you cannot be a light to yourself. So I

realize I must be a light to myself. I don't follow. I don't do any worship, any ritual, and yet that which is eternal is eluding me. It is not in my breath, in my eyes, in my heart. So what am I to do?

First of all can the brain be free of the centre which is me? You understand my question? Can my brain be free of myself, the self, whether that self is super self, ultra, ultra, ultra super, it is still the self. Is there total dissipation of selfishness, to put it very simply? Selfishness, the self-centre is very cunning - it can think it is escape from all selfishness, from all concern about its own entity, its own becoming, and yet very subtly, deeply it is putting out a tentacle - you understand all this? So one has to discover for oneself whether there can be complete and total freedom from all selfishness, which is all self-centred activity - right? That is meditation. To find out a way of living in this world, without being selfish, self-centred, egotistic activity, egocentric movement. If there is a shadow of that, a movement of that, then you are lost. So one has to be tremendously aware of every movement of thought. That is very easy, don't complicate it. When you are angry, for the moment you do not know even that feeling. But when you examine it you can observe the arising of it - right? The arising of greed, the arising of envy, the arising of ambition, aggression, as it arises to watch it, not at the end of it, as it is arising, as you watch it, it withers away. You understand? So the brain can be aware of the arising of a thought. The awareness of the arising of thought is attention, not to smother it, destroy it, put it away, but just the feeling that - don't you know the feeling of hunger when it arises? Obviously you do. Or your sexual feeling, as it arises to be completely aware of it. So the awareness, the attention of the

movement of the 'me', my desire, my ambition, my egotistic pursuit, when one is aware as it arises, it withers away. That is absolutely necessary so that there is not a particle, a shadow of this 'me', because the 'me' is separate. I went into all that. So that is the first thing I have to understand. Not control my body, special breathing, yoga - you know all those - you wash your hands of all those.

Then to have a brain that is not partial - right? You understand? That is not acting partially but whole. I do not know if you have gone into this. I am talking so long. I must be brief.

We pointed out the other day that we are functioning not with all our senses, but only partially. The partiality, the narrowness, emphasizes the self - of course. I am not going to go into it in detail, you can see it for yourself. But when you observe the mountain, the trees, the rivers, the blue sky, the person whom you love or whatever it is, with all your senses there is no self. There is no me that is feeling all of it. So that means a brain that is not functioning as a dentist, as a scholar, or a labourer, as a super astronomer, but functioning in the whole of your brain. That can only take place when the brain is completely quiet. So no shadow of self and absolute silence of the mind, quietness, not emptiness - that gives a wrong meaning. Most people's brains are empty anyhow! But to have a brain that is not occupied with anything, including god, meditation, with nothing. Only then the brain is silent, full of vitality and that brain has a great sense of love, compassion, which is intelligence. Right?

SAANEN 3RD QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 31ST JULY 1981

This is the last question and answer meeting. Probably you should meet again next year.

One always wonders why one asks questions. Is it out of curiosity or to stimulate a challenging question which will stimulate the speaker and so bring out something new? Or we ask questions which are put by serious person with serious problem? If it is a serious problem in one's life then such questions have an importance, have a sense of vitality; and such questions can be answered truthfully, in depth. There are some of these questions which have been put, which I have chosen this morning or rather last night. And there are too many questions all together, probably about hundred or more - over hundred and fifty - and it is impossible to answer all those questions. So we have chosen what is probably applicable to all those questions and not according to what one likes or easy to answer but we have chosen these. And I hope, you will excuse us if we do not answer all the questions.

Q: I hope, you excuse me for disturbing you. I hope, I do not disturb you too much. I feel yet so distance from you in order to say that you don't want to be a guru, I still feel that you are. You sitting there; we are so far away from you and I wonder, it cannot be changed. That's my own question.

K: Sitting on a platform doesn't give one authority. Sitting on a platform, little rised above is only for convenience because you can see the speaker and the speaker can see you. And the whole question of authority, guru - we have dealt with that question so

very often. Perhaps we should deal with it again. There is a question with regard to gurus little later on. May we wait till then, sir?

1st QUESTION: If two people have a relationship of conflict and pain, can they resolve it, or must the relationship end? And to have a good relationship isn't it necessary for both to change?

I hope the question is clear. What is the cause in relationship of pain, conflict and all the problems that arise in relationship? What is the root of it? Please in answering these questions we are thinking together, I am not answering it and you just receiving it or accepting it, or reject it, but together we are enquiring into these questions. This is a question that concerns all human beings, whether they are in the East, here, or in America. This is a problem that really concerns most human beings. Apparently two people, man and woman, cannot live together without conflict, without pain, without a sense of inequality, without that feeling that they are not profoundly related to each other. One asks why? There may be multiple causes, sexual, lack of temperament, the opposite feeling that of belief, of ambition, there may be many, many causes for this lack of harmony in relationship. But what is really the source, the depth of that source, which brings conflict in each of us? I think that is the important question to ask, to ask and then not wait for an answer from somebody, like the speaker, but having put the question, have the patience to wait, hesitate, let the question itself take seed, flower, move. I don't know if I am conveying that feeling.

I ask myself why, if I am married to a woman, or live with a woman, why do I have this basic conflict between us. I can give a

superficial answer - because she is a Roman Catholic and I am a Protestant, or I am this or that, those are all superficial reasons. But I want to find out what is the deep rooted, or deep source of this conflict between two people. I have put the question and I am waiting for the question itself to flower, to expose all the intricacies that lie behind the question because there are a great many intricacies in the question and what the question brings out. For that I must have a little patience - right? A little sense of waiting, watching, being aware, so that the question begins to unfold. As it unfolds I begin to see the answer. Not that I want an answer but the question itself begins to unroll, show me the extraordinary complexity that lies between two people, between two human beings that perhaps like each other, perhaps are attracted to each other, when they are very young they get sexually - and all the rest of it - and later on as they grow a little older they get bored with each other and gradually escape from that boredom through another person - divorcing or quietly, you know, all the rest of it. But the same problem exists with the other. So I have to have patience. Patience, I mean by that word, not allowing time to operate. I do not know if you have gone into the question of patience and impatience.

Most of us are rather impatient. We want our questions answered immediately, or escape from it immediately, operate upon it immediately. So we are rather impatient to get on with it. This impatience doesn't give one the depth of understanding of the problem. Whereas if one had patience, which is not of time, because I am patient, I am not wanting to end the problem, I am watching, looking at the problem, let it evolve, grow. So out of that

patience I begin to find out the depth of the answer. Right? Let us do that together now this morning. We are patient, not wanting an immediate answer and therefore our minds, brains are open to look, are aware of the problem and its complexity - right? We are trying - no, I don't want to use the word 'trying' - we are penetrating into the problem why two people can never seem to live together without conflict. What is the root of this conflict? What is the depth or the superficiality of this conflict? And what is my relationship with her, or with somebody? Is it superficial? That is, sexual, the attraction, the curiosity, the excitement, which are all superficial, sensory responses are superficial - right? So I realize these responses are being superficial and as long as I try to find an answer superficially I will never be able to see the depth of the problem. So am I free from the superficial responses and the problems that superficial responses create and try to solve those problems superficially? I don't know if you are following?

I have seen that so I won't find an answer superficially. Therefore I say, what is the root of it? Is it education? Is it being a man I want to dominate the other? I want to possess the other? I am attached so deeply I don't want to let go? And do I see that being tied, attached, will invariably bring about corruption? You follow? - corruption in the sense I am jealous, I am anxious, I am frightened, I want all the sequences of attachment - one knows very well. Is that the cause of it? Or is the cause much deeper? You follow? First of all we said superficial, then emotional attachments, emotional and sentimental and romantic dependence? If I discard those, then is there still a deeper issue involved in this? You are getting it? We are moving from the superficial lower and deeper

and deeper so that we can find out for ourselves what is the root of it. I hope you are doing this. Right?

Now how do I find the root of it? How do you find the root of it? Are you wanting an answer - right? Wanting to find the root of it and therefore making a tremendous effort? Or you want to find it so your mind, your brain is quiet, looking - right? So it is not agitated, it is not the activity of desire, will. It is just watching. Are we doing together this? Just watching to see what is the deep root, or deep cause, the basis of this conflict between human beings. Is it the sense of individual separation? See, go into it very carefully please. Is it individual concept that I am separate from the other basically, though biologically we are different but the sense of deep rooted individual separative action, is that the root of it? Or is there still a deeper root, a deeper layer, you understand? I wonder if you are following all this? We are together in this? First sensory responses, sensual responses, then emotional, romantic, sentimental responses, then attachment, with all its corruption? Or is it something profoundly conditioned brain that says, "I am an individual, and he - or she - is an individual. And we are separate entities, each must fulfil in his own way and therefore the separation is basic." - right? Is that so?

Is it basic? Or I have been educated to that? That I am an individual and she - also an individual - must fulfil herself in her own way and I must equally. So we have already started from the very beginning these two separate directions. They may be running parallel together but never meeting. Like two railway lines that never meet. And all I am doing is to try to meet, try to live harmoniously, struggle, "Oh, darling you are so good" - you

follow? - repeat, repeat, but never meet. Right?

So if that is the cause, and apparently it appears to be the cause, the root of it, is that separative existence of an individual a reality? Or it is an illusion which I have been nourishing, cherishing, holding on to, without any validity behind it? If it has no validity I must be quite sure, absolutely, irrevocably sure that it is an illusion and can the brain break away from that illusion and realize we are all similar, psychologically? You follow? My consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind, though biologically we differ, psychologically, our consciousness is similar to all human beings. If I once realize this, not intellectually but in depth, in my heart, in my blood, in my guts, the feeling, then my relationship to another undergoes a radical change - right? Inevitable.

Now the questioner asks: we are in conflict, must it end? If we battle with each other all day long, as most people are, struggle, conflict, you know, the bitterness, the anger, the hatred, the repulsion - we bear it as long as we can and then comes the moment when we have to break. We know the familiar pattern of it, there are more divorces after marriages. And the questioner asks: what is one to do? If I am everlastingly in conflict with my wife and somehow I can't patch it over, must the relationship end? Or I understand basically the cause of this disruption, of this conflict, which is the sense of separate individuality and I have seen the illusory nature of it and therefore I am no longer pursuing the individual line, therefore what takes place between me, who has perceived that and lives it, not verbally maintains it but actually lives it, then what is my relationship with the person, with the woman who still thinks in terms of the individual? You understand

my question?

It is very interesting. Go into it. I see, or she sees - better put it onto her - she sees the foolishness, the absurdity, the illusory nature of the individual, she understands it, she feels it, and I don't because I am a male, I am more aggressive, more driving and all the rest of that. So what takes place between us? She has comprehended the nature and I have not. She won't quarrel with me, never - right? She won't enter into that area at all but I am constantly pushing her, driving her and trying to pull her out of that area. I am creating the conflict, not she - you have understood how the whole thing has moved? Are you following all this? The whole thing has moved. There are no two people quarrelling but only one. See what has taken place. And I, if I am at all sensitive, if I have real feeling for her, I begin to also transform because she is irrevocably there - you understand? She will not move out of that area. See what happens. If two immovable objects meet there is conflict. I don't know if you see. But if one is immovable, the lady, and I am movable I naturally yield to that which is immovable - right? I wonder if you understand this. This is very simple.

So the problem then is resolved if one has real comprehension of relationship, without the image - which we went into previously. Then by her very presence, by her very vitality of actuality she is going to transform me, help me. That is the answer. Got it?

2nd QUESTION: Would you please go into what you mean by reading the book of one's life at a glance? Or with a single look.

I think it is fairly obvious that we human beings are the history of mankind. Right? In us is the totality of all human psychological knowledge - right? That is fairly obvious. I hope. Must I go into

that? That is, the story of mankind, which is wars, tears, bloodshed, pain, grief, laughter, agony, anxiety, loneliness, sorrow, all that is part of me, I am that. I am the story of all that - right? The book of history is me, not the kings - part of the kings too, I am all that. Now can I read that book, which is me, do I have to read it page by page, chapter by chapter, not missing a single line until I come to the end of the book? You understand my question? I am the story of all mankind, that is fairly simple, to see that even intellectually - right? Do I see that intellectually that I am the story of all mankind; all mankind suffers, has shed tears, laughter, irritation, conformity, every sense of indignity, vulgarity, superficiality, I am all that - otherwise I wouldn't elect the politicians as they are - right? So I am all that, including the priest, and the gods that thought has invented. I am all that. Now that book is me. Have I to read page by page? Or can I understand that whole book with one glance, with one single look? You understand the two questions?

We are saying it is impossible to read that book page by page, chapter by chapter. That would take you all your life because all your life is a period of time. During that time you are adding more and more, or taking away little by little. But you are gathering more and more. So the book can never be read page by page. It can never be read - you understand? If you understand that, which is logical, objective, if you realize that it cannot be read page by page then you have only one issue: which is to look at it with eyes that comprehend from the beginning to the end at a glance. You understand? What does that imply? What does it imply to look at yourself, which is the story of mankind, historia, mankind, to look at it? You understand? Again this requires patience. To look at it

with a patient, silent brain so that the book itself unfolds rapidly.

Now, just a minute: when you have a map of Switzerland - is it Switzerland, yes - when you have a map of Switzerland with all the lakes and the mountains and all that, the beauty of the land, if you have a particular direction from Gstaad to Bern you are only concerned with that route. You don't look at the rest of the map. That is, you have a particular direction and if you have a particular direction you neglect to look at the rest of the map. Please understand this. But if you have no direction then you look all round. You have understood? The moment you have a motive which gives you a direction, then you are only looking in a particular direction. But if you have no motive and also no direction then you look at the whole map at a glance. You have understood? Now can you do this, the same with oneself - anger, jealousy, brutality, aggression, attachment - all that. That is the whole map of yourself, which requires quietness of the brain and no direction. Then you see clearly the whole of it. You hear the whole tone of that history and you have captured immediately, the wholeness of it - right? Have you got it?

Shall we go on to the next question?

3rd QUESTION: Some of us including myself have had experiences of seeing lights, a feeling of oneness with the universe, energy, the awakening of kundalini, inward clarity. These last sometimes for moments, for hours. Are these not steps towards illumination?

K: Can we be little bit funny? I wonder if one's liver is alright when you see lights, flashes and all that. (laughter) Just a minute, just a minute. You know, some people do have, seriously, certain

experiences, certain perceptions. I wouldn't call experiences. Now let's examine what experiences are. What is an experience? Either it is sensory experience, sensual experiences or psychological experiences, actual physical experiences like pain, toothache and so on. We are talking here about psychological experiences.

Now what do you mean by experience? An incident, a happening which you must recognise, name it, and therefore the experience is different from you who are experiencing? I don't know if you follow all this. Therefore it means, if the experiencer is experiencing something, he must know what it is. He must be able to recognize it, otherwise it is not an experience, right? I don't know if you follow all this. If I can't recognize the experience, it doesn't exist. I recognize it because I have already had the symptoms, the knowledge of it. Therefore I say that is an experience. I have seen by experience as a Hindu - if I am a Hindu - some deity because my brain is conditioned to that. If you are a Christian, you have an experience of Jesus or whatever it is. So as long as there is an experiencer separate from the experience, experience - what you call the new experience, is really the old experience manifesting itself in a different form and you recognize it. And you call that experience. Now a mind that is clear, absolutely without that shadow of self, has no experience. Right? Because there is nothing to experience.

Illumination is a state of experience which is so absurd. Because, sir, truth or that ultimate energy, you can't experience. You can't say well, I have reached that. That statement: I have read, that is full of vanity and arrogance. A mind, a brain or a mind that is free from arrogance, which is utterly in its simplicity

humble, in which there is no self whatsoever then that eternity might be there. But if you say I am experiencing that then you are - it is like experiencing anger. It is as good as anger. But don't let's call it illumination.

And there is this new brought again from India - I wish they would keep it to themselves - brought from India, about the Kundalini. Probably many of you have heard this. If you haven't, forget it. But if you have, those people who write about it, forgive me please, I am saying this most respectfully, those who talk about do not know anything about it. You might say what right have you to say that. Why do you say that they do not know? Which means you know, right? Naturally that is an obvious question. I don't want - personally, I don't want to enter into this question because anybody who says, I know what it means, they do not know. It's much too complex. The whole idea is this: Energy, when it is misused, destroys the energy that can comprehend the total source of energy. Do you understand? If I misuse my energy in various forms - arrogance, selfish action, competition, aggression, soaked in sorrow and talking endlessly about it, or constantly being occupied with something or other, I am wasting energy. Obviously, like a motor running all the time in the garage; it will soon wear itself out. But the idea of all this is that, this energy when it is not wasted in any direction, that very human energy which is not the energy created by conflict or the energy created by thought, that energy is or apprehends the total energy of universe. That is the idea about Kundalini and all that kind of stuff.

So the questioner says, asks, is this a process of illumination? You can't, if one may point out again most respectfully, you cannot

prepare for illumination. It is like cooking a nice dish. You take time till the potatoes collect... (laughter). And illumination is not something that you come gradually, process. It is there if you are utterly, totally unselfish and have a brain that is utterly without a shadow of conflict.

4th QUESTION: You have invited your audience, listeners, to doubt, to question. It becomes necessary to question rightly, so would it be worthwhile to go into the issue of a wrong question and the whole art of questioning? (Which we have done, but I'll read it again.)

Please the speaker has not invited you to question, to doubt, to have scepticism. It is part of one's own natural intelligence. It is not the speaker says, "Let's doubt". That is meaningless. But if we are not gullible, if we want to question, if we want to find out, if we want to enquire, penetrate, you have to have scepticism, you have to doubt your own experiences, your own standards, your own conclusions, your own prejudices. But we don't. We question, doubt what others are saying - right? Now when one is questioning out of one's own innate enquiry, penetration, doubt, then it has importance, then it has vitality, it clears the brain of its prejudices. If I am prejudiced and I hold on to that never questioning it, my brain becomes gradually dull. But if I question my prejudices, my beliefs, my conclusions, my whole concept of religious behaviour, religious all the rest of it, my brain becomes lighter, clearer, active. Right? Naturally. So the speaker is not inviting you to doubt. You have to doubt, that is part of life. It is only the gullible, the people who want to hold on to some fanciful, romantic, sentimental image that daren't doubt.

And the art of questioning: you know there are three arts: the art of listening, the art of seeing, and the art of learning - right? The art of listening is to listen without interpretation - right? To listen without translating what is being said to suit your own comfort and desires. To listen not only with the hearing of the ear but to listen to the word and what lies behind the word and listen so attentively that you capture the depth of the meaning. The art of seeing is to observe without the word, without the name, without the form; which means to observe without any direction, without any motive, to observe so that you capture the whole movement of yourself - you follow? The movement of the trees, of the rivers, of the hills, to see. And the art of learning is, as we have learnt the art now, to accumulate knowledge. That is the art of learning. I don't know mathematics but I study, I have a professor who will teach me and gradually I learn mathematics so that I can apply it as an engineer, or a technician, to the whole technological world - right? (loud noise of engine) Can I wait for that?

The art of learning is to accumulate knowledge about any subject and specialize in that subject, and act skilfully. That is what we call learning. That is, gather knowledge, information and then act. The other is act and from that action learn - which is the same as the other. I don't know if you are following all this? Right? I gather information in order that I can live, have a livelihood, act skilfully or unskillfully. Or the other is: is to act and from that action learn. Which is, from that action I have accumulated knowledge. They are both similar. They are not separate, they are both similar but some are emphasizing the other, which is, act first and learn from action. This is being trotted out by some - I won't

go into it. So both are the same: which is, accumulate knowledge and act.

Now is there another form of learning? It is very interesting if you go into it, question it. We are familiar with the old system: accumulate knowledge, and act. Is there another learning - we will use the word learning for the moment, in quotes - is there another learning which is not accumulating? You understand? Because see what happens: when you accumulate knowledge and act skilfully, your skill is always limited - right? Limited according to your knowledge and knowledge can never be complete and therefore your action will inevitably be incomplete and therefore cause conflict - right? That is clear. Now we are asking: is there an action which is not based on knowledge? This is a difficult question, please have patience and find out. Is there another form of action which is not based on learning, accumulating knowledge? See what action born of knowledge implies. One must be very clear on that. Are you getting tired?

Audience: No.

Let's start again. One must be very clear: the implications of learning, being informed, and from that knowledge act. That knowledge can never be complete therefore action can never be complete. And therefore such action must bring about regrets, guilt, the feeling of guilt and conflict. That is clear. Is there another quality of action which is not based on knowledge, which is based on thought - you understand? An action which is not based on thought. Thought being the response of knowledge, experience, memory, stored in the brain. Action of thought is limited therefore there are regrets, pain, sorrow and all the rest of it. Is there an

action which is not born of thought? You get the question? Are we meeting the question?

Let's find out. If you see what knowledge and action imply and the truth of it, not the intellectual concept and acceptance of it, but the truth of it - right? - that action based on thought must inevitably create conflict, guilt, regret and all that. Because thought itself is deeply, irrevocably, limited, because knowledge is limited about anything. Now is there an action not born of thought? Probably this is the first time you hear it, therefore your whole attitude to it would be to resist it. Or you might say, "Prove it. We know the other very well but as we don't know this, prove it to us" - right? I am not proving it to you. I am not a conjurer. All that the speaker is saying is: watch the two - you understand? Watch very clearly the limitations of actions borne of thought. And question, enquire, penetrate into an action which is not borne of thought. "For us," you say, "I don't know what that means because I have never even looked at it, considered it." So somebody comes along and says let's look at it together - right? I am that person, the speaker is that person who says, let's look at it together.

Is love thought? You understand my question? Have you understood my question? Is love born of thought, born of desire, born of pleasure? I am asking, the speaker is asking a simple question. If you say love is part of thought, then love is part of hate. Naturally. Can hate and love together exist? And so logically, objectively, perhaps very, very sanely, love has no relationship whatsoever with thought. And thought, as it is not related to love, what is the action of love which has no relationship with thought? You understand the question? Are we meeting each other? Are we

a little bit paralysed by this question? I am afraid we are. If we associate love with thought, as we do, then love must inevitably bring conflict, obviously, because we have associated love with desire - sexual and other forms of desire. And also if we associate pleasure with love again it is the operation of thought, as we have been into that, then love is totally involved with thought. And if it is involved with thought it must bring about great travail to human beings. That is simple. Right?

So is there an action which is not born of thought? Perhaps I won't even use the word love because that might complicate it. We say, the speaker says very clearly, definitely, irrevocably, that there is an action not born of thought. And he will explain this to you very clearly. When you perceive something clearly and that perception of clarity can only come when the brain is free from all anchorage, from all sense of attachment to belief, persons, ideas and so on - right? That frees the brain from its conditioning so that it can look afresh. Right? The looking afresh is to have no division between the observer and the observed. We explained that again carefully. So there is an action of perception in which there is no observer and the observed and therefore no activity of thought, and action is free from thought. I have explained it very carefully - right? That is, if I can observe without any prejudice a person, specially in relationship, to observe very clearly, without all the memories one has gathered about her or him for the last twenty, forty, ten days. To be free of that, utterly, a brain that is not collecting hurts, insults and all that: such a brain is free to observe. That observation is the operation of the total brain because there is no hinderance - right? It operates as a whole. Then an action born

out of that wholeness is without conflict. It is not the action of thought. Right? I have explained it, it is up to you.

5th QUESTION: Who are you?

Is that an important question? Or would you say, "Who am I" - not who you are, who am I? And if I tell you who I am, what does it matter. It is only out of curiosity, isn't it? It is like reading a menu at the window, you have to go into the restaurant and eat food. But when you are standing outside and reading the menu, it won't satisfy your hunger. So to tell you who I am is really quite meaningless. First of all, I am nobody - right? That's all. It is as simple as that. I am nobody. But what is important is: who you are, what are you? When they ask who you are, in that question is implied that you are somebody very great therefore I am going to imitate you, the way you walk, the way you talk, the way you brush your teeth, or whatever it is. I am going to imitate you, which is part of our pattern, you understand? There is the hero, or the man who is enlightened, or the guru, and you say, "I am going to copy everything you do" - it becomes so absurdly silly - you understand? Childish to imitate somebody. And are we not the result of a lot of imitations? The religions have said - they don't use the word imitate - give yourself over, surrender yourself, follow me, I am this, I am that, worship - right? All this is what you are. In school you imitate. Acquiring knowledge is a form of imitation and of course there is the fashion - short dress, long dress, long hair, short hair, beard, no beard - imitate, imitate. And also we imitate inwardly, so we all know that.

But to find out who you are, who you are, not who the speaker is, that is far more important, and to find out who you are you have

to enquire. You are the story of mankind. If you really see that it gives you tremendous vitality, energy, beauty, love because it is no longer a small entity struggling in the corner of the earth. You are part of this whole humanity. It has a tremendous responsibility, vitality, beauty, love. But most of us won't see this, as most of us are concerned with ourselves, with our particular little problem, particular little sorrow and so on. And to step out of that narrow circle seems almost impossible because we are so conditioned, so programmed, like the computers, that we cannot learn something new. The computer can but we can't. See the tragedy of it. The machine that we have created, the computer, can learn much faster, infinitely more than I can, than the brain can, and the brain which has invented that, that has become ultra intelligent machine - right? Whereas our brain is sluggish, slow, dull because we have conformed, we have obeyed, we have followed, there is the guru, there is the priest, there is the rich - you follow? And when you do revolt, as the revolutionaries and the terrorists do, it is still very superficial - changing the pattern of politics, of so-called society, society being merely the relationship between people, and we are talking of a revolution not physical but the psychological revolution in which there is no, at the depth, conformity. You may put on trousers because you are in this country and in India it is different clothes, that is not conformity, that is nothing, childish. But inwardly, not a feeling of conformity. Conformity exists when there is comparison. For a mind to be totally free from comparison, that is to observe the whole history which is embedded in you.

I am afraid this has to be the last question. There are too many of them.

6th QUESTION: Would you please speak further on time, measure and space.

I hope you aren't tired, are you?

Audience: No.

K: Please don't be polite. If you are tired just quietly listen. As most of us are tired, our brains have become exhausted by the usual repetition, going to the office, seeking pleasure, resisting conflict. Our brains, please realize they are tired brains. If they weren't tired you wouldn't be here. I wouldn't be here either. But we are tired human beings because we are frightened, there is terror, there is danger in the streets, financial uncertainty, war, atom bombs, we are really extraordinarily exhausted human beings - through drink, drugs, over indulgence in every form. And we are going to talk about something that requires a great deal of penetration, a great deal of attention. And to go into it very deeply you have also to relax, to be free to look, to penetrate, however much one may be tired.

(Repeats the question: Would you please speak further on time, measure, space and thought.

This is important to understand because man has always asked, the serious ones, whether time has a stop, whether man can ever be free from the limited space he lives in, not only physically. The physical space is becoming narrower and narrower, because of over population, cities, we seem to live in flats, drawers that you pull out and put back. You understand? Push back. Space, physically, is becoming very small, and perhaps that is one of the reasons why there is violence in the world because we have no space. That is why big cities like New York, London, Paris, they

breed violence, we are all much too close together. This is one of the facts which have been investigated. They have put many rats in a small space and these rats become totally disorientated, they eat their own children, they kill each other, exactly as we are doing, because they have no space, physical. This is a question that one must go into very, very seriously if you are interested.

Measure - there are three things - time, measure, space. What is time, what is space, what is measure? We are going to enquire into them. Time, measure, space.

And as we said, some of the writers have asked this question, whether time has a stop - psychological time we are talking about, not the chronological time by the watch, you can't stop the sun from setting or rising. But we are talking about time as a movement of becoming or being, or climbing, or expanding - right? Time, which is part of evolution, the psychological evolution. The biological evolution has almost come to an end for man, obviously. He is not going to develop a third arm or fourth arm or something or other. So we are talking about psychological time. Time as hope, as something that has happened yesterday or last year, and that memory of it is time, the repetition of it is time, the endeavour to escape from it is time - you are following all this? To suppress it, to do something about it, all that involves time. And the people ask, not only the writers, the scholars who have written volumes about time and all the rest of it, and also the ancient Hindus have asked this question: whether time has a stop so that a new movement can take place; not imaginary, not fanciful, not romantic and all that kind of stuff but actually psychological time coming to an end. Right? That is one question.

The other is measure. The whole technological world is based on measurement. If you had no measurement there would be no technology - right? Measurement according to a ruler, or measurement by thought and so on, measurement. This measurement has become necessary, to build an aeroplane, even to have this tent. And this measurement has been handed down to the Western world through the Greeks. I am not a Greek scholar but you can observe this. The Greeks were concerned, the ancient Greeks, were concerned with measurement. They were the originators of mathematics and so on, part of mathematics and so on. So we, the Western world, have inherited measurement. Measurement not only technologically, measurement comparing one painter against another painter, one poet against another poet, one sculptor, Mr Moore, against others - right? Measurement. And also in ourselves there is measurement: I am not as good as I should be, the better, the more, psychologically as well as physically, more money, more power, more fun, all that. If I have more money, more power, I have more fun. That is part of measurement. And we are always comparing, psychologically. There is the great teacher and I am not. I compare myself and eventually I am going to get where he is.

And also space. Psychologically as well as physically, we have very, very little space. Specially you observe this when you go into crowded towns, cities and in over populated countries like India, enormous crowds. You have no concept of it. And naturally they live in narrow streets, live in small houses, physically, naturally there is always a battle going on for space, physical space. "For God's sake move over into that corner. Don't crowd me." And also

psychologically, that is in consciousness we have very little space. It is crowded - right? It is crowded with our knowledge, crowded with our fears, anxieties, despairs, depressions, seeking happiness, seeking illumination, seeking the powers of Kundalini - you follow, occupied, wanting more, better understanding, greater power. I'll fast, I'll have more energy fasting - you follow? Always occupied and therefore there is very little space. If you observe your consciousness is filled and therefore there is no space. And then realizing there is no space you begin to enquire into the space of the universe. Astrophysicists are doing this, that extraordinary world of cosmos, which is essentially order. Cosmos in Greek means order. The scientist whose brain is limited because of his knowledge, because of his conditioning, his relationship with another, his greed, his desire for more power, more money, more status, more publicity - you follow? And that little brain is enquiring into something immeasurable and translating what they see through telescopes into mathematical problems.

So if you observe there is no sense of stopping time, psychologically. There is no ending of measurement - right? We are always measuring, always looking to the future, better government, better economic position, United Nations will eventually - you follow? - the very idea, United Nations - think of it - tribalism united, how can they? So knowing all this we are asking whether time, measurement can have a stop? That is essentially: is there a stop to thinking? You understand? Because time is thought, time is movement - today, tomorrow, yesterday, time is movement. And time is also chronological, it is movement. Thought is a movement - right? So thought is the movement of

time. Thought is time. And we are asking: is there a stop to time and to thought? Or is man everlastingly condemned to this movement, which is hell? You understand? Hell - forget that word. It is a Christian word. They have also their own particular word in Asia. And we are saying also measurement. The word meditation also means to measure. In Sanskrit also 'ma' is to measure. Meditation is measurement, the word. And the Sanskrit word also means measurement and we are conditioned to measurement. Measurement is - 'I am, I shall be' - the ideal and the pursuit of the ideal, how near, how closely I am approaching the ideal. I am violent and I must not be violent, which is a measurement. So measurement, psychologically as well as physically, is a movement of time, thought - right? And space. As our brains, our consciousness is crowded, there is not a spot which is not covered. I don't know if you have noticed it. You may think that there is a space that is not covered but when you think that is not covered that very thought is covering it - you understand? Are you following this? When I think there is in me a field, or a state which is immeasurable, which has immense space, which has no time, when I think about it, it is the product or the invention of thought - right? Therefore it is part of thinking, part of measurement, therefore the concept of super, super, super egos is still part of that thought.

So this is our problem: whether time, thought can come to an end, which is measurement, and can they have space, infinite space, not the space invented by thought? Is this possible? It is possible only when you see the truth or the falseness of measurement, psychologically, imitating, conforming, and all that,

when you see the absurdity, the unintelligent way we live, and see where thought, which is time, is necessary to learn a language and psychologically it has no place. When you see the truth of it then consciousness, though it is crowded and beginning to dissipate, when you see that, the truth of that, then there is space. It is not what you do to end time, what you do to measurement, say "I must stop measuring", but seeing the truth of it will set the brain free, will bring freedom to the brain. Then you have space that is literally immeasurable. And it is only then that the apprehension or the perception, which is not personal, of that which is everlasting from everlasting.

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 23RD JANUARY 1982

We are going to talk over together the condition of man. It is not only in this country but all over the world man is conditioned according to his culture, according to his language, according to his religion. And also he is conditioned by economics, socially, and by his parents and so on. Man through out the world is conditioned. And generation after generation man apparently has not changed at all. There has been slight modification, slight change, but generally speaking man, which includes the woman naturally, throughout the millennia has evolved. That is, time and circumstances, culture, has shaped the mind of man - that is your mind. And we are going to talk over together whether that condition, the human conditioning can ever be changed, can ever be transformed; or must it always go on, century after century what it has been - his condition of sorrow, of pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair, and the search for the religious mind, a search for something that is beyond all conditioning. This has been the lot of man. And we, during these six talks here, are going to talk over together, converse together, have a dialogue together, whether it is possible for the human condition to change radically, fundamentally. That is what we are going to go into throughout these six talks if you care to attend them.

There are those who say that human conditioning can never be changed. It can be modified, it can be altered here and there, do a little patchwork but they maintain under very so-called highly intellectual, sophisticated people, they say that the human conditioning can never be changed, it has always been what it has

been, and only partially modified. That is their assertion, that is their investigation both psychologically, socially and other ways, they have stated that the human mind, the human condition, the sorrow, the pain, the anxiety, the agony, constant endless conflict, can never be radically - bring about a change. That is their statement.

And we are questioning, doubting, being sceptical, whether those statements, that the human mind can never be changed, we are questioning that. And we are going to investigate together whether it is possible, not superficially, not at the periphery, but basically, fundamentally, whether the human mind, which has brought about a great deal of happiness, technologically, and a great deal of misery in the world, whether that condition of man can ever be changed. We are going to investigate into that. If one may point out, this is not a lecture as it is generally understood, where the speaker puts out some ideas, with which you agree or disagree, some statements with which you can argue about - this is not a lecture of that kind. That is, the speaker puts forth a lot of ideas, concepts and conclusions and you, the audience, merely listen. That is, hear with one ear, let it go through the other ear. Here we are going together to investigate, therefore this is not a lecture. Please understand this very clearly. This is not a lecture as it is generally understood but we are going to face together the innumerable problems that man has, and we are going to look at them, we are going to understand the depth of them; not only the superficiality but the profundity of our human problems.

So though the speaker is describing, examining, putting it into words what the condition of man is, you, as the audience - and I

wish there weren't so many, then if there were a few we could talk together more easily - but you as an audience, who are the listener, must share, not only share but communicate with what is being said so completely that you, yourself, are examining, you, yourself are investigating, comprehending, changing radically. So please, if one may again point out, this is not a lecture. And the speaker is not doing any kind of propaganda, for any belief, for any ideals, for any conclusions, or for any systems sociologically or religiously. We are together, freely, going to understand - not only verbally but in our hearts and minds the state of man. That is your state, what is happening to man throughout the world. So please we are sharing together, partaking together, in the investigative process. It is a process. It is a thing you have to understand step by step, not according to the speaker but you are examining your own conditioning, your own condition, your own sorrow, your own pain, uncertainty, insecurity, the terrible world we live in. We are together sharing by observing critically, sceptically, without any conclusion what the world is. The world outside of us is created by each one of us. The society is the product of human struggle, human competition, human aggression, human struggle to achieve, to become, not only economically but religiously. So please be serious, this is not a flippant talk, nor is it to entertain you. The speaker doesn't want to entertain you. Cinemas, the temples, they can do that. But the speaker is very serious about this matter, questioning, doubting, demanding so that each one of us can find out the truth for oneself, not dependent on anybody. So if that is very clear from the very beginning let us proceed together to examine the human consciousness, the human state of mind, it's

conditioning.

The crisis is not political, the crisis is not economic, nor is it spiritual, so-called religious. The crisis is in our consciousness. Our consciousness is what you think, what you feel, what you act, how you behave, your beliefs, the whole complexity of human existence. So we are not doing any kind of propaganda. We are not trying to point out a way of how to resolve our problems, but if we could together step by step examine the exact position, exactly what is happening, not only in the world but also in ourselves, then perhaps we can communicate with each other more deeply more clearly. So please this is a serious gathering, it is not an entertainment, intellectual or emotional, but needs a mind that is clearly observing, questioning so that your own mind, your own perception sees what is happening out there in the world, and what is happening inwardly to you.

So first of all that which is happening out there in the world, and that which is happening inwardly, are not two different movements. It is like the tide going out and the tide coming in. But we have divided the world as something outside of us and a life which is inward. I hope you are all understanding all this. It is one unitary movement, going out there and the tide coming in, this constant interrelationship between outside of you and world inside. To bring about a radical social, economic, political change in the world you must understand what is happening inside, in yourself because you are creating the world. Your society you have created and you are responsible for that society. And if you do not put order in your own self, inside yourself, inside your house which is your consciousness, then you will create a world that is destructive,

as it is now, malignant, dangerous, preparing for wars, for destruction. So it becomes very important that we understand very deeply not only what is happening out there in the world but also what is happening to all of us, each one of us, as a human being: why we suffer, why we are in conflict, why we human beings are always struggling, struggling. So first let us look around us, the world.

All over the world there is a decline, there is degeneracy taking place all over the world. There is no freedom, freedom in the sense freedom from sorrow, freedom from pain, freedom from loneliness. There are governments that are controlling human minds, trying to shape them through their ideologies, which are the Communist worlds, the totalitarian world. In that world there is no freedom. If you go against the government you are sent off to Siberia or one of the psychological hospitals and so on. The rest of the world there is freedom, somewhat. And there is conflict between nations, economically, socially, religiously: the Catholics against the Protestants, the Hindus against the Muslims, the Muslims against somebody else, and so on, this constant battle is going on, not only physical battle, like in Beirut and other parts of the world, but the conflict in our relationship with each other. One is aware of all this, this is not something new the speaker is pointing out, this is actually what is going on. There is national division, which is tribal division, glorified as nation, there is division racially, the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu and so on. There is division between religions, there is division between gurus, there is division between gods, there is division between man and woman. So wherever there is division there must be inevitably

conflict. That is the law. No politician is concerned with the global interrelationship, which is the only way to survive. So politics are not going to solve these human problems. Governments are becoming more and more corrupt, inefficient. Nor can you rely on any leader. This country has had many, many leaders, religious, political, neurotic, and rather limited minds. You have had leaders, they haven't helped you, actually. That is, to bring about a radical transformation in the structure of the mind, in consciousness, no guru, no leader, you have had them all. And where are you at the end of it? At the end of many, many centuries? You have sacred books - I don't know why they are called sacred - but they are books, and you have relied on them as a guide. Right? And at the end of millennia you are exactly where you were when you started.

So the world out there with the politicians, religious leaders, economic strategies, and the accumulation of war material, each country spending millions and millions to destroy each other and nobody is standing against it, saying 'That is all wrong'. We all want to lead a comfortable, easy life. So that world outside of us, we have created it through our greed, through our vanity, through our aggression, competition, through our cowardice, we have created that world. We are responsible for that world, not the politicians, they are like us, crooked, double talk, like we do. So you can't rely any more on politicians, leaders, gurus or books. That is the world.

And when you examine yourself, what you are, what are you? Sad human beings, seeking security, uncertain, confused, miserable, lonely, having certain capacities either technologically or artistically, or some other form of skill. This is what we are,

each one of us. And so what we are the world is. Please understand this because we are facing a grave crisis. The crisis is not out there, the crisis is in our minds and hearts, in our consciousness. And if we don't examine them carefully, understand their nature, the structure of our minds and hearts, we will slowly degenerate, as we are doing now all over the world. So we are responsible for what we do, nobody else. You can't put it on a god, or on circumstances, or saying past lives. You are responsible because the world is created by you, the world outside, not the universe. And the gods that you have - your thoughts have made the gods, the gods haven't made you - right? Please understand all this. You have made in this country three hundred thousand gods, or more, as they have done in other parts of the world, gods which have been created by man, by thought - the rituals, the pujas, all the ceremonials are created by thought, by you. You want to escape from this world into a fanciful world, which is the world of puja, football, rushing off to temples or mosques or churches - it is the same thing, a vast entertainment. Right? We are not criticizing, we are just pointing out to you. We are examining together, not agreeing together, not opposing each other, but looking actually at what is going on. And most of us do not want to face things as they are. We would rather escape from them, turn our eyes away from them because we haven't got the integrity to stand and look.

So, during these six talks we are going to do it together, to observe actually what is happening in our consciousness, in our minds, in our hearts. The way we think, the way we act, how self-centred we are, how utterly callous we are becoming. And together we are going to examine first why we human beings have become

what we are. You understand my question? What we are actually. What has made us what we are. In asking that question we always want a cause. Please understand this, give your attention to this because it is rather difficult. I am going into something which you will have to pay attention if you want to.

We are asking why human beings have become what they are - greedy, envious, quarrelsome, lonely, sexual, seeking pleasure, frightened, sorrow, that is what you are. And we are asking why, what has made us become like this? Now when you ask a question why, you want to find a cause. Right? Whatever has a cause must have an end. Right? Please understand this. If I have pain, there is a cause for that pain physically - I have either some disease, or some incurable disease, there is always a cause and an effect. Now when we are asking what is the cause, the reason why human beings, highly educated, sophisticated, capable of thinking, why have they become like this, degenerate, dishonest, corrupt, schizophrenic, that is leading double lives, going to the temple and be a lawyer. That is a double life, a contradictory life, which is schizophrenic. Why? When we ask that question - please listen to that carefully - when we ask that question we want a cause for it. Right? Which is, the cause is circumstances, the cause is environment, the cause is I have not been properly educated. We invent a lot of reasons which seem reasonable and say these are the causes why human beings have become what they are. Right? This is not difficult to understand. Right? Now when you are trying to find out a cause you are not looking at the fact. I wonder if you understand this? Look: if I have a toothache I know the cause of it, I go to the dentist, he either pulls the tooth out or does something with it. If I

have pain there is a cause for it. Now is there a cause - please listen - is there a cause why human beings have become like this? Or human beings are always like this? You have understood? There may be no cause. Because if there is a cause it can be ended. Apparently after several millennia we are more or less what we were ten thousand years ago. So when you ask why we have become like this, please do not try to find out a cause, because that is an escape from your observation of the fact of what is happening. You understand this? I must go on.

You see when we are analyzing, which is to seek a cause, you are moving away from what is actually happening. You get that? I am lonely, let's say I am lonely. I want to find out why I am lonely so I begin to analyze, examine, go into what loneliness is and so on. When I do that I have moved away from the fact of loneliness. You have understood? From the fact of what is actually happening. So when we look for a cause we are running away from what is happening. So when we ask why human beings throughout the world have become what they are, conditioned, do not try to find a cause but stay with what is happening: that you are conditioned, your minds are corrupt and all the rest of it, look at it, remain with it, observe it, it is a living thing. So if one may point out, don't analyze, that is a waste of time. But observe clearly what is happening. So we are going to learn together what is observation. You understand? We have observed the world, what is happening in the world, and also what is happening inwardly, in the psyche, in our consciousness. So we are going to learn how to observe, what is the nature of observation, the manner of looking, not only optically with your eyes, but also looking inwardly. We are going

to see, or observe, learn to observe. Are we together so far?

Somewhat at least.

Do you observe, look with your eyes, at the squalor in the streets, do you observe the moon, the trees, the world around you? Or you are so concerned with your own problems, with your trouble, that you never look. Because when you look at the trees, at the stars, at your own wife and husband, your children, when you look at the squalor, the poverty, the degrading condition of this city, when you look around you become sensitive. You understand? You become sensitive so that you can look more profoundly into yourself. That is why it is important from the very beginning to find out for yourself the manner of observation. To look at a thing, at your wife, at your husband, at your children or the stars, to look without the word. You understand? When you look at a tree, the word tree is a distraction which prevents you looking. You have understood? Right? Is this clear? Let me put it differently: the word is not the thing. Right? The word 'wife' is not the living human entity, the word 'mountain' is not the actual mountain, the word 'door' is not the actual door. Right? So the word is never the thing. The word is a symbol, but the symbol is not reality. Right? So when you look at that thing called a tree, look at it without the word. Right? Then you look at it much more closely, much more sensitively, more accurately. But if the word interferes then the word takes away the actual observation. Right?

So to look at the world, that which is happening in the world outside there, to look without any identification. Right? To look at it as a non-Hindu, non-Buddhist, non-Christian, or Muslim, just to look at it. Right? Can you do that? Because if you do not do that

then you are preventing a global interrelationship which alone can solve the economic, social, the problems of poverty and so on, not governments any more. It is a global problem. So you must have a mind that looks at the whole world, not just the Indian world, or the Muslim world, but the whole world of humanity. Right? So you can never be identified with any country, with any people, with any group, with any conclusion, or ideologies, you must be a free person to look at this marvellous world.

So to observe not only the world - now we are going to observe ourselves. Right? To observe, to see exactly what we are. Neither get depressed by what we see, or elated by what we see, not see ourselves as our various imaginary processes, but actually what we are. Right? If you can face it. What are we? We are the past, the present and the future. We are the centre of that - the past, all the remembrances, all the experiences, the knowledge, the incidents, the pain, the past, and the present, and the future. We are all that. Right? So we are time-makers. I wonder if you understand all this? We are not only the result of time but also we make time, we are slaves to time. That is a fact. So the past, the present, which is modified by the past, and the future is born out of the modification, which is tomorrow, all that is part of what we are. We are time-makers. And also we are what we think we are. Right? If you think you are the result of past lives, that is what you are. Right? If you think god created you, it is your thought that has created you. You understand all this? So thought is time - we will go into it much later.

So thought has put together what you are. Right? Right? Thought. Thought has said you are Christian, thought has said you

are Hindu, thought has said you are Muslim, or Buddhist, thought has said you are an Indian with a peculiar flag. Thought has invented everything, including technology, what you are. Right? This is very difficult to understand so please go into it with me. Your consciousness, that is what you think, what you feel, how you act, your beliefs, your dogmas, your rituals, your gods, your fears, your pleasures, all that is your consciousness. All that is what you are. Right? And all that is put together by thought. When you say I am an Indian, it is the result of thought. Somebody has told you, or etc., etc. When you say I am a Christian, it is the result of thought. So your consciousness, it's content, is put together by thought. Right? Thought has created the extraordinary technological world - the computer, the submarine, the warship, the cannons, all that is the result of thought. Thought has created the marvellous churches, the temples, the mosques. Right? Thought has put in the temples, in the mosques, in the cathedrals, symbols which are what thought has put there. Right? So thought has created the most extraordinary complicated technological world, the extraordinary surgery that is going on, the medicine, the communication, the rapid transit, all are the result of thought. There is no question about it, you don't have to worry about that. And also thought has made you an Indian. Thought has said you belong to this particular community - the Brahmins, you know, all that, it is the result of your thinking, which has brought about this conditioning.

So we have to examine what thought is. Because if we don't understand what is thinking, we will never be able to delve deeply into that which is beyond thought. So you have to understand the nature and the structure of thought. Why thought has such

extraordinary importance in our life. We have emotions but thought recognizes those emotions, classifies them, good and bad, worthwhile and noble and so on. Thought is operating all the time, chattering. You must know that. Your mind is chattering all the time, never still, even in meditation, whatever you call meditation. So together we are going to examine what is thought, what is the source of thinking, how does thinking happen? Because whatever you do, you think, before or after. What you do, either you have thought it out and do, or do and then think it out. So thought is extraordinarily important to understand, and its place. So what is thinking? I may explain it, but you follow it, examine it, look at yourself so that it is not I think and I tell you, and then you accept it, which becomes too silly, we are grown-up people. Which is, I may describe, point out, the speaker may point out, what is thinking, how it comes. But don't memorize it, but rather look at it, find out for yourself the origin of thinking.

First of all we live by thought, we are directed by thought. Our actions are based on thought. Thought is predominant in our lives. If you are a businessman thought is operating, if you are an engineer thought is operating, if you are a guru - I hope you are not - thought is operating. So we must examine very closely what is thinking. When you are asked what is your name, you reply immediately, obviously, why? Because you have repeated your name a dozen times, so in that there is no need to think what your name is, there is no necessity to think. But when you are asked a little more complex question, there is the question and the answer. In that interval between question and the answer there is thinking going on. If I ask you what is the distance between here and Delhi

or New York, your mind begins to enquire. You have heard about it, you will ask somebody, you follow, thinking is going on. Which is an interval between the question and the answer, in that interval you are thinking, you are asking, you are looking in books to find out the mileage. And if you are asked a question about which you know nothing you say, 'I don't know'. Because there you don't have to think, you say, 'I don't know'. You understand? So there are three states: the immediate reply, a time interval reply, and the fact 'I don't know'. Right? The 'I don't know', you have said it, 'I don't know', there is no thinking necessary. It is only the time interval that demands your thinking. Right? Are you following all this? Somebody?

Now in the first case you answer it without thinking, second you take time to find out, third you say, 'I don't know'. Nobody says 'I don't know'. You understand? It is a most marvellous feeling, statement when you say, 'I really don't know'. There is a great beauty in that, great vitality of a mind that says, 'I really don't know', it is a fresh mind, not a mind crowded by knowledge, not a mind that is secondhand. It is a mind that says, 'I really don't know', that has great integrity.

So we are going to examine together what is thinking. Thinking is born out of memory. Right? If you had no memory you couldn't think. Memory is the accumulated knowledge of experience, either yours, or human experience. Like the scientists, they have accumulated during the last five hundred years or more, a great deal of knowledge, through experiment, through hypothesis, through trials, they have collected a great deal of knowledge. To be a good scientist you must have a great deal of knowledge of what

other people have said, what you have experimented, how you have tried, you have gathered. That knowledge is stored in the brain as memory, that memory responds, if you are a scientist in one way, if you are an engineer another way, if you are a businessman another way. So all have accumulated knowledge. And knowledge is the result of tremendous experience. Right? Experience of millennia of human beings, what they have gone through, their accidents, pain, suffering, anxiety, all that. So knowledge, experience of all human beings, and that knowledge stored in the brain as knowledge, and memory, which is remembrance, and from that thinking takes place. This is a fact. You can observe it in yourself. Now knowledge is never complete. Right? It can never be complete. You can accumulate more and more but it is never complete. They can look through telescopes and so on into the universe but they can never understand the nature of the universe - the enormity, the space, the vastness, the vitality, the immensity of it. So knowledge is always limited, it is always hand in hand with ignorance. So thought is always limited. Get it? Right sirs? Because my knowledge is limited, my remembrances are limited, thought is therefore limited and whatever thought does is limited. I invent a god, it is a limited god, I can say 'God is immense', but it is the creation of thought, therefore it is limited. The rituals, the pujas, are all the inventions of thought therefore they are limited. And therefore you have the Christian prayers, the Hindu - you follow? The battle is going on with this limitation. Like thought has invented the nation called the Hindu and the nation called the Arab, or the Muslim. Right? Thought is responsible for all this.

So what place has thought? If thought is all our life, then all our life is limited, which is a fact. I may go to the temple, I may pray, I may imagine the immensity, but my life is limited because I am caught in this book of knowledge. That book may be ten volumes but it is still limited. Right?

So can there be a mind which is not burdened by thought, but thought has its place? You have understood this question? Look: as we said, experience, knowledge, memory, thought and action; from that action you learn more, so you come back, more knowledge, greater remembrance, thought, action. You are caught in this chain because we are functioning on knowledge all the time and we are seeking that which is not knowledge through knowledge. You understand? I wonder if you have grasped this? Right? We are seeking as human beings something which is not knowledge, which is beyond knowledge, which is really the most profoundly sacred. Not all the inventions of thought, those are not sacred. Thought is not sacred. So we have to find out, discover for ourselves, the place of knowledge, which is, I must have knowledge of English to speak English. If you are a Frenchman you must have knowledge of French and so on. So you have to find out the place, where knowledge is necessary. You understand? To go from here to your home knowledge is necessary. To drive a car knowledge is necessary. To write a letter, to talk to somebody, knowledge is necessary. And know that knowledge is limited. Then find out why you accumulate psychological knowledge. You understand? I wonder if you understand all this? Are you getting tired? You should! Because you are not listening to me, you are thinking, you are watching, you are learning - not learning from the

speaker, learning by observing yourself. Observing that your actions are based on knowledge, experience, knowledge and therefore your actions are always limited, and therefore they always bring conflict. There is no holistic action. That is, if you are a tribal minded Hindu, then you will never understand a global relationship of human beings because you are tethered to some idea that you are a Hindu. So you have to learn to find out where knowledge is necessary, and where knowledge is not necessary. I will show you if we have time.

From childhood we are hurt, we are wounded, the parents wound us by scolding us, telling us what to do, what not to do, bully us. In the school the teacher or the fellow students hurt us, in college, in the universities, comparison is a process of hurting - you are better than me therefore I am hurt. We are all, from childhood we are hurt. That memory of that hurt remains. Can one not be free of the feeling of being hurt altogether? That is, be free of the knowledge of being hurt. You understand? Oh, come on sirs. So that your mind is free from hurt. So we are saying psychological knowledge, which we will go into much more deeply later on, is totally unnecessary because that is what is making the conflict. That is the structure of the 'me', the I, the ego. That invents a super ego, super consciousness which is to be brought down, and all the game you play. But this accumulation of psychic, psychological knowledge is the essence of what you are. So when there is freedom from hurt, which is the knowledge that you have gathered through life, that you have been hurt, and hold on to that, that knowledge is totally unnecessary, whereas the other knowledge is necessary. Now can you be free of your hurt? If you

are aware of it, most people are not because they have become utterly insensitive to it, they accept everything, the squalor, they accept everything, don't you? The poverty, the habits, the traditions, you know, specially in this country you have become used to everything. You never question, you never doubt, you never ask, you never...

So, hurt begins when you have an image about yourself. When you have an image that you are a great man, somebody comes along and says, 'Don't be silly' and you get hurt. As long as you have an image about yourself, whether you are beautiful, whether you are extraordinarily talented, that you are better than somebody else, and so on and so on, you have built that image from childhood. Either your mother, your father, has given you that image, which you strengthen by thinking more about it, and that image gets hurt. Right? So find out whether you can live without a single image. Which is to observe yourself having images and those images get hurt, and the consequences of that hurt is neurotic behaviour, frightened, more and more withdrawing, isolating yourself and so on, the consequences of that hurt. That is, the accumulated knowledge that you have kept as being hurt is the essence of that image. Now can you live without a single image about yourself? Or about anybody? That is, to have no image is the essence of humility, which has never been touched by vanity. You understand?

So, sirs, we had better stop now. We will meet again tomorrow, if you want to, and we will continue with this conversation together. (Clapping) Don't clap sirs, it is not necessary.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 24TH JANUARY 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday evening? We were talking over together the activity of thought, thought that has created the atom bomb and thought that has created marvellous communications, the thought that has created wars, thought that has brought about division among people, thought that has specialized in so-called religion. Thought has been both beneficial and destructive. We also went into the question: what is the origin and the beginning of thought? We went into that too.

And we should also talk over together this evening what is relationship, what is the nature of human relationship. Because, as we said yesterday, we are concerned with our daily life, not with some abstractions, not with some theories and speculative assertions, but rather look at things as they are, both at the outside world and the world in which we live inwardly. We talked about human consciousness and its content, into which we shall go much further later on. And also we talked about, together, why human beings are what they are - confused, seeking security, both outwardly and inwardly, uncertain, unhappy, constant struggle, pain, suffering. That seems to be the lot of human beings. And that has continued for millennia upon millennia, thousands upon thousands of years. And human beings have not changed very much. They are modified somewhat but they continue to live a life of conflict. And apparently no one has been able to solve this problem, either through meditation, which has also become another

conflict or through various forms of systems, sociological, political, religious, and none of them have been able to resolve our human problems. And we were asking yesterday why, after these millennia, we are what we are - shrunken human beings, both emotionally, intellectually and of course religiously.

And we said too yesterday, please, this is not a lecture, as it is generally understood. This is a conversation, a dialogue between two people: you and the speaker. They are talking over together their problems in a friendly way, not asserting anything, not forcing each other to accept certain dogmas, theories or ideals. They are walking together down a lane, crowded with trees and birds and the beauty of the land around them. They are walking together as two good friends. That is our relationship between you and the speaker. He is not directing you, he is not leading you, he is not helping you. But together we are going to look at our problems. And if possible resolve them. That is our relationship between you and the speaker, that he is not doing any kind of propaganda, he is not certainly your guru because one has to live one's life not dependent on another politically, religiously and so on, one has to have the strength, the vitality, the energy, the drive to live correctly. We are going to discuss all these problems, not only the problems of everyday life but also the problems of fear, pleasure, pain, sorrow, love, compassion and ultimately that problem of death. And at the end of the talks we are going to discuss together what is meditation. The speaker has purposely put meditation at the end, not at the beginning of his talks because unless you put your house in order, unless there is inwardly order, not confusion, not disorder, it is utterly meaningless to meditate,

which we will go into completely, thoroughly, during all these four more talks that are left.

So we are going to talk over together this evening the relationship between human beings, between a human being and nature, which is the relationship between yourself and the environment. The environment is not only the city, or the town or the village you live in, but also the environment of nature. If you have no relationship with nature you have no relationship with man. Nature, which is the meadows, the groves, the rivers, all the marvellous earth, the trees and the beauty of the earth, if we have no relationship with that, we shall have no relationship with each other, because thought has not created nature, like the tiger, thought hasn't made it, the waters of an evening, with the stars on it, the beauty of it, thought has not created it. Thought hasn't created the vast mountains, the snowcapped mountains against the blue sky, the evening sunset and the lonely moon when there is no other star. So thought has not created nature. Nature is a reality and what we have created between human beings is also a reality, but a reality in which there is conflict, there is struggle, everyone is trying to become something, both physically and inwardly, psychologically, psychically, and if I may use that word spiritually. We are all struggling to become something. And when one is trying to become ambitious, competitive, trying to achieve some status politically or religiously, then you have no relationship with another, nor with nature

I doubt if many of you who live in cities with all the crowds, noise, dirt, you know what you live in around, in the environment, probably you have not come across nature. But you have this

marvellous sea, you have no relationship to it. You look at it, perhaps you swim there, but the feeling of this sea with its enormous vitality, enormous energy, the beauty of a wave, the crashing of a wave upon the shore, there is no communication between that marvellous movement of the sea and yourself. And if you have no relationship with that, how can you have relationship with another, with another human being. If you don't perceive that, the sea, the quality of the water, the waves, the enormous vitality of the tide going out and coming in, if you are not aware of that, how can one be aware, or be sensitive to human relationship? Please, this is very important to understand this because beauty, if one may talk about it, is not merely in the physical form but beauty in essence is that quality of sensitivity, the quality of observation of nature.

So we are going to observe together our relationship with each other, between human beings. Have they any relationship at all? Please, as we said, this is not a lecture, this is having a conversation between you and the speaker: we are both looking at the human relationship whether it is personal, intimate, or a relationship that has no actual contact except physical contact. We are going to look into this. Because our whole external world of society is based on human relationship. Society is not an abstraction, it is a fact, that society is built, or put together by thought, by human beings who are greedy, struggling, ambitious, competitive, aggressive, selfish and so we have created a society out of our relationship with each other. This is a fact. It is not a theory. I hope we are understanding this question together.

We want to change society. The Communists have tried it, there

have been revolutions, physical, always physical, shedding a lot of blood and so on. We want to change society, all of us do because it is corrupt, immoral, without any sense of human contact and you cannot possibly change it unless our relationship with each other is completely radically changed. Again that is very obvious. But we always want to change the outer without changing the inner structure of the human mind. Right? Are we together in all this, or am I talking to myself? I don't want your approval, or clapping but we are together examining, looking, being sensitive, to be aware of what we are doing. As we said, this is a serious conversation, not an intellectual or emotional conversation. A very serious man is a religious man. And we are seriously considering human relationship. In that human relationship there is conflict, pain, misery, and there is also so-called pleasure and we are going to look at all these problems: whether it is possible to radically change a relationship in which there is hardly any love.

So we are asking: what is relationship? What does it mean to be related to another? Please, the speaker is asking the question, but we are thinking together about the question. Now human relationship has become a problem. The meaning of that word problem is to be thrown something at you, it is a challenge, flung something at you, that is a problem. Yes? Something thrown at you, something that you have to face, something that you have to understand, it is a challenge. And a challenge needs right approach. So we have to understand what our approach is to a problem. There is the problem of human relationship. It is a problem in everybody's life. If you are aware of it or not, it is there. How do you approach that problem? You understand my question? There is

the problem: how do you come to it, with what mind, with what motive? How do you approach it? How do you come closely into contact with the problem? Is the problem different from the observer who is examining the problem? You are following all this? Probably most of you will find this rather difficult because you have not thought about all these matters at all, so please be patient and let's go into it.

Suppose I have a problem, whatever the problem is, is not important for the moment, but suppose I have a problem. How do I look at that problem? How do I examine that problem? What is my response to that problem? So the problem is not important but how you approach it. Right? Is that clear? I have a problem and how do I approach it? Am I afraid of the problem? Or I want to run away from the problem? Or I want to suppress the problem? Or rationalize the problem? Or I have a motive that I must find an answer to the problem? So I approach the problem with all my confusion, with all my uncertainty, fear. Right? So the problem is not so important as my approach to the problem. Right? So we have to find out what is your approach to the problem, how you come to it. What is your motive if you have a problem? Your motive is to resolve it, if you are aware of that problem at all. You want to resolve it because it is painful. If the problem was most pleasurable it is not a problem. But when the problem becomes painful, confusing, bringing about insecurity then you have to look at the problem, then you have to investigate the problem. So please, what is important is how you approach the problem.

Please sir would you mind being quiet. Please either you are listening to the speaker, or you are listening to your own thoughts,

confused, or you want to interrupt the speaker. So would you kindly listen to what he is saying.

How do you listen to what he is saying? What is your reception? Of course, you hear it through the sensual ear. Right? You understand English and the speaker is speaking in that language, you understand the word so you hear through the sensual ear, but also there is hearing beyond the word, beyond the verbal interpretation. To listen so that you immediately understand what he is talking about. That is the art of listening. We are asking now, we have problems, and how do you approach the problem? Because your approach will dictate or resolve the problem. So find out how you approach any problem. It is very simple if it is a scientific problem, you approach it with all the knowledge you have, and try to discover further information about matter, about the atom and so on. If you have a problem, do you approach it with all the past knowledge, with all the past remembrances; or do you approach the problem as though for the first time? Do you understand my question? Are you following? No, you are not, I see you are not following it.

Let's approach it differently. What actually is our relationship between man and woman? Apart from sexual relationship, is there any relationship at all? Or each one, going separately, in their own way, never meeting, except sexually? Like two railway lines never meeting. Right? That is our relationship is it not? No? So our relationship is merely sensory relationship, sexual relationship, and the relationship between each other is based on the images we have built about each other. Right? Are you aware of all this? Am I talking Greek, or Chinese? Are you aware of all this? What

actually is your relationship with another? Or you have no relationship at all? Except sexual. If you have no relationship with each other, which I am afraid is the fact, then what is your life? Life is relationship, without relationship you cannot exist. But we have reduced that relationship to mere sensory responses. I wonder if one is aware of this complexity of relationship. You cannot escape from it by becoming a hermit, a sannyasi, a monk, you cannot escape from having human relationship.

So we must examine very closely why human beings have lost not only relationship with nature but also with each other. You understand? Why? As we pointed out yesterday, merely seeking the cause will not bring about the resolution of the problem. You may find the cause. I will show you the cause but the understanding of the cause, the examination of the cause, will not solve the problem. Right? I know for example we are selfish, totally self-centred and we are self-centred because it is our habit, it is tradition, it is our religious upbringing, you are a separate soul, you must seek your own salvation and so on. This emphasis on being selfish, self-centred through education, through pressure, it has existed from time immeasurable. That is the cause of all this misery. Right? That is the cause. We understand that intellectually. And discovering the cause does not make us less selfish. So we said, as yesterday, what is important is not the analytical process of discovering the cause but remaining with the problem, which is, we are selfish. That is a fact. And therefore there is no relationship with each other. Each goes his own way. Divorces are multiplying, in Europe and in America, and it is also coming here more and more, when women can earn their own livelihood, they walk out

on men. So gradually there is the world in which hardly any relationship with each other exists, so we become very callous, self-centred, pursuing our own way. That is, our way is to become something. Right? Become more rich, become the chief executive, or become the high priest, the archbishop and so on. There is all the struggle to become something, which is essentially selfish.

Now you have heard this, which we all know. When you hear such a statement what is your reaction to it? Do you accept it and say, 'Yes, what you say is absolutely so' and just let it go? Or you hear it, see the truth of it and remain with that truth so that it operates without your operating on selfishness? Do you understand what I am saying? No, no.

Let's look at it: suppose I am selfish and I say I must not be selfish. That is thought has brought about selfishness. Right? It has structured selfishness. So thought says I must not be selfish, so there is conflict between the fact and what thought wants it to be. Right? No, you are not getting it. I don't know what has happened to all your minds. Come on, let's go into it. Suppose I am violent, we human beings are violent. suppose I am violent. That is a fact. That is so. But I invent non-violence, which is non-fact. Right? I am violent. I do not know how to deal with it, what to do with it. I either indulge in it or try to understand it, try to go into it. And I think it will help me if I have the idea of non-violence, which this country has been preaching endlessly, without any result. So conflict arises between 'what is' and 'what should be'. The 'what is' is fact, the 'what should be' is non factual. So can we drop the non-factual, the ideal, the 'what should be' but only be concerned with 'what is', which is violence? Right? That is a problem. You have

the human problem, we want peace but yet we are violent. So the fact is we are violent. How do you approach that fact? How do you look at that fact? What is your intention when you look at that fact? Either you want to suppress it or run away from it, or transcend it, which is that you are not really then facing the fact, you are trying to escape from it. You are following all this? So we are saying: remain with the fact, not translate the fact, not try to run away from the fact, look at it, be with it. When you are with it you give all your attention to it, but when you say, 'I must transcend it', 'I must escape from it', 'I must pursue non-violence', you are wasting your energy. You are following all this? Therefore we are saying, remain with that fact which you call violence, understand it, learn all about it. And you can only learn by watching. Right?

Now, just a minute, there is a difference between learning and memorizing. All of us have been trained to memorize, whereas we are not learning. Learning is to observe and let what you observe tell its story.

So we are asking: what is our human relationship? How do you if you are married, or if you have a girl friend, or whatever you have, how do you look at her, or him? What is your reaction when you look at your husband, or wife? Or you are totally indifferent? Or you say, 'I have responsibility towards her and my children'. You are following all this? What is your inward true response? Are you going your way and she is going her way, so you never meet, because you are ambitious, competitive, wanting more money, better job and so on and so on, and also she has her own ambitions, her own ideals, so there is no relationship when two people are running parallel. You understand this? Of course, it is so simple

when you look at it.

So then what is relationship in which there is only sexual pleasure, and is pleasure love? I am asking you a question, please find out. Is love sexual pleasure? Is pleasure love? We won't go into the question of what is love, that requires a great deal of understanding, great sensitivity, appreciation of nature as beauty, beauty of form, beauty of a face, beauty of the sky. And without all that sensitive appreciation of nature you will never find out what love is. But if you have reduced life, the living in relationship to sexual pleasure, and each person pursuing his own way, then you will have tremendous conflict, insupportable rebellion, which is going on in our life between man and woman.

So in examining our relationship with each other, intimate or not, one begins to understand, or learn, and find out whether it is possible to live together as two people, man, woman, without any conflict whatsoever. Being sensitive to each other and yet no conflict whatsoever in that relationship. Is that possible? Because our life, our daily continuous life, day after day is a series of conflicts, endless conflicts until we die. And we have never known a life without a single moment of conflict. And is this conflict necessary in relationship? That is, as long as you have an image of her, and she has an image about you, there must be conflict. Right? You build an image about her, or she about you, through habit, through quarrels, through nagging, through encouraging. You are supporting each other through words, through flattery, through insult, all that is building an image about her, and she about you. Right. This is what we are doing. Right sirs? Now, as we asked yesterday, is it possible to live with another person never having an

image about each other? Sir, learn about. That is, I have an image about my wife - I am not married but suppose I have an image about my wife (Laughter) - why do you laugh when I say I am not married? Why do you laugh? Are you laughing because I am a lucky man? Are you laughing because to you laughter is a means of escaping from the fact? So please, we are talking about very, very serious things, about life, about our daily living. Don't pass it off by laughing. We have to face this terrible existence in which there is no happiness, no love.

You see sirs, one is deeply concerned, the speaker is deeply concerned in bringing about a transformation in the human mind. He is concerned. He feels it is a tremendous responsibility and therefore he is talking about it. That as we are living now, utter selfishness, callous, indifferent, brutal, insensitive, we are destroying each other. And we are asking: is it possible to live without a single conflict in our relationship? I say, the speaker says it is possible, completely possible, though he is not married, the speaker has lived with a great many people, in their houses, friends and so on, not to build an image about anybody. You know what that requires? A very quick mind, not a mind that is clogged with knowledge, clogged with remembrances, clogged with experiences, but a mind that is very quick, alert, watchful. Watchful of what is happening around you, in the street, when you get into a bus, or when you get into a train, an aeroplane, or when you are walking along the street, to watch, to look, be sensitive to everything that is happening around you, then you become very sensitive to your relationship. And is it possible to live a life in which there is no conflict whatsoever?

First of all, understand the question, the beauty of that question: to live a life, not ideally, not as an ideal which you must achieve, but the fact whether you can live a life without a single conflict. The question itself has great beauty in it. You put that question because you are sensitive, you are aware of this enormous conflict between human beings, which ends up in war, in divorce, in total neglect of each other, callousness, and all that. But if you put to yourself the question whether you can live a life in which struggle, conflict, can ever end, if you put that question seriously to yourself then that question will begin to evolve, the question itself will stir up a great many problems and you have to face those problems. And in facing them there must be no motive, there must be no struggle to understand it. Look at it. Have you ever been to museums, some of you? You have, I am sure. Have you ever looked at a picture? Not compared the picture of Rembrandt or the modern art, just looking at one picture without comparing it with other pictures? Have you ever done it? Just to remain with that one picture, sit in front of it and look at it? Then the picture will tell you its story. What the artist wanted you to understand. But if you come to look at that picture by comparing if he is as good as somebody else, then you are not looking at that picture. Right? So similarly you are the story of mankind. Right? In you is the residue of all man's endeavour, all man's suffering, his anxiety. Look sirs, you as a human being are not alone, you are like the rest of mankind: you suffer, you have pain, you are seeking security, uncertain, confused, agony, in pain and so is the man in Europe, or in America, or in Russia, or in China. So there is a continuity of human suffering of which you are. You are the rest of mankind,

you are the mankind. So you are not alone, you are not in consciousness, as consciousness something separate, you are the rest of mankind. You are not an individual. You are the whole of humanity, because humanity has gone through endless pain, immeasurable sorrow, with occasional flare of joy and love. You are that. So you have to understand that. And the story of mankind is you. So you have to learn how to read the book of mankind which is yourself. You understand all this? Oh god! You are the story of mankind and you have to read that book. Either you read it page by page, which is know all the content of suffering, pain, joy, pleasure, the terrible anxiety and agony, or you skip, you say, 'I know all about it'. Or by reading the first chapter you have understood the whole book. Do you understand all this?

Sir, knowing oneself, which is self-knowing, is important in relationship. If you don't know yourself, what you are, all your troubles, your anxieties, your uncertainties, desire for security, if you don't understand all that, how can you understand your wife or your husband? They will remain two separate entities. So relationship means not only physical contact, which is sexual, but having no image about each other. Therefore there is immediate sensitive relationship in which there is love. Love is not remembrance. Love is not the picture which thought creates about her. That is not love. Love is not pleasure. I wonder if you understand all this?

So sirs, it is important to understand the nature and the structure of relationship. To change this corrupt society you must change yourself radically. And during all these talks we are concerned about that only: to bring about a mutation in the very mind, in the

very cells of the brain. The speaker has discussed this problem with scientists, brain specialists, whether the brain, which has been conditioned through time, to function within the area of knowledge, whether that brain can radically be changed; and it can radically be changed when there is a total insight into the whole human problem. Insight is not remembrance. I won't go into it now because it is too complex. So please understand what our conversation is about, which is in our relationship with each other, as two friends, walking along a beautiful lane full of trees and birds, and shadows, numberless, we are investigating the nature of the brain, the mind, nature of our heart, whether in that structure, whether there can be total transformation so that we are different human beings, with different minds, with compassion. So please do become serious some time, not just during the talk, but be serious through life. To be really profoundly serious is to be religious - not the religion of going to temples, doing puja and all that kind of stuff, that is not religion. The man who is diligent in his seriousness, that man is a truly religious man.

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 30TH JANUARY 1982

We are going to talk over together the question of fear. But before we go into that I think we should learn the art of hearing. How to listen, not only to the speaker but to listen to those crows, listen to the noise, listen to your favourite music, listen to your wife or husband. Because we don't actually listen to people, we just casually listen and come to some kind of conclusion, or seek explanations, but we never apparently actually listen to what somebody else is saying. We are always translating what others are saying. I am sure as we are going to talk over together this evening the very complex problem of fear, we aren't going to go into too many details but explain the whole movement of fear, and how you understand it, either verbally or actually. There is a difference between the comprehension of words and the comprehension of the actual state of fear. We are apt to make an abstraction of fear, that is, make an idea of fear. But we never listen, apparently, to the voice of fear that is telling its story. And we are going together this evening to talk about all that.

And we ought also to consider the necessity of scepticism and doubt. Doubt not what others are saying only, but doubt one's own experiences, one's own thoughts, one's own attitudes and values, why we do certain things in life, why we believe. We should have a rational doubt, scepticism, because doubt cleanses the mind, it freshens the mind, it will break down the old habits, the old conclusions, the archaic concepts. So doubt, scepticism, are necessary, not only what the speaker is saying but also doubt your

behaviour, your attitudes and so on. So please during these talks having a rational doubt. You know it is like having a dog on a leash, if you keep him all the time on the leash you break the spirit of the dog, but you must let the leash go and let him run because then he becomes alive. So similarly if you doubt all the time then it doesn't lead anywhere, but know when to release and when to hold it in check. That requires intelligence. But to doubt when you release, why you release the dog, your acceptance and so on, unless the mind quickens the thought, awareness.

So please, as we said, we are talking over together. This is not a lecture, where you listen, you are told, or given certain concepts, certain formulas, certain cliches, and you accept them and go home. But here we are not lecturing; we are having a conversation. Like two people having a friendly conversation to find out, to enquire deeply. And I hope you are going to do this, not merely listen to the speaker but also use the speaker as a mirror in which you see yourself. And when you have seen yourself you can throw away the mirror. The mirror is not important. So we are going together to enquire into the very complex problem of fear, why man, millennia after millennia, has sustained, nourished, borne the burden of fear. That has been one of the deep conscious, as well as unconscious factors in life. We are all afraid of something or other, ultimately the fear of death, fear of punishment and so accept reward. Because we are always balancing between reward and punishment. Please watch this in yourself, not just the speaker's words.

So why has man not been able to solve this problem of fear? There are many forms of fear: you may be frightened of the dark,

you may be frightened of the future, or frightened of the past, frightened of your husband or your wife, frightened of your guru. You may adore him, you may worship him, that is your own affair, but there is always the lurking of fear behind. So we must examine this problem very closely.

Fear is a movement. It is not static. It is a movement. And it is the aggregate of many other factors - aggregate being the summation, bringing together of all the other factors or the movements that bring about fear. And we are going to examine together please, together, the movements, which are comparison, desire for security. We are going to go into all that, desire for security, authority, desire, time, thought. These are all the various movements of fear. And we are asking whether man can ever be free of fear at all because fear is a dreadful thing. It darkens our lives, from fear we act neurotically, where there is fear there is no love. We are asking whether man can ever be free of this terrible burden? One may not be conscious of it. It may be lurking in the deep unconsciousness, in the deep recesses of one's own brain. You may say, 'I am not afraid, I have no fear', but that is a superficial statement. But most people go through fear and agony of fear. And from that agony there are a great many sorrowful actions, neurotic actions, unethical actions, immoral actions. So please listen carefully, not only to the speaker, listen to your own fear. Don't run away from it, we will hold it together and examine closely what brings about this fear.

We said first of all comparison. We are always comparing ourselves with somebody else. We start this in schools, better marks and so on, right through college, university, this sense of

constant comparison. Have you ever tried not to compare at all? That is, of course, you have to compare between two cars, between two materials, if you are choosing furniture you have to compare. But when you compare psychologically then there is always a root of fear in it, the root of fear is there. I compare myself with you; you are very clever, very intelligent, bright, alive, aware, sensitive. And through comparison I say I am not, I am dull compared to you. If I do not compare myself with you, what happens to me? Am I dull? Or I am what I am? And from there I start to find out. But if I am all the time comparing with you who are bright, nice looking, then I am running away from myself, trying to imitate, trying to conform to the pattern you have set. You are following all this? So is it possible to live inwardly, psychologically, psychically without any sense of comparison because comparison is one of the movements of fear? Do we understand? See the danger of comparison, which maintains fear. You are something great, I want to be like you, and if I am not like you I begin to get depressed, all the other factors enter into it. So please discover for yourself, if you can live without any comparison whatsoever. Inwardly, of course, not outwardly because you are taller, shorter and different colour. But inwardly to have no comparison, which doesn't mean that you are vain, that you are arrogant, but if I am comparing myself with you I can never discover what I am. I am always conforming to what you think I am. So that is one of the factors of fear.

Then we are always seeking security, both physically and psychically, that is, inwardly, psychologically we are seeking security. Outward security like a house, food, shelter is absolutely

necessary, obviously, otherwise you and I wouldn't be sitting here. So we must have that security. But that security is denied to all people when each one of us is seeking security for ourselves. Right? You are following this? Look sirs: this is a very complex question of security, the search for security, this movement that each of us inwardly as well as outwardly is seeking security. Security being protection, stability, a sense of certainty, a state of mind that is not confused, to be completely secure. Outwardly it has become almost impossible to be secure because there is division between nations, there is division between races, there is division between linguistic differences. I hope you are following all this. There is the division of nationalities which is bringing about the destruction of security for all human beings. This is so obvious. But we human beings, we live in a state of tribalism. See what we are all doing. Either we are Parses, or Hindus, or Buddhists, or Christians, you know, or belonging to some sect, belonging to some guru, and all the rest of it. So this is a form of seeking security outwardly. Inwardly is there security at all? Please question it. Suppose I depend for my security on some concept I have, some belief I have, that belief, that concept, that conclusion gives me a sense of security. I may seek security in knowledge, or in some form of illusion. Right? You are following all this? Illusion. That is, I project an idea, which may be right or wrong, or belief in something that has no rational value and I depend on that, I hold on to that, that gives me a sense of complete security, like a Catholic, he believes in all kinds of extraordinary things, like the Hindus. And in that belief, in that conclusion, in their ideologies there is certain security. But that security can always be thrown

away by reason, by pointing out it becomes insecure. You are following?

So, is there security? I may depend for security, psychologically, on my wife, on my husband. I depend. I am attached, and in that attachment, in that dependence, there is a certain subtle form of security. And also unconsciously there is the doubt that this security may not be real because you might go away tomorrow. So there is always doubt, there is always insecurity in the search of security personally, psychologically. Right? So we are asking - please this is very important to ask and find out - if you can live not with security but with intelligence, because that is the ultimate security, a man who is really intelligent, then in that there is no fear whatsoever. So we have to enquire - by Jove, it is hot! - we have to enquire into what is intelligence.

The word 'intelligence', from the Latin and so on, is not only to read between the lines, you understand, read between the lines. Supposing you receive a letter, in that letter everything is not expressed but you have to have a clear mind to read between the words, get the significance of it. That is part of that intelligence. And also intelligence means to gather a lot of information, a lot of knowledge, and act skilfully with that knowledge, that is partly intelligence. If I am an engineer I gather knowledge all about engineering, the stresses and the strains and the mathematics and so on and so on, and according to that knowledge I act. So that is also part of knowledge. But all such knowledge is limited because it is based on knowledge. Are you following? As we pointed out the other day, knowledge is always limited. Right? And if you seek comfort, security in knowledge, you are seeking security is a very

limited thing, therefore it will always create fear. Or if you have any kind of concept to which you hold, that also will cause fear. But if you see that any dependence, any attachment, any adherence to a belief, is not intelligent, then that very intelligence gives you security. Is this clear somewhat? Are we making this clear? No? All right.

I hold on to some image I have, image of god, image of some concept and so on. In that I find a great deal of security, I find I am protected. But the god, the belief is a projection of my thought. Right? I have projected it as god, and in that I seek security, I feel safe. But when you tell me to examine this very closely I begin to discover that I am doing a very stupid thing and I get frightened and I run away from it. But if I see the truth of what you are saying, which is that thought has projected god and that which thought has projected thought then worships - which is totally unintelligent. But if I see the fact that it is unintelligent there is already intelligence. Therefore in that intelligence there is security. That intelligence is not yours or mine, it is intelligence. Sir, like there is no western thought and eastern thought, there is only thought. The Western may express in one way and you might express it in another but it is still the activity of thought, which is common to all mankind.

So security exists only in intelligence, not in cleverness, not in knowledge. Intelligence is above knowledge and the feeling of belonging, holding on to something. Intelligence is wisdom and wisdom cannot be bought in books. Wisdom is not the repetition of what somebody has said. Intelligence comes - when there is intelligence there is wisdom. And there is only security in this

quality of intelligence which is above all thought.

So this is a movement. That is, we examined comparison, which is competition, which brings fear. We also examined security which also breeds fear. And also we are going to examine together authority. Because the authority of law is one thing. You have to pay taxes, that is one of the laws. That is authority, collective authority for the protection of the collective. Right? We are not questioning that. You can question that, you can question it, change it, politically, religiously and so on. But we are questioning the whole concept of authority, the whole burden of authority which man has carried for millennia.

We are saying one of the causes of fear is authority. Have you ever considered, if you had no authority whatsoever, how would you behave? Social authority, the authority of books, the authority of gurus, the authority of State, the authority of the superior and so on, if you had no authority, would you have fear? Or you do exactly what you want to do, which you are doing now. You are following all this? Are we meeting each other? Or are you merely listening to a talk? We are questioning, and it is right to question, doubt all authority: the authority of a wife, or the husband; the authority of so-called leaders; the authority of the priests, the gurus; the authority of the speaker - the reputation of the speaker, which breeds authority. So why do we obey? Why do we follow? Because in that following, obeying, we feel there is certain security: you know better than I do therefore I follow; you are the authority and I become the slave. It may be pleasurable or unpleasant but I follow you, because in that following I feel gregarious, together, you know what you are doing and I don't so I

will accept it. In that there is also fear. I don't know if you are following all this. Because sirs, we are examining and finding out if it is possible at all, to live absolutely without any shadow of fear. We are then extraordinary human beings.

So we have examined together comparison, security, authority. And we ought to talk over together the factor of desire, because desire is also one of the movements which causes fear. What is desire? Why is man a slave to desire? Why desires predominate our lives? Why religions have suppressed, have said suppress all desire? If you want to serve god you must be free from all desire, from all wanting - why? We are asking not how to suppress desire, how to run away from desire, but to understand the movement of desire, what is the essence of desire? Those crows are making a lot of noise tonight. They are saying probably good-night to each other!

So we are together going to examine, look, observe, not even examine, just observe, as you would observe a beautiful sunset, as you would observe light on water, as you would observe the new moon. Just to observe without any sense of regret, without wanting, changing, just look at something without reward or punishment. So we are going to look together at the whole movement of desire because it is very complex. We are not advocating suppression, or escape, or to deny. We are going to see the nature of it, the structure of it. Right? Are we together in this? We are asking: what is desire, not the objects of desire. The objects may be a shirt, a robe, sari, a car, a house. We are not talking about the objects of desire but desire itself. How it arises and why human beings are so caught up with it. You are waiting for me to explain.

That is the tragedy of the modern mind, they want explanations, they want interpretations or an interpreter who will translate what I am saying because they find it awfully difficult to understand what I am saying, so they need a commentator. This is how we live. We never look, understand, delve into ourselves to find out deeply what is desire, what is love, what is compassion, if there is god, what is death. We never ask passionately. And we are asking this question passionately not intellectually, verbally because desire is one of the strongest motives in our lives. It has tremendous energy. A man who is in an office has great desire to succeed, he works like fury to reach the top, the desire to become enlightened or whatever that may mean, and you practise, struggle, sacrifice, deny. So this is very important to understand what is desire, how it arises, what is its origin. You see when you look at the movement of desire - please just listen to it - when you look at the movement of desire there is great beauty in it, there is great sense of extraordinary vitality in it. So please look at your desire - to be rich, to be poor, to be a sannyasi, to be enlightened, to be, whatever the desire is, sexual, sensory, whatever desire it is, look at it. Hold it in front of you and look at it and see how it arises, what is the origin, the beginning of this extraordinary vitality which is called desire. The speaker will explain but the explanation is not desire, the word is not the fact. So you are looking at your desire and trying to understand what is its origin, its depth, its extraordinary expanse.

Please as I said, you are waiting for me to explain. The speaker will explain in detail but stay with your desire, look at it, hold it like a precious jewel so that you are looking at it greatly, with clear

eyes. You see, sirs, we have become secondhand human beings. We never discover anything for ourselves. We read, we are told, the psychologists, the gurus, the saints, tell us what to do and we follow them. So we have become secondhand, mediocre human beings. And when this problem of desire is explained you will say, 'Yes, I agree with that.' But it is not your discovery, it is not your passionate understanding of it and you are free of something; but always waiting for some explanation, some direction. I will go into it, patience. You know, patience has no time; impatience has. You understand that? Must I explain that? When you are patient now, looking at your desire, patiently looking at it, you are not thinking about time. But when you are impatient to find an explanation, a resolution of it, then you have time. Whereas if you are patient, that is, looking at something which you have to deeply, profoundly understand there is no time at all. And where there is no time there is patience, real patience. I wonder if you understand all this?

What is desire? Why religions throughout the world have said be without it, always associate it with sex. Sannyasis are supposed to be chaste, no sex, but they are burning inside, and so they suppress and go through all the agonies of it. Now we go together, please together, we are going to go into this question of desire. You have to pay a little attention, if you are asleep please wake up because it is very complex, it requires careful, step by step explanation and understanding.

Our brain is the centre of all senses. It is the centre of all the responses of the senses. And we use our senses partially. If you are an eye doctor you only look partially, at the eye, you don't look at the whole human being. If you are a heart specialist you are only

concerned with the heart. You are following all this? The brain is the essence of the senses and its responses. And our brain has been conditioned through millennia to the drive of desire. Right? You are following this? It has become our habit. So in looking at desire you have to be aware of how the brain looks at desire, how it feels it, what is its sensation? All right sir, I will explain. Sensation is the response of our nervous organism, our sense response. You see something beautiful, seeing, then contact with that something beautiful, with that contact there is sensation. Right? I see a beautiful piece of furniture. The seeing of a beautiful piece of furniture, touching it, then sensation from it. Now that is normal. Right? Seeing, touching, contact, then sensation, then thought comes in says, 'I wish I had that furniture in my room.' Which is, thought creates out of that sensation the image of me sitting on that chair in my room. Right? Is this clear? Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought seeing that furniture, creating the image of me sitting on that furniture, so the moment when thought creates the image that is the second desire is born. Have you understood this? This is very simple if you look at it for yourself. I see a beautiful suit, or a beautiful robe, sari, whatever it is - I go inside the shop, touch the material, sensation, then thought creates the image of me in that suit. At that moment when thought creates the image then that is the origin of desire. Got it? You understand this? I see a man riding in a rich car, beautiful car - there are no beautiful cars in this country, but there are beautiful cars - and I see it going by, or I see it in the street, locked. I go up to it, look at it, touch it, then thought says 'I wish I owned that car, sitting in there and driving'. The moment of identification of thought with the image of me sitting in

that car, that is the moment of desire. You understand? This is clear. I am not going to repeat it over and over, it has no meaning.

Now can one be aware, attentive - please listen to this - contact, seeing, perception, contact, sensation, and be aware at the moment when thought creates the image? That requires extraordinary attention, so that the image is never formed. You understand this? I wonder if you see the beauty of it? So that the brain is so active at that moment there is no desire, because thought is not creating the image. So desire, being one of the factors of our life, of our daily life, and in finding out, discovering for ourselves the origin, the beginning of that desire, and seeing that desire has its own fear, because I may not sit in the car, I may not have that dress, or if I do I may spoil it. There is always unconscious fear behind desire. So we have said comparison, seeking security, authority, desire; these are the movement of fear. I haven't finished yet, don't stop there!

There is also the factor of time. Time is fear. That is, if I am killed instantly now I have no fear. But if I think about death, ending, not carrying all my wealth to the next world, which I can't anyhow, so I am afraid. Right? So we ought to consider together what is time. I hope you are not tired. What is time? Time is a movement, which is, from here to there requires time. Right? I live here and I am attending this meeting and I have to go back home, that takes time. From one point to another point requires movement, which is time. Covering the distance requires time. And if I have an ideal, which is, I am violent and I have an ideal on non-violence, if I have, to achieve that non-violence, whatever that may mean, that requires time. So time is according to the watch, chronological time, time by the sun, sunrise and sunset, that is the

outward time. Psychological time, that is, I am this but I hope to be that. I am not good but I will be good. So 'the becoming' requires time. You understand? Please understand this really deeply because you will see something extraordinary if you understand this. Becoming something requires time. To learn a skill requires time. But if I am not good, say I am a hypocrite - much better. I am a hypocrite because I double talk. And I say to myself I must not be a hypocrite. That will take time. If I am aware at all that I am a hypocrite and not wanting to be a hypocrite, that will take time. At least our brain is conditioned to time because the brain itself has evolved through time. It is not your brain, it is the brain of mankind. I won't go into that for the moment, it is too complex.

So there is time to learn a skill, a language, to drive a car, to learn any trade requires time. And I am this, I hope to be that. Now the 'hoping to be that' is unreal. Are you following all this? What is real is 'what is'. 'What is' has no time. Do you understand this? I am so caught up. 'What is' and 'what should be' are two different things. Right? Looking at 'what is', that is, I am not good, that is 'what is. Or rather let's make it much simpler: I am violent. That is 'what is'. But becoming non-violent is not. That is not a fact. So 'what is' has no time. But if I have something in my mind, in my brain which says 'I should not be that, but be that', then that requires time. You are following this? So to remain with 'what is' and the resolution of 'what is' has no time. Do see this. Right? Have you got this?

So, as we said the other day, we are the past, the present and the future. We are the past, modifying itself in the present and continuing the future. We are the time-makers. Right? We can be

free of time or create time. I create time when I say, 'I am this and I should be that', I create time. But I do not create time if I say, this is 'what is' and look at it. In that observation there is no time. The looking without time, which is the past and all that, looking at it dissolves whatever 'what is'. You try it. Do it and you will discover for yourself. Right? We are the makers of time. When I say, 'I hope to be something', that is making time.

So please understand this extraordinary subtle factor that we are creating our own time, and therefore we are a slave to time. Which is, I must achieve something, I must become something, therefore we are creating time. But if you understand the nature of time and remain totally with 'what is' - I am jealous, envious. I am envious. Don't try to transform it into something else. Remain with that envy and look at it, observe it, as you observe it dissolves. In that observation there is no time. Do it. Find out. So time is a factor of fear. I am afraid of the past, or the future, or even the present. So time is a factor of fear. One of the factors of fear is comparison. Don't learn it by heart. Look at it. Comparison, searching for security, which is to deny intelligence, then this whole concept of authority, which makes us slaves, sycophantic, how one grovels in front of authority. I have seen it all over the world, specially in this country. It exists all over the world. You meet a minister and you are all down on your knees; or a guru, or somebody or other in authority. Which is, you are worshipping reputation not the reality.

And also one of the movements of fear is desire. And one of the movements of fear is time. And the other factor is thought. Thought which is the response of memory, memory is the outcome of knowledge, knowledge is experience, that is thought. I think

about the future and I am frightened. Right? I think about what may happen. I am very healthy but I may fall ill. Or I have fallen sick, remembered it and frightened not to be sick again. So thought is the operation of past memory, past experience, past knowledge and thought says, 'I hope all that will not happen in the future' - therefore there is fear, which thought has created. I wonder if you understand all this? I have a job, a good job, but I may lose the job, thought says you might lose it, be sycophantic to the boss. You follow? The whole movement of thought creates fear. So the aggregate of all this, which is the collection of all this, all these movements, is the root of fear. If there is a complete intelligent observation of all this, the root, the cause of all this, then where there is a cause there is an end. Right? Do you see this? That is, there is a cause for ill health. If I see the cause, unless I am utterly stupid, that cause tells me why I am not healthy, then I can act upon it. And then there is health. So where there is a cause there can be an end to it. So we see the whole movement of causation of fear. Right? The whole movement of fear, the cause of all this, of this terrible burden man has carried. When you see it all, aggregated as a whole, not as comparison and all the rest of it, when you see it as a whole movement, the totality of that movement, then there is the complete ending of that, of fear.

Now are you free of fear now? Are you going home and starting the whole business again? You might say, ask the speaker: are you psychologically free of fear? Wouldn't you ask that question? No? Of course it is in your mind. If the speaker says, yes, what value has it to you? The speaker doesn't talk about all this unless he does it himself. Right? Which isn't double talk. Where there is no fear

there is love. Negation of fear is the most positive action. And the negation is the understanding of the whole movement of fear.

And pleasure is another one of our basic pursuits. The pursuit of pleasure. What is the relationship of fear and pleasure? Have you ever asked that question? Or we are merely pursuing pleasure at any cost?

So we have to go into this question, not now, perhaps tomorrow, if you are here and I am here. I am afraid I will be here! Tomorrow we can talk over this. Because you see sir it is no good talking endlessly about these matters, words don't mean a thing unless you live it, unless you absolutely have integrity, when you say, 'I am not afraid' you mean it because you have examined the whole movement of fear. Then you are an extraordinary human being. Then that is real meditation. What we have done this evening, the understanding of desire, is profound meditation. And that requires a great deal of attention, subtlety of brain, quickness of perception, which no amount of reading, following will bring about. What will bring it is your observation of everything around you, the squalor, the dirt, the terrible misery of human beings. And in that perception we see the whole of the human mind, how stagnant it is, how dead it is. So one has to question, doubt, and out of that doubt cleansing, purifying the past, the whole nature, then you are really an extraordinary human being and there is no fear, then gods disappear.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 31ST JANUARY 1982

I would like to remind you, if I may, that this is not an entertainment, an intellectual appreciation, or an emotional gathering. This is rather, a gathering of serious people, I hope, people who are gathered together with serious intent. If you are merely attracted by curiosity I am afraid you will be disappointed. But as we have been saying for the last three talks, we have to exercise our brain, we are not repeating something that you would like, or quoting somebody. We are here, if one may point out, to think together, to exercise our capacity to its fullest extent: capacity to doubt, as we pointed out yesterday, to question, not only what the speaker is saying, but also to question one's own intentions, one's own prejudices, point of view, because that clarifies the brain so that it can think clearly, objectively, not all the time personally. So we are together, as we have been doing for the last three talks that we met here, concerned and committed to the whole complex problem of daily living.

As we were pointing out yesterday, fear has been the common lot of human kind. Every human being in the world is frightened about something or other. We went into that yesterday very, very carefully, step by step, pointed out all the factors that are involved in the culmination, which is fear. We said thought is the origin of fear, thought is time, thought is desire, thought is the factor of comparison, searching for security and so on. We went into that very carefully. And tonight, if you are willing, we should talk about together the whole question of suffering. Talk over together

why human beings lack the energy to solve their own problems, why they look to another to help them, why each one of us is not capable of resolving our own confused, conflicting, contradictory lives. We are always looking for somebody else to solve our problems, politically, economically, socially or in any other direction, even religiously. And here during this gathering, if one may point out, we are not trying to persuade you to think in a particular direction, do any kind of propaganda for any ideal, for any system, for any philosophy, for any belief or religion. But rather together, the speaker means together, to observe our lives, our daily lives, why human beings have become what they are - mediocre, frightened, conflicting life, in their relationship with each other, without any aesthetic sense, without the quality of beauty, why we have become like this.

It is very important to find out for oneself. As we pointed out also yesterday, we have become secondhand human beings; we quote others, we follow others, the psychologists, the philosophers and all the saints and so on have told us what to do, what to think. We never wipe the slate clean so that our brains are fresh. We never read the story of ourselves. The story of ourselves is the story of the rest of mankind, the story which is you. We never read that book, it is not printed in a book, you cannot possibly learn sitting at the feet of another. Nor can you follow another, but you have to observe the extraordinary evolution, which man is, the extraordinary content of his consciousness, what is his consciousness, what he is, why he behaves in this unreasonable way, without any sense of beauty, love, compassion.

So first, if we may, let us look at the book which we are, each

one of us. We are the rest of mankind. Please follow this a little bit, if you will. We are not individuals. Our consciousness, with its content, is like the rest of mankind. Our consciousness, that is what you are, your beliefs, your sorrows, your anxieties, your pain, your miserable existence that you lead, the confusion, the uncertainty, is what every other human being throughout the world goes through, whether they live in America, Russia, or here, or in China, they suffer, they are uncertain, they are caught up in innumerable dogmatic beliefs, as one is. So please observe, look at it. Don't deny it, don't hold on and say, 'I am an individual', look at it carefully.

Your consciousness, what you are, not physically, but inwardly, psychologically, your beliefs, your search for security, fear, pursuit of pleasure, worship of images, is like the rest of the world, only modified, civilized, or uncivilized. Either it is merely a tribal or it is highly sophisticated rational conclusion, but the consciousness of each one is the common consciousness of all mankind. So you are not an individual. This is very difficult to accept because we are conditioned by religion, by education, by society, that each one of us is separate, seeking his own particular salvation, his own particular enlightenment; but when you observe this very closely and carefully, totally impersonally, if you can, then you will see that we are like the rest of the world, like every other human being who is sitting next to you, or sitting miles away. He goes through what you are going through. Physically, bodily he may be taller, fairer, capable, but consciousness, the inward content of your being, is like the rest of the world. So you are the world and the world is you. It is logical, sane, rational. You cannot possibly deny

this fact, though you may cling to your individuality, this is the real actual fact: that we are actually the rest of mankind. And we ought to be able to read our lives, which is the rest of mankind, the book of history, of which we are.

So let us enquire together if one is capable of reading the book - I mean the book in the sense, what you are. To look at what you are. And as I said, what you are is the content of your consciousness, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, both the obvious and the hidden, the superficiality and the depth of it. We ought to be able together to read this book. So we have to look at our consciousness. That is, to observe silently without any direction, just to observe what you are. You are obviously a name, a form, you have certain characteristics, idiosyncrasies, capacities, skills, certain limited energy. That is the outward clothing of man. Inwardly, deep inside us, there is a craving for comfort, for security, a craving for some kind of protection from this hideous world, because the world is becoming more and more dangerous because of overpopulation, division of nationalities, division of religions, all the separate States preparing for war. So the world is becoming terribly dangerous. I wonder how many of you realize this fact? Each nation is buying armaments beyond their own financial limitations, piling up instruments of war to kill each other. And here we sit discussing, talking over together casually, not facing this enormous reality that the world is becoming, for which we are responsible. We have created this society, we have created these wars, or the preparation for war, each one of us is responsible because we pay tax, we are supporting all the industries in the world to prepare cannons, all those terrible things

they are preparing to kill each other. For that we are responsible. And I am afraid we do not feel responsible at all. That is one of the tragedies. Please this is not rhetoric, it is not an intellectual froth. This is actuality that is taking place under your noses. And we seem so utterly indifferent, utterly callous.

So together, if one may, let us look at ourselves as if in a mirror. What you see in a mirror is not distorted, it is what you are. Thought can distort it, thought can say, 'I don't like what I see', thought can say, 'I get depressed when I look at myself'. But when you are looking in a mirror you can't change your face, it is there. So similarly let us look in the mirror very carefully. The mirror is the relationship between each other. In that relationship, if you are aware, if you are sensitive, actively watching, all the reactions that take place, in that relationship is the mirror in which you see exactly what is taking place. Right? Are we following each other? Or as I pointed out the other day, am I talking to myself? Or are you serious? And it is only the person who is serious that lives, it is only the person that is profoundly serious, he is a religious man.

So what are you? Apart from a name, a form, perhaps if you are lucky a bank account, perhaps a skill, apart from all that what are you? Are we not suffering? Or suffering doesn't exist in your life? Is there fear? Is there anxiety? Greed? Envy? Worshipping some image which thought has created? Frightened of death? Clinging to some concept? A contradiction, saying one thing and doing another? So we are all that. Our habits, our inanities, the endless chatter that goes on in the mind, all that is what we are. And the content of consciousness makes consciousness, and that consciousness has been evolving through time, through tremendous

experiences, pains, sorrow, and all that. Now we are asking: can one be free of all that? Free from all sense of fear? Because where there is fear there is no love. And we are going to go into all that this evening. Where there is no sensitiveness, and that sensitiveness cannot exist if there is self-centred activity all the time, without that sensitivity there is no love. And there is no love when there is no beauty. Beauty exists only in the flowering of goodness. Are you understanding all this?

So, sirs, let us first examine and look at what beauty is. Not the beauty of form, which is also nice, the beauty of a lovely tree, the beauty of a green field, the beauty of a mountain, the majesty of it against the blue sky, the beauty of a sunset, the beauty of a solitary flower in the pavement. We are not being romantic, nor emotional. We are enquiring together: what is beauty? Do you have that sense of beauty in our lives? Or it is becoming so mediocre, meaningless, everlasting struggle from morning until night? So we are asking: what is beauty? Because it is a very serious question. It isn't a sensual question, nor a sexual question. Because without beauty in your heart you cannot flower in goodness. So what is beauty? When you look at a mountain, or the blue sea, when you look at it, if you have ever looked without chattering, without making noise, if you have really paid attention to the blue sea, the beauty of the water, the beauty of light on a sheet of water. And when you see such extraordinary beauty of the earth, with its rivers, lakes, mountains, when you look at it, what actually takes place? We will go into it, but first look at something which you have seen which is actually marvellously beautiful: a statue, a poem, a lily in the pond, or a well-kept lawn. And when you see such a piece of beauty -

when you see such, not piece - when you see beauty what takes place? At that moment, the very majesty of a mountain makes you forget yourself. Have you ever been in that position? When you have you see that you don't exist, only that grandeur exists. But a few seconds later or a minute later the whole cycle begins, the confusion, the chatter. So beauty is where you are not. Have you understood this? Do you understand sir? Oh, what a crowd! The tragedy of it. Truth is where you are not. Beauty, love, is where you are not. Because we are not capable to look at this extraordinary thing called truth.

So sirs, let us look first at our suffering, whether man can ever end his suffering, not only his personal suffering, which we will also go into, but the suffering of humanity - the humanity that has put up with a thousand wars. Think of all the men and women maimed, hurt. There is sorrow in the world, a global sorrow. And also there is sorrow of your own. They are not two separate sorrows. Please see this. I may suffer because my son is dead. And also I am aware that my neighbour's wife also is dead. I am also aware, it is the same throughout the world. It has been like this for millennia, for thousands upon thousands of years and we have never been able to resolve it. We may escape from it, we may do puja, ceremonials, we may invent all kinds of theories, that it is our karma, it is our past, but suffering is there, not only yours but the whole of humanity. We are asking: can that suffering ever end? Or is it the condition of man that he must continue from time immemorial to the ending of time, suffering. He must suffer, that is his condition. If you accept that, which I hope you don't, if you accept that then you will continue to suffer endlessly. You get used

to it as most of us do. But if you don't accept that, what is your position? That human beings in the world, and you who are also a human being, suffer, will you take time to end that suffering? As we said yesterday and in other previous talks, not only here but in the rest of the world, we said you are the past, the present, and the future. You are that. You are the master of time. And you can shorten the time or lengthen the time. That is, if you are violent and you say, 'I will become non-violent', that is extending time. During that interval of time you are being violent, and there is no end to that kind of activity. Whereas if one realizes that you are the master of time, which is an extraordinarily important thing to find out, to realize, time is in your hands. Which means facing the fact of violence, not pursuing non-violence, but facing the fact of violence, and in that observation there is no time at all because in that observation there is neither the observer, nor all the past accumulation, there is only pure observation. In that there is no time. Right?

Are you doing this? When the speaker is talking about it are you actually seeing the truth of it and therefore you are doing it? Suppose I have a habit, a peculiar habit, both physically and psychologically, can those habits end immediately? Or I will take time to end a habit? You understand my question? That is, suppose I smoke - I don't - but suppose I smoke, probably many of you do, I don't know why, but you do. Can you end that habit immediately? The craving of the body for nicotine is different from the perception that you are the master of time, you can shorten the time, therefore that perception is not a decision not to smoke. I wonder if you follow all this? Is this too difficult? Are we

understanding each other? Oh, do tell me for god's sake.

You see sir, one can end sorrow, and then only there is passion. You understand the difference? Passion is not lust. Lust is sensual, sexual, it is full of desire, pictures, pursuits of pleasure and so on. Passion is not. You must have passion to create, not babies but passion to bring a different world, different human beings in the world, passion to change the society in which one lives; without that tremendous passion one becomes mediocre, soft, unclear, lacking integrity and so on.

So my son is dead and I suffer. I shed tears, I go to all the temples in the world. I have put all my hope in that son and he is gone. And I have a craving that he will live somewhere else and I hope I will meet him somewhere, in the next life, or somewhere or other. We are always playing that. So my son is dead and I suffer. Suffering is very painful, tears, other people's comfort, my own search for comfort away from that pain does not resolve that pain, the tremendous sense of loneliness. So can I look at it, be with it, without any kind of escape? Without any kind of rational explanation for this death of my son. Without saying reincarnation, this or that, can I remain completely, wholly, with that feeling of great pain? Then what takes place? I hope you are doing this with the speaker. Don't just listen to it. This is not a lecture. This isn't something you are being told what to do. This is not an intellectual play, this is our life, daily existence. The person one loves may go away - jealousy, anxiety, hatred. This is our life and we suffer. My son has gone, cremated, gone. I can't tolerate the idea that he has gone. So without any sentiment, without any emotion, can I remain with that pain, the pain of loneliness. You know most of us know

loneliness, don't we? Or is that too abstract? You know what loneliness is, don't you? Yes sir? That is, that loneliness is when you are totally isolated from all relationship, you suddenly find yourself in a crowd but you are utterly lonely, alone. That is part of sorrow, to find such a state. And when my son dies I am lonely. And can I look at that loneliness, observe that loneliness without any past memories? And to observe without the observer? You understand all this? I will tell you, I will show you sir, we will talk about it together.

When one is angry, at that moment of anger, which is a reaction, at that second there is neither the observer nor the observed - have you noticed? There is only that reaction which is called anger. A few minutes or a few seconds later, the observer says, 'I have been angry'. So the observer separates himself from anger and then says, 'I have been angry'. But the observer is the observed. Anger is not different from me, I am anger. I am greed. I am frightened. I am all that. But thought says, 'I must control, I must escape from fear', so thought then creates the observer different from the observed, and in that state there is conflict. Whereas the fact is the observer is the observed, that is, anger is you, anger is not different from you. So similarly you are - not you - I have lost my son. I am in that state, observing without any movement of thought, which is to give total attention to that thing called pain, to that thing called loneliness which brings about such despair, such neurotic activity. So can I remain with that sense of intense sorrow, pain, shock, without any single movement or shadow of thought, that is, to give complete attention to it. And you cannot give complete attention if you are trying to escape from

it, that is a wasting of energy, whereas if you give your total attention you are then all the energy focused on a point which you call suffering. When you do that you understand the whole significance and the depth and the beauty of such an extraordinary fact. And then suffering ends. When there is the ending of suffering there is passion. And with the ending of suffering there is love.

What is love? Have you ever asked? Have you ever asked your husband or your wife what is love? No answer! You daren't! Now we are going to ask: what is love? Do I love anybody? You know what that means? Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love attachment? Please consider all this. Is love jealousy? Or love has now become a sexual act? So we are going together to see the quality of a mind or a brain that loves. Do you love your children? Or do you feel responsible for them? Your duty? Have you ever considered whether you love your children? You will say, 'Of course.' But we are asking this seriously. If you loved your children would you want them to be what you are? Would you answer that? Or would you want them to be totally different from you? Do you want them to follow your trade, your business, because you are an industrialist, your son wants to be industrialist, you want them to be industrialists? Or are you concerned that he should grow in goodness, flower in beauty? Or are you preparing him for war, to kill and be killed? Is all that love? I know you will say, 'We can't help what we are. We can't help our children. We send them off to school and that is the end of it. Only we want them to get married, settle down' - as you have settled down, in mediocrity, lack of integrity, say one thing and do another, go to the temple and be an

excellent lawyer. That is a contradiction. You want your children to be like that? If you loved them would you do this?

So what is love? Please this is a very serious thing. Don't say, 'Does it exist in the rest of the world?' - we are asking you: what is love? Is love jealousy? Is love attachment? I am attached to my wife; what a tragedy it all is, isn't it? I am attached, if I am married, thank the lord I am not, if I am attached to my wife, what are the implications of that attachment? Is that love? I am attached to her, I depend on her, both physically, psychologically, she helps me, I help her, I am attached. That is, I am frightened that she may leave me - it is happening more and more. When the girls are becoming educated they are going to be more free. It is happening in this country, it is happening in Europe - divorce. And if I am attached to her I am anxious that she shouldn't leave me, she mustn't look at another man, she must remain faithful to me. I must possess her, dominate her. And she wants to be possessed and to be dominated. Is all that love, in which there is fear, jealousy, where there is jealousy there is hatred, antagonism - is all that love?

So to deny, to negate everything that is not love, is love. Deny, negate jealousy, completely. Negate totally attachment. Negate every form of possessiveness. Then out of that comes, through this total negation, love. That is through negation you come to the positive. And the most positive thing is love. And one of the odd things about love is: do what you will, that will be correct if you love. You understand? When there is love, action is always right, under all circumstances. And when there is that quality of love there is compassion. Compassion means passion for all. Compassion cannot exist, nor love, if you belong to any sect, any

group, or to any organized religion. Compassion comes only when there is freedom from all that. And that compassion has its own extraordinary limitless intelligence. So when there is love there is beauty. Love and compassion with their intelligence is the endless truth. To that truth there is no path - not Karma Yoga, Bhakti Yoga and all that, there is no path to truth. But only when there is that immense sense of compassion which comes when there is the ending of sorrow, then that which is, is truth.

BOMBAY 5TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH FEBRUARY 1982

I would like to, if I may, this evening to talk about many things. Perhaps they are interrelated. The speaker doesn't know where to begin. Most of us, the average person, is wasting his life. Most of us waste our life. We have got a great deal of energy and we are wasting it. We spend our days in the office, in the kitchen, or in digging the garden, a lawyer's life, or the life of a sannyasi, or the life of an average person seems at the end of one's life utterly meaningless, without significance. When one looks back, when you are fifty, or eighty, or ninety, what has one done with one's life? Life has a most extraordinary significance, great beauty, great suffering, anxiety, accumulating money, working from eight or nine until five for the rest of one's life. At the end of it all, what have we got out of life? Money, sex, the constant conflict of existence, the weariness, the travail, unhappiness, frustrations - that is all we have. Perhaps occasional joy, or you love someone completely, wholly, without any sense of the self, the 'me' and you.

And there seems to be so little justice in the world. Philosophers have talked a great deal about justice. The social workers are talking about justice. The average man wants justice. But is there justice in life at all? You are clever, well placed, good mind, nice looking, you have everything you want. And another has nothing. You are well educated, sophisticated, free to do what you want. Another is a cripple, poor in mind and in heart. You are capable of writing, speaking, a good human being. The other is not. This has been a problem of thinkers, of philosophers. The word 'philosophy'

means the love of truth, love of life. And perhaps truth is in life, not away from life, not in books, not in some ideas, but truth is where we are, and how we live that life. And when you look around, life seems so empty, meaningless to most people. And can man ever have justice? So as the speaker is sitting on a platform and you are just listening, that is not just. He has been all over the world, talked, televised and you will never have a chance like that. It is most unfair, it is degrading. And so we are asking if there is any justice in the world at all. You are fair, I am dark. You are bright, aware, sensitive, full of feelings, you love a beautiful sunset, the glory of a moon, the astonishing light on the water, you see all that and I don't. You are reasonable, sane, healthy and another is not. So one asks seriously if there is justice in the world at all?

And before law you are all equal, but some are more equal than others. Others have not sufficient money to employ good lawyers. So there is, apparently observing all this in the world, there is very little justice. Some are born high, others low, and where is justice then? It appears there is justice only when there is compassion. And as we pointed out the other day when we met here, compassion is the ending of suffering and that compassion is not born out of any religion or belonging to any cult. You can't be a Hindu with all your superstition and invented gods and yet become passionate, you cannot. Compassion, to have compassion there must be freedom, complete, total freedom from all conditioning. Is that possible? The human brain is conditioned after millions of years. That is a fact. And the more we acquire knowledge about all the things of the earth and heaven, it seems we get more and more

bogged down. And if there is compassion, with it there is that intelligence, and that intelligence has the vision of justice. You see we have invented the word Karma, next life. We are going to go into that question presently. And we think by inventing a word, a system, a something that is to happen in the future, we have solved the problem of justice. Justice begins only when the mind is very clear, when there is compassion. And our brain, which is a very complex instrument, is not yours or the speaker's brain, it is the brain of humanity. Your brain has not developed when you were born until now. That brain has evolved through endless time. So our consciousness which the brain holds is not personal. This consciousness, as we pointed out earlier, is the ground of all human beings, on which they stand.

And when you observe this consciousness with its content - the beliefs, the dogmas, the theories, the concepts, the fears, the pleasures, the agonies, the loneliness, the depression and despairs, all that is our consciousness. It is not your consciousness, it is not the individual that holds this consciousness. Please, it is logical, look at it sanely, rationally. We are so conditioned to think that it is our brain, mine and yours, that we are separate individuals. We are not. We have been talking about it a great deal. Our brains are so conditioned through education, through religion, that we think we are separate entities, with separate souls, separate this and that. We are not individuals at all. We are the result of thousands of years of human experience, human endeavour, of human struggle. And is it possible for the brain to uncondition itself? We are conditioned, therefore we are never free. As long as I live in a concept, in a conclusion, with certain ideas or ideals, the brain is not free and

therefore there is no compassion. Where there is freedom from all conditioning, which is, not being a Hindu, a Christian, a Muslim or a Buddhist, not being caught in any specialization, though specialization is necessary, not give one's life entirely to money, as long as the brain is conditioned, which it is now, there is no freedom for man. You cannot ascend as some philosophers and biologists are saying, there is no ascent of man through knowledge. Knowledge is necessary, to drive a car, to do business, to go from here to your home, the accumulation of technological knowledge and all that is necessary. But the psychological knowledge, the knowledge that one has gathered about oneself, through experience, culminating in memory, memory which is the result of external pressures, and inward demands.

Please, as we said the other day, and if we may we will repeat: this is not a lecture, where you are told what to do, what to think, how to think and so on. This, we are observing together. Not resisting each other, not clinging to our own particular opinions, knowledge and concepts but together looking at the world and ourselves in the world. So it is not a lecture. We are thinking together, not along any particular direction, or coming to any conclusion. But when one observes purely without any barrier, without any impediment, without any prejudice, then that observation itself finds the answer to all our problems. So please bear in mind that we are walking along the same path, looking at the same thing, like two friends talking over their problems amicably, in a friendly spirit, where there is no division between the two of them. Then we can communicate deeply, not merely verbally but non-verbally also, which is much more important. So

please, if one may point out bear that in mind when we are talking over together this evening.

And as we began, our life is broken up, fragmented, divided, it is never whole, we never have holistic observation. We observe from a particular point of view. We are in ourselves broken up. Our life is a contradiction in itself, and therefore there is constant conflict. And we never look at life as a whole, complete, indivisible. The word 'whole' means healthy - to be healthy. And also the word means sanity, and also it means holy - h-o-l-y. That word has great significance. It is not the various parts getting integrated in our human consciousness. We are always trying to integrate various contradictions but is it possible - we are conversing with each other, we are asking each other - is it possible to look at life as a whole? The suffering, the pleasure, the pain, the tremendous anxiety, loneliness, suffering, going to the office, having a house, babies, sex, not as though they were separate activities, but a holistic movement, a unitary action - is that possible at all? Or must we everlastingly live in fragmentation and therefore ever in conflict?

Is it possible to observe the fragmentation and the identification with those fragments? To observe, not correct, not transcend, not run away from it or suppress it, to observe. Our life is so fragmented, broken up and divided, to look at it. Not what to do about it because if you attempt to do 'what to do about it' you are really then acting from a fragment and therefore you are cultivating fragments, divisions. Whereas if one can observe holistically, observe the whole movement of life as one, then conflict not only ceases with its destructive energy but also out of that observation a

totally new approach to life comes. We are talking about our daily life, not some philosophy, not some ideas, not some conclusions. We are talking as two people about our lives. Our lives are broken up. I wonder if one is aware of it at all. And if one is aware then one asks: how am I to bring all this together to make a whole? And who is the entity to bring all these various parts and integrate them? You are following all this? Who is the entity who is trying to bring all the fragments together? The entity, is he not also a fragment? Thought is a fragment. Please - shall we go into that? Do you see that? Thought itself is a fragment because knowledge is never complete about anything. And knowledge is the result of accumulated memory and thought is the response of that memory and therefore it is limited. Thought can never bring about a holistic observation of life.

So can one observe the fragment, the many fragments that we have, which is our daily life, look at it? You are a professor, or you are a teacher, or you are merely a householder, a sannyasi who renounces the world and goes off - these are fragments of our daily life. And to observe the whole movement of these fragments, their separate and separative motives, to observe them all. And we said, also, during these talks, to observe without the observer. The observer is the past, the accumulated memories, remembrances, incidents. He is all that past. That is time. The past is looking at this fragmentation and the past is also the result of other fragmentations. Are you following all this? Are we talking together in all this? So can one observe without time, without the remembrances of the past and without the word? Because the word is the past, the word is not the thing and so we are always looking

through words, through explanations, which are a movement of words. So we never have a direct perception. And that direct perception is insight. And that insight transforms the brain cells themselves. Our brain is conditioned through time and functions in knowledge. And it is caught in that cycle. And to bring about a transformation in the very structure of the cells, which scientists are asking, discussing - we have talked with some of the scientists and it is possible to bring about a mutation in the brain cells themselves when there is pure observation of any problem.

And, as we also said the other day, we are masters of time. We have created time. Not the time of the sun and the sunset, not the rising and the waning of the moon, but the psychological time, the inward time that man, that thought has put together. We are masters of that time. Please this is important to understand because we are going to deal with something which is much more complex, which is death. We are going to talk about it presently. And that is why we must understand the nature of time which man has created. Time as hope, time as achievement, psychological; you need time to learn a skill, you need time to learn a language, you need time to learn certain technological, complex problems, there you need time, there you need knowledge, there you need application. But we are asking why human beings psychologically, inwardly, have created time? Time when I will be good; time when I will be free of violence; time as achieving enlightenment; time as achieving some exalted state of mind; time as meditation. We have invented that time, therefore we are masters of that time. And when we function within the realm of that time we are bringing about a contradiction and hence conflict. Time is conflict. I wonder if you

understand all this?

So we are the master of time - that is really a great discovery if one realizes the truth of that: that we are the past, the present and the future, which is time. Time as psychological knowledge. And we have divided life, the living and the dying. We have created a distance between life, that is our living, the living in our consciousness and the distance as time, which is death. That is, I am living with all my problems and death is something to be avoided, postponed, put at a great distance, which is another fragmentation of our life. Right?

We are saying: to observe holistically, as a whole movement of life, which is to live the living and the dying, the whole of it, that is our life. And we cling to life and avoid, run away, don't even talk about it. So we have fragmented our life, not only superficially, physically, but also we have separated ourselves from death. And what is death? We are going to enquire together into that because it is part of our life.

One may be frightened, one may want to avoid it, one may want to prolong living, and they are doing it perhaps another fifty or a hundred years you may add to your life but always at the end of it there is that called death. So we must enquire together: what is living? What is living, which is our consciousness? The consciousness is made up of its content. The content is not different from consciousness. Our consciousness is what you believe, your superstition, your ambition, your greed, your competition, your attachment, your suffering, the depth of loneliness, your gods, the rituals, all that is your consciousness, which is you. And that consciousness is not yours, it is the

consciousness of humanity. That is, you are the world and the world is you. Your neighbour suffers, you suffer, your neighbour goes through most difficult times, you may not, but you also go through difficult times, your neighbour may faint be anxious, lonely, and you will go through that too. So you are your consciousness with its content. That content is the ground upon which all humanity stands. Therefore psychologically, inwardly, you are not an individual. Outwardly you may have a different form, you may be pink, yellow, brown, black, purple, or whatever it is, tall, short, woman, man, but inwardly, deeply, we are similar. Perhaps with some variations but the similarity is like a string that holds the pearls together.

And in examining our living, which we must to comprehend what is living, we are asking what is living? Then we can ask what is dying? What is before is more important than what happens after death. What happens before, not the last minute. It may be an accident, a disease, old age and the end. Before the end, long before the end, what is living? Is this living travail, conflict, without any relationship with each other? That relationship like two parallel lines running, never meeting except perhaps sexually. This sense of deep inward loneliness and that is what we call living - the conflict, the pain, the anxiety, the agony, the loneliness, and the immense suffering; going to the office from 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, until 5 o'clock day after day, day after day, month after month, what happens to your brain? And this is what we call living. And to escape from that living, so-called living, you go off to churches, temples, mosques, pray, worship, which is utterly meaningless. Or if you have money you indulge in extravagance,

the extravagance of this country in marriage. You know all the tricks you play to escape from your own consciousness, from your own state of mind. And this is what is called living. And death is the ending, the ending of everything that you know: every attachment, all the money you have accumulated, you can't take it with you therefore you are frightened. Fear is part of our life. We went into that very deeply the other day. And so whatever you are, however rich, however poor, however highly placed, whatever power you have, whatever kind of politician you are, from the highest politician down to the lowest crook in politics, this is the ending, which is called death.

And what is it that is dying? The 'me' with all the accumulations that it has gathered this life, all the pain, the loneliness, the despair, the tears, the laughter, the suffering, that is me, the words - they are words. The summation of all this is me. I may pretend that I have in me some higher spirit, the atman, the soul, something everlasting which is all put together by thought. And therefore thought is not sacred. So whatever thought invents is not sacred, whether in the church, in the temple, or in the mosque. So this is our life. This is the 'me' that you cling to, are attached. And the ending of that is death. The fear of the known, and the fear of the unknown, because our known is our life, and we are afraid of that life, and we are afraid of death. Have you ever seen a man or a woman frightened of death? Have you ever seen them closely? Death is the total denial of the past, present and the future, which is me. And being frightened of death we think there are other lives to be lived. That is, you believe in reincarnation, some of you, probably most of you do. That is a nice, happy, memory of

comfort, invented by people who have not understood what is living. They see living as death, pain, constant conflict, endless misery with occasional flare of a smile, laughter and joy, and they say 'We will live next life. After death I will meet my wife' - or husband, my son, my god. We have not understood what we are. What are we attached to? Look at it. Please look very closely together. What is that we are attached to? To what? To money? If you are attached to money, that is you, the money is you. Like a man attached to old furniture, beautiful 14th century furniture, highly polished, great value, he is attached to that. And that attachment is to furniture, therefore he is furniture. If you are attached to nose and throat specialist, your heaven will be nose and throat. You understand what we are talking about?

So what are you attached to? Your body? If you are really attached to your body you have to look after that body, you have to eat properly, you have to exercise properly, but you don't. You are just attached to the idea of the body - the idea but not the actual instrument. If you are attached to your wife because of your memories, if you are attached to her because she comforts you for this and that, all the trivialities of attachment, death comes and says, 'You are going to be separated'.

So one has to enquire very closely and deeply to what you are attached. Because death says you can't have anything when you die. Please follow this carefully and go into it. Your body is cremated or buried, and what have you left? Your sons, for whom you have accumulated a lot of money, which he will misuse anyhow. He will inherit your property, pay taxes and go through all the terrible anxieties of existence - is that what you are attached to?

Or attached to your knowledge? You have been a great writer, great poet, painter, to film. Or you are attached to a word because words play a tremendous part in our life. Just words. Because we never look behind the words, we never see the word is never the thing, the symbol is never the reality.

So as we are the master of time because we have invented time psychologically, can death, can the brain, the human consciousness, be free of this fear? Freedom to be free. In the democratic world they are supposed to be free, to say what they want, to think what they like, to do what they like - up to a point. In the totalitarian states they are not free, you can't - you know all the rest of that I don't have to go into it. Here you can do what you like, which you are doing: doing exactly what you want to do, yielding to pressure, yielding to circumstances, but pursuing your desire, what you want to do. Choose - to have choice, freedom - is that freedom, to have choice? Choice to move in this one field of knowledge, psychological knowledge, from one corner to the other - and you consider that freedom. I hope you are understanding all this. So is there freedom from fear of death? That is, as you are masters of time, to live with death, not separate death as something to be avoided, to be postponed, something to put away, but death is part of life. That is, to understand the meaning of ending, to understand the meaning of negation. When you end something, it may be a small habit, end your smoking, drinking, end it. Ending your attachment, ending your belief, negating. When you negate, end, there is something totally new. So while living, can you negate attachment completely? That is, living with death. Death means the ending. You are following all this? You understand?

That way there is incarnation, that is something new taking place. The ending is extraordinarily important in life. To understand the depth and the beauty of that word, which is negate something which is not truth. To negate for example your double talk. To negate, if you are a lawyer, and you go to the temple, negate the temple. You understand? So that your brain has this quality of integrity.

So death is an ending and has extraordinary importance in life. Not suicide, not euthanasia; the ending of your attachment, your pride, your antagonism for another, your hatred for another, ending your - oh, so many things you have collected to end. But when you look, as we said, a holistic view of life, they are all interrelated, the dying, the living, the agony, the despair, the loneliness and the suffering, they are all one movement. When you see it holistically then there is total freedom from death. Not that the physical body is not going to be destroyed, but the sense of ending and therefore there is no continuity. You understand? The fear is not being able to continue.

And suppose, or when, one human being understands the full significance of death and the depth of that, the vitality, the fullness of that word and what lies behind that word, he is out of that human consciousness. Because human consciousness is what we have described, but the description is not the content. Then what happens to people, to human beings who have not broken away completely from the content of that consciousness? You are following? Or is this too much for an evening? Suppose I, a human being, have not understood, or gone into myself, and studied the whole content of my consciousness, and I die with fear, separation

from my family, from my bank account, from my daily ugly routine, what happens to me? I, who have thought I was a separate individual, my consciousness being separate, my soul, all that is separate, what happens to me when I die? Will I still continue this separation as an individual next life? And if I believe in a next life, as most of you do, then what matters is how you behave now. Right? Because next life you are going to pay for it. Right? But you don't believe in reincarnation really because you are not behaving now. This is just a trick of the brain to give you some kind of solace, some kind of comfort. If you really believed in it you would have extraordinarily good minds and be a good human being now. But you don't believe in anything really. You only believe, you only want your power, your money, your status, your position, your technique, skill and money, and perhaps sex. That is all you want. And that is what human beings want so you will continue in that state. Not you as an individual but that state of consciousness will continue. And this is life. This is the agony of pleasure and pain of life. But when you understand that life and death are one, they are one when you begin to end in living: end your attachment, end your beliefs, end your antagonisms, your prejudices, your conclusions, end all your gods. Negate all that, then you are living side by side with death, which is the most extraordinary thing to do. Which is, there is neither the past nor the present or the future, there is only the ending.

BOMBAY 6TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH FEBRUARY 1982

This is the last talk. I am sure you are glad of it, so am I. It is I think, necessary to make a short resume of all the talks we have had here, which has been five talks. We said society is corrupt, immoral and degenerated. And that society we have created, each human being with his greed, ambition and corruption, with his lack of consideration, lack of love. We have created this society. And to bring about a change in that society which is so necessary, it is important that we, as human beings change radically, not superficially, not environmentally but in the whole psyche of man. And we have been talking about the necessity of transformation in the very brain itself which has been conditioned for thousands and thousands of years. And is it possible, we asked together, whether we can change at all? Human beings have been, more or less, for the past millennia upon millennia what we are now - in conflict, in pain, in sorrow, killing each other, thousands upon thousands of wars. And we seem to be pursuing the same path. And we asked ourselves in our conversation together, whether the human condition can ever be transformed. We said there are a certain group of philosophers who say the human condition can never be changed, it can be modified but it cannot be radically transformed. They have their logic, reason and innumerable examples for their assertions. We are talking together whether it is possible for us to change, admitting that we are conditioned, admitting that we are the past, the present and the future, becoming aware of our conditioning, religiously, politically, economically and so on, to

become aware of that, to become aware of the consciousness of which we are. This consciousness, with its content, is one's life, one's behaviour, one's conduct. And if one becomes aware of the content of our consciousness, can there be in that awareness, in which there should be no choice, can there be a radical transformation?

So we took first the human hurt, that we are hurt from childhood, through schools, colleges and universities, and the whole progress of man's evolution is to get more and more hurt. From that hurt he acts neurotically, not reasonably. And we asked if that hurt - and there are a great many accumulated hurts - whether those hurts can be completely wiped away from one's consciousness. We talked about that a great deal, what to do. We are not going over that again this evening.

And also we talked about relationship. The relationship between man and man, between human beings, whether they are near, intimate, or far away. We hardly have any relationship with each other. Man and woman, married or not married, they pursue their own particular line, like two railway lines never meeting, perhaps they meet in bed and that is about all, because the man pursues his ambitions, his greed, his pleasure, so does the woman. So there is no contact, actual relationship between each other. That relationship is the building up of images about each other. And these images, we think, have a certain relationship. So actually we have no relationship, which is obvious.

And also we talked about fear. We went into it a great deal, whether human beings, you, each one of us, can ever be free from fear. Basically, psychologically, most of us are afraid of so many

things - fear of loss, fear of not achieving and so on and so on. We went into the whole movement of fear - comparison, desire for security, time, thought. We said thought is the root of fear and together we went into the question of what is thought. Because all of us live by thought. You came here because you wanted to, which is directed by thought. All the technological world with all its complexity and subtleties, is the product of thought. And all the things that are in churches, temples and so on are put there by thought. And we examined what thought is. Thought is the response of knowledge as memory. We went into that very carefully. And most of our actions are based on thought. And thought is always limited. Do what you will, thought is everlastingly limited because knowledge, which is the outcome of experience, is also limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything. So thought with its action must bring about division. Whatever is limited is divisive, separative. So we went into the question together: the movement of thought, which is time. And we talked about time also, that we are the past, the present and the future. We are all that. That is, we are the masters of time. And this is important to understand and we went into it considerably.

And also we went into the question of love, compassion, the ending of suffering. All this has been necessary because that is our life. That is our everyday life of pain, pleasure, anxiety, insecurity and sorrow.

And this evening we ought to talk over together what is order. Because without putting order in our house, not only externally, but basically order in ourselves, meditation has no meaning. And we are going to talk over together what is meditation. Not that we

should meditate first and then order, but order prior to meditation. We will go into that. So we are now considering together what is order in our life, and order outside in the world. The order outside in the world can only come about if there is order in ourselves, in the whole structure of our being, complete total order. So we are going to talk over together what is order?

Please, as we pointed out, throughout these talks, this is not a lecture. This is not something the speaker is telling you what to do, or what to think, how to act and so on. Which is the intention of a lecturer to inform you what he thinks. But as we pointed out earlier, we are together examining our lives, together we are trying to find out order, the meaning of that word and the significance of that word. And we are going to go into it together. Please be clear on this point, that we are not trying to persuade you what is order, a blue print, a pattern which you must follow, but rather we are investigating, examining, observing rather - it would be better to use the word observing - without direction, without motive, to observe. To observe a tree without the word, which is, the word interferes or blocks, or prevents the observation of something clearly. To most of us words become all important. But words, explanations are not the actuality. The symbol is never the real.

So what is order? To examine, to come to the point, which is, total order in virtue. And as most of us live in disorder, which is confusion, conflict, the conflict of dualities, all that is disorder. Where there is conflict there must be disorder. As there is disorder when one nation separates itself from another, builds up armaments ready to kill each other, that is disorder. Religions have contributed to this disorder. One has been told there are about three hundred

thousand gods in this country. And these gods are invented by thought. And each worshipper is against the other worshipper. So religions with their separative authoritarian traditional pursuits, authority, have also brought about a great deal of confusion in the world. These are facts, it is not the speaker's opinion or judgement, this is what is actually going on. The insistence on the part of the Christian Western world of a saviour, faith and in the Eastern world, the Islamic world, the Hindu world and the Buddhist world, each pursuing, maintaining, sustaining, nourishing their separative ways.

So there is not only economic disorder, national disorder but also there is disorder in ourselves. As we said conflict, contradiction, is the essence of disorder. We never see 'what is', but we are always trying to transform 'what is' into 'what should be', that is duality. There is violence. That is a fact. And the projection of an idea as non-violence is its opposite. So then there is conflict between 'what is', which is violence, and the idealistic nonsense which is non-violence. So there is always this conflict between what is actual and what is not actual - the ideal, the conclusion, the philosophical assertions. So there is only 'what is', there is no duality. The duality is an escape from 'what is'. And one contributes to disorder - the man who pursues an ideal instead of understanding what actually is, himself, his life, so he brings about in himself this contradiction, this hypocrisy, this lack of integrity. Integrity is to remain with 'what is', and not the everlasting pursuit of something which is non-existent.

So we are looking together at this confusion, which is disorder. And in this disorder we are trying to find freedom, we are trying to

find what is truth. And volumes have been written about all this. Volumes have been written to escape from actuality, what is taking place now - what is taking place in your mind, in your heart, in your activity. As we do not diligently apply to the understanding of that disorder we create more disorder. So we, together, if it is possible, to observe this disorder holistically. We explained yesterday what it means to be whole. That is, a human being who is not fragmented, not broken up, saying one thing and doing quite the opposite, thinking one thing and acting quite the opposite. This contradiction in our life is one of the major factors of conflict and therefore there is no possibility of observing our life holistically, that is, as a whole movement, which we talked about yesterday.

And as we said yesterday evening: death is part of this life, not something to be avoided, something put away in the distance. But when one observes life as a whole movement, which has its own extraordinary beauty, when you observe it as a whole, with all the movements of pain, sorrow, pleasure, then death is part of our life. Death is the ending, and the ending brings about totally a new dimension. The negation of all the content of consciousness is a religious mind.

So we are going together to first put the house in order. Our house, which is me, you. If you cannot put it in order, which every serious man must, considering what the world is, what is happening around you, if you do not put your house in order, that is, to understand disorder, to understand the nature and the movement of disorder, which is your daily life, you will degenerate. Obviously this is taking place. You will pursue false gods, you will pursue all kinds of gurus with their nonsense. So it

behoves us, if we are at all serious, to consider the nature and so observe disorder, not try to change disorder. Observe it, remain with it, hold it, look at it. That is, to diligently bring all your energies to look at it. To look at that disorder. And when there is total perception of that disorder then there is total order. And that total order is complete virtue. One hopes that we are following each other. You are not merely listening to a series of ideas, words. We are examining our own minds and our own hearts and see ourselves directly, not persuaded, not pushed around, but to see directly for ourselves that we live in disorder. And to hold it as a precious jewel, look at it. Then out of that clear perception order comes. And when there is total order there is no order. I don't think you understand this. I will leave it at that for the moment.

Because when you negate totally disorder, totally, with your whole minds and hearts see what disorder has done to man. Then order is a living thing. And in that order there is virtue and freedom. When there is freedom, because you have put your house in total order, freedom has no order.

Now we ought to consider this evening what is religion. Because religion has transformed man. Religion has brought about a new culture, a new order of things, both historically and actually. When you observe the religions that exist in the world, without any motive, without any critical destructive cynicism, all religions throughout the world are the inventions of thought. Thought has created gods because thought is insecure in itself, limited in itself, therefore it projects an idea, a concept of something total, whole, complete. But all the scriptures of all religions are put together by thought. And thought is not sacred. Thought may worship the

symbol which it has invented by going to a temple, and all the things that are in it have been put there by thought, not by some outside agency. Man has done it out of his fear, of his insecurity, of his sorrow. So please observe it. Don't accept what the speaker is saying. He said you must have scepticism, doubt, doubt your religions, question. Don't accept but observe how the world is divided by religions and each religion has its own particular form of sects by the hundred. So religion as it is now is not religion.

So we are going to find out together when you totally deny, negate, that which is false, because thought, as we pointed out, is limited because knowledge is limited. And whatever thought does as action, invents both technologically as well as psychologically, must be limited. So all the gods and all the temples, churches, all that are the product of thought, invented by thought - the rituals, all that. Now to find out what is a religious mind one must totally negate all that. Which means to have no fear whatsoever, because religions are born out of fear. When there is no fear at all there is no need for god.

So what is a religious mind? You understand my question? A human being who has lived in illusion and becomes aware of the illusion, either examines it carefully, what that illusion is, how it is born and why one clings to that illusion, and when one negates that illusion, which is the gods, the temples, the whole circus that goes on in the name of religion is an illusion, totally unreal, when you negate the false, in that negation of the false there is truth. You understand all this? So one must have a clear mind to understand, a clear heart to understand what is a religious mind. You are putting on sannyasi robes, putting on whatever you put round your neck -

you are not a religious man, it is mere pretension. You are what you are, with all your troubles, anxieties, loneliness, despair. By putting on these strange, unfamiliar, dramatic, theatrical dresses doesn't show you are religious. I know you will laugh but you will continue to do the same thing tomorrow because it doesn't mean a thing to you. You really do not want to find out a way of living which is truly religious, without gods, without following somebody, none of that. You are completely integrated, you have got such deep integrity.

So we are going to examine together - not those people who have put on sannyasi robes, they cannot examine because they are stuck in their own particular groove - but those who are out of that class, out of that orbit, can examine closely what is truly a religious mind. To find that out we are going to examine together what is meditation. Without meditation there is no religious mind. Without meditation, which is the outcome of total order in your house - it is not the other way round: meditate first and then order. If you meditate without order you are merely living in a series of fantasies, imagination, romantic illusions. So to find out for ourselves what is truly, actually, a religious mind we must observe the nature of meditation.

Why should we meditate at all? Is it necessary to meditate? The classical meditation is practise, control, control thought so that it quietens down, practise, follow a system, discipline, torturing yourself to meditate. And to meditate classically is to take certain postures, sit cross legged, do all that circus that you go through. Here if one may tell you a story of a teacher who was sitting on the banks of the river and he was looking at the flowing waters, the

beauty of the waters, the ripple of the waters, the line of the bank, the pure waters flushing against it. And as he is looking a man comes, a disciple saying, 'Master, please teach me what truth is'. So he takes a position, the disciple, sits cross legged and closes his eyes. And the master or the teacher - I am afraid not the guru! - picks up two pieces of stone and he is rubbing one against the other. And the disciple, who has come to meditate and find truth from the master, he hears this peculiar noise of two stones rubbing. He opens his eyes and sees the master rubbing two pieces of stone. And he says, 'Master, what are you doing?' He says, 'I am rubbing two pieces of stone in order to make them into a mirror.' The disciple says, 'Master, if I may tell you, you will never make a mirror by picking up two rocks and rubbing. You can do that everlastingly, you will never succeed.' And so the master says, 'Sitting like that, shutting your eyes and thinking you are meditating, you will never meditate.' Do you have humour? Does humour exist in your lives, to laugh, not at somebody, not at some joke, stupid joke, but to have laughter in your eyes, in your mind, in your mouth, laughter. That is necessary. If you don't know how to laugh at yourself you will never be able to laugh at all.

So we are together observing what is meditation. Practice, the everyday practice, practice, makes the brain mechanical, dull, which it is already when it practises. You understand? It is only the dull mind that practises meditation, not an active watchful, vital mind. It is the mind that says, 'I am going, through practice, to get something, achieve some spiritual heights.' So any system of meditation is merely following a pattern, convenient, satisfying, but it has no meaning whatsoever where meditation is concerned,

because meditation requires, as we have said, total order in your life. And because we do not know how to bring about that holistic order, we invent all kinds of tricks and entertainments and part of classical meditation, which you do, is a form of entertainment. It doesn't affect your life whatsoever.

So if you deny, as we said, negate that which is false, then in that false you find what is true. You have negated all the systems of meditation because you yourself see that these systems are invented by thought, put together by a clever man, or an unclever man generally, an unintelligent man, not a spiritual man, and you, who are gullible, who want to have some deep satisfaction, some love, something that is stable, permanent, everlasting, because our lives are so shoddy, so uncertain, we want something that is immutable, non-changing. And we think we will get it if we do certain things. Those things are invented by thought and thought in itself is contradictory. So any form of structure in meditation put together by thought is not meditation, whether it is Zen, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, it is not. You understand what this means? A total denial, negate totally everything that man has invented, psychologically, not technologically. You can't deny that. Here it is right in front of you. But all the things that man has created in search of truth, and writes about it. And we wanting all the escape from our weariness and sorrow, agony, we fall into that trap.

So one must totally deny all postures, all breathing, all activities of thought. When you have done that, negate all that, then the question arises: can thought come to an end? That is, thought as time, can time have a stop? The time, not the external time, but the time which is becoming something - becoming enlightened,

becoming non-violent. A vain man tries to become humble. This whole pattern of becoming psychologically is time. Time, we said, is also thought. Can thought come to an end? Not through discipline, not through control because who is that entity who disciplines the meditator? You follow this? There is always in us this sense of duality: the controller and the controlled, the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experienced, the thinker and the thought. There is always this divisive duality in us.

Probably it is brought over from physical observation: there is duality, there is light and shade, dark and light, there is man, woman, and so on, there is duality. We have probably brought that over into the field of the psyche. So is there a controller which is different from the controlled? Please go into this very carefully. In meditation, classical, ordinary, the much talked about, it may be a lot of propaganda, and all the gurus who are propagating it, coining money, they are always concerned with the controller and the controlled. They have always said 'Control your thoughts,' - because thereby you will end thought, or have only one thought. But we are enquiring into who is the controller? You might say, 'He is the higher self', 'He is the witness.' 'He is something which is not thought.' But the controller is part of thought. Right? Obviously. So the controller is the controlled. Thought has divided itself as the controller and that which he is going to control, it is still the activity of thought. You are following all this? Right? It is a strange phenomena that thought has invented gods and then thought begins to worship them. Have you noticed that? That is self worship. You understand? No, you don't.

So when one understands the wholeness of this movement of

the controller is the controlled, then there is no control at all. This is a dangerous thing to say to people who have not understood this. You will probably say the speaker is advocating no control. I am sure you will say that, because you really have no control either. But we are not saying that. We are saying: where there is the observation that the controller is the controlled, the thinker is the thought, then if you remain with that whole truth, with that reality, without any further interference with thought, then you have totally a different kind of energy.

So meditation is the summation of all energy. Not the energy created by thought through friction, but the energy of a state of mind in which all conflict has completely ceased. Religion, the meaning of that word etymologically probably means gathering together, gathering together all your energy so that you can act diligently. A religious mind acts diligently, that is, caring, watching, observing. In that observation there is affection, compassion.

And concentration is another invention of thought. In school you are told to concentrate on the book. You learn to concentrate, trying to exclude other thoughts, trying to prevent yourself from looking out of the window. In concentration there is resistance, narrowing down this enormous energy of life into a certain point. Whereas attention which is a form of awareness in which there is no choice, a choiceless awareness, in that attention all your energy is there. When you have such attention there is no centre from which you are attending. Whereas in concentration there is always a centre from which you are attending.

Then also we ought to talk over together space. We have no

space, both physically, the way one lives in the modern world, an apartment on the top of another apartment, there is no space outwardly, and inwardly you have no space at all because our brains are constantly chattering, active. So meditation is to understand or come upon that space which is not put together by thought. Space as the 'me' and the 'not me'. I hope you are understanding all this. Are you all getting tired? I am surprised. Because without space - not invented space, the idea of space but actual space, that is, vast distance, limitless distance, our observation unhindered is this perpetual movement without any barrier, that is vast space. And in that vast space there is no time. Time has stopped long ago, time as thought, because thought has understood, or the observer, or observation has seen that thought has its place and thought has no other place. You understand? Thought has, as knowledge, time, space, when we want to learn a technique, I do not know how to become a carpenter but I need space, that is time to learn the skill as a good master carpenter, there I need time. But psychologically there is no accumulation of any past event. There is always that awareness that cleanses the brain of any accumulation as memory. Memory is necessary at a certain level, at the psychological level, that is the 'me' progressing, the 'me' achieving, the 'me' in conflict, all that has come to an end long ago because you have put your house in order. Then the mind - or rather, let's talk about the brain - the brain has its own rhythm, but that rhythm has been distorted by our extravagance, by our ill treating the brain through drugs, through faith, through belief, through drink, smoking and all that has distorted the brain. It has lost its own pristine vitality.

So meditation is this sense of total comprehension of the whole of life, and from that right action. And meditation is absolute silence of the mind, not relative silence, or the silence that thought has projected and structured but the silence of order, which is freedom. Only in that total complete unadulterated silence, then there is that which is truth, which is everlasting to everlasting. This is meditation.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH PUPUL JAYAKAR 21ST JUNE 1982

K: What would be the greatest interest, not only to appeal to the West but also to the Indian mind that has thought about these things, perhaps, much longer than the Western world - considering both the West and the East what would be the greatest significance and lasting, not just passing significance but something that is enduring, that is worthwhile?

PJ: Sir, most of our lives are so futile. And unless one discovers within oneself - I want to use a right word - perhaps the capacity to leap out of the futility. For the mind to have the creative spring so that it can move whatever it does. It is not what it does that is important but the need for something which is new, which is not tainted, so that it doesn't matter what the circumstances are, you seem to go beyond circumstances. And that only happens when the mind is not dependent on anything, and it has some space, some perception. And I have been wondering, perhaps it is a difficult question but it is a question on which I have been wondering for the last few months, and that is, what is the ground of the creative?

K: I wonder what you mean by creative. I mean an artist says he is creative, a poet, a thinker, or some new discovery by scientists. Would you call all that creative activity?

PJ: Perhaps.

K: But it is limited. They might not acknowledge it.

PJ: Sir, why do you bring in the word limited.

K: Don't let's use 'limited', partial.

PJ: You mean that. Why do I bring it in, I don't know the other.

K: No, it is partial because it is not related to their daily life.

PJ: Again...

K: No, one may be a great scientist, and may lead a very, very mediocre life. And the scientist may discover extraordinary things and call that creative.

PJ: But you see that's why I did not speak of 'a creative action'...

K: ...but a creative mind.

PJ: ...but a mind, a perception which rests in the creative.

K: I think we should make it a little clearer.

PJ: You have never answered any questions on the ground of manifestation, for instance. Let's take it at the simplest level: this coming into being of anything.

K: Of birth, of anything.

PJ: Of birth.

K: Whether it is a baby, or a new tree, or a bird.

PJ: What is involved?

K: Are you asking, what is the source of all life, both the manifest and not manifest?

PJ: Yes. I would like to probe, if it is possible to probe into what you have said just now, unmanifest and manifest, the manifest and the pre-manifest. I won't say unmanifest. That instant before manifestation is.

K: Or birth is.

PJ: That's one instant.

K: Are we discussing this subject in a technological, scientific verbiage, or are we probing - probing into something which you and I don't know? Just a minute, I want to make it clear. Because after all the birth of babies we know that, how that comes into

being.

PJ: But one may know how it comes into being but one still does not know the quality of life which pervades it. Knowing that a baby is born doesn't give you experience of birth, the actuality of birth is very different from the description of birth. It is the same with everything.

K: The description is not the thing, or the explanation is not the actual.

PJ: But you cannot live through life without going into this coming into existence.

K: I don't quite follow what you are trying to convey. I am not being obstreperous but I don't quite follow. If you have talked about what is the origin of all life, what is the beginning of all existence, not go back and back and back - you follow what I mean - but try to discover, or come upon something which is the beginning of all things. I mean various religious people have said, god - god is the origin of everything. But that is just a word, that doesn't convey the mind that investigates what is the origin. You follow?

PJ: Yes.

K: Now, are we discussing that, having a dialogue about that - to delve very, very deeply into the origin of all life, without any belief, without any dogma, and so on? Or are we having a dialogue theoretically, moving between the actual and not the actual, and trying to probe into something with thought? I don't know if I am making this clear?

PJ: I understand what you are saying. You see, sir, we have narrowed the word 'creative' to mean, as you said, painting, writing

a book, or discovering something in science, but basically the whole meaning of a tree, a human being, the earth, the sky...

K: Man has asked this question.

PJ: Of course he has asked this question.

K: He has asked, what is the meaning of all this, and what is the origin of all this.

PJ: Where does it arise?

K: What is the ground from which this all this arises? That is what you are asking, isn't it?

PJ: Yes.

K: What is the source of all existence, all life, all action? Now how does one enquire into that? What is our approach to it? How do we come to investigate into something that demands an extraordinary freedom, an extraordinary sense of non-conditioned mind - if I can use that. A freedom, perhaps that very word 'freedom' is love - it requires that quality of mind that is both practical, sensitive, and has this quality of great compassion.

PJ: I can't start with that because I don't know what it is.

K: How do we come to that point and from there move?

PJ: So if you put it that way then I am stuck.

K: You are stuck.

PJ: Then I can't move.

K: No, I am just asking: I don't say, it must be there. Isn't that the process of enquiry?

PJ: I say this question arises in my mind, and I would like to move with this question into it. If I say that the mind must be free and therefore it is love, then what do I do?

K: You can't do anything. But how do you enquire into

something that man has asked for millions of years, and give it a name and be satisfied with it. But we are not doing that. We are saying, how does a mind enquire into something that must be extraordinary, that must have a quality of not only universal, cosmic - if I can use that word - how does one's mind go into such a question, into something of supreme order? How does one's enquiry begin, where? If you enquire with thought, that doesn't lead very far.

PJ: No. You asked how did the enquiry begin.

K: Yes. What is the manner, what is the approach of a mind that wants to enquire into something that it doesn't know, or aware, something that demands an extraordinary quality of deep subtlety, deep capacity of order, and so on. Where do I begin?

PJ: Obviously by being aware of the disorder within oneself.

K: That is, I begin, I am after all the manifest. I am a human being born. I know the process of being born, how a child is brought into being. We are not talking of that. Now I enquire into myself. Where do I begin? Let's go slowly. Take a little time. Where do I begin?

PJ: I begin by what is around me, what is within me.

K: Yes.

PJ: Obviously sir. There can be no other starting point.

K: The world outside, the world inside. What is the criterion which measures the outer and the inner? What is the measurement? I am using not judgement, I am using purposively the word 'measurement'.

PJ: But is it necessary to measure?

K: If I enquire into myself in a monastery, I can deceive myself

so enormously. But if I have a measure - just let me use that for a moment - of what is actually happening in the world outside of me, to observe all that without any bias, and to relate what is happening to what is happening inwardly, so that I see that is one movement, not two separate movements.

PJ: Sir, I am not in a monastery. I am in the midst of life. And being in the midst of life I see action at various levels, connected with things, connected with me. I also see the responses within me to action, all the capacity which I may have over the years, been able to even remain without reacting. I see all that. And I move into that - I move with it - it is not into, but with it.

K: You are it.

PJ: Yes, that's right.

K: I move with it.

PJ: I am it.

K: You are this.

PJ: It is easier with the interior movement to see I am it; it is much more difficult with an exterior thing to see that I am it. If you tell me that I am all the wars which are taking place, that is very difficult for me to see.

K: No, we are responsible for all the wars that are taking place.

PJ: Yes. But that is a distant thing for me. You must understand. That is a distant thing. That responsibility is a distant responsibility. I say, yes, perhaps if I take it to its ultimate I am responsible. But I can't link it to saying in the same way with which I link to a response within me.

K: Quite.

PJ: Actually a response within me is a living response, which

has much more reality.

K: My next question - would it deviate from what we are discussing: why don't you feel total responsibility for the wars, the brutality, the terrible things that are happening in the world, why doesn't one feel totally responsible?

PJ: How is one totally responsible? By being involved?

K: No, not involved.

PJ: By being born.

K: No, as a living grown-up human being all my tradition, all my way of living, way of thinking, acting, as a nationalist, this or that, has contributed to this, to the present state of the world.

PJ: Sir, you are making it so difficult. A man commits a sadistic murder. I can't say that I am responsible for that sadistic murder. So when you take it to that extent it is impossible for me to feel the reality of it.

K: Let's leave that for the moment.

PJ: It is better to leave that. But let's probe into the ground of existence which is the 'isness' of life.

K: Isness - the verb, is.

PJ: So the only way to probe is to move into oneself, whatever that means.

K: All right. Let's take for the moment that word, go, or move, or enter into the whole complex of oneself. Enter into it, not as an observer from the outside. I am all that.

PJ: It is not even that I state what I am.

K: Yes.

PJ: I don't state. Let me discover, uncover.

K: Uncover rather than discover.

PJ: Uncover what I am. And in uncovering what I am, I comprehend that one is uncovering the whole existence of man. That is possible to see.

K: That is fairly simple.

PJ: In this journey of uncovering, I mean the superficial things are relatively easy, so we won't go into that.

K: No, those are fairly simple.

PJ: But once the superficial, the room has been swept...

K: Isn't that important too? Who sweeps the room? What does it mean, having swept the room, what it is? You follow what I am asking? Is the sweeping, or cleansing, or uncovering, completely moving away from all the superficial reactions, superficial conditioning, and trying to enter into the nature, or the movement that conditions the mind.

PJ: Obviously, sir, you can't say you have swept the room and it is over, dust gathers again. So sweeping is a movement which is part of living. You can't. But the grosser elements can certainly be eliminated. The subtler things survive in corners in which you have not been able to get to. But the more obvious things it is possible to sweep away.

K: Yes. Obvious things can be swept. No, we must be a little more. What are the obvious things?

PJ: You know, for instance, Krishnaji, ambition, or envy.

K: Yes, hatred.

PJ: Hatred.

K: Pupulji, really to be free of hatred, to wipe it - just go into it a little bit - to be free of hatred means something extraordinary, to be free of all sense of aggression, all sense of - there is no enemy.

The enemy is you.

PJ: But hatred is a different thing from the quality of aggression. Let's go into it a little, sir.

K: Aggression is related to hatred because an aggressive nation, or an aggressive person, inevitably hurts the other, and that hurt breeds hatred. It is part of the same movement.

PJ: Yes, that is why I say that there are the coarser things and then the subtler things. Hatred, anyone who has known hatred knows that hatred is a very powerful thing and a very destructive thing. But aggression may be to some extent part of one's nature even. It may be that from the make-up...

K: ...from the animal and so on.

PJ: As a human being you are more assertive than another. And to be assertive is not hatred.

K: All right. Move. Let's move.

PJ: That is why I made the distinction of the grosser things which are possible to sweep clean.

K: But how does one know what is gross and what is subtle? What is the mind that says, this is...

PJ: That's why I think the ordinary way to move into this is to see that nothing is trivial.

K: That no reaction is...

PJ: ...is trivial.

K: Not only trivial but has its source in one's conditioning.

PJ: You know, sir, I saw recently the casting of a tremendous metal cauldron, about seven feet diameter. The slightest flaw, it didn't matter how slight it was, would have cracked the cauldron. And it is exactly like that. It doesn't matter how slight, how subtle,

it still cracks the investigation.

K: I understand that. Are you saying to me that it needs a great training, great discipline, a sense of tremendous control, like the potter who did a marvellous thing, it needs a great attention, energy, and very, very subtle hands and so on.

PJ: Does it?

K: Oh, yes it does.

PJ: This is where I think one takes the word 'free' from you.

K: Free?

PJ: Yes. And takes it to mean a certain flabbiness of the spirit.

K: Oh no.

PJ: Please, let me pursue this. It is very important.

K: It is not flabbiness of spirit. Good lord!

PJ: Because it may mean that I don't accept authority, I don't think it necessary to do something. I can live a futile life, I can live a trivial life. It doesn't matter.

K: Freedom. The very word freedom, Pupulji, as far as I understand it, I looked at in several dictionaries, means, the very word is affection, love.

PJ: And a tremendous discipline. Let me use the word discipline.

K: I know you are using the word discipline, but I am not sure.

PJ: When I am using the word discipline, I am speaking of it as the demand for a watchfulness that the trivial does not creep in.

K: Yes, but is watchfulness, which is awareness, does it need training, does it need discipline? Let's understand the meaning of that word discipline.

PJ: No, you see discipline - if I say that I must sit in the

morning, cross my legs, look at the wall and fix my eyes and see that my mind has no thought. That is one kind of discipline. But the mind awakening to the fact that it must be aware of every movement within itself is also a discipline.

K: I wonder how you are using that word because discipline, isn't it generally used as training, conformity, imitation, restraint?

PJ: But no sir, without diligence nothing is possible. And so you may discard the word discipline, you put in the word diligence.

K: Wait a minute, wait a minute. Let's go slowly. To be diligent, that means to be aware of what you are doing, what you are thinking. To be aware of your reactions, and from those reactions observe the action taking place, and in that observation, in that awareness is the action controlled, put in a certain framework? What I am objecting to if I may, subject to discussion, what I am objecting to is the word discipline altogether.

PJ: But sir, if I may say so, you have become allergic to that word.

K: No, I am not allergic. I have got an allergy but I am not allergic to the word.

PJ: Because you use it to mean putting it into a framework.

K: Wait a minute. And I also mean the very act of learning is its own discipline.

PJ: Yes. But how does the act of learning come to be? You see, take it one step further back. From what does the need for observation arise?

K: All right. Need?

PJ: Why should I observe?

K: For the very simple reason, whether it is possible for a

human mind to change something, to change himself, to change the world which is entering into such a catastrophic area.

PJ: Yes, but if I start with that premise...

K: No, not premise, it is so.

PJ: All right. If I start there, or if I start with sorrow, which is very often the real ground from which one starts.

K: Yes. It is very complex.

PJ: The ground is really sorrow. I think we have moved away. So let's go back to this question...

K: What we started out with was: what was the origin, the ground of all life? Then to enquire into that you have to enquire into oneself, because you are the expression of all that.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: You are life. Now the origin of that we are trying to discuss. Right?

PJ: Yes, the origin. The state from which that arises.

K: I can only do that by understanding myself.

PJ: Yes.

K: Very simply, understanding myself. Myself is so terribly complex, how do I approach - I am just now asking - how do I approach a problem that is complex, that is not to be easily diagnosed, easily say, "This is right", "This is wrong", "This should be", "This should not be", it is like a living, complex, messy, disordered entity.

PJ: But is it not because one starts with an attention, which is looking for an ordered entity that one is finding disorder.

K: Oh no, I am not looking for disorder.

PJ: In which case if you are looking without concern as to what

you are looking for.

K: No, we are missing something. I said the world is in disorder. I observe it. And the world, I see I am also in disorder. I begin with that. I am in disorder. Human beings have lived and created such disorder in themselves, and therefore outwardly. Leave that for the moment there. Now how do I comprehend, be aware of the origin of disorder? You follow what I am saying? If I can begin to understand the origin of disorder I can move more and more deeply into something which may be total chaos, but is orderly. You follow what I mean?

PJ: Isn't it by being as simple as possible about it.

K: Yes, that is what I am trying to be. I am in disorder.

PJ: I have certain instruments of enquiry. I have my eyes, my ears, my senses.

K: Yes, yes. You don't enquire with your ears, or with your eyes.

PJ: Don't you? Don't you enquire with your eyes and your ears?

K: A little bit. I enquire when I look around.

PJ: When you look at yourself.

K: Now can I look at myself with my eyes, my optic eyes, or I can see myself in a mirror. But I can't see the complexity of myself with my eyes. I must be aware sensitively, without any choice into this conditioning.

PJ: Why do you say, sir, that you cannot be aware with your eyes?

K: Again, what do you mean 'with your eyes'? The inward eye?

PJ: No. There is a way of looking out, and there is a way of looking in.

K: Looking in. All right. Looking in with your eyes.

PJ: Looking in, listening in.

K: Yes. We must be a little careful here, we can mislead.

PJ: Yes, let's go into it. Is there any other way?

K: Yes, I think there is.

PJ: Let's go into the other way. But first of all let's go into the way, whatever it is. Is the eye, ear, not part of the other way?

K: Breathing, hearing, seeing, feeling. Those are actually sensory responses. Right? Actually I see that colour. I hear noise. I taste something, and so on. These are sensory responses.

PJ: Yes, but is there not a seeing of anger, the action of anger, and listening to a reaction of anger?

K: Do you listen with your ears, or do you observe anger?

PJ: How do you observe anger?

K: By when you are angry, to look at the cause and effect of anger.

PJ: When you are angry you can't.

K: So later on you...

PJ: You see the nature of the mind which has been in a state of anger. But you see the nature of the mind - the word you use is 'you see the nature of the mind'.

K: All right.

PJ: It is very important, Krishnaji.

K: I understand what you are saying, that the very act of listening, the act of feeling, inwardly, is it that you see it with your eyes, hear with sensory ears?

PJ: You see if you put it that way we will never get to the point because the sensory ear is so used to listening out that it can never

comprehend what is, if you take that and try and push it in, you will never get to it.

K: But would it help if we talked about perception?

PJ: No, sir. I say it would help if you talked about seeing, listening with the eye and ear, because there is a seeing, listening, with the eye.

K: I hear you making that statement. From that hearing I have understood the words and see the meaning of what you are seeing. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: The verbal communication has taken place. But the deeper significance...

PJ: But that is also taking place. While I am listening to you and seeing you I am also listening and seeing my own mind, the ground of the mind.

K: No.

PJ: Then what is taking place?

K: Listening.

PJ: There is listening. I am not saying, who is listening.

K: No, listening.

PJ: There is listening.

K: Just a minute, Pupulji, we must be clear on this point. There is - we must be go into a little more carefully.

PJ: No, sir, but in an act where you are totally attentive, take an act where you are totally attentive, what is the state of that act of being totally attentive?

K: What is the state of action that is born out of complete attention? I think it is clear. I will answer it. First to answer that

question we must understand what we mean by complete action, attention. Attention. It's not concentration.

PJ: No, sir.

K: No, no, I want to be clear on this.

PJ: Of course it is not.

K: So attention means there is no centre from which you are attending.

PJ: No, of course not.

K: No, don't say, "Of course not", see what is implied in it.

PJ: You see, sir, I would like to ask you one thing: are we still dusting the periphery?

K: No.

PJ: If you are not dusting the peripheral...

K: ...argument.

PJ: ...then when you ask that question unless I can understand what attention is I can't even take the first step.

K: No, so I just want to be clear: attention means - what does it mean - I attend completely.

PJ: To see, to attend completely is for the 'I' not to be there.

K: That is the real thing. When there is attention there is no 'I'. It isn't, I am attending. There is only that state of mind which is wholly attentive.

PJ: So all the senses...

K: The whole body, the whole...

PJ: Being is awakened, if I may say so.

K: Yes.

PJ: And if you are in that state where the being is awake then you can listen, observe.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: Now can we proceed from there?

K: We are wandering off. I want to enquire into myself. Right? Because myself is life. In enquiring about what I am, I may, if my enquiry is correct, accurate, not distorted, the ground, the beginning of all life may be discovered - may be uncovered.

PJ: If you are starting from there then I will say the first step you will find that 'I' is there.

K: Yes, yes. First step: see clearly, hear clearly.

PJ: But the 'I' is there. So there is the observer and the observed.

K: Oh, of course.

PJ: Now seeing that, it is also...

K: Now wait a minute, Pupul, don't move away from that. I know there is the observer and the observed. Is that so? I am enquiring? I have taken it for granted.

PJ: No, first obviously, sir, when I first started enquiring I started from the observer.

K: Yes, I start with the observer.

PJ: Now I ask - or you have asked and therefore that thought is in my mind, that is there the observer.

K: Is there an observer different from the observed?

PJ: Now having that statement within me I look for the observer.

K: Yes, yes, who is the observer.

PJ: I look for the observer.

K: Yes, enquire into the nature of the observer. Go slowly into that. Because if I understand the observer - if there is an understanding of the observer, then perhaps the observer may see

the falseness of this division between the observer and the observed.

PJ: Who will see it?

K: Not 'who will see it', but the perception of what is truth. Perception, not who sees it, perceiving.

PJ: So the seeing of what is the truth of the observer will end the state of division.

K: Of division, yes. Yes, that's is what I have said a thousand times.

PJ: And it is not a one process, one act, that I end the process of division. You might say it happened once and you have seen everything. But it doesn't happen that way.

K: No. it is generally stated that way.

PJ: For that instance it is so.

K: No. Go ahead, what are you trying to say?

PJ: What I am saying is, diligence - we used that word - diligence or discipline is to have that enquiry alive within one.

K: And that does not, I am saying, that does not need training.

PJ: No, I am not talking of training. You brought it in.

K: When you used previously the word discipline...

PJ: No but I am using the word discipline without yet bringing in the word training. I say discipline is that I cannot expect to have an understanding of this unless the mind is awake to this and is diligent about being awake to this.

K: Yes. All right I won't bring in anything. I'll go ahead.

PJ: You can't deny that.

K: No, it has to be diligent, it has to be watchful, it has to be attentive, subtle, hesitant, it has to be all that.

PJ: It has to observe, and rest in observation, find a new home for itself in observation.

K: Pupul we are wandering off again, perhaps I am wandering off. I said I am enquiring into myself.

PJ: Well that's enquiring.

K: How do I enquire into myself except through my reactions - the way I think, the way I act, the way I respond to the environment, my relationship to another.

PJ: If I am starting from there I find that as I first observe myself - the responses, the reactions, all rapid, confused, continuous...

K: I know, contradictory.

PJ: ...contradictory, but in the very observing some space comes into this.

K: Some space, some order.

PJ: This is just the beginning.

K: I know, I know. We are sticking at the beginning.

PJ: That's what I am asking.

K: I am bored with the beginning.

PJ: So let us proceed further.

K: Pupul, I would like to ask a question. Is it necessary to go through all this? To watch my reactions, to watch my responses, to observe diligently my relationship with another, intimate or not? Must I go through all this? Or...

PJ: Sir, I'll say something now. The fact is one has gone through all this. The fact is...

K: You may have gone through it because you have accepted that pattern.

PJ: No.

K: Just hold a minute, hold a minute, hold on a minute. You see we have all done that: the thinkers, the sannyasis, the monks and...

PJ: And Krishnamurti.

K: I am not sure.

PJ: That's the point.

K: I am not sure. Just a minute. I want to discuss this point very seriously.

PJ: You either have in the last thirty years jumped yourself.

K: Wait a minute, let's see it for a moment. We have accepted this pattern of examination, analysis and investigating these reactions, paying attention to them, and watching, self-recollecting and so on and so on. There is something in it which rings a false note. At least to me.

PJ: You mean to say a person caught in the whole confusion of existence...

K: He won't even listen to all this.

PJ: There has to be space in order to even listen. How does that space arise?

K: Pupul, either you have suffered and you say, "I must find out", or you suffer and say, "God exists, I love him and I am comforted by him".

PJ: So you have still not answered me. You say, is it necessary to go through all this.

K: I am asking that. I think it may not be.

PJ: Then show me how. You can't...

K: Wait, I will show it to you in a minute. Let's go into it. If as long as you accept this analytical process, which we will call for

the moment the analytical process of enquiry, watching diligently your reaction and all that, we use one word for that, this analytical self-introspective, this constant watching, watching, watching.

PJ: It is not analytical.

K: All right, put it out. Constantly watching, constantly enquiring - you follow? I feel, as I see it, that man has done that thousands of time.

PJ: He has not, sir.

K: Oh yes he has.

PJ: He has not. He has done something quite different.

K: What has he done?

PJ: He has looked at his mind and tried to suppress.

K: That's part of the pattern: suppress, escape, substitute, transcend, that's all within that framework.

PJ: It is not the same thing as to observe without trying to do anything about the observation.

K: No, I am asking, Pupul, we are not meeting my question, if I may point out, perhaps I may be wrong. You are not answering my question: must I go through all this?

PJ: You are saying the word 'must'.

K: All right, I won't use 'must'. Is it necessary, is it imperative, is it essential that I must go through this?

PJ: No, but are you trying to say that out of the middle of chaos you can leap to a state of total non-chaos?

K: No, I won't put it that way. You see you are trying... No, I wouldn't put it that way.

PJ: Then what are you saying?

K: I am saying very clearly, I am saying, humanity has gone

through this process, some diligently, some sacrifice everything and so on. This has been the pattern of our existence. Some have done it. Right? Enquired, analysed, searched, introspective examination, diligently watching every action and so on, at the end he may be just a dead entity, with some illusory concept.

PJ: He may not be.

K: I said, may not be. And very few, very, very few have gone out of it.

PJ: But when you say, is it necessary, then you have to...

K: I know, I know, if it is not necessary then show me the other way. That's what you are saying. I'll show it to you. But first step out of this.

PJ: You see, sir...

K: Wait, wait, wait. I'll show it to you.

PJ: But look what you are asking.

K: I know I am asking.

PJ: If I step out of the other it is already there.

K: Of course. Step out. That's what I am saying. Don't take time to go through all this.

PJ: But what is meant by 'step out of it'?

K: I'll tell you what I mean. I recognize - let me talk a little - I recognize very clearly, perceive, whatever word you use, that this process of introspective observation, diligence and so on, man has tried a great deal, for a million years, in different ways. And somehow his mind is not clear at the end of it, he has got some fixations, he has got some ideas and so on. Somehow this quality of movement is very, very shallow. Now if you listen to that, that it is very shallow to do all this, and you see the truth that it is

shallow, which means your disordered mind is now quiet, listening to find out. Right? Your confused traditional mind says, "I am accustomed to this diligent observation of all my activities, and that it is really very, very superficial", if you see the truth of that superficiality you are out of it. It's like putting away something utterly meaningless.

Now wait a minute, let me put it round the other way. My mind is disorderly, my life is disorderly. You come along and say, "Be diligent, watchful of your actions, of your thoughts, of your relationship, diligent, be utterly watchful all the time". And I say, "That is impossible because my mind won't allow to be diligent all the time. It is not diligent, it is negligent." And I struggle between these two: being diligent and negligent. And I see man has done this.

PJ: But you mean to say, Krishnaji, a mind that is not capable of observing...

K: No, I am saying, a mind that is willing to listen.

PJ: But please listen to me, sir. You think a mind can be in that state of listening.

K: That is very simple.

PJ: Is it?

K: Yes. I say just listen to a story that I am telling you, you are interested. Your mind is quiet, you are eager to see what the story is and so on.

PJ: I am sorry, sir, it doesn't happen that way, no.

K: Just a minute. Just a minute. Don't say, no. I asked you, Pupulji, to listen to what I am saying.

PJ: I have listened.

K: Wait a minute. I am going to explain what I mean by listening. Not only with the sensory ear, but with the ear that has no movement, that is really listening, that is not translating, that is not comparing, that is not trying to find - listening. I am listening to what you say so completely, then if you are so listening, a man comes along and says, "Don't go through all this diligent process, it is false, superficial". If you hear that, the truth of it, what takes place? What actually takes place when you see something really true? Now is this diligent process, is it time consuming - right? I have not time. My life is so short. I have got so many problems, and you are adding another - be diligent. And I say, please I am worn out with problems, and you have introduced to me another problem. And I say, please. You have problems, I know you have got many problems which are all interrelated. Forget that for the moment and listen to it. That's all.

PJ: Sir, if that were so, if that were so - listen, sir - if I could listen, and I do listen, to music in that way.

K: Ah, music is different.

PJ: But to listen - if I listen to music in that way it should change me totally. It does not.

K: Of course not.

PJ: Then?

K: We are moving to something else.

PJ: You are talking of a mind which is already - I am using the word in inverted commas - which is mature already, listening to a state like that.

K: No. Pupul, I am not sure we have not made our minds so immature that we are incapable of listening to anything.

PJ: But how, Krishnaji, you start by making things impossible.

K: Of course! See the truth. Something impossible...

PJ: But that kind of energy which is needed to deal with an impossible thing.

K: That's what it is. This has been possible, this diligent affair. I say that is so trivial.

PJ: I'll ask you: what is the mind that can deal with an impossible statement like that? What is the nature of that mind?

K: That which is utterly impossible is non-existent. We are thinking everything is possible. I am getting there.

PJ: See where you are getting to, sir. You are saying, what you said just now, is non-existent. So with a non-existent mind - listen.

K: Look, Pupulji, if you and I, both of us agree, just a minute, even temporarily that this diligent process has really led nowhere. It has led to various activities which may be beneficial and so on, but the enquiry which sees that I must go to the very source of things - not through this way obviously.

PJ: Obviously, that I would accept.

K: That's all. No, if you accept that is not through diligent awareness.

PJ: But, sir, even to come to a point when I see it cannot come to it through this...

K: Therefore, what has happened to your mind? You have then put this aside.

PJ: Yes.

K: Now what is happening to a mind that says, this is too trivial, too superficial, out, put it out, what is then the quality of your mind?

PJ: I know what you are trying to say, sir.

K: You answer my question. What is the quality of a mind which has been caught in the process of diligent enquiry, this time consuming diligence, when it sees that it has no deep fundamental value - value in the sense that this diligent process will led to comprehend, of come upon the origin? This process obviously not because it is time consuming, the other way may have no time at all.

PJ: But look at the danger in what you are saying. The danger in what you are saying is, I will not be concerned with sweeping the room.

K: No, no. I am enquiring into myself. That very enquiry demands that the mind and the heart, the whole existence is orderly.

PJ: You start with the impossible.

K: Of course I start with the impossible, Pupulji, otherwise what is possible - you have done all the possible.

PJ: No, no, sir.

K: You have done everything that is possible. One has fasted, sacrificed, done everything to find the origin of things. That has been possible. And the possibility has led nowhere. It has led to certain benefits, social benefits and so on, and also it has led to a great deal of misery of mankind. So if you tell me that, that this diligent process is time consuming and therefore time-binding, and as long as you are doing this you are just scratching the surface - the surface may be most extraordinary, very nice and pleasant and ennobling and all that but it is just on the surface. If you grant that, not only grant but actually see it, feel it, it is in your blood, that this

is false, you have already stepped out of something - that is, the ordinary into something extraordinary. And we are not willing to do that. We want to go through all this. We treat it like learning a language. Learning a language is a disciplinary action, diligent attention and so on and so on. We carry the same mentality into the other. That's what I object to.

PJ: But I put aside the other.

K: It is not a game we are playing.

PJ: No, I am not playing a game. You put aside the other.

K: Which means, careful Pupul...

PJ: Which means even the seeing, listening is at an end - if I may put it this way.

K: Which means what? The movement of diligence has stopped. Of course. If that is false it has gone. So what has happened to my mind? My mind has been caught in the diligent enquiry and so on and so on, which is time-binding, and now it says, "By Jove, I see this to be utterly superficial". And what is the state of the mind which has put away something which man has carried for a million years? What is that state of mind? Right? It is a fresh mind. Right? It is a totally new mind. And such a mind is necessary to enquire - not enquire - necessary to uncover the origin.

If I talked like this to a very disciplinarian, religious man, he wouldn't even bother to listen. He would say, "No, it is all nonsense that you are talking about". But you, in our dialogue, say, "Let's go into it", and so you have put yourself in a position of listening, to find out. But if you keep on repeating this diligent process you are still like everybody else.

Now such a mind, first of all, such a mind has no bondage. Right? It has no bondage to time, which is, this diligent process is to become something, is to clarify, to understand, to go beyond. So this mind has no beyond, it is not becoming something. Would you go as far as that?

PJ: You see the moment movement ends...

K: No, I am asking you, would you go so far as to see the fact that such a mind cannot have any kind of dependence, attachment and so on?

PJ: Yes, that I see, because as movement ends...

K: The movement of becoming.

PJ: ...all this which you have talked about is the movement of becoming.

K: Which is the perpetuation of the self in a different form, in a different network of words. You see if you tell me this, and I start out to uncover the source - and to me that is a passion, I want to find out, I am not just playing a game, and to me it is utterly necessary - if when that uncovering of the origin of all life, when there is that uncovering my life, my actions, everything is different. Must be. But the other diligent process, my god, I will die at the end of it. You see that's why I feel the understanding of that has a time consuming factor which is so destructive. Time consuming is necessary to learn to technique but this is not a technique to be learnt.

PJ: Sir, you have really an antique mind, a mind of great antiquity. Antique in the sense of containing the whole of human...

K: You see, Pupul, that is why it is important to understand, I am the world. You understand? I am the world.

PJ: No one else can make that kind of statement, Krishnaji.

K: One must make it, otherwise where are you when you see all this destruction, brutality, wars, killing which has never stopped. A man who loved - loved - wouldn't be British, or Argentine or Israel, or Arab, or something, he couldn't kill another. So I see this process has been going on for thousands and thousands of years, everybody trying to become something. And all the diligent workers are helping man to become something. Illumination, enlightenment, is to achieve enlightenment. It is absurd!

PJ: You see, sir, with you...

K: Not 'with me'.

PJ: Just listen, sir. The whole movement of the dormant has ended.

K: That is diligence is ended. Becoming has ended.

PJ: The whole thing which is dormant.

K: Pupulji, don't let's make this into something elitist, it is only for the few - the elite can only have this kind of mind. I refuse to accept that. That goes back into the old division of the elite and the non-elite. Any person who gives attention, who wants to hear, who really says, "I must find the source of life", is passionate about it, not just casual, then he will listen - not to me, he will listen. It is in the air. You see, like Buddha is supposed to have achieved enlightenment. Just think of such a statement! Sitting under a tree, meditating, fasting, striving - you follow. And ultimately one day it happened. That's too utterly meaningless. That means you are allowing time to be the factor of enlightenment, time the factor of deep profound understanding. Do we stop?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION WITH PUPUL JAYAKAR 23RD JUNE 1982

PJ: Sir, I was wondering whether one could discuss the wonder and nature of birth in the human mind, not birth of having a baby, but a mind that is jaded, old, incapable of perception, can it renew itself, or totally have a new perception? I think that is a problem with many of us. As one grows older one finds that the quickness of the mind, the capacity to perceive, and take in deeply, perhaps dims.

K: Are you asking: is it possible to keep the mind very young, and yet ancient?

PJ: Yes. You used the word 'ancient', I also would like to go into the nature of what is meant by the word ancient. If we could go into the nature of that first because you have used it, and I have heard you use it several times. Obviously that ancient quality is unrelated to time as yesterday.

K: Yes, let's go into it.

PJ: What is the nature of the ancient?

K: After all the human brain, as far as one understands, and if you have listened to some of the television programmes, the scientists talking about the quality of the brain and how the brain works and so on, it has its own protective nature, protective chemical reaction when there is a shock, when there is a pain and so on. We are after all, or our brains are very, very ancient, very, very old. It has evolved from the ape, the ape standing up, and so on till now. It has evolved through time, through tremendous experiences, acquired a great deal of knowledge, both the outward knowledge as well as inward knowledge, and so it is really very,

very ancient. And it is not as far as I can understand, as far as I can see, it is not a personal brain, it is not my brain and your brain. It can't be.

PJ: But obviously your brain and my brain have a different quality of the ancient in them.

K: Wait. Don't let's talk of mine or yours for the moment.

PJ: By making a statement...

K: I am just exploring the beginning, laying a few bricks. If that is granted, that we are very old, very ancient, in that sense, and that our brains are not individualistic brains, we may have reduced it, we may think it is individual - it is personal, it is my brain, but it can't have evolved through time as my brain.

PJ: No, obviously.

K: No, it is absurd to think that, no it may be obvious but most of us think it us a personal brain, it is my brain. Therefore from that is born the whole individualistic concept. Leave that for the moment.

Now are we saying such an ancient mind, brain or mind - for the moment leave the mind, let's look at the brain - such an ancient brain, which has been so conditioned, and has lost, or it may be very, very deeply embedded in the unconscious, in the deep down, that it is becoming very, very coarse, superficial, artificial and vulgar. You follow what I mean?

PJ: But an ancient mind, as you just now said, is the result of evolution in time.

K: Of course. Evolution means time.

PJ: In time. Now the search which has gone on for centuries...

K: Since the beginning of time man must have asked.

PJ: ...has been whether it is possible to free this of that, because with time also is inbuilt with this aging quality, is built in with the sense of the ancient.

K: Yes. I understand that question.

PJ: So are you talking, when you say it is necessary to have an ancient mind, are you talking of a brain which has also inbuilt in it...

K: ...the quality of its own deterioration. Of course.

PJ: Why is that necessary? It is so.

K: No, it is so because experience, knowledge has limited it, has conditioned it, has narrowed it down. Right? The more we acquire knowledge, the more there is the limitation of itself.

PJ: No, you seem to be implying two things. One is the sense of the ancient, and the weight of the past, which gives it a sense of being very old.

K: It is old.

PJ: Because it has experienced for millions of years.

K: Which has conditioned it, which has narrowed it down, limited it.

PJ: But the ancient you are talking about, are you talking about that which it has experienced through time?

K: We will go into that in a moment. First let us see how ancient it is in the normal sense of that word. And how it has in its own million years of experience has limited itself. Therefore there is the quality of deterioration. And the modern world, living in the modern world, with all the noise, with all the terrible shocks, and the agonies of war and so on, has made it still more limited, more in conflict. Because the very limitation brings its own conflict.

PJ: Sir, there is a mind which because the sense of these millions years, gives to it a density and weight.

K: Yes, yes, quite.

PJ: Then there is a mind which is brittle.

K: Which is?

PJ: Brittle, easily corroded.

K: No, the mind and the brain, which are you talking about?

PJ: I am talking about the brain.

K: The brain, don't use the word mind.

PJ: All right, I'll use the word brain. The brain has a certain weight to it, and a density to it, which...

K: Yes, a coarseness to it, heaviness to it, quite.

PJ: A heaviness to it. Now is that what you mean by the ancient?

K: Not quite. I just want to go into it a little bit slowly. If we admit that the brain, by its own evolution, has conditioned itself, and therefore it has the inherent quality of its own destruction, and whether that quality can ever be stopped, in the sense of its deterioration, can the brain cells renew themselves in spite of its conditioning? Do you follow what I am saying? In spite of its agonies, failures, miseries, all the complex modern world in which we live, whether that brain can renew itself so as to achieve its originality, not originality in the sense of individuality, but originality in its origin.

PJ: Would you say that a baby, the brain cells of the baby are original in that sense?

K: No. Of course not.

PJ: So what is meant by original, originality of the brain cells?

K: Let's go into it a little bit. What does the word 'original', what does it mean? Unique, special.

PJ: No, it has a quality of 'for the first time'.

K: A pristine quality.

PJ: Yes.

K: Original means that. Untouched, uncontaminated by knowledge.

PJ: Yes.

K: Can it - that's the question - can such a brain which has been conditioned for a million, or two million years, reach that, or wipe away its conditioning and reach that quality of pristine freshness of the brain? It may be a wrong question altogether.

PJ: But it is I think scientifically they would say that the brain cells are dying all the time.

K: All the time.

PJ: Therefore the number of brain cells available...

K: And also are renewing itself. Apparently certain cells die and certain cells are reborn. It is not dying all the time so that the brain goes to pieces, dies.

PJ: No, but the very fact of aging is that the renewal does not keep pace.

K: Yes, that's it. That's the whole point really, isn't it, is it possible for a brain that has been conditioned, and therefore, as you put it, the built in quality of its own deterioration, can that quality stop, end, disappear?

PJ: Yes.

K: That is, can the brain keep young, young in the sense fresh, alive, has a quality of its originality.

PJ: Yes. How would you...

K: ...proceed from that. I think we have to go into the question, what is consciousness? That's part of our brain, part of our whole being, which is our consciousness. Right? What is consciousness? Not only being conscious of things, outwardly and inwardly, but the whole content of consciousness. Because without the content there is no consciousness, as we know it. So can the content, which makes up this consciousness, can that content end by itself so that there is a totally different dimension to consciousness? You follow? Because the brain or the mind has the quality of consciousness. Right? That is consciousness. The content is the consciousness.

PJ: Yes, that is so.

K: The content is pleasure, belief, excitement, sensations, reactions, faith, agony, pleasure, suffering, affection, and so on, the whole of that is consciousness. And as long as the content, which is all this, exists, it must, because of its conflict, its confusion within consciousness, must wear itself out. And that's why the brain becomes old - in the sense old, aging, dies. There is no freshness to it.

PJ: No, sir. Is the content of consciousness identically with the brain cells?

K: Yes, of course.

PJ: Then as the content of consciousness, because of its very nature wears itself out...

K: ...through conflict. Be careful.

PJ: Yes, I understand that. That very process is wearing out the brain cells.

K: Is conflict, the disturbance, the shocks, the pressures.

PJ: So the physical and psychologically are the same thing really then?

K: Yes. And psychological, that's right. Physical reactions, psychological reactions, they are both reactions.

PJ: Because the brain is physical. The content of consciousness is psychological.

K: Which is also a process of the physical. Of course.

PJ: Yes.

K: So it is psychological as well as the physical, with all their reactions bring about the thought of pain, the thought of agony, the thought of pleasure, the thought of achievement, ambition and so on and so on, and belief, faith, is all this.

PJ: It creates disturbance. But the nature of the brain cells is to continually die.

K: Yes. They carry on. The tradition carries on.

PJ: It is inbuilt, that also is inbuilt.

K: Of course.

PJ: Therefore...

K: And also its own protection, its own reaction, chemical reactions, from what one hears, the cells with their reactions, they produce their own chemical to protect itself.

PJ: But so is time inbuilt.

K: Of course, after all that is the product of time.

PJ: Time is inbuilt in the brain cells.

K: The question really is whether all this consciousness with its content can end, in the sense conflict totally end.

PJ: But with conflict totally ending will time end?

K: Yes. After all that is what the sannyasis, the monks, the real thoughtful people have enquired whether time has a stop. Right? Of course, they have all asked this question.

PJ: You are talking of time now as the psychological process of conflict.

K: Conflict, yes.

PJ: Not time as duration, or the watch.

K: No, no. So what is it that we are trying to find out, or rather investigate together?

PJ: What is it that will bring this quality of birth into the mind?

K: The quality of birth. Let's be clear what you mean by birth. A new, a fresh element enter into it.

PJ: Continual - I won't use the word continual.

K: No, you can't.

PJ: Let me cut out continual. But a being born and with the freshness of birth, and purity of birth.

K: No, wait a minute, careful. Birth you mean what - a baby is born, and his brain already has the quality of its father, mother, and also the tradition, it is gradually bringing all that out.

PJ: But birth also has that quality of the new. Birth is, it was not, and it is.

K: Ah, you are using birth in the sense - just let's be clear - the old being born. The ancient mind, the ancient brain, which is neither yours nor mine, it is the universal brain, is reborn in a baby.

PJ: It is reborn in a baby.

K: And the baby as it matures, the brain is the common brain.

PJ: But what is reborn in a mind which is free? Is it the ancient reborn?

K: No, let's be clear. First, is it possible to be free of this conditioning of the brain, which has brought about its own decay, and whether that consciousness can totally end all its conflict. Then out of that comes the new birth. I don't know if you follow what I am saying. As long as my brain, as long as one's brain, that is one's consciousness, is in conflict, there can be no new element enter into it. That's obvious. Would you grant that? Not verbally, but see the fact, that as long as I am fighting, fighting, struggling to become something.

PJ: I think one sees that.

K: All right. Now if one sees that, not merely verbally, but actually inwardly sees it, then the question arises whether it is possible to end it - end, I mean end suffering, end fear.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, the danger comes in that you can end it without renewal. Please listen. There is a possibility of ending all these things and yet diminishing.

K: Ah, no, we mean two different things by the word ending.

PJ: Ending what?

K: Ending that which is.

PJ: Ending that which is.

K: Which is my consciousness - all the thoughts that I have had, all the complexities that have been accumulated through time, the ending of that. So we will have to be clear what we mean by ending. Either you end it by deliberate act of will, or deliberate ideal, purpose, by a superior goal.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, when actually ending happens, which is coming to a stop, the real standing still of the mind, it happens without any reason.

K: Yes. Sometimes, let's go slowly.

PJ: Sometimes it happens without reason. It is not due to any single thing. So is it that you throw yourself to chance?

K: No, no. Let's be clear first, Pupulji, what do we mean by ending. Is the ending - does the ending create its own opposite?

PJ: No.

K: Careful! We generally mean that. I end this in order to get that.

PJ: No, I am not talking of that ending.

K: So I mean by ending, the total perception of that which is, total perception of my consciousness, the whole, the complete perception of that consciousness which is insight, that insight has not a motive, a remembrance, it is immediate perception, and the ending of it is there is something beyond, which is not touched by thought. That is what I mean by ending.

PJ: Is it that the million years which you call the ancient?

K: No, that's part of the ancient brain, naturally.

PJ: Is it that the totality of that million years sees itself?

K: Yes, that's right. That's the real problem. Pupul, let's make it a little more simple, or a little more definite. Do we see the point that our consciousness has been cultivated through time? Right?

PJ: Yes, that's easy.

K: Just a minute. And any reaction to the ending of that is furthering another series of reactions. Which is, if I desire to end it, then that very desire creates another object to be gained. So is there a possibility of perceiving without the movement of the future? You understand what I am saying? The ending has no future, only ending. But if the brain says, I cannot end that way because I need

a future to survive. I don't know if I am conveying it.

PJ: Yes, because inbuilt in it is the future.

K: Yes, of course. So is there an ending, the psychological demands, conflicts, ending of all that, ending without the thought of what will happen if I end? I don't know if I am conveying anything. Because, look, I can give up something if you will guarantee me something else. I will give up suffering if you will guarantee me that I will be happy with the ending of it. Or there is some extraordinary reward awaiting me. Because my whole brain is constructed as part of that consciousness, reward and punishment. Punishment is the ending, and the reward is the gaining. Now as long as these two elements exist in the brain, the future, the continuation of the present will go on, modified and so on. Right? So can these two principles, reward and punishment, end? When suffering ends the brain is not seeking a future existence in paradise.

PJ: But even if it is not seeking a future in paradise, suffering itself corrodes the brain.

K: Yes. But you see, Pupulji, this is very important to understand that the brain is seeking constantly security, it must have security. That's why tradition, remembrance, the past has extraordinary significance. Right? It needs security. The baby needs security. Our brains need security - security being food, clothes and shelter. Security is faith in god, faith in some ideal, faith in a future better society, all these are contributory causes which make the brain say, I must have deep security otherwise I can't function. Right? So physically there is no security because it is going to die, it knows it is going to die. Psychologically it has no

security, actually. Am I going too fast?

PJ: No, it is not that. With all this I still say that there is one central demand.

K: Which is to survive.

PJ: No, sir.

K: What is the central demand?

PJ: The central demand is to have a mind, to have a brain which gives the flavour of a new existence.

K: Wait, wait, who demands it? Who actually wants such a brain? Not the vast majority of people. No, they say, please stay things as they are.

PJ: But we are not talking about the vast majority. I am discussing with you, or 'X' is discussing with you.

K: Let's be clear.

PJ: So it is basically that, there are many ways of getting security.

K: I question whether there is security in the sense 'we want security'.

PJ: So the brain will never understand because inbuilt in its very nature...

K: No, that's why I am saying perception is important.

PJ: Perception of what?

K: Perception of actually what is, first. Move from there slowly, slowly.

PJ: Perception of 'what is' includes the creative things it has done, the stupid things it has done, what it considers worthwhile, what it considers not worthwhile, the perception of all these and the ending of all this.

K: No, just a minute, be careful, Pupul, let's go slowly, if you don't mind. Perception of what is actually going on. Right? Both physically, outwardly, and inwardly. What is going on around me and psychologically, inwardly what is happening. That is 'what is'.

PJ: Yes.

K: Now, the question is: can 'what is' be transformed? Right? Which is my consciousness, which is part of the brain.

PJ: But in the emptying of that consciousness, an emptying of that consciousness...

K: By asking that question, is that possible? Is it possible to empty, or to wipe away the whole of the past? The past is the time, the whole of my past, the whole of the content of my consciousness is the past, which may project the future, but it still has its roots in the past. Right? Now is it possible to empty? Really this is a tremendous question, not just an ideological or intellectual question. Is it psychologically possible not to have the burden of a thousand yesterdays? The ending of that is the beginning of the new, is the new.

PJ: You used a phrase just now: is it possible not to have the burden of a thousand yesterdays. Is the problem in the burden, or in the thousand yesterdays?

K: The thousand yesterdays is the burden. You can't separate the two.

PJ: No, no.

K: How do you separate the two?

PJ: Because the thousand yesterdays is a fact.

K: Oh, you mean in that sense.

PJ: The burden is when I have given a special content to many

of these experiences which I have had, but the thousand yesterdays are...

K: Just a minute. Would there be a thousand yesterdays if there was no remembrance of those thousand years of sorrow, or whatever it is, can I separate - I can separate by the calendar.

PJ: Yes you can, sir. You can separate a thousand yesterdays from the burden of the thousand yesterdays.

K: Show me how. Let's be clear first what we mean. When we say a thousand yesterdays, by the encyclopedia, or by a calendar, I can say Egypt was...

PJ: No, but let us take one's own life.

K: One's own life, which is forty, fifty or eighty, ninety, or whatever it is, or twenty.

PJ: Now you can separate the thousand yesterdays of one's own life from the pain, sorrow, burdens, all that which is the burden of the thousand yesterdays.

K: Yes.

PJ: So you can cut away the...

K: The what?

PJ: The pain and the sorrow.

K: Can you?

PJ: Why not?

K: What do you mean 'cut away'?

PJ: Perceive. You just now said it.

K: But it is not a cutting away in the sense - you see cutting away implies two parts.

PJ: You see this is where the difficulty comes in. Can I cut away the fact of my thirty years, fifty, sixty years? I can't do that.

My body is sixty five years old.

K: I know we said that. I can't commit suicide. I have lived eighty seven years - am I eighty seven, or eighty eight - I have lived eighty seven years, of course it exists, but I am talking about the remembrances, of course, that I am talking about. I am saying a thousand yesterdays exist.

PJ: They can be cut away. You can divided.

K: Ah, I can't divide. My body has not existed for a thousand yesterdays. I mean thousand yesterdays in the sense...

PJ: You are talking of the ancient mind of man.

K: I can't cut it away. This whole brain, and all the material processes of the organism is part of it.

PJ: Then what do I do with the ancient mind? Sir, one has understood what one has to do with the superficial yesterdays, with the burden of the superficial yesterdays.

K: Do you know what that means? Have I really wiped, or ended a thousand yesterdays, with all its superficialities, its pettiness, its narrowness, its brutalities, cruelty, and ambition and so on, which are all superficial, can I wipe all that away, can that all end? I can say, I can cut away - but which is the knife, which is the entity that is cutting it? It is part of that.

PJ: No, but I am not cutting away one pain.

K: I am cutting away the whole thing.

PJ: If I were to discriminate and say, "I will cut away this, and not this".

K: No, that is too silly.

PJ: But when I say I am cutting away, I am cutting away the whole burden.

K: Now wait a minute, Pupilji, I understand. Don't say "I cutting away".

PJ: I am not cutting away.

K: Let's be clear on that.

PJ: Let's cut, remove the 'I'.

K: You see I do object - if you don't mind, cutting away doesn't mean - you see when you cut something there are two parts.

PJ: Yes, what I am trying to get at is - you see this is where a lot of confusion takes place.

K: Verbal confusion takes place, semantic.

PJ: You cannot cut away the eighty seven years, or the sixty five years, the sixty six years.

K: Of course not. You are not eighty seven.

PJ: I am sixty six. But you can cut away - cut, that word is wrong.

K: Don't use that word.

PJ: You were using the word, the seeing of 'what is'.

K: The ending of 'what is', that is totally different.

PJ: Why do you want to draw a distinction between the ending of 'what is' and cutting away?

K: Ending, to me, means there is no continuation of something that has been.

PJ: What is in cutting away?

K: Cutting away implies - you know, when I cut a piece of wood there are two parts of the same thing.

PJ: Well I think it is a semantic thing.

K: Semantic. But I am asking: is it first of all possible to completely end the whole content of my consciousness, of human

consciousness which has grown through millenia. And that content is all this confusion, vulgarity, coarseness, pettiness, triviality of a stupid life.

PJ: But it is also the goodness.

K: Oh yes. Now wait a minute. Goodness is something entirely different. Goodness has no opposite. Goodness is not the outcome of that which is not good. The ending of that which is not good is goodness. That's a different matter.

Now is it possible to end all this conflict? If there is no ending to conflict, conflict can be modified but...

PJ: There is an ending to conflict.

K: Why do you say that?

PJ: There is an ending to conflict.

K: Is there? Or a forgetfulness of that which has caused conflict, or really end it.

PJ: Do you mean to say, sir, the very fact of the ending of conflict is the birth of the new?

K: Yes. You understand the implications of conflict, the depth of it, not the superficiality that I am no longer British, or French, or I don't belong to this country, or to that country, or that religion, or that race. Those are all very superficial. I am talking of the deep embedded things.

PJ: You are talking of conflict as separation from another, the sense of separateness.

K: That is the real thing. Isolation, which inevitably breeds conflict. Is that possible? What does it mean? There is no conflict. Now wait a minute. Problems may arise but those problems are dealt with immediately, ended. Problem means conflict.

PJ: Why should problems arise?

K: The word, the common usage in the dictionary, is that a problem is something thrown at you, which is a challenge. Problem means that. Something you have to face. We resolve the problem intellectually, or physically and so on and so on, which is still creating further problems. Like the politicians, that is what they are doing: you conquer, and the result of that conquering is some other factor which is another series of problems. You keep this problem going all the time. I am saying there is no problem. Physically or psychologically there is no problem; if I can't live at Brockwood for a few months, all right, I won't live at Brockwood, if nobody feeds me, all right - you follow. There is no problem. If a new thing arises, either my brain is incapable of solving it and therefore it becomes a problem.

PJ: You mean to say, sir, for the birth of the new...

K: That's it, you are getting it. And therefore the birth of the new is the most ancient.

PJ: Can we go into that? Would you say a little about it?

K: After all that is the ground beyond which there is no other ground. That is the origin beyond which there is no other origin.

You see, Pupulji, this is really a problem, not a problem, this is really a question whether the brain can ever be free from its own bondage. After all ending something is not total freedom. Right? I can end, say for example, my hurts, I can end it very simply. But the images that I have created about myself, those images get hurt, and the maker of the images is the problem. So it leads more and more to something else, which is: to live a life without a single image, and therefore there is no hurt and no fear, and if there is no

fear there is no sense of safety, god, comfort and all the rest of it.

Would you say the most ancient, of which - no I won't even say that - which is the origin of all life? It must be ancient of ancient, beyond all thought of old or new. That is the origin of all life. When the mind which includes the brain, when that mind reaches that point of that ground, which is totally original, new, uncontaminated, is that possible? Meditation has been one of the means to reach it. Silencing the mind has been the way that one hopes will help, will bring about that coming to it. You see we are all making efforts to come to it. That's what I am saying. It requires no effort. The very word effort means conflict. You see that which has no conflict cannot be approached through conflict. Of course not.

PJ: In this sense, does it really mean that there is no partial approach at all in your teachings?

K: Impossible. How can there be? If I approach it through various parts, which the Hindus have discovered, Karma Yoga and all the rest of it, it is just partial. You can't approach it.

PJ: What do you do? You are an ordinary human being.

K: No, you can't do anything. First of all, you can't do anything. You can only do physical activities. Psychologically you cannot do anything.

PJ: What do you mean by physical activities?

K: Creating a garden, building houses, technological.

PJ: But the physical is going on.

K: It is going on.

PJ: So what does one do?

K: But if there are no psychological fears there will be no

division of countries and so on and so on. There would be no division. You follow?

PJ: Yes, but the fact is that there is psychological fear.

K: That's just it. Therefore you will never get a brain which has lived in psychological isolation, which means conflict, that can never possibly come to that ground, that ground which is the origin of all life. Obviously not. How can my petty mind, worrying about my beastly little self come to it?

PJ: That is more futile, sir, the whole of life is more futile if after doing everything you haven't taken the first step. Then where are you?

K: What is the first step? Just a minute, go into it, what is the first step?

PJ: I would say the first step is seeing whatever is.

K: Seeing 'what is'. Wait a bit. How do you see it, how do you approach it? On that depends the totality of 'what is', or only you see the partiality of 'what is'. If you see the totality of 'what is', finished.

PJ: It doesn't just work like that.

K: Of course not. Because our minds, our thoughts are fragmented, therefore I will approach the life, or 'what is' actually with my fragmented mind, fragmented brain which has broken up.

PJ: And again with time the fragmented gets less. Don't jump on me.

K: I know what you are going to say.

PJ: With time the fragmented gets less. And it is possible to listen to you, for the mind to be still, not to make any movements, not to make any effort, but that is still not the first step.

K: No. When you say, please you used the words, the first step to observe, or to perceive 'what is'. Right? That's what you said. If I perceive it partially, then you know, that leads to further complications. Right? Partial perception creates partial problems. Right? Now is it possible to see the whole complex of 'what is'? To see the whole and not the fragment. That means - wait a minute - I have to see if I lead a fragmented life, a life of fragmentation. That is where I would begin. Because if I approach life, which is my consciousness, which is the way of thought, feeling, actions and all that, if I approach it fragmentarily then I am lost. That's what is happening in the world. They are totally lost. Those people who govern us, those people who tell us what is right or wrong, and all the rest of it. Is it possible to look at life as a whole without fragmentation?

PJ: Why doesn't the ancient mind see this?

K: It can't, it won't. How can total complete order?

PJ: But you said that ancient...

K: Just a minute, that is the ancient, the original ground is the most ancient.

PJ: No, that is there.

K: No, no.

PJ: What do you mean, no?

K: Unless it is there as an idea, which is what all people have maintained. God is there. That is just an idea, a concept, a projection of our own desire to be comfortable, to be happy, to be - all the rest of it. Can I live a life, can a human being live a life in which there is no fragmentary action? If somebody says, "Where am I to begin?", I would say, begin there, find out for yourself if

you lead a fragmentary life. You know what a fragmentary life is - saying one thing and doing another, the whole fragmented way of living, which is isolation, and therefore I have no relationship with my wife, or with the rest of humanity. So begin there. You know what that means? What tremendous enquiry you have to make to find out.

PJ: What is enquiry?

K: Observation. To observe very clearly without any bias, without any direction, without any motive, how my life is fragmented. Just to observe it. Not say, I am fragmented, therefore I must be whole. The idea of becoming whole is another fragmentation. So the implications of observing the way of fragmentation. Which means thought itself is a fragment. Right? And that is the cause of fragmentation. I am becoming something different from you.

PJ: So the birth of the new...

K: ...is not possible unless you have this. Obviously. We had better stop.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 28TH AUGUST 1982

I hope you are not as nervous as I am! Each time that one talks and goes through all this nervousness, apprehension, one doesn't quite know what one is going to say, at least I don't.

I think one should be aware of what is happening in the world, and not be depressed by it, or optimistic or pessimistic, but to observe impartially, dispassionately what is actually going on. Technologically the Far East is gaining more and more rapidly, advancing more than the Western cultures, probably. And the economic situation right throughout the world is very shaky, uncertain. Socially there is a great deal of confusion, uncertainty. And religions throughout the world have played very little part in our daily life, they have lost actually their meaning altogether, though the organization, the religious organizations maintain status quo, talking about superficial things, not the fundamental realities of life. And what is going to happen to man in the future, to all of us and our grandchildren, or whatever they are, what is going to take place?

One has to look at all this very carefully, not draw any conclusion either Left or Right, or Centre, politically, or in any way take sides, not be committed to any political, religious body but be concerned with what is happening to man. We are preparing for war, armaments are being sold by industrial countries all over the world, their economy depends on it. And killing man seems to be fashionable, seems to be heroic, they are praised, their names are put in cathedrals, and apparently killing other human beings in

the name of religion, patriotism, country, has become all important. Nations are divided - the British, the French, the American, the Russian, the Indian, Japanese and so on. There is an economic war between them all, not only physical war but economic and other forms of destructive attitude towards life. These are obviously, for any thinking man, these are the facts. And when one observes all this one asks what a human being, like you and me, what can we do in this world? This becomes a rather serious question. Some of us join some other group, commune, or follow some leader, putting on different kinds of robes and so on, which doesn't really fundamentally affect the whole movement that is going on in the world towards destruction, towards war, in which the human existence has very little value. And when one asks: what am I to do, facing all this? And we must ask this question together. We must think this out together, not accept what the speaker says, but together, you and the speaker. And asking this question: what are we to do in this mad world which is becoming more and more insane, more and more violent, appalling things are happening of which we don't know - chemical warfare, biological warfare, nitrogen bombs and neutron bombs. The scientists are preparing all this. If one country invents something more than the other, the other competes with the other. Scientists are maintaining all this. And the philosophers are merely spinning a lot of words.

Now what shall we, as human beings, living in this world, with our families, our children, what is our action, what is our responsibility? Just to turn our back on it? Retreat into some monastery? Into some ideological conclusions? Inventing new ideologies? - none of these have solved our human problem

confronting this frightening state, dangerous world in which we are living.

So please you are not just listening to the speaker expecting to find out what his answer is to all this, what his activity is, his responsibility, but that is a wrong question, if one may point out. It is: what is our responsibility? - not the speaker's responsibility only. It is what is the responsibility of each one of us. And the world is aflame, burning, thousands are suffering in the name of the country, patriotism, and all that nonsense that is going on in the world. So we ought to, during these few talks here and questions, we ought to think together over this matter. Together, not being committed to anything, to no group, to no politics, to no religion, to no country, and together find out what we, as human beings living in this dreadful world, what is our responsibility, what is our natural response to all this horror going on?

First of all, all human beings throughout the world, East, West, or Middle East, are going through a great many difficulties, a great many problems, starvation, overpopulation, bad governments, governments committed to their own particular ideologies, governments and the people who rule us are mad about power, position, prestige, helping the terrorists by selling armaments. The other day one heard on the television 80% of the armaments this country produces are sent abroad and 20% are kept for their own self-defence. This is happening right throughout the world. And human beings have suffered endlessly for millenia upon millenia, and they have found no answer to all this. And more and more we are becoming dependent on outward environmental control, trying to find answers in outward activities, through governments,

through special laws and so on and so on. All outward, peripheral activities. And apparently the answer doesn't lie there, neither in politics, nor in separate nationalities, nor in various religious organizations, sectarianism. There is no answer there at all. But we are always seeking answers for fundamental human disturbance in the outward symptoms. We are trying to deal with superficial symptoms without going very, very deeply into why human beings throughout the world are behaving as they are, callous, indifferent, totally concerned with themselves.

Please bear in mind that we are thinking together, not merely listening to the speaker, but be concerned with our responsibility, with our activity of our minds and our hearts about all this.

First we ought to look, I think, at the consciousness of mankind. Why this consciousness, which we are, why it has become what it is. Each one of us thinking that our consciousness is ours, our particular inheritance, our particular evolution. It belongs to each one of us, and we are confined to that limitation. This is what each one of us thinks, it is our consciousness, each one with our particular isolated consciousness. Right? That is a fact. Each one thinks what you are is that you are special, inherited results, yours. Now we are going to question that. Is that yours? Is it your consciousness? Or the consciousness of all humanity, of which you are. That is all human beings throughout the world, wherever they live, under whatever climate, whatever government, religion, they go through great fears, anxieties, sorrow, misery, some vague happiness. This is the common lot of every human being. Right? Of every human being. Even though they may be highly placed, living in great houses, or in a hut in poverty, mankind goes through

this. So there is the common consciousness of which we are. So it is not your consciousness. You suffer, you are uncertain, great anxiety, loneliness, depression, seeking something beyond all this, calling it god, outside agency, and so on and so on. Every human being - please do realize this, not a verbal association or verbal comprehension, or some intellectual conclusion but an actuality, a reality that we, each one of us, is the rest of mankind. Please this must be really grasped because from that we are going to find out what to do then. If we are not clear on this point - clear in the sense not verbally or intellectually but in our feeling, in our hearts, in our depth of our being, in our blood - that every human being whether they live in the Totalitarian states or in the so-called Democratic world, Capitalist or the other, Left or Right, Indian, Japanese, black, white, purple, whatever the race and religion, every human being goes through this, as each one of us does, having tears, laughter, worshipping something that thought has invented. This is the ground on which all human beings stand. You cannot possibly refute it. Logically, intellectually, if you will, this is a fact, though on the periphery, on the outside you may be more educated, living in an affluent society, better hygiene, better fed, perhaps a little better government, it is all the peripheral activity. But deeply, fundamentally, each one of us is the whole of mankind. Right? Do we actually comprehend this? Or our brains refuse to accept such an idea, refuse to see the fact because we are so conditioned that my life is mine, my consciousness, my thoughts, my activity for which I am solely responsible. Your brain refuses to face this enormous reality that we, as human beings, are the rest of mankind.

We can endlessly discuss this, pros and cons. We can endlessly

analyse whether we are separate from all other human beings, consciously, in our consciousness. You may be tall, you may be short, you may be pale, you may be white or semi white, or brown, black and so on, those are all peripheral, outside activities. But deep inward states we are like the rest of mankind, so you are the mankind. You are the rest of humanity. Right? Please one has to be industrious with regard to this. Work it out so that when this is absolutely irrevocably clear then we can proceed to enquire what we human beings can do.

When we ask that question: what we can do? We are still thinking what I can do. You understand? We are not thinking as a total human being. We are thinking as isolated entities asking this question: what I can do? Right? Which is a wrong question because we are still concerned with ourselves as a separate isolated human being. Of course we are isolated, you are different from me, you are tall, I am short, I am brown, you are white or black, or whatever it is. But when you shift the superficialities of all this, and when you delve deeply in oneself, into oneself which is our consciousness, then you begin to discover that you are like the man next door, or very far away, going through various agonies, depressions and anxieties, loneliness and sorrow.

Very few of us ask such questions. We are all so highly educated as individuals, separate, isolated from each other, as countries are divided. And so when we ask what to do, we are asking as an Englishman, British, French, belonging to certain government, or belonging to certain groups and so on. But we never comprehend deeply the reality that basically we are all one. Can we move from there? Not - we can move, talk about other

things very easily but if this ground is not actual on which we can stand firmly, nothing can shake us from that, then we can find out what is our responsibility as a whole human being, not as an isolated human being. We are going to go into it more and more as we go along. We are thinking together about these matters. Please the speaker must insist on this. The speaker is anonymous, he has no authority, he, as a person, he doesn't exist. He is merely, observing, we are both observing together what is happening. So please don't pay any attention, or give any importance to personality. It is like a telephone, you don't respect the telephone, put garlands round it, worship it. You listen to what it has to say. The telephone may be black, white - they have many colours nowadays! But when you give it importance it becomes too absurd and childish.

So we can proceed. Technologically - please understand this question, I am going to go into it - technologically man has turned his mind towards perfecting more and more technology - computers, armaments. So technology is moving more and more to the East, to the Far East. That is, man has given importance to technology: better instruments of war, better communication, better means of killing another human being and so on. I won't go into all that - we probably all know about it. So man has given time, energy, money, his capacities towards that, improvement of technology. Please see this, what is happening in the world. So his consciousness has moved towards greater technology - right? He has given his thought, his energy in that direction. So our brains are becoming more and more technologically minded, gadgets. Please we are not saying that you shouldn't have that, we are saying that is

inevitable, that is what is happening. And man has given very little time, energy, thought in any other direction. He doesn't say: "I am going to find out for myself what I am, why I behave like this. What is beyond all this?" We haven't given a thought to it. You understand the two? That is man has given enormous time and energy towards the conquering of environments, which is the sky, heaven, and the world. And we have not given that equal energy or time or vitality to enquire within ourselves, what we are, why you behave like this, is there anything ultimate, is there any existence without cause? Which is the enquiry of something far greater than all technology, all human thought. You understand? You see the picture? Technology is invading our whole consciousness and we are not giving enough energy and time to the other. And if there are a few who do they are submerged by the other. Please see the actuality of all this. I hope this is all clear, that we are all understanding each other in what we have been saying.

One may give energy, time, to the enquiry of that which is material, and that which is far beyond all material explanations, if there is something eternal, beyond all sorrow. Very few of us give time to it. And when we do, perhaps one or two here and there, then the other world submerges it. So if more, if all of us who are listening here give time, energy to the enquiry of something beyond all this, then we are adding to that consciousness something which is not the technological world at all. Do you understand? Am I making this clear.

Suppose you give your time, energy, your capacities, to real enquiry, not accepting, belief, and all that childish stuff, but deeply enquiring. Enquiry is different from analysis. Enquiry is to observe

and pursue that observation. So when one human being does this you may add to the whole human consciousness a certain quality to it. And that quality is soon destroyed, or submerged, or diminished by the other. But if there are a thousand people who are concerned with this, not forming a group and all that kind of silly stuff, but actually giving your whole life to this, then you are adding to that consciousness, to the human consciousness a quality of something beyond all words, beyond all thought, beyond all conclusions, something eternal. You understand?

So if this is clear then we can ask: what are we to do? Not before. It merely then becomes a superficial activity. If each one of us said to ourselves, because that is an obvious fact: the world is now becoming technologically minded, I don't know if you are aware of all this - Japan is becoming the centre of know-how, the centre of technology. The Japanese government is investing billions and billions and billions of money to investigate into computers. They have already almost conquered the West by their cars, by their watches, by their cameras, by their gramophones, everything. Other far Asiatic countries are pursuing them, are cultivating this. And not in opposition, not as a reaction to that, but man cannot live on technology alone, and its products, one has to go into something that is immeasurable. So if all of us who listen to all this give time and energy to this enquiry then that very enquiry will answer that question: what am I to do? Right? So we are going together to find out how to enquire, how to observe.

First of all to observe is not to analyse. When you observe a flower you see the beauty, the quality, the colour, the perfume, the untouchable beauty of it. And after that you can analyse it. You can

look at the plant, tear it to pieces if you want to, I hope you won't tear it and then look at it. Analysis is a dead process. Observation is not. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. The analyser thinks he is separate from that which he analyses. This is the whole psychology that the analyser is separate from the analysed - right? It is not a fact. The analyser is also the result of the past, his memories, his experiences, his knowledge and that which he observes he thinks he is separate - right? I will make it much simpler.

I am envious, envy involves jealousy, comparison, imitation, conformity. And I am envious, it gives me pleasure in fulfilling my desire. And you come and say, "Look, envy is an ugly thing, it is really quite destructive." So in me there is immediately the analyser saying, "The envy is different from me. I am going to control it, I am going to shape it. I am going to mould it. I am going to put it away - or keep it." But when you examine it more closely the analyser is the analysed, envy is part of me, I am not differing from envy - right? Anger is not different from me, I am anger. But my conditioning has been that my anger is different from me, because then I can control it, then I can shape it, then I can rationalize it, give a dozen explanations as to why I am angry. But anger, envy and so on, is part of me, I am anger. You see when there is a division between the analyser and the analysed there is conflict. There is struggle, there is pain, there is every form of substitution, transcending it and so on, but when the analyser is the analysed the whole problem undergoes a radical change because there is no conflict. Then you are really observing. Are we getting clearer between ourselves?

Please don't look so solemn. Is this clear for ourselves? Because we have lived with conflict, all our relationships bring about conflict, from childhood we live with conflict - the more, the better. This measurement, which is the space between 'what is' and 'what should be', this is the measurement, which is time, is bringing about great conflict in us. I am this, but I will be that. Either in the business world or in the artistic world, or in our daily life. This conflict we accept, we say that is normal, healthy, it brings about progress, all that, bla, bla, bla! But if you are enquiring into whether the brain, whether the mind can be free from conflict then you have to go into this question: whether the observer, the analyser, is entirely different from the analysed. Or the analyser is the analysed and therefore the ending of conflict. And therefore observing what takes place when there is no conflict. Because if I am envy, I am envy, I don't say, "I should not" or "I am" but I observe the movement of envy - right? Observe without any pressure, without any future to that which is being observed. This requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of energy to look so clearly. Then the whole conditioning of man who has accepted conflict as the way of life disappears completely.

Human beings in the world in which they have lived for so many million years, not four thousand, five hundred years ago. Not the fundamentalist's idea which is rather absurd, they have lived for so many, many years, centuries upon centuries, they have accepted conflict, they have accepted hate, they have accepted to wound each other, kill each other and when one realizes that our consciousness is not mine, my thinking is not mine, thinking is common to all mankind whether they are poor, uneducated,

completely ignorant and superstitious, they think. Or the great scientists, they think. Thinking is not yours or mine, it is thinking. And one begins then to discover that observation is far more acute, direct, has a quality of decision, not analysing, tearing everything to pieces to find out why we act this way and go back to your grandmother, or your mother or your father. That whole business - I hope there aren't any psychologists here - is rather immature. Please, we have discussed this matter with many psychologists. So if there are any psychologists here please don't get hurt. Just look, listen, observe what we are saying, we may be totally wrong, subject to all your correction, but enquire, look at it. Where there is observation there is no analysis. Just to observe as you observe a beautiful mountain, you cannot alter it, its grandeur, its majesty, its great beauty. Just to observe it. In observation there is beauty.

So with such quality of observation we are going to look. Not what I think is observation, but together to observe? You understand? Are we together in this a little bit? To observe, say for example, the hate that is spreading throughout the world, one human being wanting to hurt another by a gesture, by a word, by a look, by something that you are right or say hate. It is spreading throughout the world. The poor man who has hardly anything to eat in the East hates when you go by in your car, have clean clothes - you understand all this? And see what the recent wars in this country and other parts of the world are doing, they are cultivating hate in the name of god, in the name of country and all that, patriotism and all that childish stuff. So observe this hate. Do we hate anybody? It is rather an odd question to ask but we are going to go into all this. Do we hate somebody? Because if somebody

you hate for various reasons, he may have hurt you psychologically. Anger is part of hate. When you observe, not analyse, this hate, why human beings have cultivated diligently this hate through wars, can one, in oneself can one honestly, without any sense of hypocrisy, dishonesty, say, "I have observed my hate for another" and it is in observation which is like a flame of attention it wipes away that hate.

And most of us from childhood are hurt, wounded by parents, by teachers, being hurt through comparison, better marks, better - you know the whole business of modern education. You are getting hurt. And to observe that wound, or many wounds - there are not many wounds, there is only one wound, one hurt, that is, hurt. You may be hurt by this person, or that person, for this reason or for that reason, but the hurt is the same. Can you look at that hurt, observe it, not try to transcend it, go beyond it, all the rest of it. Because when you observe the hurt you will see all the consequences of that hurt. It is a wound that is continuous, though it may be submerged, it is continuous, it is producing various results, results of isolation, fear and so gradually resistance and further isolation.

So when you observe very closely this hurt, which is to observe, to give your total attention to that observation, it is like fire that burns out, that cleanses the wound. So we are proceeding still further into the enquiry of observation. Which is to observe our relationship with each other. Observe our relationship whether intimate or not. What actually is our relationship? Is it of dependence, is it that I need somebody to fulfil my desires, to escape from my loneliness, to biologically, sexually to appease my

demands? Please you are enquiring - I am not enquiring. We are together enquiring, please don't say I am enquiring and you'll just listen to me. You are enquiring into your relationship. You may not want to, that is a different matter. You can shut your ears or leave the tent, the marquee, but since you are you have to listen to it willy nilly.

So what is your relationship? Just to observe the quality of that relationship. Is it attachment? An escape from loneliness? A sense of dependency? So is your relationship - please listen to this for a minute, if you are interested, has your relationship a cause? You understand my question? Has it a motive? If there is a cause, cause means a pressure, a motive which is a movement of intention, conscious or not, that which has a cause must inevitably end. You understand? If I have a cause to love you - think of the horror of that - if I have a cause to love you because you are sitting in a large audience and it gives me pleasure which is my cause, my motive, then the consequences of that are ugly. So I depend on you. And where there is dependence there is fear. So I am discovering where there is a cause there must be an ending. If I have a cause in my relationship with my wife, my husband, with my children, cause, then that relationship must create conflict inevitably. And there is always an escape from that conflict - god, football, psychologists and so on and so on, and so on, divorce, you know the whole process of it. So when you look at one's relationship, it is as it is now, except on rare occasions, a form of self exploitation of each other and in that there is great ugliness and brutality and violence and quarrels and all that is the relationship which most of you know.

So can one observe this fact? We have analysed it briefly, we can go into it much more deeply but can one observe this extraordinary fact of self, of dependency, attachment? So one asks: is attachment love? Is love possession? - my wife, my girl, my husband - attachment. Is that love? If that is love then it has a cause - right? Because I depend on you because you satisfy me, gratify me and therefore where there is a cause our relationship must inevitably end up in conflict. So has love a cause? You understand my question? Please ask these questions.

So one has to observe closely the nature of relationship and love. Love has now become - you know what it has become, sex, pleasure, a form of entertainment. And where there is the cause to love, love has gone. So can human beings - please ask this question - can human beings live without a cause? Not a political cause or some other cause, I am not talking of such causes. To live in one's life, in one's daily life without a single cause. Is that at all possible? Or we are so conditioned that as we have lived for thousands of years on causation and its effect, it is very difficult to observe a life without causation. You understand the implications of that question?

If the speaker comes here and talks because he has got a motive, propaganda, fame, notoriety, bigger audiences and therefore gratifying to the speaker, all that business, then the speaker has a cause. And then what takes place? He is in a terrible pickle! He then depends on you. He wants your flattery, your criticism, you know, all that. He doesn't want your criticism, he wants your flattery, he is dependent, attached, and so he is perpetually in a state of anxiety and therefore he is a monster, he is exploiting you.

Then we may ask: why is he speaking, what is the cause? There is no cause. Find out what it means to live without a single cause because love has no cause - right?

So we have examined, observed hate in the world, perpetuating, governments are perpetuating it, human beings are perpetuating it. When I say "I am British" I am perpetuating hatred because British means, or French or German, or whatever it is, a process of isolation. Where there is isolation there must be conflict. I go and kill somebody, organized murder. And we looked at the wounds that one has received from childhood. To observe it so that it is totally cleansed, wiped away, which means to be vulnerable, which means to be sensitive. A sensitive person is not wounded, he is sensitive. Right? Because then a sensitive person is attentive, watchful. And when there is attention there is no space for getting hurt. And also we looked at, observed, relationship, which is very important in our life. We cannot possibly live without relationship. You may go off into the mountains by yourself but you are related. Related means you are carrying all the tears of the world, the laughter, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness is there. You may physically wander off but you are carrying all that weight on your shoulders. As relationship is extraordinarily important, we live by relationship. We cannot possibly escape of relationship, but we dictate what that relationship should be. And so we get caught, we kill each other in our relationships. So one has to enquire very, very deeply, the nature of relationship and love. Where there is a cause there is an ending, a conflict, a brutality in that relationship. So one has to find out what love is. If it has a cause, "I love you because..." Good god! Then it is a trade. And to find out much

more is to find out, to live without a cause. You understand what the implication for that is? There is no ending to such a life, such a way of living. Right, we had better stop now.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 29TH AUGUST 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday?
Before we go into that may the speaker remind you this is not a weekend entertainment. You are not here just to be amused, or intellectually excited about it. This is in no way a form of entertainment. We are rather serious and I hope you are also serious.

We were saying yesterday that human consciousness, that is what we are, not superficially but deeply, is a common ground upon which we all stand. Our consciousness is more or less similar to the whole of mankind. Wherever you go there is always sorrow, anxiety, uncertainty, great sense of deprivation, a pursuit of pleasure and the endless pain of thousands of years of tears. This is the common lot of all human beings, whether they live in different climates, whether they live in China or in Russia, or in America, or in different parts of the world, this is the common lot of all human beings. And this is the consciousness, with its content, of all individuals who think they are separate, but they are similar to all mankind. I think this is irrefutable, both logically, intellectually and factually, this is so. It is not a dogmatic statement but when one closely observes what human beings are actually, not ideologically, not in phantasy, or romantically, but actually: each one of us suffers, each one of us is in a great deal of trouble, in sorrow. We are uncertain, insecure, frustrated, wounded, and wherever you go this is so with all human beings. Though superficially they are divided by nationalities, by different cultural

religious differences, but those are outward coatings of an inward travail, inward agony, pleasure, joy and so on. So when you consider this carefully, what place have individuals in it at all? We are conditioned to individuality, we are conditioned to think that we are separate from another. We have separate souls, whatever that may mean. We must succeed separately. So is that mere conditioning, or is it an illusion, or it is something that superficially - because we are different superficially, you are tall, I am short, or I am black and you are brown and so on and so on - superficially we may be different at the peripheral level, but that does not constitute individuality. You may have a different capacity from another. I may be an artist and you may be a politician, those are outward dressings, outward coatings. And we take the outward effects, outward appearance as individual.

As we said yesterday, we are not merely listening to the speaker but we are thinking together over this matter. The speaker is not laying down any dogmatic statement. We are questioning, we are enquiring, and doubt, scepticism, is part of this enquiry. Not only doubt what one thinks, doubt one's beliefs, one's conclusions, not merely doubt what the speaker says, that would be quite easy, and it becomes rather superficial, but to doubt one's own behaviour, the way one lives, the whole religious structure, to doubt it, question it; to doubt all nationalities, why we kill human beings who are like us; why we tolerate wars and so on. Scepticism has a place in our enquiry. And we are enquiring together, not the speaker is enquiring and then you follow him. Or you say it is absurd and move away from it. But rather we are together going into this matter. It is not a one-sided affair. So if that is very clear that we

are together enquiring into the question: what has happened to man who is supposed to have evolved through millions of years? And through that evolution, through that time, period, we have more or less remained as barbarous as before, killing each other, constantly in conflict, divided religions and so on.

So as we said yesterday, our consciousness, which is what we are, is the consciousness of mankind. And we are concerned whether that consciousness with all its content, the beliefs, the conclusions, the faiths, the acceptance, the fears, the pleasures, the agony, the loneliness, the despair, sorrow and the constant enquiry if there is something more beyond all this, is the content of our consciousness. This is what we are. And thought, as we said, is not individual thought. Thought is common to all mankind. So again very obvious. And thought has created all this world in which we live. Not nature, not the tiger fortunately, not the lovely trees or the mountains, but the society in which we live, thought has created all that. And having created it then thought tries to solve the problems involved in that society, of which we are. We are society, society is not different from us. What we are, the society is. If you are ambitious, greedy, envious, competitive, violent, you create a society which is what we make of it. So as one observes, these are all obvious facts if one has looked into it. And I hope - one hopes that you are doing this, not accepting what the speaker is saying but enquiring together into this very serious matter. And this is not a weekend seriousness, for a few days, for this morning, for an hour or so you are a bit serious and then forget all about it, back into the routine, into the tradition, into the habit. It is a mechanical process of living. We are enquiring together why human beings,

you and those people who live miles and thousands of miles away, have made society as it is, and whether it is possible to bring about a radical change in that society, which means a radical change in ourselves because we are society. The world is not different from us. We have made this world. Unless our world, which is the world which is within us, in the psychological area, if that world is not transformed we will go on killing each other in the name of god, in the name of religions, for patriotic reasons. And all that indicates we are thinking in terms of isolation - the British, the French, the Tibetans and so on - thinking in isolation, and hoping to find security both physically and psychologically in this isolation, trying to find security. There can be no security in isolation. It is so obvious. There can be no security in religious isolation. There is no security in Communism because they are isolated. There is no security when we think we are separate from the rest of mankind. Isolation is a very complex problem because we are all conditioned to live and function in isolation. That is our tradition, that is our culture. If you are an artist, you are an artist separate from everybody else, a business man, or the priest, separate. And religions throughout the world are cultivating this separatism. This is a very serious matter, please do pay attention to this because things in the world are getting worse and worse. People are preparing for war. This is not a threat by me but it is there. And we human beings are caught up in it.

The politicians will not listen to any of this because they cultivate isolation, because the vast majority of people in the world think and believe, have faith, that when there is separate nationalities there will be peace. When history has proved there is

no peace in isolation, and yet we carry on. We have had a war in this country. There is war going on in different parts of the world because everybody ideologically, nationally and individually are working for themselves, thinking in terms of security in isolation. And, as we said yesterday, to observe this fact, this reality, to perceive it, not emotionally, not as an intellectual concept but as an actuality, a burning reality, that as long as we are thinking in terms of isolation there must be conflict. Conflict in our relationship, as we pointed out yesterday. And this isolation brings about hatred. This isolation brings with it this sense of separate entity who must work for himself, cultivate his selfishness, pursue his own trade, his own capacity. That is what the scientists are doing. The scientists, they are interested in one or two things, really great scientists are concerned with matter, what is beyond matter, but those who are employed by the government, the scientists are maintaining war, as the priests throughout the world are maintaining war - right? These are all facts.

So as we said yesterday, to perceive these facts is not to analyse the fact. That which one observes, to observe. And we went into that question briefly yesterday: what does it mean to observe? Observe what is happening out there, outside of our skin, the society, the world as it is, where technology is advancing so rapidly, it is almost destroying the human brain. And the East, as we pointed out yesterday, that is the Far East is now going to be completely mechanized, technologically advancing far more than any other country, as you know, Japan's cars, radios, televisions and all the rest of it. And the brain has been occupied mostly with that. And now if we do not wisely, carefully, intelligently observe

the deeper quality of the brain, the deeper quality of human beings then the brain will naturally deteriorate, as it is deteriorating now. The brain has got infinite capacity but it is limited now as we live. It is limited by our desire to fulfil as an individual, it is limited by the travail, the agony, the despairs, the loneliness, the terrible state human beings live in, all that, by all those activities the brain is limited. When that limitation is broken down it has got infinite capacity - right? And we are enquiring into that, whether it is possible to break down, to be free from this conditioning of, as we said, from hate, because human beings hate each others, you may not hate your neighbour but you hate anybody who interferes with your particular ideas; or you tolerate them, which is the same form.

And we went into the question also of human beings being wounded psychologically. To observe that wound and not carry on and on for the rest of one's life. See the consequences of being hurt psychologically, what it breeds, loneliness, resistance, more fear. To observe it. And observation is like a flame which is attention, and with that capacity of observation the wound, the feeling of hurt, the hate, all that is burnt away, gone, if you observe attentively?

And also we talked yesterday about relationship, human relationship, intimate and not intimate. How we are in constant conflict with each other in our relationship, man, woman. I am sure we know all this. But we tolerate this conflict. We have put up with it, we are educated to accept conflict. And conflict you can say is necessary, a form of progress. So where there is conflict there cannot be love. We talked about it briefly yesterday also. Conflict has a cause and has love a cause? If I love you because you give

me food, sex, comfort, dependence, I feel attached to you for various reasons - economic, social, health - is that love? Please we are asking this question - the speaker may ask it but you have to ask this of yourself. Has love a cause? The two words are contradictory because our present so-called love has a cause and therefore in it there is always the seed of conflict. So what has a cause can end, an effect can end.

And we ought to talk over together this morning, there are so many other things involved, like fear, pleasure, loneliness, whether sorrow can ever end. You know man has never understood, or finished, ended sorrow. After millions of years he is still living with sorrow and fear, pursuing something which he thinks is real, true and he is always disappointed, and to achieve that reality, that truth, he must travail, and thinks conflict is necessary to achieve that which is beyond all time. So we are trained, we are educated, it is our habit, our tradition to struggle, to live in conflict. Conflict is not only personal but the conflict with other people, with other nations. We are asking what is the root, the cause, of this conflict? Please you are asking this question with me. Please don't wait for an answer from the speaker. We are both together examining the cause of this endless conflict between human beings: conflict of religion, conflict of nationalities, the destruction of human beings who believe in something different from you, the conflict of ideologies, conclusions. Can this conflict ever end? Or must human beings everlastingly live with it?

What is the root of this conflict, the cause? If one can find out the cause then the effect can naturally be sterilized, wiped away or end. But if we don't find the cause, the deep rooted cause, then you

may try to effect, try to alter the cause - you understand? If I don't find cause for my unhappiness I live always in my unhappiness. If I don't find cause for my sense of loneliness I'll always tolerate it, put up with it, be frightened by it, go through the various travail involved in loneliness. But if I can find the cause of it I can end it. So we are trying together, we are not accepting what the speaker is saying. The speaker is totally anonymous, it is not important what the speaker is, but what he says is important.

So what is the cause of this conflict? First of all look at the ideologies man has created. The Russian ideology, Marx, Lenin ideologies, Mao Tse Tung ideologies, the Christian ideologies, the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Tibetan, the American Democrat, is one of the causes of this conflict ideologies? You understand? Please ask yourself this question. You are a Christian, which is an ideology, with your form of worship, mass and all the tradition which goes with it, the peculiar dresses and so on, and I as a Hindu, I am not, I as a Hindu, if I am one, have my own peculiar ideologies, my own belief, my own faith, my own superstitions. So we are in conflict with each other, we tolerate each other but yet there is the strain between us. You believe in one thing and I believe in another. There is the whole Totalitarian ideologies and the Democratic ideologies. These ideologies are at war - right? So we are asking if one of the roots of conflict is any form of ideology, any form of intellectual conclusions based on study, based on enquiry and you come to a conclusion, and you come to a different conclusion, studying the same thing, and so we are at each other - right? So we are finding out whether ideologies are one of the causes of this conflict in the world, and also in

ourselves. Which is I conclude something from my experience, I have had an experience of a peculiar kind, I hold on to it. And you have another. So there is a difference, there is conflict. Can one then, if ideologies are one of the root causes of conflict, can one live without ideologies? Go on sirs, work it out, think it together. Do it, please, as we are sitting here, enquiring, do it. See whether one can be free, if you think ideologies are one of the root causes of wars, disturbances, conflict, whether those ideologies are necessary at all. Ideologies are the projection of thought. That thought may have enquired, studied, accumulated a great deal of historical knowledge and come to a conclusion and holds to that conclusion. Another does the same thing. So there are two different camps, dividing each other, arming each other, killing each other - right? And we are doing the same thing in our private lives, in our relationship with each other.

So can one be free of all ideologies? We see the cause of it. The cause is we think that with ideologies, with ideas, with ideals, we will be secure, we will be safe. And we discover that ideologies in themselves created by man will inevitably bring about conflict - right? There is the cause, which is, the cause is isolation. Isolation may be two hundred million people on one side and ten million people on the other. Or two people on one side and ten on the other. So having discovered the cause, which is, the desire to live according to a pattern, traditional pattern, or ideological pattern, or a noble pattern, such ideologies will inevitably bring about isolation. And that may be one of the major causes of conflict. Now when one has observed this fact, and the causation of it, to be free of the cause, that is be free of the desire, of the urge, that in

ideas, in conclusion, in concepts, ideals, there is safety. Come on sirs. Either it is a fact, or it is not, it is a wrong conclusion.

Conclusion, you understand, again, which means separate. I don't know if you see that. The moment we come to a conclusion it breeds isolation. I believe in Christ and you don't. I believe in the Buddhist way of life and you don't. So there is this constant struggle, which means the brain has accepted a pattern of living according to some ideal, a concept, a symbol, and there is the illusion in that there is safety, so I cling to it. But when you point out to me the nature of this movement, either I reject it entirely, which is natural, or if I am at all sensitive, at all aware of the world as it is now, then I begin to enquire. Then I begin to see that the facts are much more real than the conclusions about the facts - right? So can one be free of the cause of this ideological concept of life? Which is really a very, very serious question, because from Plato, Aristotle, and from the ancient Indians, ideals have become extraordinarily important, and we live according to the Greeks and their conclusions - though we have expanded, we have narrowed it down and so on. So this same thing, this whole idea of living according to an ideal, which must breed conflict - right? Which is the fact is, 'what is', not 'what should be' - 'the should be' has no fact whatever. 'What is' is a fact - right?

So we are asking also: are there other factors of conflict in one's life? We are asking this question because - not because - we are asking this question naturally: is there a way of living in our daily life, a peaceful, vibrant, active life, not just a sleepy life, to be free from all conflict, to have no problems? Problem is another factor of conflict - right? We are trying to find out a way of living entirely

different from what we are living now. The world is becoming more and more insane and for those who want to be sane, it is rather difficult in this world.

So is fear one of the causes of conflict in one's life? We said ideals may be one of the factors of conflict because it takes away from us facing the fact. And we are asking: is fear one of the factors of conflict? Is isolation, which is part of fear, is that a cause of conflict? Isolation - me and you, we and they, the enemy and the allies - you understand? This perpetual process of isolation. Identify with one group against another group, the Buddhist group, the Christian group, you understand? This seems so absurd. And is fear a major factor? What is the cause of fear? Because, as we said, when you discover the cause, the effect can be wiped away. But we are always dealing with the effects. I am afraid of that person, or I am afraid of thunder, or I am afraid of my wife, husband, a dozen forms of fear. And we want to wipe away the effects of fear. We never question whether fear can totally end, which is to find out the cause of it - right? Can we go along together with it? Please you are asking this question of yourself, not merely listening to the speaker. You know we always want to be lead, that is our beastly nature. We all want to be told what to do - Marx tells you what to do, Christ tells you what to do, the psychologists tell you what to do, the politicians tell you what to do, the gurus and you know all that business. We are always looking for leaders - a better political leader than the present one. And the better political leader is always not good enough but the next one will be better. And so we keep this idea.

So we are asking - there is no leader here, please let's be clear

on this point. There is no leader as far as I am concerned. You can create the speaker into a leader, which will be utter folly, but the speaker is not a leader. We are together co-operating to discover the cause of all this misery of man. You have had a thousand leaders. They have all failed - right? So it isn't that we must have self confidence, or that we must rely on ourselves, we have also done that. That hasn't lead very far. Whereas if we can co-operate together in our enquiry, find out why these human beings are what they are now. You see there is perpetual misery, conflict and we say fear. Fear is one of the causes of conflict. What is the cause, the root of fear? We are not talking about the branches of fear or trimming the branches of fear but the very root of it, the tree that has many branches, many leaves, many flowers, we are not concerned with that, but the root of it. Is it this eternal seeking of "I am living in isolation"? which is living on the periphery. You have certain characteristics, certain culture, certain way, certain tradition, and you are satisfied with that, you are British - all right? Do you tolerate this? And in France we are French. Go to Spain it is the same. Go anywhere in the world, it is the same assertion. Outwardly and inwardly we are isolated. My desire, my fulfilment, my wanting, and all the rest of it. So is that one of the causes of conflict, isolation? Obviously. Politically, as long as you remain British and the French, and all the rest, there will be no global relationship and therefore there will be no peace in the world at all. Right? Tell that to the politicians and they will say, "Buzz off". And we elect these politicians!

So we are finding out ideologies, isolation, and now we are enquiring into whether fear is one of the factors of conflict in our

life. Obviously it is. I am afraid of you because you are cleverer than me. You are more beautiful than me. You know, this constant comparison. So is comparison one of the factors? Of course it is. Can one live a life without any comparison, which means no measurement? I am this, but I will be that - that is a measurement. "I will be that" breeds fear - right? Oh I don't know if you follow all this. So, what is the root of fear, the cause? Is it time? Is it thought? Is it desire? So if these are the causes, if they are, we are saying is desire one of the causes of fear. We will go into it. Is it thought that is the root of fear? Is it time, time being a movement from 'what is' to 'what should be', time being the state of the brain that says, "I am this but I will pursue the ideal." And is thought the root of fear? The remembrance of pain of yesterday, hoping that pain will not occur again. Thinking: is that one of the causes of fear? Don't say, "If I don't think what shall I do?" That is not the point. The point is we are trying to enquire whether thought breeds fear. Of course it does. Is desire the ground on which fear flowers?

So we have to enquire into these factors. What is desire? What is thought? What is time? Shall we go on? You are not tired? What is desire, which shapes our life, which has such extraordinary vitality, drive? We live by desire, the objects of desire may vary from time to time but we are not concerned with the objects, we are concerned with the root of fear. Which is we are asking whether desire is one of the factors, and not desiring that or this, but desire itself - right? What is desire? We have to enquire into what is sensation, both tactile, touching? What is sensation? What is the function of the senses? Are the senses separate in themselves? And if they are separate you cannot hope to do anything about it? But is

it possible - please listen to this, you may not of thought of it - is it possible to operate with all your senses fully awakened? You understand my question? I may be very good in seeing clearly with my eyes; or I have a very good taste about wine; or I am sensitive about this or that. But I am asking: is it possible to have all your senses heightened and fully operating together - right? Do you understand my question? Have you ever looked, have you ever tried - I am not asking, please, I am asking this politely - have you ever tried to look at a tree with all your senses, or at the sea with all its beautiful waves and colour and depth and the tremendous vitality of it? To look at something with all your senses, that is to have total sensation, not partial sensation. And sensation, what is sensation? Pain, physical pain, physical discomfort, ill health, and also psychologically the sensation, the feeling of being hurt, being lonely, the sense of depression, and elation, the sense of deep inward loneliness of man. When we talk about man we are also including the woman, so don't get excited about it! We live by sensation, only partially. And is sensation, is that one of the causes of desire? I desire a car, a suit, a shirt, or a robe, or a dress. Look in the window. I perceive, optically perceive and I go inside and touch the material, it is good material, which is sensation - right? So I am beginning to discover that, seeing, touching, contact, from that sensation - right? Seeing visually, contact, sensation. Then what happens? Then thought arises and says, "How nice if I could get into that car and drive fast". Or in that shirt, in that dress, in that"... So thought creates the image of me having that shirt, or something else, when thought creates the image then there is the beginning of desire. Are you following all this? Go into it sirs. This

is part of meditation, if you are interested in it, not just sitting cross-legged and going off into some fantasy. This is part of meditation, to enquire very deeply into the nature of conflict, into the nature of desire, not what other people say about desire. The whole concept, the Christian concept of the suppression of desire - as we have come to serve the Lord, have no desire, except one desire to be like him - or whatever it is.

So seeing, contact, sensation, then thought creates the image, at that moment is the birth of desire - right? - with all its problems. Controlling it, not controlling it, accepting it, enjoying it, with all the consequences of pain, struggle, and it may also be included in it, it may be one of the causes of fear, because I may not get what I want. I am depressed by it, frustrated by it, I am afraid I can't get it, and so on. So I discover that one of the causes of fear is desire. I am not asking how to be free of desire, I see the cause. I perceive the cause. By the very perception of the cause something will take place. I am not going to say "I must be free" - or not free of desire - that is very important to comprehend this. Then who is it that is going to suppress desire? Desire itself, surely, isn't it? I suppress desire because I want another form of desire. So it is the same movement. So we are saying we are not discussing, or going into the question of suppression at all, or escaping from it, or transcending it. We see the movement of desire, observe it. Then we say is time the factor of fear? Time. I might die tomorrow, or ten years later. I am all right now but god know what will happen tomorrow. Tomorrow is time - right? There is time by the universe, that is the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, night, day and all the rest of it. And also there is the inward time. The inward

time which is, I have had happiness another day and I hope I will have it in the future. Or I have had an experience, I cling to that experience and hoping nothing will disturb it, or I have had pain, both psychological and physical, and I hope that will never happen again. Time is a movement - right? And thought is also a movement, thought which is born of knowledge. Knowledge is the result of experience. We are the result of thousands of years of experience, thousands of years of knowledge, psychologically. And we need time to learn a language, to acquire various capacities. So there is time outwardly, there is time inwardly. And thought is also the result of time, the accumulated knowledge of centuries stored in the brain as memory, and that memory responds as thought. These are all facts. It is not my invention, it is so.

So, desire, isolation, thought, time are the factors of fear, the root cause of fear. Now how does one deal with a cause? You understand my question? I have found out for myself the cause of fear. And is it possible to dispel that cause without effort? The moment I bring effort into it, it is another form of conflict - right? So is it possible to be entirely free of the cause, or the causation which breeds all this? It is possible only, please we are talking over together - it is possible only when you observe the fact. That is, when there is the realization that the cause is producing all these effects. And also one knows where there is a cause there is an end. If I have a cause for tuberculosis, that is the cause and I cough and all the rest of it. Now there is medicine to cure tuberculosis, there is an end to it. Where there is a cause the effect can be wiped away. So I am asking: I have found the cause, now how am I to deal with it, what is to happen with it? You understand my question? Any

movement on my part, that is, any movement of desire to say, "I must be free of fear, I must be free of this cause", that is another form of desire - right? So I realize any movement of thought, any movement of the urge to be free, is part of the same thing. So can I observe without any movement of thought or time, just to observe? And remain with the cause, not move away from the cause. You are following all this? That requires tremendous close attention. So one has to enquire much further into the nature of attention. Not for the moment, today, we will do it another day. But to be aware of the cause and to have no choice about the cause - to go beyond it, suppress it - just to look at it, hold it. When you give your whole attention to that cause, that very attention is like a fire that dispels the cause. Right, that is enough for today. May I get up please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 31ST AUGUST 1982

There are several questions that have been handed in. You can't probe into all those questions and we have chosen some of the more representative of those questions.

Do questions need answers? Or there are only questions? Questions are like a challenge and what is important is how one meets the challenge, not what is the answer to the question, but what is one's response to a challenge, to a question, to a demand. I think that is far more important than to ask a question and wait for somebody to answer it, including myself. So let us first find out how to probe a question. Not, if one may remind oneself, not search for an answer, investigate into the outcome of the answer, but rather the cause and one's response to the question.

So how does one approach a question? Suppose I have a question. That is, I question the whole of modern civilization, not one particular part of that civilization, the Christian, or the Hindu, or the Muslim, or the Buddhist, but I want to question the whole cultural development of man. I can study it, all the various historians - that would take too long and I haven't got the time, for am I interested in finding out what others say about history. History is the story of man, which is the story of myself. So how do I approach a question of that kind? I see a whole culture of India, for example, the Brahmanical culture which has lasted from between five to three thousands years completely disappear over night. I don't know if you are aware of all that. It doesn't matter, just to inform you. It has disappeared over night. So what is

culture? Is it just a coating? However deep that coating may be, it may have different layers of coating but it is still a coating because deep down man is more or less the same as he has always been - violent and all the rest of it. So how do I approach - how does one approach a question of this kind? The approach matters far more than the question. Please we are talking over together. I am not laying down any dogmatic statements, or asking you to accept what the speaker is saying. But how does one approach any problem? Any question? What is my motive in my approach to the question? What is the problem and the cause of that problem, and one's approach to the investigation to the probing of that cause and the problem? Do I come to it with a motive, with a desire to get rid of it, or go beyond it, suppress it and so on? What is my inward reaction to it? If I am not very clear on that, I am only seeking an answer somehow to resolve the problem, I am not really concerned with the issue at all. I am only concerned with going beyond it somehow. And so the escape from the problem creates more problems - right?

So it matters a great deal one feels, if one may point out, how one approaches a problem, a question. Is the mind or the brain seeking an answer, then we are not investigating the problem, the issue, the challenge, the question, but merely trying to find out an answer which is immediately satisfactory. So I think it matters very much, if one may again point out, how one comes to a problem, how close one gets to it. Approach it means to come near. How close, how near, does one get to the problem? Or the problem is out there and I am approaching it. You understand? Or the problem is me, not somewhere in the periphery of me, the trap is me? So

how do I go into all this? Just superficially, casually, or with great hesitation, sensitivity, not coming to any conclusion, probe into it deeper and deeper and deeper? Is the brain capable of doing this? Or we are so terribly conditioned that we say "For god's sake let's get rid of the problem." You understand all this?

Now we are going to investigate, probe into the question, not find an answer to it. The answer is in the question, not away from the question. And who is to answer the question? Some leader, some prophet, some politician, some guru, some priest? - which means we are always seeking an answer from somebody else. And please don't put the speaker in that position, because he is not going to answer, we are going together to investigate the question, which is much more intelligent than say if one answers you say, "Well, that is not good enough," or "That's all right, that is satisfactory" - you begin to discuss about the answer. But if we begin to look, probe, play with it, it reveals a tremendous lot - right?

There are several questions here.

1st QUESTION: You have said that there is a group consciousness. What is the relationship between the group consciousness and the individual consciousness? How can human beings undergo a total psychological change while the group consciousness has not changed totally?

We are going to investigate the question, there is no answer, but when one investigates this really important question, it reveals so much.

First of all is there a group consciousness? Some scientists are experimenting - I have been told by one of them - that a certain

species of animals undergoing certain experiments and achieving a certain result, these results are communicated to the whole group - rats, wolves and so on. So they are trying to establish a consciousness of a group which is affected by a few individuals who learn something very quickly. They are doing this. Perhaps some of you have heard about it or read about it. And if this is so, then is human consciousness different from the individual consciousness? And is the group consciousness, like the British, it is a group, British consciousness, French consciousness, German, American - you follow? Now take a group of British, the British group consciousness: traditional, very proud of their past Empire, ready to kill, probably the British have the greatest number of wars to their record and so on and so on. They have a certain consciousness, the group. And in that group there is the individual consciousness. That is what the questioner is asking. What is the relationship between the group consciousness - right? - and the one who lives in that group who is separate from the group? Right? Are we following each other? Need I repeat that again? Yes? All right. There is the Indian consciousness - the British consciousness you may object to it, so I won't go into that! (Laughter) There is the Indian, or Japanese consciousness as a group, and in that group I live with my consciousness. The questioner asks: is that group consciousness separate from my consciousness? Or is my consciousness similar to the group? Right? That is the question. We are investigating this. We are not trying to find an answer.

In that group consciousness of India there are various levels of consciousness - the Brahmanical and so on and so on and so on. And if you are born amongst one of those separate little groups

contained in India, what is the relationship of that individual to that group? It may be a limited group but it is the whole of Indian consciousness - you understand? You have to think with me a little bit.

Now the relationship is, surely, there is a coating of group consciousness, level of it, layers of it, and within those layers the individual consciousness. The individual being his sorrows, his anxieties, etc. etc. The group says you are an idealist, if they say so. And you, within that group, have also learnt the importance or unimportance of an ideal. So what is the relationship of one who believes or doesn't believe in idealism, and to the group that believes? You are following this? If he has no belief whatsoever in idealism then he is totally out of that group - right? But if he believes in idealism he belongs to that group.

Now the questioner asks: how can a human being undergo a total psychological change while the group consciousness has not changed at all? I am also reading the question for the first time.

First of all is the group consciousness separate from the individual consciousness? That we have to establish completely. Are you an individual different from the group consciousness of a Britain, or British, or the French, or the Dutch, or whatever it is? Are you different radically from the country, the culture, the economic condition, the cultural education, all that, are you different from the rest of the group? Are you? Are we? Each one of us? Or are we the result of all that? Do you understand? Am I the result of all of India, of Europe, of America, because one has lived in these parts for most of one's life, am I the result of all that? You are following all this? Are we moving together? Or am I totally

different from all that? Are you totally different from your culture, from your environment, from your hereditary, from your thousand years of evolution, wars and so on, are you not the result of all that? Right? You are, obviously. Now if you are the result of all that, another group is also the result of all that too - right? Are you following? You may call yourself British, I may call myself Dutch, you may call yourself French, but we are the result of all that, though linguistically we may be different. So go a little further.

Is our consciousness, which is our entire being with its beliefs, its faith, with its dogmas, fears, superstitions, longings and anxieties and loneliness and all that, is that not common to all mankind? Right? You will not accept the next step if you don't understand this. Are we not, each human being, the representative, or is the rest of humanity, psychologically? What do you say? Obviously. You suffer, the man in Japan suffers, though he may be technologically terribly advanced, highly disciplined, industrious, keeping his place, it is part of the Confucian education, culture, but inwardly he is just like you and me.

So if the human being who is the rest of mankind psychologically, if he changes completely, is he not adding, helping, increasing a totally different kind of mind to it? You understand? Are you following this? All right suppose I change radically, belonging, recognising that I am the rest of mankind, and I personally mean it, it is not just an intellectual assumption, and I am the rest of mankind psychologically. I may be darker skinned than you are, but you have suffered, you suffer and so on and so on, and I am the rest of mankind, if I change radically, am I not bringing into the consciousness of humanity, which I am, am I not

bringing to it something which is totally different? And if all of us were changing rapidly and adding to that, the content of human consciousness will also be affected. You are following all this? Right? Are we together in this?

So is it possible for human beings, living wherever they are, assessing that our consciousness is similar to the rest of mankind, but clothed in different garments, when there is a change, radical change, it does affect the whole: like Hitler affected the whole of human consciousness: like the war that is going on, it is affecting the whole of mankind - right?

So the next investigation into this question is: Why don't you change? That is what is implied in this question. Why is it human beings who have lived on this marvellous, beautiful earth, which they are trying to destroy, why have they not, after so many centuries upon centuries of civilization, experience, sorrow, tears, joy and all the rest of it, why are they like this? Always waiting for somebody to lead them, always waiting to be told what to do. And even when they are told what to do they don't do it! Now why? Please answer this question. It is not for me to answer it. Question it. Why is it human beings, affluent, well to-do, fairly well placed, having to struggle for food like in Asia, certain parts of Asia, why is it they don't see the extraordinary importance, the urgency of all this? Why don't they move? Is it they need more suffering, which is too callous - you understand? Suffering has not changed man. Reward has not changed men, nor punishment. Those are the two principles upon which we act, reward and punishment. Neither of those two principles have helped man. Nor externalizing some agency, like god, worshipping him, which thought has invented,

then thought worships him. A crazy business! And that too has not helped man. So what? Please ask these questions of yourself. We have looked to leaders. We have looked to outside agency, some great influence, some pressure, none of these things have helped man. So what will he do? Go on ask this. Go off into communes and little this, and little that? Or see the great danger of what is going on, see the utter lack of love in all this, utter callousness of human beings, killing for some piece of land, for some honour, a whole group of human beings - you understand? So what will you all do? Go back to our daily routine, to our jobs? You can't help that. You have responsibilities, so we have to do all that. So what shall we do apart from all that? Is it that our brains have become so utterly mechanical that any new challenge is immediately translated into the old pattern, and go on with the old pattern? Please investigate all this.

2nd QUESTION: Can right action - quotes right action - ever encompass violence?

Now we are probing into the question. What is right action? Right action must be right under all circumstances, not depending on pressure, on climate, or one's prejudices, conclusions, ideals, but when it is right action it must be right under all circumstances - right? So what is right action? What is right? Which means correct, precise, actual, objective, non-personal - right? All that is implied in that word 'right'. Right is not opposed to wrong. If right is opposed to wrong then the right has its roots also in the wrong - right? This needs a little bit of enquiry.

Is goodness separate, totally separate from that which is bad - we are using the word good and bad in the ordinary sense of the

word. Is it separate, totally separate? Or is goodness born out of badness? - you understand? I am bad - whatever that may mean. And I am trying to be good. That goodness is the opposite of what I am. I am bad and I am saying I must be good. So it is an opposite. And the opposite is created by thought which says this is bad and I must be good. Are you following all this? So is right the opposite of the wrong? If it is the opposite there must be conflict between the two and therefore the right is not right. Where there is a conflict between good and bad, that conflict is wrong, therefore we are asking: is right totally independent, totally divorced, has no relationship to the bad? Then it is right under all circumstances. But if it is the outcome of the bad, that is, I want to be good, creating the opposite of the bad and then fighting for that - right? Then that which I then call right is wrong. I wonder if you have understood this? - If we have understood each other, rather.

So we have more or less gone into it but we must also go into action. What is action? Any movement is action - right? Going from here to your house, sitting here listening, action, the doing, not having done or will do. That means acting, present participle. So acting. Now what is that acting - what is the root of that acting, the cause of that acting? Has acting a cause? Please this is very interesting if you go into it, it is not intellectual assessment, intellectual entertainment, but if you go into it very deeply it brings out something extraordinary. Our present action is based on past memories, or on a future principle, the ideal according to a pattern I am going to live, and act according to that pattern. That pattern is established by thought, from what I have learnt, or imitated, and I copy that pattern and I call that action - right? Which is, I am

acting according to a principle which is rewarding, which will be pleasurable and I act according to that. All the ideologies do this. All the theoreticians whether the Capitalist theoretician, or the Totalitarian theoreticians act upon this, they establish theories and act according to those theories, hypothesis - right? So our action is either based on a reward or punishment, obviously. So action has a motive. That is, I am acting according to my desire, my pleasure, my past memories, or I am acting according to some principle, some ideal, but I am not acting, I am acting according to something. I wonder if you understand this? So can the mind be free of the past and the future and act? It is really very interesting to go into this. Can my brain, which has evolved in time and so it functions in time - time being past rewards, past memories, past accomplishments and so on and so on, and the future with all its rewards etc. So my brain has been conditioned to that - most brains are. And it is acting according to the past or to the future, and that is its conditioning. Now we are asking that brain: is it possible to act without the whole burden of the past and the future business? You understand the question? We will come back to that.

And the questioner asks: violence. He uses the word violence. What is violence? Physical violence, killing each other, hurting each other, maiming each other, physically by word, by a gesture, by a look - right? We hurt each other. And that is also part of violence: the word, the gesture, the blow, the bayonet, the bomb. And also is there not violence when we imitate people? Is there not violence when we are caught in the movement of comparison? I am comparing myself with you, clever brat and so on and so on. Or I want to be somebody. That is also part of violence. Right?

Conformity, comparison, following, obeying, all that is part of violence. We are not saying going against law, we must be careful here otherwise the police will be after us. So realizing this is violence, then we proceed to create a state, a principle, called non-violence, quite the opposite of what I am, what we are. Then what takes place? I have created the idea of non-violence because I am violent. This is a fact, and that is non-fact, and I pursue the non-fact I don't know if you realize this. That then leads to all kinds of illusions, whereas there is only the fact, violence, there is no other fact. Now to understand the nature of violence, to go into it, to encompass the whole content of that word and not move away from it, which is not to escape, not to run away, not to submerge it, not to suppress it, not to go beyond it, just...

So, what is right action which will encompass the whole movement of violence? Right? What is right action? Right? Which is, non-action. I don't know if you follow this. Any action born of violence is violent. One country is aggressive and you respond with aggressiveness to that country. That is what has happened. And that is positive action, it is considered positive action. You hit me, I hit you back. But seeing the whole nature of violence, observing it closely, there is only a state which is non-action. I wonder if you understand this. What is considered positive action with regard to violence in the ordinary accepted traditional sense is to retaliate. This has been our tradition. We own that particular piece of land miles away and if anybody is aggressive, enters into that land I will send all my warships to it. This is what is happening all the world over, meet aggression by aggression. And that is considered positive, realistic action. And this has been the

history of mankind. For thousands of years. So when one investigates into this whole problem of violence, any movement from violence is still violent - right? If one understands this. Therefore when there is violence no response to violence, which is the most positive action - right?

3rd QUESTION: You speak of compassion but claim that action should have no cause. In what way does compassion act without being a cause of action.

The questioner says you speak of compassion and you claim - please the speaker doesn't claim anything. Then you can kick him around if he claimed. But as he doesn't claim anything and he doesn't speak of compassion as though something extraordinary that human beings have lost or not found, so we have to go into this question together.

What is compassion? What is love? As it is generally understood love is sensory, sensuous, sexy. Love is understood as pleasure, as some form of self-fulfilment - right? I am just stating what is commonly understood. So we have to enquire, probe into this word, the content of the word, the depth of the word, the real quality of that word. That word has been ruined, spat upon, trodden down, vulgarized, any other word you would like to use. So pushing all that aside, what is love? If it has a cause, "I love you because..." then obviously it is not love. Let's be clear on that - right? "I love god because I hope some day he will help me." "I love my wife because some...", I don't have to go into all that - or my girl friend. So if you are very clear that love has no cause - it hasn't, if it has then it is not love, it is a convenience, self-satisfaction, gratification, companionship, escape from loneliness

and all that kind of stuff, but if it real it has no cause. I don't love you because you are an audience which helps me to fulfil myself, which is too silly.

So love has no cause - right? This is not a verbal assessment, a verbal intellectual agreement, it is a deep truth. When one perceives that truth then the cause which we have had disappears altogether - right? And is love different from compassion? Or it is the furthering of the same thing? Can there be compassion, that sense of enormity of it, the beauty of it, the quality, the depth of that word, can that compassion exist where there is sorrow? I may be suffering because I have lost this and I am suffering from loneliness. I am suffering. And out of that suffering I attach myself to certain ideological principles. I become a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or a Christian. I anchor my being in there and go out to help you. Because I think I am compassionate. Is that compassion? You are following? Are we together in this? We are investigating, we are not asking that you should agree. If I am attached to some principle, to some belief, to some faith, and that is my strength, my anchor, and then I talk about compassion - go to the world, to China and help there, or India, the poor people. Is that compassion? Or is it pity? Sympathy? Kindliness? Generosity, which I call compassion? Or compassion cannot possibly exist when there is any kind of anchorage. When I am no longer a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Catholic and so on - you follow? Which is, compassion has its own intelligence. It is unintelligent to have an anchorage of security in some deity, some symbol, some faith. That indicates lack of intelligence. But when there is compassion it has its own intelligence. So intelligence has no cause - right? Because if it has

a cause - I am intelligent because I have read books and have clever arguments and so on, that is not intelligence. That is cleverness, erudition, professional activity. So compassion, love, has no cause and therefore as intelligence has no cause, love, compassion, intelligence go together.

Then the questioner asks: when there is that compassion what is action? You understand the question? I haven't got it but tell me about it. I don't know what love is, but what is the action of that love? We are back into theories, hypothesis and idealism. Tell me what it is to live with love though in my heart I don't know what that flame is. And it would be foolish to talk about what that is when one hasn't got the flame. So the question then arises: why is it human beings who have undergone such tremendous agonies, dreadful wars, shedding tears beyond all the rivers and yet they are going on the same way, killing each other and all the rest of it. Where there is compassion and intelligence, that very intelligence is action. But I haven't got it. It sounds good in this tent but when I leave it, it is gone. I have been stimulated by the speaker, or by somebody else, and it is not there. And that is a tragedy. So again what am I to do? How am I to capture that flame? You see love is not an experience. All experiences are sensual, reactions. As love is not desire, pleasure, reward, escape from one's own misery, if one sees that, observes it, then out of that observation the thing may flower.

Shall we go onto the next question? It seems a pity doesn't it?

4th QUESTION: To exist I have to perform daily mechanical tasks without any meaning. This lack of meaning leads to a feeling of destructiveness, an inner rage. I see this clearly in myself and

the same process growing in the rise of terrorism, crime and delinquency. There is the feeling that nothing can be done about this increasing chaos. That society is destined to collapse. How does one approach this tremendous chaos both without and within oneself?

I wonder how many of us are aware of this fact? Economically, socially, morally, the structure of society as we have known it is gradually collapsing, imperceptibly or very, very quickly. How many of us are aware of this? Or we just live from day to day and forget the whole bally show? Please enquire in oneself if one is really aware of this, not in the newspapers, not in the magazines, not in the editorials, not in any book, but actually it is going on. Are we aware of it, are we sensitive to all that is happening? What the scientists are doing? They also want to fulfil. Russia invents something, and the other scientists invent something more, better, and so keep this up.

If one is aware of the chaos, the catastrophe - I wonder if one is really aware of it, that is what I want to know. It is really very important to question this: whether one is really deeply aware of this, sensitive, not just what is happening in one's own country but in the world, poverty in certain areas is increasing, overpopulation, total indifferent, callousness. If one is aware of it, why does one have rage, anger about it or be depressed by it? It is a fact - right? The thing is collapsing. Why should one get angry about it, have a tremendous anxiety, rage about it, why? Why don't we look at the fact and see what we can do? You get depressed, full of anxiety, rage and say, "My god, what is going to happen to my family" - this and that, you are lost. But if one acknowledges the real fact of

this, not verbally but inside yourself deeply, in your heart, then the questioner says, "What is one to do?"

Where would you begin to understand this chaos? The house is burning, we are not saying something that is not actually so. The speaker is not pessimistic or optimistic, he is just facing things as they are. Where would you begin to bring about order out of this chaos? More leaders? Better Prime Ministers? Better Labour leaders? Better police order? Suppressing crimes - not that there shouldn't be all that but where would you begin? Please ask this question: where would you begin? Out there, or in here? Who has created the outward chaos in this world? We human beings have created it, each one of us - right? Obviously. Our grandparents or great great grandparents, and we are inheriting what they have done and we are contributing to it. This is a fact. So where shall I begin, realizing the outward chaos? I realize that we human beings have created this and as a human being, who is the rest of mankind, I must begin with myself, which is not a selfish movement. I have contributed, caused, brought about this chaos. Each one of us has brought about this chaos, the collapse or the impending collapse. And I must begin with myself - please this is really important - I am mankind, not just a verbal statement. It is in my blood that I am the rest of mankind. I must begin to bring about order in myself because I have lived, and I still live, in chaos inwardly. Chaos being disorder, conflict, struggle. Can there be order in all this? Can order be created out of disorder? Please - I am the result of disorder, I am disorder. I am not saying disorder is out there and I am looking at it, I am disorder. There is no part of me which is not in disorder. I may invent a part. I may think there is a part of me

which is completely orderly, beautifully orderly. The rest of me is chaos. So if I assert that then I am pursuing something which I have invented that there is some pure order. Which is, out of disorder I have created order - right? - hoping that order is real. I see the fallacy of that. So I say to myself "I am the cause and the trap of disorder. And can I clear up this disorder?" - not search for order. You understand this? How can my mind which is disorderly, chaotic, how can such a mind create order? It can't. All it can do is to understand the nature of disorder, the structure, the movement the quality of disorder. The essence of disorder is conflict - right? When you have no conflict there is order. So what is the cause of conflict? Go on sirs. I hope you are thinking, you are investigating with the speaker otherwise you are just listening to a lot of ideas and they will have no meaning whatsoever. He will become another stupid leader. And please I beg of you don't put the speaker in that position.

So can there be dissolution of disorder? We are not seeking order. The order, like the universe, will be when there is no disorder. So what are the contributory causes that bring about disorder?

Are you tired? Shall I finish this? You are not tired? I am sorry.

What are the many causes that bring about disorder? Or is there only one cause? We like to think there are many causes because then it gives us time to play around, investigating the many, many causes. That is part of the psychological game which human beings play with. But when looking at it all, there is only one cause. Go on sirs, think. Or shall we investigate various other causes? Which is a waste of time obviously. What is the one cause that is bringing

about this great disorder out there and in oneself? Is it the me, the self, with all its conflicts, desires, hopes, fears, past memories, the self-centred entity, who is concerned with himself, isolating himself, holding on, clinging to that which thought has invented as the me? Go on sirs, look at it. And if that self-centred entity, the me, the form, the name, all the accumulated memories, which is the me, which is in essence isolation, the me is always in isolation - right? I may be related to you but I am related to you - right? I am the principal and you are the second. I, though I am related to you intimately, I am pursuing my own desires, ambitions, fulfilment, and you are also doing the same, like two parallel railway lines never meeting. That is, the me with all this sense of isolation, that is the root cause of this chaos out there and in me. And do I realize this? Or is this verbal accumulation which I have gathered and I am living with the words? I say, "Yes, that is me, what am I to do about it?" If I realize that is me I can't do anything. You understand? I can't do anything because the doer is still the me. So there is only a state of pure observation of the fact. And that observation with its intense attention brings out its own action, which is intelligence.

Right Sirs. Finished today.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 2ND SEPTEMBER 1982

I wonder why you all listen to me? (Laughter) I am asking this seriously, not flippantly: why we listen to others, not that we shouldn't but why? Either we listen to somebody who knows his subject very well and we want to be informed on it, or we turn to some specialist, professional, who will discuss his particular study, or we listen to some music - Mozart, Beethoven and so on - and we are delighted by it, stimulated by it, see the beauty of it and enjoy it. And when we ask why you are listening to the speaker, in which category do you put him in? I think it would be necessary and right if we could probe into these questions co-operatively, that is, we all share together in the exploration of these questions, co-operate, not that the speaker reads a question, investigates it, but if we could do it together it would be really extraordinarily good and important. Few of us know how to co-operate. We co-operate round an idea, if we agree with that idea, or we co-operate round an ideal to be certain that ideal is carried out, then we all get together if we agree with that ideal, that is, if it pleases us, that ideal. Or we co-operate round a person, some authority, as we do round a bishop, or a priest, or a guru, or any of those people. But it all implies, does it not, that we co-operate about something, or with something, or with something. But here we are not co-operating in that sense. We want the co-operation that is not personal, that is nothing to do with ideas, authority and so on but the feeling of co-operation. I wonder if I am making myself clear. Feeling that, let's all tackle this problem together. Because that is the problem of most of our

lives, we have so many problems, physical, psychological, and problems invented by thought. And we live with these problems everlastingly until we die. We are never free of any problem. We are always carrying them with us and we never try to find out what it means to live a life without a single problem, psychologically first, not outwardly, which we generally do. Let us solve the outward problems first and then we will tackle the other. But I don't think it ever works that way. We have to solve the psychological problems first and then the other problems can be intelligently, co-operatively, understood and acted upon. So please we are co-operating together, not that you are co-operating with the speaker or with what he says, but coming together to resolve some of these problems.

1st QUESTION: Most of us are married, or involved in a close relationship which began for all the wrong reasons you have so correctly described. Can such a marriage or relationship ever be made into a really positive force? (Laughter)

You poor chaps! Now how do we tackle this question? We went into the question the other day into what is relationship. What does it mean to be related to another? You may be related very closely, intimately, physically, but are we ever related psychologically, inwardly, not romantically, sentimentally, but the feeling of being related? The word 'relation' means to be in contact, to have a sense of wholeness with another, not as separate entities, then coming together and feeling whole but the very relationship brings about this quality, this feeling of not being separate. This is really quite an important question because most of our lives are so terribly isolated, insulated, carefully structured so that we are not

psychologically disturbed. And such relationship will inevitably bring about conflict, disturbance and all the neurotic behaviour that one has. So first let's be clear together what we mean by relationship, not only the meaning of that word, the verbal meaning, but the significance that lies behind the word, behind the two people. What does it mean to be related? Are we ever related in the deep profound sense of that word? Can there be a relationship of that kind, undisturbed like the depth of the sea, can there be a relationship if each one of us is pursuing his own particular path, particular desire, particular ambition and so on? Can there be such relationship with the other if these things exist? If you say, "How can they not exist? Is it not necessary for each one of us to fulfil, each one of us to flower with each other?" - whatever that may mean. That sense of separateness exists. If each of us says we are helping each other to flower, to grow, to fulfil, to be happy together, then one is still maintaining the isolated spirit. Now why does the mind or the brain, the human entity, always cling to separatism?

So, please this is a very, very serious question: why human beings throughout history have maintained this sense of isolation, insulation, separatism, division. You are a Catholic, I am a Protestant. You belong to that group and he belongs to that group. I put on a purple robe, yellow robe or a garland round my something or other, and we maintain this, and we talk about relationship, love and all the rest of it. Now why? Please we are co-operating, investigating together. Why do we do this? Is it either conscious, deliberate, or unconscious, tradition, our education? The whole religious structure maintains that you are separate, separate soul

etc. etc. Or is it that thought in itself is separative? You understand? I think I am separate from you. I think my behaviour must be separate from yours, because otherwise there is the fear that we will become automatic, zombies, imitating each other. Is thought the cause of this separatism in life? Please investigate together in this. Thought has separated the world into nationalities - right? You are British, another is a German, I am French, you are Russian and so on. This division is created by thought. And thought assumes that in this separatism, in this division, there is security, belonging to a commune, belonging to the same group, believing in the same guru, believing in the same clothes that one wears according to edicts of the guru, one feels secure, at least the illusion of being secure.

And so we are asking: is it pleasure, the pleasurable desire which is the movement of thought also, that separates us? Right? That is, is thought ever complete, whole? Because thought is based on knowledge, which is vast accumulated experience of man, either in scientific, technological world, or psychologically - right? We have accumulated a great deal of knowledge outwardly and inwardly. And thought is the outcome of that knowledge, thought as memory, knowledge, experience - right? So knowledge can never be complete. We agree? About anything, about god, about Nirvana, about heaven, about science, anything. So knowledge must always go with the shadow of ignorance. Please see this fact together. So when thought enters into the field of relationship it must create a division because thought itself is fragmented, thought itself is limited - right?

If this is clear to all of us - I am not explaining, you are

discovering it for yourselves - Then what place has knowledge in relationship? Please this is a serious question, it isn't just a casual, argumentative proposition. This is an enquiry into what place has knowledge, experience, accumulated memories, in relationship? Please answer this yourself, don't look at me. If I say, "I know my wife" - or another form of intimate relationship, I have already put that person into the framework of my knowledge about her, or him. So my knowledge becomes the divisive process. I have lived with my wife, husband, girl, or whatever it is, and I have accumulated information, I have remembered the painful statements she has made or one has made, there is this whole building up of memory as an image, which interferes in my relationship with another. Right? Please observe this in oneself. And she is doing exactly the same thing. So we are asking: what place has knowledge in relationship? Is knowledge love? I may know my wife, the way she looks, the way she behaves, certain habits and so on. That is fairly obvious. But why should I say, "I know her"? - or him. When I say, "I know" I have already limited my relationship. I don't know if you understand? I have already created a block, a barrier between myself and her. Does that mean in my relationship to her I become irresponsible? You understand my question? If I say, "I don't know you basically" am I irresponsible? Or I have become extraordinarily sensitive. If I may use that word, that is a wrong word - I am vulnerable, I have no sense of division, no barrier.

So if I have this quality of mind, brain or feeling that in relationship it is a flowering, a movement, it is not a static state, it is a living thing, you can't put it in a crate and say that is it, don't move from there. Then we can begin to ask: what is marriage?

Right? Or not marriage. One may live with another, sexually, companionship, holding hands, talking - you know all the rest of it, and go to a Registrar, or go through a Catholic or Protestant ceremony and I am tied together, only let god put it aside, which means absolutely nothing, just a form of tradition. Or I may live with another without being married. With one in certain conditions, I have taken a vow of responsibility; in the other I don't. And with one I am legally married, separation, divorce becomes rather difficult. With the other it is fairly simple, we each say goodbye and walk off in different directions. And that is what is happening more and more in the world. We are not condemning either. Please we are just looking at this whole problem. The children, responsibility and the feeling of this tremendous burden of children. And there, legally, you are tied. In the other you are not, you may have children but there is always this open door. Now is all relationship in both these cases, a mere form of attraction, biological responses on both sides, the curiosity, the sense of wanting to be with another, which may be the outcome of unconscious fear of loneliness, the tradition which has established this habit. Now in both cases it can become a habit - right? And in both cases there is the fear of losing, possessing, exploiting each other sexually and all the rest of it follows. Now in both cases what is important? Please we are talking over together, I am not telling you what is or what is not. What is important, necessary in both cases? Responsibility is essential - right? I am responsible for the people I live with. I am responsible, not only with my wife, but I am responsible for what is happening in the world. I am responsible to see that people are not killed. I am responsible. I am

responsible to see that there is no violence - right?

So is my responsibility just for the one and for my family, for my children, which has been the tradition? And the family in the West is disappearing more and more. Whereas in the East the family is still the centre, tremendously important, for the family they will do anything, even though they are distant cousins they will keep together, help each other, pull wires for each other. But here it is gradually disappearing altogether.

So seeing all this, the responsibility as it exists in marriage, the responsibility as it exists in the other, living with somebody, we are irresponsible because if we have children our responsibility is to see that they are properly educated, not sent off to some kind of... you know get rid of them as quickly as possible. You see sir, when you go into this problem it becomes extraordinarily complex and extraordinarily vital because if you have children, if I love them as I do and I feel responsible, I am responsible for the whole of their life, and they must be responsible for me for the whole of their life. I must see that they are properly educated, not butchered by war.

So all that is implied in this question. And this question, in investigating it profoundly, unless one has this quality of love everything is just beside the point. If I have no love for my wife, that is I am not pursuing my own self-centred activity and she is not too, but if I am and she is not then the trouble begins. That is if I am attempting not to be self-centred, not to be isolated, to have this feeling of deep affection in which there is no attachment, no possession, not the pursuit of pleasure, and my wife feels the opposite, quite different, then we have a totally different problem. You understand this? Then the problem is: what shall I do? Just

leave her, run away, divorce. I may have to. She insists something - you follow, it is not a question to be answered by a few statements but it requires a great deal of inward enquiry into this on both parts. And in that enquiry, in exploring, if there is no love then there is no intelligent action. Where there is love it has its own intelligence, its own responsibility - right?

Can we go on to the next question? Not we are bored with that but relationship is one of the most extraordinary things in life, to be totally, completely related with another, without any sense of me interfering with it, without any sense of the self with all its egotistic pursuits, it doesn't enter into that relationship.

2nd QUESTION: Is our continuous search for security a valid need or a neurotic one? Is there a security that is not the opposite of insecurity?

Can we to on with this question? Shall we? Sir, what is an opposite? The contrary? There is man and woman, light and dark, sunrise and sunset, darkness, there is division between nature and man, actual nature and man. There is division between the man who is tall and the other who is short, light skinned, dark skinned, brown skin, yellow skin and purple skin - they are painting themselves. So there is division, obvious division. A marquee and a house, a dome and a flat surface. Now is there an opposite psychologically at all? Please enquire into this together. Is there inwardly an opposite? We have inwardly the opposite - right? I am good, or bad, and I must be good. I am greedy and I must not be greedy. I am violent and I hope one day not to be violent. So inwardly, psychologically there are opposites. Where there are opposites inwardly there must be conflict - right? That is so. I am

violent, but thought has created a state of non-violence which is the opposite of what I am actually, what is. And I am struggling through time, experience, to become non-violence - right? Please, can we go on with this?

So 'what is' and 'what should be', so there is conflict. Now 'what should be' is non-fact, it is not so; 'what is' is my violence. That is all; not "I should become non-violent". I wonder if we see this clearly. 'What is' is far more important than 'what should be'. Because 'what should be' will never take place because 'I will be one day'. And in the meantime I am sowing the seeds of violence all the time. So psychologically the opposite does not exist actually. It is an illusion that there is an opposite. Now if the mind, if our conditioning is to create the opposite, if we are free from that conditioning then we can look at 'what is'. Right? So let; look at 'what is'.

What actually is, is that we are insecure. I am seeking security but the actual fact is I am insecure, uncertain, confused, waffling about, moving from one thing, one family to another, one woman to another, one man to another, one guru to another - you follow? I am seeking security and I think there is security in nations, in a community, in a family, or if I am fairly intelligent I say, "No, there is no security but there is security in god." - in obeying, in following, in accepting. But the fact remains all the time that there is this feeling of deep insecurity. So can we put away the search for security psychologically and enquire into what is insecurity? Then I can deal with it. But if I am all the time seeking security and I see very well I can't find it, in churches, in priests, in books, in people, in gurus, in ideas, there is none of it, I see that. So I come back and

say now, I am insecure, why? What is insecurity? I am talking first of all psychologically, not first secure outwardly, then secure inwardly. But first psychologically I am enquiring into insecurity. Please see the importance of this. The Communists, Socialists and various other groups have tried to find, bring about security for man outwardly, and they have all failed. The Communists started out - you know, I won't go into all that. All kinds of propositions, ideals and then ended up in Totalitarianism.

So unless we tackle, grasp the inward structure of human behaviour, human mind, psychologically, merely the outward coating will have no effect. One doesn't realize this. So first we are seeking together, trying to find out, why psychologically we live in insecurity, while we feel insecure - right? Not the other. Why? Now when I am insecure, and I know I am insecure, is there subtle urge, subtle intimation, that there is security? You understand? I am insecure. I am married and all the rest of it, but I feel insecure. But there may be also deep down in me the feeling that there is somewhere security and I am pursuing that unconsciously though I am trying to investigate insecurity - you follow? I wonder if you see this? I must be very clear that I am not surreptitiously under the table seeking security though I profess I am insecure.

So we must be clear right through our being that one lives in insecurity - why? Then we can ask the real question, but if you are half and half - you know half and half about anything you become mediocre. That is a good subject, mediocrity, but we won't go into that. The word 'mediocrity' means going up the mountain half way. A person who goes half way is mediocre, who doesn't go right to the top of it, not in professions, not in some particular subject, but

psychologically he doesn't go right to the top of it, such a person is mediocre. I am not saying you are! (Laughter)

So what is insecurity? Can there be security at all? Don't be depressed, don't feel anxious, we are investigating. Can there be, though I am seeking, wanting, searching, longing for security, realizing I am insecure, I am also asking: is there really security at all? My search for security may be wrong. What I am seeking is not security but a quality of mind, brain, that will meet everything rightly - right? I wonder if you understand this? I feel insecure and I see life is insecure, there is death always, there is always an accident, there is always something happening, shaking my foundations. I realize that and I say to myself is there security at all? Wait a bit, don't deny it, I am questioning it, going into it, because security is necessary. The brain can only function effectively, vitally, fully with all its extraordinary capacity when it is secure, like a child, baby, must be secure. So the brain must feel that it is completely secure, not be shaken, it must be immovable in its security, then the brain is flowering - you understand? Are we following each other?

So let's find out if there is security at all. And if there is no security the brain cannot possibly function properly. So we are asking: what is security and insecurity? Are you getting tired? We are going to find out first what is insecurity, why we live perpetually in insecurity. Now in that very enquiry, why we live in this state, confusion and all the rest of it, the very awareness of it is the beginning of intelligence. Right? Are you following this? Now let's begin again.

I am insecure. I have searched for security, which is, run away

from my insecurity, which is, I have created the opposite and I am in conflict with it: knowing insecurity and wanting security. There is a struggle going on. So I see how stupid that is. The very recognition of this is the beginning of intelligence - right? Are you following? Are we together in this?

Questioner: Not completely.

K: Not completely. Sir, look: we have divided the world into nationalities, and it is nationalities that is one of the major causes of war - right? One of the causes, the economic and so on and so on, but one of the causes is this feeling that we are separate from this person, you follow, nationalities. Now to recognize that and to be free of it is to be intelligent. No? Or would you want to be unintelligent? (Laughter) No, this is important, please. To recognize, to see that which is false and to abandon that is intelligence. Right?

Now I see, after investigating, which we have done, there is no security in belief - right? - because belief changes all the time. It can be argued down, it can be broken down, faith, belief, ideals bring doubt to it and it begins to disappear. So there is no security in that. Therefore my brain has seen that which is illusory, which it has considered before as giving it security, it has abandoned it. So it has become alive, intelligent. And it says: is there security at all? There is when there is intelligence - I don't know if you follow this? Intelligence is the most positive force of security. Right? Is this clear? To abandon psychologically everything that is false, to perceive it, to see it very clearly is intelligence. Where there is intelligence you don't even ask whether you are secure or insecure.

So, can we then, together, see the nature of security and

insecurity, and in that very examination, observation, probing, discover for ourselves, not because anybody says, discover for ourselves that there is supreme security where there is intelligence? Not the cunning thought of intelligence - right?

Can we go to the next question?

3rd QUESTION: Would you please clarify what you mean by brain, mind and consciousness?

I am not going to clarify, we will talk over together. First of all we are not professionals, thank god: We are enquiring, not that professionals don't enquire, I don't mean that. We are ordinary laymen, we are enquiring into this very, very complex problem which is, consciousness, the quality - not the structure, the nature, the cells and all that, but the brain and the mind - right? Please don't look at me, look at yourselves.

First of all consciousness: to be conscious, which is to be aware, which is to be attentive, not negligent, but diligently enquire into the nature of our consciousness. There has been the division as the unconscious and the conscious. The unconscious is all the past, all the inheritance, all the memories of thousands of years of man - right? Unconsciously you may have the memories of being conditioned in Protestantism and Hinduism and all the rest of it, two thousand years of Christianity and propaganda has sewn deeply the fear of heaven and hell, the saviour - you follow? - it is there deeply. And if you go to the Islamic world, it is there also. And the Hindu world and so on. So the unconscious is the movement of the past. We won't go into too many details because it is a very complex question we are going into. The past is a thousand memories, thousand years of pain, struggle and all the

travail of man. The unconscious is the idea that you are British, French and so on. And the conscious, as one observes, one may be wrong, one must always be doubting, the conscious is all the recent covering, education, technology, the covering. That is, the conscious mind has often the intimations of the unconscious - right? You are following all this? And the conscious mind is always, if one is at all aware, is being guided by the unconscious. You follow? So there is actually, if one is at all alive, aware, there is no unconscious and the conscious. It is one unitary movement, if one is alive, fully aware. And one is fully aware when there is a crisis, when there is some deep disturbing challenge everything, your whole consciousness comes into action. And our consciousness is everything that thought has put there - right? Our belief, our tradition, our faith, our fears of heaven and hell, our fears, you know, our whole movement of our life is our consciousness. That consciousness is part of our brain, of course. If I have no brain I have no consciousness. So the brain is part and the necessary movement of consciousness, acting through, or in the brain. Now the brain - I am not professional, please, I have discussed this point with professionals but they won't accept what we are saying but that doesn't matter, I may be false, I may be wrong. We are saying the brain is now conditioned - right? Technologically, look how much energy has gone into technology. Our brain is limited, conditioned through vast experience, knowledge, conditioned. But to discover the quality of the brain which is not conditioned and therefore infinite capacity, look at what the technological people are doing, they are not conditioned, they are enquiring, pushing, driving to find out, and therefore they

have got extraordinary capacity - the atom bomb, the things the technicians, the scientists are creating, some of you don't even know about it, the horrors. So the brain has infinite capacity. But it is conditioned now as British, as French, and all the rest, I believe, I don't believe, I believe in god, in my guru, that guru is better than this guru - you follow? All that nonsense is going on.

So as it is conditioned its capacity is limited, and only when that conditioning is totally free, that means no faith, no fear, you follow? - no attachment of any kind to anything, to past memories, past experiences. And they are that way when they are technologically involved, they are tremendously alive, I have talked to them. They have no time, they brush you off. So is it possible for the brain to be unconditioned? Which means is it possible for the brain to be free of the known? That is, I have to know where I have to go home, which road to take, what language I speak, I have to, there is knowledge, but to be free psychologically, which is the conditioning, which the brain has been conditioned, conditioned by knowledge, to be free of that then it has got extraordinary capacity.

Then we are saying what is the mind? First of all we talked of consciousness, the brain and the mind. When the brain is completely free of that psychological knowledge, then the brain is the mind, because mind is infinite. So to understand all this you have to study yourself, not from books, not from other people, you have to look at your own life, give time, energy, patience, probing. We haven't time because we are chattering all the time. So mind, brain and consciousness are really one, when there is total freedom of all conditioning.

Shall we go on?

4th QUESTION: When we see someone being aggressive verbally or physically towards another, we feel a need to intervene. Can such intervention be just? Or is it a mere subtle reaction of the self?

Can't one find out for oneself, this? Can't one be aware of one's own reaction and see whether it is a self motivated reaction, or it is kindly - you know somebody is hurting, you naturally interfere. But if one is not aware of one's own reactions, it may be selfish reaction, make you self important. Is this question good enough, may I go to the next one?

5th QUESTION: The violence and disorder of the world demands from us an urgency and intensity of response, which we seem to lack. Our intellectual awareness is inadequate. Can there be a deeper awareness which meets the enormity of the problem?

Let's enquire together please, what is it to be aware? To be aware, to be conscious, to be cognizant, to be sensitive to everything, to nature, to people round you, sensitive in your own reactions, what does it mean to be aware? Is one aware of this marquee? Or you take it for granted? Have you counted the number of poles in this marquee? Have you looked at the trees, not give it a name, but to be aware of it, to be sensitive to it. Or is one aware of the person sitting next to you? Aware of his physical movement, how he looks at people, aware of his clothes, his dress or whatever it is. Or we are all so self-centred, we haven't time, we have no regard for another. We are so entangled with our own problems, with our own misery, that we don't look at anything else. So to be aware, does it not mean to see, feel, look, without any

choice of what is happening? To be aware of what is happening in the world, not necessarily from newspapers and magazines but to be aware that there are wars going on, people are killing each other, thousands of years of shedding tears and we don't seem to have learnt anything. To be aware of all this without any choice. One is aware as a British, what is happening here, one knows very well. But one isn't aware globally as a human being. So are we aware in such a sense, a global feeling of mankind, not the Arab and the Israelis and British and the French and so on - it all becomes rather silly, all that kind of stuff. To be so aware of this human suffering, human sorrow, human pleasure. And if one is so aware, which is not concentration at all, aware, then the questioner says: is there an awareness of something very deep, from which you act? That is what the questioner says, asks. Then there is attention. Awareness and attention, not concentration.

Concentration is merely focussing all your energy on a particular point. That we can do fairly easily. When you are interested in certain subjects, certain ideas, certain story, you are completely concentrated. Or you may force yourself to concentrate, which is to resist other intrusions of other thoughts. But awareness is different: to be aware, to be sensitive, to have this feeling of a movement which is total, which is human. And attention is this quality in which there is no centre from which you are attending, which means no frontiers to attention, no borders. When there is that quality of attention, which is part of love and compassion, and intelligence, then from there one acts, or non acts.

Shall we go on to the next one? It is the last one.

6th QUESTION: At the talks you give many of us feel, or

sense, something of immeasurable importance. This is not romantic fantasy, or illusion. It is more profoundly real than much of the rest of our lives. But after I leave I cannot stop the gradual dissipation of that great profoundness. Sir this is a true tragedy. What can one do?

First, if I may most respectfully ask, are you being influenced? Are you being stimulated? Are you being driven by the words of the speaker, or the feeling of the speaker, that what he says is true - if you think so. Are you being influenced by all that? Then if you are influenced, and I hope you are not, if you are, then it becomes a drug, then you lose it. Then you can't help dissipating that which you have been driven to, or influenced, or that which has been said or felt. If it acts as a drug then it must disappear. Quickly or gradually. But if one - this again is being said most humbly - if one actually hears what is being said and discovers for oneself the truth, then one is a light to oneself. That light itself can never be put out, can never be extinguished. But if one is dependent on another, however much the other may have something, if it is not part of one's life, one's daily beauty of this, then dissipation is inevitable. And the tragedy is that all of us do listen, sometimes profoundly, sometimes casually but that very seed is there, but we never give it an opportunity to let it flower. The world is too much with us. And to be conscious of all this, the vastness of the earth, the vastness of the human brain, and love and all that, is so, if one comes to it, not just verbally, romantically or sentimentally, but actually, then that fire can never be put out.

Right sirs. May I get up please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH SEPTEMBER 1982

This is the last talk. I suppose you will be glad, and I'll be glad too.

I think one should go over briefly what we have been talking about the last two talks and the two question meetings. We talked about the chaos in the world, the great uncertainty for all of us. Life is becoming more and more dangerous, unpredictable, and the future, from what one observes as things are politically, economically, even socially, it is rather grave. One is not pessimistic or optimistic, but these are facts. They are preparing for war. Man apparently has not learned from past history that killing another human being is of no value, it doesn't solve any problems. But apparently that is the fashion, that is the national inheritance and the accepted orthodoxy. And nobody seems to demonstrate, and there have been a great many demonstrations about nuclear war, about this and that, but nobody, from the highest to the lowest, seems to demonstrate to end all wars, not a particular kind of war, atomic, or a conventional war, or other types of war, but one has not given one's energy, or the drive, or the intensity to stop all wars. Of course the politicians would never agree to that, nor the gurus, nor the highest Christian authorities. If they did they wouldn't be the highest authorities.

And also we talked about the general disorder outwardly and the inward disorder that we live with. We talked about hatred spreading throughout the world more and more, and there seems to be no end to that. We talked also about human beings wounded psychologically from childhood and the consequences of that hurt,

the wounds that one receives while being educated, in the family. Education, college, university, and the whole process of living seems to breed this kind of inward hurt, which breeds isolation, fear and the kind of neuroticism that seems to be common.

And also we talked about, perhaps the most important thing is relationship. How essential it is to find out for oneself to live a life in which conflict doesn't exist in relationship - sexual, the individual search for his own fulfilment, pursuing his own ambitions and therefore the relationship is never complete, it is always divided, like two parallel lines that never meet. And that is what we call relationship, and therefore in it there is perpetual conflict. And the cause of that conflict, that lack of deep fundamental relationship is this sense of isolation, not only the individual isolation, the very word indicates isolation, but that word too has a different meaning - indivisible, a human being who is not broken up, living at different levels of his life: business life, religious life, social life, family life and so on. Such a human being cannot possibly have deep abiding, lasting relationship in which there is love. We have talked about it quite a lot.

And also we have enquired together into the nature of fear, whether it is possible for human beings living in this ugly world, to be totally free completely of all fear. Fear is a terrible thing, it darkens, shortens, makes one's mind so brittle. And whether it is possible to be free of all fear, both psychologically and outwardly. Where there is fear there cannot be generosity, cannot be that sense of great affection.

We also talked about love and compassion and intelligence. We said that that which is love cannot be approached positively but

that which is not can be put aside: jealousy, ambition, antagonism, ambition, competition, deny the very nature and the beauty of love.

And we talked also about compassion. There can be no compassion obviously if one is anchored in a belief, in a faith, in a dogma, or belonging to some group, some sect. Such a person may have pity, sympathy, generosity but it is not compassion. Where there is compassion there is intelligence. We went into that. We enquired into what is the nature of a human being who is intelligent. If intelligence is based on knowledge, is the outcome of knowledge, then we have a great deal of knowledge of most things in life, but that knowledge has not transformed us, has not made us intelligent. The very antagonisms, national divisions and racial and religious divisions indicate how unintelligent we are. Somebody should write a history about stupidity! I believe they have, perhaps in the thirties somebody wrote a book. But such books are easily forgotten. Put aside.

And we talked about yesterday the nature of suffering, why human beings, who apparently have such extraordinary skill, extraordinary capacity in the technological field, have not used that capacity, that energy, that quality of intensity to wipe away all human suffering, both physically and psychologically. Perhaps they will succeed wiping away physical pain, disease and so on, but man has lived for millenia upon millenia, and yet he suffers. And we went into that very carefully and it would not be the occasion again to repeat what was said yesterday morning?

So we ought to talk over together this morning, and please don't consider it rather morbid, or unnecessary on a lovely morning like this, to talk about death, because it is part of our life, as all the

other characteristics of our life, like hate, jealousy, violence and occasional flare of the beauty of love; it is all part of our life. And also we ought to talk over together, not that you are listening to the speaker, copying his words, or his statements or trying to understand what he is talking about but rather together investigate these problems and find out the truth of them. And so please we are talking over together, you are sharing, partaking, co-operating, not just listening and then agreeing or disagreeing and walk off, do your T'ai chi endlessly or your Yoga, or some practice of some guru which he thinks will enlighten you, but we are concerned with our daily life, not some exotic, fanciful religious concepts but actual daily life of conflict, the confusion we live in, the uncertainty, the search for security. We have been through all that, it is part of our life. And also death is part of our life, though we may not acknowledge that fact. We may try to avoid it, slur over it, or only be concerned with the last minute, as most people are. So we should together enquire into the nature, into that extraordinary fact, as life is an extraordinary fact, we ought to consider that also.

And we should too consider before death and meditation, what is beauty. It is important too. Does beauty lie in the eye of the observer? Is beauty a state of mind that has studied all the paintings, the poets and the statuary of the world and come to a certain conclusion. The architecture of the most extraordinary buildings in the world, from the deep pyramids to the Parthenon, to the cathedrals, to the temples and the mosques. And when one observes those marvellous trees, the sequoias that have lived five to six thousand years, some of them, what is beauty, where is beauty? In the poems, in the literature, in the painting? Or when

you see a beautiful person, well formed, beautiful features? What do you consider to be beauty? It is important because love goes with beauty.

So one must enquire into this nature of what is beautiful? When do you perceive beauty? You see a marvellous mountain with deep valleys and shadows, against the blue sky, with all the light of heaven upon it, and for a moment you are struck by its grandeur, by the greatness of that enormous solid rock. And for a second you are absent, you have forgotten your problems, your petty quarrels and all the rest of it, and you are facing this tremendous beauty. Does beauty exist only when the self is not? Please do ask these questions of yourself. The self, the me, the person, the name, the form, all those words of fear, violence and problems and deep loneliness with its despairs, that is the self, the me, striving, striving to become something. When that self is absent completely, does that state of mind, being, perceive beauty? As you do when you see a great monument, great mountains, for a second the self is driven away by an accident, by a crisis, then perhaps one sees that which is beautiful. It happens to all of us, please it is nothing extraordinary. When you see a lovely sunset, indescribable light, golden, orange, green, and for a second everything is forgotten. There is the startling clarity of beauty, of light. At that moment the self is not.

Now can one live that way, not be absorbed by something enormous, something majestic, like a child with a toy? The child is absorbed in the toy and forgotten all his eager mischief, for the moment the toy has taken him over until he breaks that toy. So he depends on that toy to make him forget. And we depend on some

toy also, grown up people. The toy of a symbol, the toy of a world, the toy of a mantra - the word mantra, in Sanskrit, I believe, means meditate, or think over, not becoming and absorb all self-centred activity. That is the root meaning of that word - and what we have made of it!

So is it possible to live a life without causation? Please enquire together into this. Our life, our whole existence has a cause. I do this because... I love you because... I worship because I am afraid that my life is empty and perhaps some outside agency will help. There is always a cause in our life. And where there is a cause there is an ending. If I love because you offer me sex, pleasure, companionship, because it has a cause that kind of relationship soon ends. But to live a life without any causation is to live a life that is measureless because such a life has no ending. It isn't my life that I am ending. Those people who have a cause will always find an end. Perhaps that may be immortality, not my immortality or yours, but to live a life that has no beginning, which is a cause, and therefore it has no end. If one sees the beauty of that then life has a totally different meaning. Please, as we said, we are talking over together. It is not that the speaker is stimulating you, then the speaker becomes a drug, then you depend and all the mischief begins. But if we are together enquiring into this, probing very, very carefully, sceptically with a great deal of doubt of everything you have examined, because that may not be complete examining, doubt, scepticism are great factors in life.

And so we should together go into this question of death. What is it that dies? And what is it that lives? Both of them go together. When you use the word death, dying, it means that you have also

lived. The two cannot be separated. That is a basic truth, that it cannot be separated, as you cannot possibly separate relationship as though by itself, like a hurt, like a wound, like a fear. They are all interrelated. There is no one problem. One problem if it is properly understood psychologically, then in that problem all problems are included. But if you separate and say this is one problem I must solve then you are reducing life into a shoddy little affair. But if one examines one problem completely, and to understand the nature of that completeness one must understand how one approaches a problem. So we must be very clear that life and death go together. They are not something in the distance. When one is young, full of life, enjoyment, and a great deal of energy one doesn't ever think about the other end. As one grows a little bit older, watches one's son die, then you begin to question, then you begin to shed tears and anxieties of life. Death is there for all of us. So what is it to die? And what is it to live? One cannot ask what it is to die without asking what it is to live. If we don't understand the living then we will be frightened of the other naturally. But if we understand the nature of living then we will comprehend also deeply the nature of dying, not what happens after death but rather what happens before one dies. That is far more important to find out what happens before dying rather than what happens after. Volumes have been written of what happens after death. And we are all eagerly searching or waiting, or rationalizing what happens after but we never look at what happens before. So we are going together to look at what happens before. What happens to all of us before, the thing called living, the thing called becoming, the struggles, the pains, the anxieties, the loneliness, the deep endless

sorrow, working from morning until night until you are sixty and then retire to die? This is what we call living. And we are questioning whether that is living at all. Please you must question this, not I, not the speaker, but each one of us must question. Question, not find an answer. It is a challenge and you must know how to meet a challenge. This is a challenge. What is our life, the living? The acquisition of money, the search for power, sexual fulfillment, the striving, the conflict, the fears, the anxieties, the loneliness and the deepening sorrows, is that our life? It is our life. It is everlastingly becoming something. That is why you all belong - not all of you - some of you belong to some group hoping to become something, to become illumined, to become rich. So the becoming has a cause and if you don't become in a certain direction you go to the other and keep this strain of becoming all the time. That is our daily life, in the business world, in the political world, in the religious world. Think of it - absurd, in the religious world. The priest becoming the bishop, the bishop becoming the cardinal and the cardinal eventually becoming the top dog! No, please don't laugh, see the fact, see the extraordinary cruelty of it all. And this is what we call living and of course then we are frightened of death.

So we are going to find out if we can whether in this living, whether it is possible to be free completely of all the burden of man. That's what we have been discussing for the last sixty years or so, whether it is possible to be free totally from all fear, from all the wounds that man has given to man: the agonies, the loneliness, the utter separation of existence, whether we are individuals at all, because our consciousness with all the things that thought has put

there like fear, faith and so on, is the common lot of all mankind. Our consciousness, though we think it is ours, individual consciousness, it is not when you examine it very closely. It is the common lot, common ground of all human beings. So one questions whether there is individuality at all, though on the peripheral, on the outward existence, you may be better educated, more money, better fed, better clothes, more power, but inwardly we are all the same. You all belong to one sect, or one group, one communal, call yourself or robe yourself differently but inwardly inside the skin, psychologically, you are humanity. And so you are basically not an individual, that is one of our illusions. We also say, "Thinking is my thinking". Thinking is never personal, individual, thinking is common to all mankind from the great philosophers to the mathematicians, to the scientists and to the poor ignorant man never knowing how to read or write or travel. Thinking is again common to all of us. So thinking is neither East nor West. That is our life.

When there is no freedom from this kind of travail and agony, and occasional sense of beauty then what is death, why are you frightened, why are we all so scared? The Hindus, the ancient Hindus have invented a theory that you will live after, carry on with your misery, this life, next life if you behave properly it will be better. You will have more money, better houses, better clothes and you will have greater power. Or you will be a great saint. And the Christians too have their own rationalization - resurrection, you know all the rest of it. Those who believe in reincarnation, that is to incarnate next life, what is it that incarnates next life? Go into it sirs, don't accept the tradition. Go into it, what is it that incarnates

next life? Your thoughts? Your loneliness? Your striving? Your utter confusion and sorrow? And is sorrow, anxiety, loneliness and agony to be dispelled through time, which is evolution. We like to think so. We like to think violence will end, give me time. While you have time you sow the further seeds of violence, obviously. So those who believe in this theory, though some of them say, "Oh no, it is very actual" - maybe, one has to be very careful of all these beliefs. It isn't one belief that is going to solve all the problems. If you believe in that, that means you must live now a righteous life, a good life, an intelligent life, a life of love and compassion. But you don't. That is just a theory to comfort you at the last minute.

So what is it that dies? Please answer this question to yourself. Not what the books say, not what your tradition says because that just may be another form of illusion. It doesn't matter who says it, the Buddha or anybody, Shankara according to the ancient Hindus, they may be deceived, and human beings are deceived very, very easily because the root of it all is they want comfort.

So what is it that dies? Obviously your attachments, your bank account, though you may like to have it until the last minutes, it is your bank account, your beliefs, your loneliness, your relationship, intimate and otherwise, all that dies. Just see what happens. That is what is dying. You have collected a great deal of art treasure, wealth, good houses, your character, cultivated this and that, not only the garden but you have cultivated your own mind, your own heart. At the end of it all death is there. That is, all these qualities is you. You may call it the soul, the Hindus give it a different name but it is that centre of the self, the name, the form, the quality, the wounds, the hurts - all that is me. And through disease, old age or

accident, all that is cut off. And that is death. Right? So we have separated living and death is somewhere far round the corner.

Now the next question to that is: can death take place while living? Please understand what we mean. I am attached to my family, to my wife, to my house, to the beautiful furniture I just bought the other day - I haven't bought it but - I am attached to all that. Death is the ending of that. Now can I living in this life with all my vitality, end the attachment, which is death? You understand? Are you following? I am attached to my wife, or to my children, more to my bank account, and death wipes all that away. While living with my clear mind, with her clarities, with my vitality, end that attachment, so I am living with death all the time. Do you understand the beauty of it? Do you understand? That is, ending that which psychologically I have accumulated. Therefore the living and the dying go together. Do you understand what it means? Would it be possible to do this? Have you ever tried, if one may ask most respectfully, have you ever tried to end something without any cause? Ordinary things - smoking, drinking, chattering, end following somebody, your leader, your guru, your priest, your specialist, specially psychologically I am not talking of the specialist, the doctor and so on. Have you voluntarily, without any cause, ended something? You may dislike somebody, hate somebody, end it. That is death. So one begins to understand, if one goes into it very deeply that death is not something at the end of one's life, however brief, or however long, but death is a movement of life. Death is closely related to life. And so where there is an ending, complete ending, without causation, then there is a beginning without an end, that is immortality. That is a state of

timelessness. But if I am frightened of death, which is frightened of losing, to end that fear, lose now - you understand ? In that there is great beauty.

So we ought next to talk about - we haven't finished the subject of death because it is much too complicated. One has to go into it very, very deeply. That is, what happens to all of us whose consciousness is common to all mankind, what happens to the one who is out of that consciousness? What relationship has that person to the rest of mankind - you understand? I won't go into it now because we haven't got time. As I said death with all its meanings is very complex, needs very careful observation. It cannot be observed when there is fear. It requires great hesitancy, affection, seeing what life and death are.

Now we ought to talk about also, as this is the last meeting, what is meditation? In relation to that we ought to talk over together, what is religion? Go to the smallest Indian village, poor, hungry, probably one meal and that meal is not sufficient, and they have also the feeling of religiosity. They worship a tree, a stone. And you come to a more complicated, sophisticated society, it is the same movement, they may put a garland round a stone with great reverence. In a sophisticated society it is much more polished; there you have got marvellous cathedrals, churches, painted windows, solemnity, chanting, candles, the strange dress. That also creates a great atmosphere. If you have been to some of the old cathedrals where cardinals are performing, it is really an extraordinarily beautiful thing. Big announcements, all the world shall know all the things that go on - it may all be ridiculous but the atmosphere, the beauty of those vast pillars reaching up to the

heavens. That is the same quality only polished, clean, healthy, two thousand years of repetition. It is the same as the man or woman in the village who puts a garland, a flower, in front of a stone. Both are so-called religious. Don't call the other a heathen, an ignorant man, he is doing exactly the same thing as you are, worshipping something outside, something, an agency, a god with all the paraphernalia of religious orthodoxy. So what is religion?

This is necessary to understand before we go into the question of meditation. Is all that is going on in the name of religion, the Judaic, the Arabic, the Islamic world, their brutality, their whippings - you know what is happening there. And all the vast superstitions of India with their three hundred thousand gods or more. You can invent as many gods as you like and that is more fun than having one god! But all gods are invented, as all the rituals. But the longing, the feeling that there must be something beyond all this, beyond all the human suffering, beyond all the human sorrow, work, labour, all the materialistic world and their marvellous technology, there must be something beyond all this, otherwise life has very little meaning as it is now. So man invents: my life is empty, shallow, meaningless and I must have something more. So he invents gods. And gods are invented. God hasn't created us - if he has he must be rather a funny god! Because he has made our life into such appalling misery, hate and all the rest of it. So we have made god after our own image, which is the opposite of what we are - kind, benevolent, all-knowing, protective, great comforter and so on. Is all that religion? And man has always searched for something sacred. You may not believe in anything sacred. That is your affair. But there are many millions

and millions, including oneself, if one is serious, one asks "Is there something sacred? Imperishable? Not measurable?" And to come upon that meditation is necessary. So we must ask: what is meditation?

To find out what meditation is, the beauty of it, not the word - the word means to ponder over, the meaning of that word, to ponder, to think, to recollect - so to find out what is meditation we must approach it negatively. That is to find out what it is not. You understand? Most of us are so positive, and we think meditation is something that we have to do, practise, but if we can approach it with intelligence, not with desire, but with intelligence, which is to see what it is not. So shall we do it together? What it is not.

First of all it is not a system. If you practise a system your brain becomes more mechanical than it is - right? It is so obvious. If I practise some Tibetan, Zen, or recent money-makers of meditation, then this repetition, whether it is twenty minutes morning, afternoon and evening, repeat mantras, knowing the meaning of that word, if you knew the meaning of that word you would never repeat the mantra, it is so ridiculous. So any practice - it is like practising a wrong note on the piano. You may practise, practise, practise - so please go into this. The Eastern world has brought this unfortunate word here. So meditation is not practising a method. It is so obvious. Whether it is the Zen, which is extraordinarily put together, from ancient India it went to China, from China to Japan. They couldn't pronounce a certain Sanskrit word 'dhyana', and so on and so on. Nor is it a becoming - right? Meditation is not a becoming. That means meditation is not a process of time. Is this clear? That is, according to all the people who have advocated

meditation, it is a process of achievement. I am here, I am building layer by layer, brick by brick, day after day, until I am illumined. Whatever that may mean! So it is a practise, a becoming in time. See the implications of this. We are talking over together, you are not accepting what the speaker is saying. See what is involved in this. That illumination is a matter of time. Is it? They say the Buddha went through all kinds of trials, sat under a tree and suddenly got illumined - which I question. Illumination is not a matter of time, which means gradually becoming something, gradually putting away all the miseries of one's life, step by step like you peel an onion, shedding tears, one after the other. See what that means: this constant conscious effort to achieve a result. The result being that which has been promised, that which has something totally different from my daily miserable life. "I will, in spite of all the misery, I will work for that." It is like building a house on sand. And this is called meditation.

Meditation is also called great awareness - be aware of your breathing, your control, step by step, control. That is, becoming aware of yourself, of your thoughts, of your feelings, of your reactions. Is that meditation? You can do all that very easily, why call it meditation?

So if all that is not meditation, which means meditation is not a conscious effort. Where there is conscious, deliberate effort there is the action of will. Will is the summation of desire, as one desires to become prominent in the business world, what is the difference? You call this more holy, the other is mundane. But it is the same movement. So if meditation is not a conscious process, which is will of action - I will practise, I am lazy this morning, I must get

up, and all the rest of it, sit cross legged, breathe properly, do this kind of yoga, that kind of yoga - you follow? It all becomes so childish if you look at it all. That is not intolerance, why should one be tolerant about ugliness? That means you put up with it. If all this is nonsense, they are all making quantities of money out of it, they are rich beyond words, some of them are. So if all this is not meditation, then what is meditation?

That is, a mind, a human being, understands this world, the world outside of us, and the world inside. And in the understanding of the world outside and the understanding of the inside, they are like the tide, going out and coming in. Please understand the reality of this. It is a tide - right? The tide has gone out, created the world, the world outside of us - wars and all the rest of it - and then the tide comes in carrying the same movement within us, and we modify it, we cherish it, we do something to it, and it goes out. This is the movement. They are not separate movements - my movement is not separate from the world. It is this eternal movement that has been going on. Man has created society and then he becomes a slave to society. This is the movement.

Now please go into this. To have no such movement - you understand? Have you captured this? To end such a movement, without any cause, because if there is such a movement it is the perpetual reaction, perpetual response to the outer, and then that response creates another reaction in me and I react and create another outward response. So this movement of the outer and the inner, when that stops, comes to an end, not consciously, then you are back - if you do it consciously then you are back into the same movement. That is to see the truth of this, to perceive the nature of

this movement, the logic of it, the sanity of it, the truth of it. When one perceives that then there is the ending of that.

To put it differently: I hope you are not tired: to put it differently: we depend on experience, that is what all the meditative people, who have all these kind of strange experiences, that is, to recognize an experience as an experience you must have already known about it. I read a book about some strange experience of another, he may be all cuckoo but yet he has written a marvellous book and I read it, and I say, "By Jove, I have got some pain in my head" - or somewhere - "and I am beginning to have that experience." So to live - please understand this - to live without a single experience, which means to be a light to oneself. Right? And seeing all the religious circus that is going on in the world, in the name of god, in the name of whatever it is, is meaningless, having perceived the truth of all that, having set aside completely all that, that means there is no outside agency, except you. And meditation is the ending of this movement of action and reaction, the outer and the inner.

And then such an ending, because it has no cause it is endless - you understand? It is timeless.

And also we should go into this question of a mind, a brain, that is quiet. This is part of meditation, not make the brain quiet, through breathing, through repetition, through various tricks, but to make the whole physical, psychological entity absolutely quiet, to bring about this quietness, which is to bring about this silence of the brain. There are various types of silence: silence between two terrible noises, silence between two thoughts, silence between two efforts, silence between two notes. It is like silence squeezed

between two wars. That is what we are having. There is quietness, there is peace between two wars. That is not silence, that is not peace.

So one has to enquire what it is to have a deep causeless silence. When the brain is totally free of its conditioning, then only there is that quality and a great depth of that silence. Then in that silence there is the flowering of that which is eternal. But that requires, all this requires great seriousness, not just an hour separated from the rest of one's life, but life is serious and if one wants to be serious it is up to all of us. The world demands such a group of beings who are tremendously serious. In that seriousness there is humour too. So a small group can affect the whole world, as one human being can affect the whole world. So this whole movement is meditation and the happening of that which is timeless, nameless, measureless. Meditation means also to have no measure. That is also part of the root meaning of that word meditation, to have no measurement, to have no comparison. That which has happened is finished, you don't build on that which has happened. There must be constant emptiness so that there is a movement without any cause. May I get up please?

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 28TH DECEMBER 1982

There are a lot of questions here, which I haven't seen. It's good to ask questions, and from whom do you expect the answer? Is the answer more important than the question? To put the question rightly also requires an art. When you have put the question, are you putting it to somebody, or to yourself? And if the question is important, does the answer lie in the question, or away from the question? I hope we are communicating with each other. Does the answer lie, or is contained, or held in the question itself and not away from it? So in answering some of these questions we are going to examine the question, not try to find the answer to it, because in the examination of that question the answer itself lies, or is revealed in the examination of that question. I hope this is clear, that you and I are going to examine the question. See the nature of the question, the significance of that question, and in the understanding of that question the answer is revealed in the question. Are we together in this, I hope.

1st Question: In the first talk you said that thought is responsible for all our problems. And you also said that thought has failed to resolve those conflicts, and you raised a question: if there is any other instrument to resolve our conflicts. Please explain.

Do we all agree, or see the truth that thought throughout the world has brought about a great technological advancement, whose future is incalculable, and that thought has created the wars, the destruction of human beings; thought has created all the religious

edifices, and the content of those edifices, it has created all this. Are we all together on this point? Are we? Would you agree to that? Or you believe that thought is not responsible for the content of your temples, the churches and the mosques? What's your reaction to it, please if you will kindly talk it over with the speaker. You understand what I have said? That thought, which is the act of thinking, is responsible for all the wars in the world, for the national divisions of the world, that thought has created the gods which we worship, all the rituals, the whole hierarchical outlook of religious structure. Would you agree to all that? Not just intellectually agree, that has no meaning. Do we see this? What's the difficulty? Would you kindly talk it over with me? Or do you think the gods, the various saviours, are not the result of actual thinking? No?

Q: The significance which thought creates is not thought.

K: The gentleman says, the significance of thought is not thought. When we use the word 'significance' it means the meaning. Right sir? The meaning which thought conveys. Thought cannot be separated from its significance, can it? Or significance, the meaning, is contained in the thought. I think that - suppose - I think that India is the most spiritual country, and I think about it, surely it is thought that has given the significance that India is the most extraordinarily religious country. Right? What's the difficulty, sir?

So I am sure you don't agree with this, because for a very obvious reason, that the things that we worship in the temples and so on, are some miraculous happening, are something that is brought about through some kind of divine action. That's why we

rather hesitate to accept or see the fact that thought has been responsible for all this. Right?

Q: We do not know any other response.

K: We are going to find out. But that requires a great deal of enquiry and freedom, otherwise you cannot find out. One has to put aside all that which is false. Right? How can one find anything new if we are attached to old traditions which are dead, to some belief which we hold dear, to some ideal we think is necessary - if we hold on to all those there is no freedom for enquiry. Right? Sir, a good scientist, in his research first he acquires, has the knowledge of other people who have researched, has accumulated, and then he must set aside all that to find something new, otherwise he is not a top scientist, he is merely a machine repeating. Would you agree to that?

Q: What is it that generates thought?

K: What generates thought? What do you think generates thought? What is the beginning of thought?

Q: Thought is the result of something happening after observing.

K: Thought is the result of something happening. The happening is - suppose, I have a motor accident and I have broken my leg, and that is an experience which is stored in the brain, an experience stored in the brain, and that experience is knowledge of that accident, and from that accumulated knowledge of that accident there is memory, and from that memory there is thought, that I had an accident which was very painful. It is the whole movement of experience, knowledge, memory and thought. That's the origin of thinking. Not the accident, and then thought, the

whole accident took place because I was driving badly. Or somebody ran into me. What's the difficulty in this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I'm afraid I haven't heard. Has somebody heard? Would you kindly repeat it?

Q: You said the discovery of the findings of the previous scientists had to be set aside for a scientist to discover something new.

K: Obviously.

Q: Or has he to put away as the previous scientist's knowledge and experience in order to find something new.

K: Of course, sir. If I am a physicist I study from college, from school, college, university, and have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about physics, matter, the enquiry into matter, and if I want to discover something new I must put aside all that which I have known. Have you ever considered how the jet - you know, the jet aeroplane - came into being. It didn't just happen. The previous engineers who constructed the piston engine had gathered a lot of information and had put that aside and said this isn't good enough, and they were looking, waiting, searching, and suddenly somebody discovered the jet. But we don't want to do that. And one wonders whether one likes to live in this conditioned brain with all its problems, you follow, and accept it and carry on.

So the speaker said at the first talk that all the activities of thought, both important and unimportant, dangerous and the search for safety, security, are all the movements of thought. It's so obvious. I don't know why we hesitate about this matter. Right sirs? Can we go on from there? No. It is very difficult for us to

accept a fact, or a truth, when we are attached to our own particular concepts. If you would kindly for this morning at least put aside all one's conclusions, beliefs and ideas, and look at something different. After all, when you have a refrigerator in your house, if you are rich enough or well-to-do, you have moved away from the old, haven't you. But in the same way would you kindly move away from the old and see what happens. You may not like it, it may disturb you life, but you can go back to it.

Q: I think there might be fear.

K: Of course, of course there is fear. That's why you are all hesitant. It's so obvious. If you are guaranteed that whatever the new instrument is, and you haven't to do anything, you would grab at it very quickly. But unfortunately we are so frightened of anything new. Right? Because it is very disturbing. You have to scrap all the piston engines, you have to invest a great deal of money in something new. And that's what's called material progress, which you are doing. You are not frightened of having a new refrigerator or a new washing machine, or a new car. But one is really frightened to let the old go. Which indicates that one's brain is functioning mechanically. Right, sir? I have known this, I am going to stick to it, and prove, guarantee me something that if there is the new I will also be safe. When you invest money, perhaps some of you do, when you invest money in stock there is always fear that it might not succeed, but you invest it. Right? Because there is the reward behind it. Here there is no reward. That's what your trouble is. Here there is no reward because it requires clear thinking, clear objective, non-personal observation. Right sirs?

Q: Sir I have the realization that religion is a form of security for those who are psychologically insecure. Could you explain the origin of our first thought?

K: The origin of first thought. Do you want my explanation?

Q: Very much so.

K: What for? I'll explain, but what for?

Q: From what I can gather, sir, for thought to observe itself.

K: Have you ever done that?

Q: I'd like to try it.

K: You are all so crazy. You won't do anything original for yourself. You see that means we are so authority-bound, so traditional, so mechanical, and you don't see the mechanical process of thought. All right sir, let's go back to it.

The questioner says, thought has created the problems, like war, like various forms of division between people, and thought then, having created the problem, thought tries to find the answer to the problem. Right, sir, would you agree to that? Would you agree to that? I have created a problem between myself and my wife, we have constant rows, disputes, quarrels. They arise because I want something and she wants something else. Or she tells me what to do which I don't want to do. You understand? This constant division. Now has thought created the problem between me and my wife? I am not married, fortunately, and I am asking you, has thought created the problem, this quarrel between me and my wife? Would you kindly answer this.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Obvious, isn't it? No? By golly, you are the most extraordinary people all right. You refuse to see something obvious

and acknowledge it. Thought has created the problem, quarrelling with my wife, and then thought says, I am going to try and resolve the problems. Right? First it creates the problem, then it tries to solve the problem. You have it in this country politically, haven't you? It is all such a mess here. No? Even that you won't acknowledge. All right, sirs, it's up to you.

Q: Is not a question of collective thought?

K: Yes, sir, it is collective thought. Do you understand, sir, when you said sir, if I may respectfully ask, do you understand what the implication of that is?

Q: There is no me.

K: If thought is collective, then your thinking is collective, and therefore you are part of the collective. Right? So you are not an individual. Look sir, thought has created the problem. I am a Jew, you are an Arab. Right? Could you look at that, what is happening in the Middle East? I am a Jew, you are an Arab. I am a Jew because for the last three to four thousand years I have been programmed. Right? I have been told from childhood, and do various activities of childhood, that I am a Jew. Right? That is repeated to me day after day, day after day. So my brain is conditioned to the acceptance that I am a Jew. Right? And the other fellow across the border, which may be very near, he has been also told that he is an Arab, a Palestinian Arab. He has repeated that for the last fourteen hundred years, and he repeats that. Right sirs? Now has not thought created the Jew? And the Arab? Has not thought created that you are a Hindu? You accept that? If you accept that, then thought is responsible for the division between the Arab and the Jew, between the Hindu and the Muslim.

Right? And thought then, because of this division, brings about conflict. Right? Pakistan and India. Right sirs? Which is, that division has brought about war. So thought is responsible for war. Right? And then thought says, I must solve this problem; we must seek peace. But I still remain a Jew and you still remain an Arab. No?

Q: A noble thought can...

K: So there is a noble thought and ignoble thought. Right? But it is still thought. Right sir? It is still thought. You may think what I say may be ignoble, and you may be noble, but the division, the division between what is noble and what is ignoble is created by thought. No?

Q: Thought arises from experience, cannot thought arise spontaneously?

K: The gentleman asks cannot thought and experience arise spontaneously. No? He didn't say that. I didn't hear properly.

Q: Thought arises out of memory and experience, cannot thought arise spontaneously?

K: Yes, I see. Thought arises from experience, knowledge, memory. Right, sir? And you are asking cannot thought arise spontaneously without knowledge.

Q: And without experience.

K: Yes, that's right. Can thought arise spontaneously without knowledge, without experience and memory? That's the question, sir. Now what do you mean by spontaneity?

Q: Spontaneity means without experience and the past memory.

K: Yes, sir. I am asking, if you will forgive me, I am asking what do you mean by the word 'spontaneous'?

Q: Having no knowledge.

K: Sir, to be spontaneous.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, the word, the meaning of the word, it means something you do spontaneously, you do it without thought, which means you do something from freedom. Right? Are you free to do something freely? If I may ask you a question sir.

Q: We try to do that.

K: You can't try freedom. Either you are free or not free. You can't say, 'I will try to become free'. You see if you are really interested in all this, would you kindly listen first? The speaker has said over and over again that thought is the result of experience, knowledge, memory, stored in the brain, and from that memory thought arises. If I have no knowledge, no experience, no memory, what am I? I am in a state of amnesia. Right? You know that word 'amnesia' means blank. Right sir? Unless one has an accident, or some kind of disease in the brain, human beings have not amnesia - that would be terrible, wouldn't it? So please listen, find out for yourself, whether thought is not responsible for all our miseries, and also thought is responsible for this extraordinary free flowing technology. Right, would you agree to that?

Q: To find out should we not think?

K: Yes. Think. All right, let's think. Let's think. Now wait a minute. Let's think. Right, will you think with me? Or...

Q: You said thought cannot solve our problems.

K: I have said it, the speaker has said it. You may not believe it.

Q: I may not believe it but then to find out the origin of it shouldn't I think to find it out.

K: I am going to point out lady, I am going to do it presently. But first if you don't mind my telling you most respectfully that we must think first. Right? Do we think, or repeat, repeat, repeat? Is repetition thinking? Right? I have been trained as an engineer and I repeat. Right? So are we aware that our brains are mechanical now? You see now there comes our difficulty. Right? Would you agree to that? That our brains now, the educated brains and the uneducated brains have become mechanical. Would you agree to that? Are we aware that your brain, your actions are mechanical? If you admit our brains are mechanical then your life is mechanical. No? Right? You are unwilling to admit that. That's just it!

Q: Sir, when you come to the conclusion that thought is responsible for all our misery...

K: It's not a conclusion, it is a fact.

Q: Whether it is a fact, you see knowledge is limited, and thought is limited because is a kind of knowledge.

K: Sir, the speaker has said knowledge is limited. Right?

Q: Yes, limited.

K: Are you aware the knowledge is limited?

Q: No, according to you.

K: Sir, sir, just a minute if you don't mind. Are you merely accepting what the speaker says, or have you investigated for yourself that knowledge, all knowledge, not a particular subject, all knowledge - the scientific knowledge, the technological knowledge, the knowledge of books, the knowledge of your experience, all knowledge is limited.

Q: Yes, if it is limited then it means that thought, which is a kind of knowledge, is also limited. So we can't say.

K: I don't quite understand this.

Q: Well we accept that knowledge is limited.

K: Don't accept it, sir, it's a fact.

Q: OK, it's a fact.

K: Not, OK. Really most extraordinary. Sir, when you have pain - I hope you haven't - when you have pain you don't acknowledge that you have pain, you have pain. Right sir? Right sir? Now do we see the fact that thought born of knowledge is always limited? Right, sir, can we go on from there? That knowledge is limited, otherwise there would be no technological advancement, if it is limited you stop, but they are breaking through. You understand? Trying to find more and more and more, but whatever they find is always limited because there is something more. Right? Technologically. Agree to that sirs? So as knowledge is limited, thinking which is born of knowledge must always be limited. Right? Would you agree to that? This is logical, sir. So what is limited must inevitably create problems. Right? Would you agree to that? Look sir, I am a Jew, you are a Hindu, or a Muslim, or Arab - the same thing, the Islamic world. The division has taken place by thought. Right sir? Thought has brought this division because thought itself is limited. Right? So where there is division there is bound to be limitation. Right? Where there is limitation there must be conflict. I am a Jew, you are an Arab. Right? This is difficult. Right sir?

I am saying, to put it differently, where there is division, Jew, Hindu, Arab, where there is a division there must be conflict.

Q: There can be division without conflict.

K: Oh, can there be?

Q: Yes.

K: Just a minute, look into it. The Arab and the Jew; the Arab says, god is with me; and a different kind of god is with the Jew - which is created by thought. Right?

Let's go into it again: would you acknowledge, or see the fact for yourself without the speaker influencing you, that thought is limited. It can imagine the limitless but it is still born of thought. Right? Now thought has divided the world into Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, so where there is division there must be conflict. Wait a minute, I'll bring it much nearer. Is there not division between you and your wife, or your husband? Right? Would you acknowledge that? There is, sir? So where there is division there must be conflict between you - perhaps not you sir, I hope - but isn't there conflict between you and your wife? That is, if there was no division would there be conflict? No, obviously. So conflict arises always where there is a division - the poor and the rich, the communist and the non-communist, the Marxist and the capitalist and so on. Right? So where there is division, there must be conflict, it's law. Right? It's a law, it's an eternal law. Agree? Where there is division of any kind there must be struggle, conflict, problems.

Q: You cannot do without thought.

K: We are going to find out, sir. You are saying that we cannot do without thought. Now where are the limits of thought? You understand my question? That is, where do you draw the line? Thought has its place, which is going to the office, speaking a language, driving a car, the whole world of technology, thought is necessary. Right? Now where is thought not necessary? Find out,

sir, come together, let's find out. You understand my question, sir? Thought is necessary. Thought is necessary to go from here to your house. You take the road, the car and all the rest of it. And we also see that thought has created division, where there is division there must be conflict, that's a law. So where do you draw the line, say thought is necessary, and thought is not necessary? I wonder if you understand this? Is thought necessary - just a minute, listen, please sir - is thought necessary in relationship? Now you are stuck!

Q: If physical needs create division, why hunger?

K: Hunger is hunger. No, sir. It's not your hunger or my hunger, it's hunger.

Q: It's the vital food.

K: Which is what?

Q: I don't know.

K: Don't say you don't know, let's look at it. Survival. I seek...

Q: I need food.

K: I understand sir. I need food and you need food. Now in India there is over population, multiplying every year by ten million or more. You understand the danger of all this, sir? And governments are trying to solve the problem, I don't know if they are, but perhaps you know better. Now can they ever solve it? You want food and I want my food. Right? Hunger - to survive we must be fed. Now if the population is increasing every year by fifteen million, I wonder if you realize what that means. Every year the population of Holland is added to this country. You understand sir? Now how are you going to solve the problem? By being India, which means what? A global relationship. Right? Would you agree to that. A global relationship which means no nationalities. Right?

Q: My physical needs create a division.

K: Yes, sir, I am saying that. Because your hunger, my hunger must be fed. And there are thousands of people in this unfortunate country not being fed. One meal a day, or less than that. And how is this multiplying population going to be fed? Either India has a great deal of rain, no failure of monsoons and so on and so on, even then it will not be enough. Right? Therefore logically, humanly, sanely, there must be no division between people - America, and - which means global interrelationship. Right? And no governments want to do that because you elect them, because you still feel you are an Indian, he still feels a Pakistani. This is all so simple sir. Can you drop your nationalism?

Q: The government encourages nationalism.

K: Of course, the government encourages you to be nationalistic.

Q: Competition will...

K: Yes, sir, I know all that. And you fall into the trap. And you like that.

So, let's come back. Do you see the fact, if I may ask, that where there is division between my wife and myself there must be conflict? Right sir? Now how will you get over that conflict?

Q: By...

K: Wait, sir, look at it carefully. I am married, I have a wife. She thinks one way and I think another way. She wants babies and I don't want babies. She wants to be popular, belonging to some select group, and I say, silly, I don't want that. You follow? There is constant division. Isn't your problem this? No? Gosh, are you ashamed, we don't even face these facts. Right. Now how am I to

get over this division which thought has created? You understand? Right? I am ambitious, I am greedy, I am envious, I want to become the executive, or the chief foreman in a factory, and she has her ambitions and so on. Right? So what shall I do? Both are created by thought. Right? So what shall I do? Advise me please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Drown my wife, are you saying?

Q: The moment I am aware...

K: Sir, just stick to one simple thing sir: there is division between me and my wife, and that division must inevitably create conflict. Right? How am I to get over this division?

Q: Compromise.

K: Compromise. That's - all right, compromise. What am I compromising?

Q: The moment I want something and she wants something...

K: Sir, are you being factual, or just imagining? How do I compromise with my wife? I don't want to go out at night to parties and all that, she does. Wait, sir, listen to this, sir. And what am I to compromise with? I don't want to go out at night, to parties. I think parties are disgusting. Personally I do. I don't want to go out. And my wife who has been brought up differently because her father is rich and all that nonsense, and she says, I want to go out - where is the compromise?

Q: You allow her to go and you don't go.

K: So she goes and I stay at home. And you call that compromise? You are all rather funny, sir. Do look at it please. Stick to one thing.

Q: You can't do anything, you just think about it.

K: No, sir. If there are a whole group of us, not just you and I, but the whole group of us, saying look, nationalism is a disease. Right? Nationalism divides people, nationalism creates - one of the reasons for war is nationalism, economic war, you follow, all that. So I have thought about it and you have thought about it. As long as there is nationalistic division there must be starvation. Right? So the solution to that is no nationalism, a global relationship. People - it is now becoming more and more strong, nationalism - British, British, British; French, French - you follow? So one has to show to all the people logically, sanely, that nationalism is a disease. Then we might have food for all people. Right sir?

Q: In Russia there is no starvation.

K: What are you talking about sir? They are buying grain from all over the world. You people! You see you don't - you always go back to something, explain something else. Please just give this one thought, think about this, that where there is division there must be conflict. My wife and I quarrel, have rows every day. You understand what happens when I have a quarrel with my wife everyday what is happening to me and to her? You aren't even aware of it. What is happening to her? We are destroying each other, aren't we? No? Now if you see the fact, not theories about it, not intellectual comprehension, it is a fact that where there is division there must be destruction. Right? Destruction is quarrels, rows, each wanting his way. Right? So what shall I do? Thought cannot solve this problem. Right? Are you quite sure? Then what will you do? Thought is not the answer to our quarrels, to our divisions, then what shall I do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir.

Q: See that nationalism is a danger.

K: Do you see nationalism as a danger?

Q: Somewhat.

K: Not somewhat, sir. Cancer is danger, isn't it? If I have cancer, will I say it is partly dangerous.

Q: Cancer is...

K: I say nationalism is a cancer, is cancerous. Right?

Q: How is the family unit to be secure without nationalism?

K: Sir, you jump from one thing to another. You haven't given up your nationalism, you won't, I know you won't, but you have now turned to the family unit. What is a family unit? Me, my wife, or my wife and me, and my children. Right? I educate them, if I can, send them to a good school, if I can, and I am concerned. As the world is now over populated my son goes off to Bombay, or to Delhi, or to America, and my family is in some village or in some town, the family is broken up. Right? There is no family unit. Even in India that is gradually being broken up. It has broken up in Europe and in America. And that's one of the calamities. Oh, you people don't even think about all this. Right sir?

So is there another instrument which will solve this problem? You understand, sir? You understand my question? Thought has not solved it by yielding to her, or surrendering to her, or she surrendering to me, which is a terrible thing, isn't it. Why should she surrender to me, or I to her? When you surrender you are still what you are. So what shall I do? Knowing that thought will not solve this problem, what shall I do?

Q: End my 'me'.

K: Now, how do you end the 'me'?

Q: By being aware.

K: Don't use just words, sir, don't play with me. This is a serious talk, don't just play with words. Are you aware of your selfish attitudes, are you aware that your wife is selfish and you are selfish? Are you aware that your children are also selfish? And this selfishness is increased by becoming an engineer, a physicist. They may be marvellous physicists, great scientists, but their life is mediocre. No? So what shall I do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am going to show you something. I know you are aware. You are aware of the division. Right sir? And what havoc it is creating in the world. Agree? Sir, this is not an agreement, you have to feel this, it must be in your blood, that wherever there is division there must be conflict. That's a law, like gravity is a law. Right?

Q: Don't be a part of division.

K: You hear that statement, sir? Don't be part of division. He is just throwing words. You are not serious when you just say, drop your division. You can't. Sir, just let's stick to it. We are divided. Right? My name, my form, my desires, my reactions, my education has helped me to keep divided. Right? And that division is creating great danger outwardly as war, and also with my wife and children. What shall I do? Pray to god? Run off? Leave, abandon my wife? Or she runs away. What shall I do? Don't go to sleep, please, find out what to do.

So I have to enquire, haven't I? Right sir? What does enquiry mean? To enquire into something I must be free to enquire - there

must be freedom to enquire. Right? I mustn't say, this is the way to solve it, this is the way to solve it, I must surrender, I must do this - I must be free from all that to enquire. Right? Like a scientist, he is free to enquire. Right sir? So are you free to enquire? Or in your enquiry there is a motive. You understand what I am saying sir? If there is a motive, that motive is going to dictate your enquiry. Right, sir? So can you enquire without a motive, without an end, just to have the capacity, the intelligence to enquire. You understand, sir? That is, I have a tremendous problem between me and my wife - which is the same problem in the world - you understand? This problem cannot be solved by thought. So what shall I do? I must find a new instrument which is not thought. Right sir? Now I have to enquire into it, I can't say, tell what is the new instrument. Right? I have to enquire. Right sir? Now to enquire there must be freedom, from my tradition, from my conclusions, from my opinions. Right? I can't say, I'll stick to my opinion, my conclusion, my tradition, and enquire, that is not possible. You understand? It is like a boat in a harbour which has dropped its anchorage, and says, 'I must sail' - it must remove the anchor and then move. Right sir? The anchorage that you have dropped is your tradition, is your belief, is your conditioning, is your conclusions - drop them, otherwise you can't find the new. Right sir? Right? Would you agree even logically to that? Can you drop your conclusion, that there is god, there is no god, that this system is better - conclusion. Do you know the meaning of that word 'conclusion' means - to end all further discussions. I conclude you are great, and I stop there. But if I don't conclude I have freedom to enquire. You follow sir? Most of us have conclusions.

Right? Now to enquire I must drop my conclusions. Right? Which means what? The brain then is becoming free. Right sir?

Conclusion now is conditioning the brain, is limiting the activity of the brain. Right sir? So if I drop my conclusions about politics, about god, about anything, drop it, then the brain becomes extraordinarily alive. Right? Right, sir?

Sir, look, some Indians are going abroad, aren't they? Here they feel there is no opportunity for them. They go abroad and do extraordinarily well - extraordinarily well in the sense of having a great deal of money. Right sir? They are doing very well, joining big companies, inventing new things. And here they say there is no opportunity. I heard an Indian, who is fairly well known on television in England, he was being interviewed, the interviewer asked him, 'Are you going back to India?', and the Indian said, 'No, there is no opportunity there'. Right? Opportunity being more selfish advancement. Right sir? More money. Yes, sir.

So, will you give up your conclusions to investigate? Right sir? Will you? To find out how to end this terrible destruction between me and my wife, between my wife and me. You understand, sir, can't we give up a conclusion to settle this. How tragic it all is, isn't it sir? I can't give up a conclusion, or several conclusions, to end the battle between me and my wife. Right, sir? Which means what? We are so damn selfish. Right sir? Unless you drop, understand naturally, logically, sanely, that any form of conclusion - the word 'conclusion' means to end: I conclude a Treaty, I conclude a marriage, I conclude that god exists, then I can't enquire. If I keep on repeating, 'I believe in god, god, god' - it just a repetitive conclusion. But if I really want to find out if there is god then I

have to drop my conclusion and enquire. Which means I must be fearless to find out. Right, sir?

Q: Why do we cling to conclusions?

K: Because why am I clinging to my conclusions, you think in conclusions there is safety, there is security. You don't know what will happen if you give up your conclusions, therefore you are frightened, therefore you hold on to your conclusions.

Q: How can we break it?

K: It is not, how to break it. See the fact. I have got cancer. That's a fact. I don't say, how to break it, it's a fact. So I go to the doctor and the doctor says, my friend, come immediately you have to be operated. If he is a good doctor and you trust him and all the rest of it, I am operated, I may die but I am out of it. Right sir? But I may die. And if I don't, say, 'I may die therefore I am frightened' I don't get operated but I stand with the pain. It's all so logical.

So I am concerned to end my division, quarrel with my wife. I am concerned. I really want to end this division between me and my wife, between me and the world. You understand all the rest of it. And for that I have to give up - I see I cannot conclude, if I do there must be division, and the quarrel will continue. That's all. If you like quarrels, if you like rows, endlessly until you die, it's your life. If you like to live that way, live that way, don't talk about god, puja, that leads to hypocrisy. The rich man doing puja - right sir? You see the cynicism of it? Right sir?

Q: The trouble is that I can't give up my selfishness.

K: I didn't say that. Give up your conclusion.

Q: I can't give up my conclusion.

K: I don't want to conclude - selfishness is such a complex,

subtle process, take one thing, which is conclusion, and find out if you can end it. I conclude I must be something, and my poor wife doesn't want any conclusion, she wants to be treated kindly, gently, affectionately. My conclusion is preventing that. Right? Will you give up your conclusion? Oh, no you won't sir, you just nod your head but you won't.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I have made it very clear. I have made it very clear sir, if you don't mind my repeating it. We are together investigating, together thinking, to find out a way of living in which there is no conflict. We are thinking together. I am not your guru, I am not your doctor, I don't want to be your doctor, or your guru. Perhaps because you aren't worth it. Or you are not the right patient.

So, sirs, to end division you must have love. Right, sir? And you don't know what that word means in this country, or in Europe. Right, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, did you hear what I said? I'll repeat it sir, if you don't mind. Where there is division there is no love. Right? Agree? Not agree, see the fact. See it sir?

Q: If there is no division, then how can there be love?

K: What?

Q: How can there be love without division?

K: Sir, have you been listening to what we have been talking about for nearly an hour and a half? Sir, apparently from this question of this morning, we have come to a certain point from which you can go further, which is, where there is division there cannot be the end of conflict. Conflict will continue as long as

there is division, between peoples, between nationalities, between people who are rich and poor. You follow sir? As long as there is division there must be conflict. And between my wife and me there is conflict. And I want to end that conflict because I don't want to destroy her or destroy myself. Right sir? The way we live is destroying us, so I want to end the conflict. And to enquire into how to end that conflict I must be free from my conclusions. Just one conclusion, or half a dozen conclusions, end them. See the fact. Conclusions divide. You understand, sir? You have concluded that you are a Hindu, I have concluded that I am a Muslim. Right? It is a conclusion. I hold to that conclusion, which means I won't think any more about it, it is so, I am a Muslim. I have concluded. You understand, sir? And you have concluded as an Indian. So can't you give up that conclusion? One conclusion. Can you? Because if I can't I am going to destroy her, and she is going to destroy me. Right sirs? So I say, for god's sake, I give it up, it has no value. Because my urge is to live peacefully with her, to have affection for her, not treat her like a breeding instrument, to treat her as a human being. That means I must consider her, I must care for her, I must look after her, I must have sympathy, affection, love for her. But all this is meaningless to you because you have never enquired into the nature of love. Right, sirs?

So we have answered the question, that there is a new instrument, which is not thought. We can go - I'll go into it much more but you must leave your position to understand what the speaker is saying. Right? Not always repeat the old, enquiry means moving together. Right, sir? Will you do that? Because the world is in a tremendous danger, sir. Right? As long as I am quarrelling

with my wife I will quarrel with the rest of the world. If there is no order in my house I create disorder in the world. Right, sir?

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 30TH DECEMBER 1982

I hope this meeting is not merely an amusement or entertainment. There are several questions here which I have not seen, and we will talk over together. I wonder if one participates or shares in what we are discussing, we are going to answer these questions. Do we share or do you merely listen to the speaker? Do you understand the difference? Say for instance, I would like to share with you certain thoughts, certain attitudes, certain qualities of the mind. And to investigate that, the quality of one's brain and the mind requires a great deal of patient direct investigation, not through some theories, not through any form of concepts, principles, but putting all that aside to find out why we think certain things, why we believe, what is the cause of our anxiety, our lack of relationship, our lack of communication and so on. Are we aware of the activities of our brain with all its extraordinary capacities? Are we aware of our senses, the senses that are really part of our life? Are we aware of this extraordinary complex movement of life, not only as one lives but the life of humanity which has such varieties, such great aptitudes and capacities? Are we aware of all this, or are we merely aware of our own little problems, one's own dejections, impressions and so on? It is really quite an interesting question to ask of ourselves, whether we are aware, actually not theoretically, of what is going on in the world and in ourselves? Or are we so conditioned, so neglectful, not diligent that we really are totally unaware of the beauty of these trees, the quality of the air, the dirt, the squalor, the ever restless seas, are we aware of all this,

or only a very limited life?

So, we will answer some of these questions.

1st Question: The Indian mind for centuries has probed into the nature of self and of cosmos. In spite of this, today it is completely materialistic. What has happened to that ancient wisdom of the mind?

Shall we talk over this together? The speaker has been every winter for the last 50 years coming to this country, travelling abroad, going all over the place. And one sees the decline not only in Europe and America but also especially obviously, palpably, the decline in this country. The speaker has been asking various scholars, politicians, some scientists and so on, what has happened, or what is the quality of the Indian mind? Of course, it is a vast generalization to say what is the Indian mind, because the Indian mind varies from the north, south, east and west, but assuming that it is inaccurate to put such a generalized question, but knowing that and probably it is incorrect to say what is the Indian mind - you are following? What is the Indian mind?

The questioner says the ancient people of this country - this country has exploded all over Asia at one time, historically - as Greece, ancient Greece, exploded waves all over the west - and the questioner asks what has happened to the Indian mind. So, we are going to, if you will, enquire what is the Indian mind today. Are you interested in it?

What actually is the Indian mind, today? Not go back to the ancient world and be proud about it: or that we are a very ancient race and all that kind of business, but actually when you begin to investigate what is the Indian mind, knowing a generalization is

always inaccurate because you cannot generalize the whole, what is the European mind or the American mind or the British mind, but if you begin to enquire into what is not only the human mind, the mind of humanity, but also to particularize that mind, geographically as India, what is our mind? I wonder if you have ever asked that question. I doubt it, if you do ask that question what is our mind. Is it materialistic? Drawn towards technology? - following the western world of vast movement in the technique, with the computers. Computers are taking over the world. They outthink, outsolve all the technological problems, think much faster, have infinite memory. Right? Your computer is taking over the world. The speaker saw on a television in California where the Japanese car makers Honda - the workers were in white gloves, white apron, spotless, and there was a computer and the robot. The computer was telling the robot how to build a car and the robot was screwing the nuts and polishing, doing everything that human beings generally do in building a car.

Is our brain computerised? You understand my question? That is, we have been programmed as the computer is programmed. But our brains are much slower, not tremendously active. We only use a very, very, very small part of the brain. So, are we, is the Indian mind materialistic, which is seeking, you know materialism. And is the Indian mind, knowing always generalization is not correct, is the Indian mind - may I talk about it frankly? You don't mind? Are you sure you don't mind? Can you stand it? Right, here goes. Because the speaker would like to be as polite as possible, most respectful, but when we are investigating into a thing like this we must be totally unbiased, totally impersonal, completely

unidentified.

The Indian mind as one observes is authoritarian-bound. It functions in a hierarchical movement. Right? It follows, it accepts authority, ancient tradition, the authority of some ancient books, the authority of the guru, the authority of someone who says he knows, he is illumined, bla bla, and you follow. Right? Would this be correct? Which means where there is authority, there is fear. Have you ever watched a high politician meet you, how you grovel, almost double up with false respect. This is one of the conditions of the Indian mind: following authority, psychopantism, fear and therefore total disorder. Right? No? Disorder in the streets, disorder in one's life, disorder in society and each one out for himself. Not that it does not happen or take place in Europe or America or even Russia, but it is more obvious in this country - utter carelessness, total disregard, lack of consideration. Right? Would you accept all this? And the Indian mind is capable of absorbing everything; different kinds of philosophies, however much contradictory they are. It is so tolerant. It will accept everything - contradictory philosophies, contradictory gurus, contradictory concepts. So, when your brain is capable of such absorption, it becomes rather sloppy. (Sorry, sir, you can't see my face, but you can hear my voice. Come and sit in front. Come and sit in front, sir, plenty of room here. Have some fun. Come in please sir, you don't have to look round the corner. I hope you understand English.)

So, when such a mind, a brain is capable of absorbing, tolerant of dirt, squalor, disorder, lack of beauty - probably you never look at a tree, never look at the open skies with all the brilliant stars, put

up with anything. So, such a mind is a very sloppy mind. It is not a mind which is active, alive, serious. So, it is tradition-bound and very theoretical, very clever in analysis. That is why they are doing such excellent work in Europe and America; they are capable of great analysis, more subtle than the western world, but it is all theoretical, problematical, hypothetical, quoting the Gita, the Upanishads, and then trying to relate what has been said to your life. Obviously you don't, so essentially the brain has become sloppy. Therefore, it is capable of becoming materialistic - money, money, money. Isn't that so? Do look at it all sirs. Don't accept the speaker's word and then refute it, or argue against it, split hair about it, which you are doing now. But if you really want to try and utterly change such a quality of the brain, which has become so dead, but technologically it has become extraordinarily alive. But in the psychological world which is much more interesting, there, there is not activity at all. You will talk about the self, the cosmos, discuss very clearly, and cleverly - a sophisticated brain which has lived in theories But when you come down to our relationship with other human beings, there is nothing at all. And one asks - may I go on? You don't mind? I don't care if you mind or don't mind, these are facts - and one asks: is there love at all? Love; not attachment, not personal pleasure in sex and so on, but is there love in this country? That is, generous, kind, considerate, having great sympathy - that is only the outward symbols, the outward activity - but the depth of love, compassion. Have you? If you have such love, would there be war, would you allow the government to accumulate armaments to kill other human beings? Enquire into all this sir. Or we don't care what happens, how we treat our women or

wives. Have you ever gone into all this? The husband walks in front, the wife follows behind.

And is the Indian mind, apart from the technological inventions, is the Indian mind capable of creation? You understand the word creation? To live a creative life, not a life of pattern. You understand? Following pattern after pattern, system after system, therefore, gradually the brain withers through constant conflict. Is this the Indian mind? Please ask it yourself. I am not asking you, I am not telling you. Is this the Indian mind that is so chaotic, so disorderly, irresponsible? Somebody the other day wanted to telephone to Europe and nobody cared to get the number requested. I waited two or three hours to get it until somebody appealed to a higher authority, and immediately there was action. What do you think of all this? Do please see the tragedy of all this. You may read the Gita, Upanishads - totally unrelated to daily life. There is no application of what you read to daily life. You hear this, and if one may point out it's just words. You don't say: look, am I like that? Is my life disorderly? Is my life, my way of thinking hierarchical? One has to have authority of law - naturally - the policeman and so on. But there too there is such vast corruption. You know all this. So, what is the Indian mind? What is the French mind, the British mind? If you live there long enough, one begins to find out. I won't discuss the French mind or the English mind. That is an easy escape from facing these facts.

So, what shall we do when an ancient race, three to five thousand years of a certain culture wiped out overnight. The Brahmanical culture, don't get upset about using that word. You are all probably anti-Brahmin, pro-Brahmin, or whatever it is. The

Brahmanical culture, however bad or good, for five to three thousand years has put a strong imprint on the Indian brain - their cultures, their books, everything, and overnight it is gone. You understand? It is gone. Why? You understand what I am talking? Are you interested in all this? You must ask this very serious question: why a certain culture lasting for thousands of years, which has had such strong imprint, strong impression on the human brain, why there is this anti-Brahminism, pro-Brahminism. You follow? Why has it been wiped out? Now it is the fashion in this country to smoke, to drink, to eat meat. I am not pro, or anti, Brahmin, but I am saying that these are the facts. And what has happened to that culture, whether it is good or bad? Was it just a veneer, surface, like a coat that you put on and throw off? The tradition which is dead, is this the Indian mind? And if it is - we are not dogmatic about it - that is why I am saying if it is - if it is, what shall we do? Come on sirs. Answer this question. Just carry on sloppily, indifferent, sluggish?

Have you ever noticed that whenever you go over to a meeting, somebody is telling you what to do - the politicians, the gurus, the philosophers, who are translating or interpreting the everlasting Gita? You know all this, don't you. Commentaries on Gita - if you have nothing to do, you make commentaries. You live on commentaries.

So, realizing all this, what shall we do? Don't go to sleep. This is a question that you must answer. This is the crisis, not wars or nuclear bombs, this is our crisis. That means one has to observe very carefully, become aware of ourselves because we are the history of mankind. We are the story of mankind. If we don't know

how to read that book with clarity, without any interpretation, then we are going to destroy ourselves. But you don't care, do you? You have clever arguments against all that the speaker has said and thereby prevent yourself from doing anything. That is what I call a sloppy mind, a brain that is analytical, clever, very subtle, and in their analysis they remain at that superficial, theoretical level, which has nothing whatsoever to do with our daily life. I hope you see the tragedy of this.

So, is it possible to change radically, break through our conditioning and be free human beings?

Is that enough? Please, there is no sense of scolding about this, no sense of being superior or inferior. I am not your guru. I am not a philosopher. Each one of us has to be both the teacher and the disciple. The teacher who teaches and the disciple who is learning, learning from life, not from books. There is no end to the making of books. But each one of us, if we see what we are and learn from what we are, move, change, then we become both the guru and the disciple.

2nd Question: The body ages, but is the ageing of the mind inevitable?

The body ages, grows old, but is the ageing of the brain - not the mind for the moment - inevitable? As the questioner say, it is inevitable for the body to age, to grow old and die through accident, disease or constant usage, malnutrition, wrong food, the battle that goes on in our heart and mind and all that psychosomatic activity affects the body. Right? Over-drinking, over-sex, overeating, no exercise. Look at you all. So, the body inevitably ages.

And the questioner wants to know is it inevitable for the brain to age and decay. You understand the question? What makes a machine, an internal combustion machine, what makes it age? Any kind of friction in the machine makes the machine grow old. Right? This is obvious. Our brain is a kind of machine and it grows old because we live with friction, we live with conflict, struggle, perpetual battle with ourselves, and with the rest of the world. Right sirs? I am not saying anything new. This is a fact that as long as there is friction, conflict, battle, rows with one's wife, husband, quarrel, abusing each other, hurting each other, the brain must inevitably decay. Right?

And also the computer has come into being. Please listen to this. We have been talking over with experts about this, top people. The computer can do almost anything that the human brain can do. Right? Almost. It can outthink, outplan, remember vast information, outplan. A little chip contains million memories and if the computer can do anything, almost anything that human beings can do - of course, it cannot look at the stars and see the beauty of the stars; it cannot watch the movement of the wind among the leaves; but each generation of computers is better than the other generation. So, what is going to happen to the human brain? You are following all this. Sir, please do ask these questions, for god's sake. This question is not being asked by the professionals, by the top people. They are only concerned with building better computers, more advanced, ultra mechanical intelligence, they call it. If the computer can do everything, almost, then what is going to happen to the human brain? Are you interested in all this? Or are you just listening for the fun of listening? What is going to happen

to your brain if the computer does almost everything. The brain has lived because it has to struggle, it has to work, go to the office, it has to be active, active in its friction, but when that friction, that activity is gradually transferred to the computer, what is going to happen to your brain? The computer can invent a new god, a super-god, better than your gods, it can have marvellous theories. It can invent. A mathematical professor can programme a computer, most complex mathematical problems, and the computer comes out with its own new theorems. Go into it all sir. You don't know what is happening in the world.

So, what is going to happen to your brain? Either it is going to pursue entertainment, religious entertainment, football, cinema, the puja, it is all entertainment - aren't they - to pass the time in the name of god, in the name of some kind of silly affair, because we all want to be entertained. You are following all this, sirs? See the seriousness of all this sir, for god's sake. The entertainment industry is already so active: television, football, cricket. I don't know if you have noticed the world of sport is becoming more and more. Right? So, the human brain demands entertainment because it cannot face itself - the trouble, the anxiety, the sorrow, the pain, so it wants to escape into all that. Either you escape through all that and therefore the brain becomes inactive being entertained from the outside, or you go inward. There are only two possibilities. Are you getting tired? You understand, sirs, all this? Either you are being entertained as you are now, becoming more and more caught in the world of entertainment, going to the temples and making more... or you go inward: the whole exploration of the whole psyche, not according to books and philosophers and

psychologists, but for yourself enquire into yourself.

So we are enquiring into astrophysics, that is into the heavens, there they are discovering all kinds of things - black holes; but nobody except very, very, very few have gone into the whole inward world. That inward world is vast, immense, incalculably deep. Don't accept my words for it. Don't say it is what our ancients said. Throw the ancients out. You are all too clever, but you have never gone inward and discovered for yourself the great beauty, where a perception that is logical, sane, healthy, a world that is immeasurable, which has nothing whatsoever to do with entertainment. That requires great care, hesitant observation, step by step. That brings about order in one's life. And when there is order in your house, there is order in society. But now we want order in society, in environment while we are disorderly. That is what the communists try to do - establish order outside while there is tremendous suppression and all the rest of it, hoping to change man. It is the same pattern being repeated in a different strata. Right?

So, the brain can remain without ageing if there is no friction, if there is no strain, no conflict, but as long as there is the self - me and you, we and they - as long as there is this idea of the individual opposed to the whole, there must be conflict, and that is what is happening to all human beings. To have a brain that is untouched by memory. You won't understand all this. Our brain - oh, I can go on but what is the point of it - our brain is trodden down by tradition, our brain is caught in past memories, remembrances. There is no pristine quality, a brain that is completely free. Then that brain is ageless, and yet has got extraordinary vitality, passion

behind it. Right sir? Will you do something about it? Or just listen to a talk and say, yes, that's good, but, but, but.

3rd Question: Can thought be separated from the sensory perception?

Very good question sir, if you are willing to listen. All religions have suppressed the senses. Right? Face the fact sirs. Control your senses, don't yield to them. The speaker was walking behind a group of sannyasis in Kashmir at one time. There was a marvellous blue sky, clean air, lots of wild flowers, the air was scented with the smell of the hills and the groves and the valleys, the smell of the earth, the dew upon the earth. And these sannyasis in front, about a dozen of them, never looked at the trees. They had their head bent, chanting something or other, muttering, and never took notice of the beauty of the earth. You have seen them haven't you? Which you are doing too - it is not reserved to the sannyasis, it is not their special privilege. And they never, never from mile upon mile, never looked at the trees. You understand? There was a stream flowing by. That stream was chattering, making music. The flow of that stream was clear, unpolluted water, and the sannyasis never looked at that water, nor the trees, nor the blue sky, nor the mountains covered with snow, because sensory responses might lead to sex, might lead to all kinds of desires, therefore, don't look. This happens also, sir, in the west, the monks. Right sirs? Am I telling a strange story? So, the religions throughout the world have said if you want to serve god, you must suppress your senses, you must control them, shape them according to a precept or to a pattern laid down by the abbots and the priests and the sannyasis and the books. So, your senses are completely numb, completely

destroyed. Look what has happened to you sirs. You never look at the skies. Do you? The beauty of a tree, the light on a cloud, the new moon, just a slip of light, you never look at all that, do you.

So, we are going to find out what is the relationship between thought and the responses of the senses. What are the senses? Now, please, we are going to talk about it, just follow it, because it is important to understand this. Through tradition, through so-called scriptures, through authority, we have suppressed all our senses, the sensory perception, seeing something beautiful whether it be a man or a woman, whether it be the stream or the cloud, full of light, we never look at them because there is the fear that if we do it might lead us astray, astray in one direction, sexual, pleasurable, and the senses might betray our purpose, our goal, which is to reach god, or whatever you call it. Therefore, suppress it, control it, don't yield to it. So, that is our conditioning, because sex, there you have all that you want. That is one sensory reaction that you have which is free. There you do what you like, but you must not see anything. So we look at life with one or two senses that are awakened. And you eat good food, the taste, and then you become slave to the taste. So, the question is not to suppress any sense, any of the senses. Please listen to this carefully, this requires great deal of understanding. It is not control of senses, it is the awakening of all the senses. Have you ever done that? Have you ever looked at the sea which is nearby with all that vast movement, the tremendous waves, the energy potential, the extraordinary depth of it, the blue of the evening, the full moon. Now when you look at that with all your senses, the seeing, hearing, the smell, the feeling, the depth of the feeling - you understand - looking at that vast

movement. Wait, listen to it quietly. Then thought comes along and says: how nice that is, I will come back next evening and have the same sensory response. Right? You are following this? Thought interferes with the senses. Thought is also a sensory response. So, thought controls the senses. Thought then says this sense is right, this sense is wrong, this sense is beautiful, this sense is ugly and so on. So, where there is the interference of thought with the senses, though thought is part of the senses, when one of the senses, which is, thought controls the other senses, shapes the other senses, then there is the beginning of the self, beginning of the ego, beginning of the 'me'. I wonder if you understand all this.

To look at something sir, with all your senses, that means to pay attention to what you are looking at. When you pay such tremendous attention to what you are looking at, there is no self. It is only when thought says I must pay attention, it is only when thought says those senses are good, those senses are bad, then begins the psychosomatic self and you battle with the self - I must not be selfish, I must not be this, I must be that. So, to be attentive to all the senses and to see when thought begins to interfere with the senses, that requires a great attention. It is not control of the senses. It is thought that makes the senses to distort. Sex, when thought creates the image, the pleasure, the remembrance, all that, then sex is merely a mental activity. That is what you are all doing. Then you take an about turn on sex and go through all the tortures. You see how thought is operating. Or indulge in it. So if you are really aware of the whole senses, like being aware of the earth, the fertility of the senses, like the fertility of the earth, virgin earth, earth which has never been trodden on by man. And to have these

fertile senses which have not been touched by thought, then out of that comes the extraordinary sense of beauty and life and love.

Now what have you got out of it, and what are you going to do with it? You understand my question, sir? What has the speaker been talking to? A sloppy brain, a brain that is so heavily conditioned that it won't receive anything new - except in the technological world, there is money, position, power. Where there is power, there is evil. Look at the local politicians, how much power they have and what an evil thing it is. And absolute power is absolute evil. You all know this, but each one wants power. Power means position, prestige, you tell the people what to do and get away with it. So, one asks what is one talking to? You understand my question? How do you receive all this? You understand my question, sir, or is it just another talk, another chapter, or you have no book, no chapter, you are living?

OJAI 1ST CONVERSATION WITH BOHM, HIDLEY & SHELDRAKE 16TH APRIL 1982 'THE NATURE OF THE MIND'

JOHN HIDLEY: We are particularly interested in regard to the OJ82CNM1 disorder. Perhaps we could start with the question of what is the source of psychological disorder.

KRISHNAMURTI: Yes, sir. And I would like to ask, if I may, what do we mean by disorder, when the whole world - as one knows, as one sees it from continent to continent - there is a great deal of disorder.

JH: Yes.

K: Economically, socially...

TOM KRAUSE: This is one of a series of dialogues between J Krishnamurti, David Bohm, Rupert Sheldrake, and John Hidley. The purpose of these discussions is to explore essential questions about the mind: what is psychological disorder and what is required for fundamental psychological change? J Krishnamurti is a religious philosopher, author and educator who has written and given lectures on these subjects for many years. He has founded elementary and secondary schools in the United States, England, and India.

David Bohm is Professor of Theoretical Physics at Birkbeck College, London University in England. He has written numerous books concerning theoretical physics and the nature of consciousness. Professor Bohm and Mr Krishnamurti have held previous dialogues on many subjects.

Rupert Sheldrake is a biologist whose recently published book

proposes that learning in some members of a species affects the species as a whole. Dr Sheldrake is presently consulting plant physiologist at the International Crops Research Institute in Hyderabad, India.

John Hidley is a psychiatrist in private practice who has been associated with the Krishnamurti school in Ojai, California for the past six years.

In the culture there are conflicting points of view about the proper approach to dealing with one's own or others' psychological problems. And the underlying principles from which these approaches are drawn are in even greater conflict. Without invoking a narrow or specialized point of view, can the mind, the nature of consciousness, its relationship to human suffering, and the potential for change be understood? These are the issues to be explored in these dialogues.

K: Is disorder the very nature of the self?

JH: Why do you say that? Why do you ask that, if it is the nature of the self?

K: Isn't the self, the me, the ego...

JH: Yes.

K: ...whatever word we like to use, isn't that divisive? Isn't that exclusive, isolating process: the self-centred activity which causes so much disorder in the world, isn't that the origin, the beginning of all disorder?

JH: The origin being selfish activity.

K: Yes, self-centred activity, at all levels of life.

JH: Yes, and certainly that's the way in which the patient comes in, he's concerned about his depression.

K: Yes.

JH: Or his fear.

K: His fulfillment, his joy, his suffering, his...

JH: Yes.

K: ...agony and so on, it's all self-centred.

JH: Yes.

K: So, I am asking, if I may, is not the self the beginning of all disorder? The self - I mean the egotistic attitude towards life, the sense of individual - emphasis on the individual: his salvation, his fulfillment, his happiness, his anxiety, and so on, so on.

JH: Well, I don't know that it's the source of the thing. It's certainly the way he experiences it and presents it. He presents it as his.

K: Yes, but I mean, if you go all over the world, it is the same expression, it is the same way of living. They are all living their own personal lives unrelated to another, though they get married, they may do all kinds of things, but they're really functioning from an isolated centre.

JH: And that centre, that self, is the source of the difficulty in the relationship?

K: In relationship.

JH: And the difficulty that creates the symptoms.

K: And I wonder if the psychologists have tackled that problem, that the self is the origin, the beginning of all contradiction, divisive activity, self-centred activity, and so on.

JH: No. I think that the way psychiatrists and psychologists look at this is that the problem is to have an adequate self.

K: Adequate self.

JH: Yes.

K: Which means what?

JH: Defining normality...

K: The self that is functioning...

JH: Sufficiently.

K: ...efficiently.

JH: Yes.

K: Which means furthering more misery.

DAVID BOHM: Well, I don't feel that the psychiatrists would OJ82CNM1 that at the proper, or properly organized self could get together with other properly organized selves and make an orderly society.

K: Yes.

DB: And you are saying, as I understand it, something quite different.

K: Yes.

DB: Which is that no self can do it. No structure of the self can make order.

K: That's right. The very nature of the self must intrinsically bring disorder.

DB: Yes, but I'm not sure this will be clear. How can that be made clear, evident?

RUPERT SHELDRAKE: Sorry, it seems to me that the context is even broader than that of psychology, because in the world we have all sorts of things which are not human beings with selves, they're animals and plants and all the forces of nature and all the stars and so on. Now we see disorder in nature too. It may not be consciously experienced and a cat that's suffering or a lion

suffering or a mouse or even an earthworm that's suffering may not come into a psychiatrist's office and say so, but the fact is that there seems to be disorder and conflict within nature. There are conflicts between forces of nature, inanimate things, earthquakes and so on; there are conflicts within the animal world; there are even conflicts within the plant world - plants compete for light, and bigger ones get higher up in the forest and the smaller ones get shaded out and die. There's conflict between predators and prey; all animals live on other plants or animals. There's every kind of conflict: there's disease, there's suffering, there's parasites; all these things occur in the natural world. So is the context of psychological suffering and disorder something that's merely something to do with the mind or is it something to do with the whole of nature, the fact that the world is full of separate things and that if we have a world which is full of separate things and these separate things are all interacting with each other, that there's always going to be conflict in such a world.

DB: So, I'm wondering, is it clear that there is that disorder in nature. Would we say that disorder is only in human consciousness?

K: Yes.

DB: That is, the phenomena that you have described, are they actually disorder? That's a question we have to go into. Or what is the difference between the disorder in consciousness and whatever is going on in nature?

K: I saw the other night on the television a cheetah chasing a deer, killing it. Would you consider that disorder?

RS: Well, I would consider that it involves suffering.

K: Suffering, yes. So are we saying that it is natural in nature and in human beings to suffer, to go through agonies, to live in disorder?

RS: Yes.

K: So what do you say to that, sir?

JH: Well, I think that's the way it's looked at by the therapist. To some degree it's felt that this arises in the course of development and that some people have it more than others... suffering - some people are more fortunate in their upbringing, for example, or in their heredity. But it isn't questioned that that may not be necessary in any absolute sense.

DB: Oh.

JH: Well, that's what we're questioning.

K: That's what I would like to question too.

JH: Yes.

K: Dr. Sheldrake says it is accepted. It's like that.

JH: Yes.

K: Human conditioning is to suffer, to struggle, to have anxiety, pain, disorder.

JH: Well, it's certainly...

K: ...human conditioning.

JH: ...certainly necessary to have physical suffering. People get sick, they die, and we're wondering whether or not psychological suffering is analogous to that or whether there's something intrinsically different about it.

K: No, sir. I do question seriously whether human beings must inevitably live in this state: everlastingly suffering; everlastingly going through this agony of life. Is that necessary, is it right that

they should?

JH: It's certainly not desirable that they should.

K: No, no. If we accept that it's inevitable, as many people do, then there is no answer to it.

JH: Yes.

K: But is it inevitable?

JH: Well, physical suffering is inevitable.

K: Yes.

JH: Illness, death.

K: Yes, sir, physical suffering, old age, accidents, disease.

JH: Maybe we increase the physical suffering because of our psychological problems.

K: That's it. That's it. Sir, a mother bearing babies, she goes through a terrible time delivering them. Strangely, she forgets that pain. She has the next baby, another baby. In India, as you know, there mothers have about seven or eight children. If they remembered the first agony of it, they would never have children. I have talked to several mothers about it. They seem to totally forget it. It's a blank after suffering. So is there an activity in the psyche that helps the suffering to be wiped away? Recently, personally I have had an operation, a minor operation, there was plenty of pain; quite a lot. And it went on considerably. It's out of my mind completely gone. So is it the psychological nourishing of a remembrance of pain - you follow - which gives us a sense of continuity in pain?

JH: So you are saying that perhaps the physical suffering in the world is not the source of the psychological suffering, but that the psychological suffering is an action of its own.

K: Yes. Right. You have had toothache, I'm sure.

RS: Yes. I've forgotten...

K: ...you have forgotten it. Why? If we accept pain is inevitable, suffering is inevitable you must continue with it. You must sustain it.

RS: No, we have to accept that it's inevitable, that it happens sometimes. But we can forget physical pain; can we forget the kind of psychological pain that's caused by natural things like loss, death of people?

K: Yes, we'll come to that. I come to you, I've a problem with my wife, if I'm married. I am not, but suppose I am married. I come because I can't get on with her.

JH: Yes.

K: And she can't get on with me.

JH: Yes.

K: And we have a problem in relationship. I come to you. How will you help me? This is a problem that everybody's facing.

JH: Yes.

K: Either a divorce...

JH: Yes.

K: Or adjustment. And is that possible when each one wants to fulfil, wants to go his own way, pursue his own desires, his own ambitions, and so on?

JH: You are saying that the problem arises out of the fact that they each have their own interests at heart.

K: No, it's not interest, it's like - sir, we are all terribly individualistic.

JH: Yes.

K: I want my way and my wife wants her way. Deeply.

JH: And we see that our needs are in conflict for some reason.

K: Yes, that's all. Right away you begin.

JH: Yes.

K: After the first few days or few months of relationship, pleasure and all that, that soon wears off and we are stuck.

JH: Okay, that's the same problem then with the mother raising this child and making it her toy. Her needs are in conflict with the needs of the child.

K: Please perhaps you'll go on, sir. The mother, her mother was also like that.

JH: Yes.

K: And the whole world is like that, sir. It's not the mother.

JH: Yes.

K: So when I come to you with my problem, you say it's the mother.

JH: No, I wouldn't say it's...

K: I object to that.

JH: I wouldn't say it's the mother.

K: Ah, no.

JH: You were saying that it's a much broader problem.

K: Much deeper problem than the mother or the brother didn't put the baby on the right pot, or something.

JH: Right. Then it appears that the needs are in conflict.

K: No, I wouldn't say needs are in conflict. Basically, they are divisive; self-centred activity.

JH: Yes.

K: That inevitably must bring contradiction - you know, the

whole business of relationship and conflict.

JH: Yes.

K: Because each one wants his pleasure.

JH: There's self-centred activity on the part of the person who's raising the child or on the part of the person who is in the relationship, married. The child is the victim of that.

K: Of course.

JH: And then grows up to perpetuate it.

K: And the mother's father and mother's fathers are like that too.

JH: Yes. Now why does it have to happen that way? Are we saying that's the way it is in nature? Or are we saying that...

K: No.

RS: Well, I mean, there are certain conflicts in nature. For example, among troops of gorillas or baboons - take baboons or even chimpanzees - there's a conflict among the males. Often the strongest male...

K: Yes, quite.

RS: ...wishes to monopolize all the attractive females. Now some of the younger males want to get in on the act as well. They try going off with these females and this younger male will fight and beat them off. So they'll be kept out of this. This selfish activity of this one male keeps most of the females to himself. The same occurs in red deer, where the stag will monopolize the females. Now these are examples of conflict in the animal kingdom which are quite needless. There would be enough food for these hens without pecking each other. Now these are not exceptions; we can find this kind of thing throughout the animal kingdom. So I don't think that the origin of this kind of selfish conflict is

something just to do with human societies and the way they are structured. I think we can see in biological nature this kind of thing.

K: Are you saying that as we are the result of the animal, as we human beings evolved from the animal, we have inherited all those pecking order?

RS: Yes, I think we've inherited a lot of animal tendencies from our animal forbearers.

K: Oh, yes, yes.

RS: And I think that many of these show up in these psychological problems.

K: Yes, but is it necessary that we should continue that way?

RS: Ah.

K: We are thoughtful, we are ingenious in our inventions, extraordinarily capable in certain directions, why should we not also say, we won't have this, the way we live, let's change it.

RS: Well, we can say that; many people had said it.

K: I know, many people have said it.

RS: But without very much effect.

K: Why?

RS: Well, that indeed is a question. Is it that we're so completely trapped in the ancestry of the past?

K: Or so heavily conditioned that it's impossible to be free.

RS: Well, there are two possible kinds of conditioning: one is the genuine biological conditioning that comes from our animal heritage, which means that we inherit all these tendencies.

K: Let's accept that.

RS: Now that is undoubtedly extremely strong. It goes right

back into our animal past.

K: Right.

RS: The other kind of conditioning is the kind of argument that I'm putting forward, perhaps: the argument, this has always been so; human nature is like this, there have always been wars and conflicts and all that kind of thing, and therefore there always will be; that the most we can do is try to minimize these, and that there'll always be psychological conflicts within families and between people and that the most we can do is try and minimize these...

K: So, accept the...

RS: ...or at least make them livable with.

K: ...conditioning, modify it. But you cannot fundamentally change it.

RS: Yes. I'm saying this is a possible kind of conditioning: the belief that we can't really change it radically is another kind of conditioning. I'm a victim of it myself. So I don't know if it's possible to get out of it.

K: That is what I want to discuss. Whether it's possible to change the human conditioning. And not accept it, say, as most philosophers, the existentialists and others say, your human nature is conditioned. You cannot change. You can modify it; you can be less selfish, less painful, psychologically have problems, bear up with pain, this is natural, we have inherited from the animals; we'll go on like this for the rest of our lives and for the lives to come. Not reincarnation, other people's lives. It'll be our conditioning, human conditioning. Do we accept that? Or should we enquire into whether it's possible to change this conditioning?

RS: Yes. I think we should enquire into that.

K: If you say it cannot be changed, then the argument is over.

RS: All right, so I'll say...

K: No, I'm not saying...

RS: I'd like it to be changed, I deeply want it to be changed. So I think that this question of enquiring into the possibility is extremely important. But one of my points, to go back to the conditioning point, is that a lot of this conditioning is deep in our biological nature and people who wish to change it merely by changing the structures of society...

K: Oh, I'm not talking about that.

RS: ...are operating at too superficial a level.

K: Like the Communists want to change it.

RS: But the idea that you can do it by just changing environment is what the Communists thought and still think, and in a sense the experiment has been tried and we can see the results in various communist countries. And of course, believers in that would say, well, they haven't tried properly or they betrayed the revolution, and so on. But nevertheless, the basis of that belief is that the source of all the evils and the problems is in society and by changing society man is perfectible.

K: But society is formed by us.

RS: Yes.

K: And you, by us is going to be changed, so we have to change ourselves. We depend on society to change us. And society is what we have made it; so we are caught in that trap.

RS: Yes. Exactly; and if we start off with a heritage which is built in to us, inherited, which comes from our biological past, and

if we start with that and we start with these societies that also have bad effects, some of them, and to varying degrees, and we just try to change the society, the other part, the inherited part, is still there.

K: But cannot those also be transformed?

RS: I really...

K: I may have inherited what - violence from the from the apes and so on, so on. Can't I change that? The inherited biological...

DB: Drives.

K: ...conditioning, surely that can be transformed.

RS: Well, all societies surely seek to transform these biological drives we have, and all processes of bringing children up in all societies seek to bring those drives within the control of the society. Otherwise you would have complete anarchy. However these drives are always brought within certain social forms and individual aggression is obviously discouraged in most societies. But is it really transformed? Doesn't it just come out again in the aggression of the society as a whole, war and so on. So we can see that these things are transformed by society, these basic drives that we inherit.

DB: I was going to say they really haven't been transformed, but I think you're meaning by transformed a fundamental change and not just a superficial change or a transfer of the object of aggression from other individuals to other groups. So if you talk of transformation you would say really that they would more or less go away, right? That's as I understand it.

RS: Well, they'd be changed from one form to another...

DB: I meant...

RS: ...that's what I mean.

DB: ...I don't think that's the meaning which Krishnaji is using for the word 'transform,' but essentially can't we be free of them, you see.

K: Yes. That's right. Sir, why do you divide, if I may ask, society and me? As though society were something outside which is influencing me, conditioning me, but my parents, grandparents, so on, past generations have created that society, so I am part of that society. I am society.

RS: Well, yes.

K: Why do we separate it?

RS: I think the reason why we separate it is that there are different kinds of society. And if I'd been born in India instead of in England I would have grown up in a very different way...

K: Of course, of course.

RS: ...with different set of attitudes.

K: Of course.

RS: And because we can think of ourselves growing up in different kinds of societies and we'd be different if we had, that's why in thought, I think, we have the idea that society and me are not exactly the same. We'd always be in one society or another, so society as a whole, all societies taken together, we would only exist within society, but any particular society is in a sense an accident of our birth or upbringing.

K: But even that society is part of us.

RS: Oh, yes. I mean through growing up in it, it becomes part of us and we become part of it.

K: But, I want to abolish this idea in discussion, this separation from me and society. I am society, I am the world. I am the result

of all these influences, conditionings, whether in the East or in the West or in South or North, it's all part of conditioning.

RS: Yes.

K: So we are attacking the conditioning, not where you are born or East or West.

RS: Oh, yes. The problem would be conditioning of every kind: our biological conditioning, our conditioning from society.

K: That's right.

RS: Yes.

K: So personally I don't separate myself from society, I am society. I have created society through my anxiety, through my desire for security, through my desire to have power, and so on, so on, so on. Like the animal. It's all biologically inherited. And also my own individualistic activity has created this society. So I am asking, I am conditioned in that way; is it not possible to be free of it? Free of my conditioning? If you say it's not possible, then it's finished.

RS: Well, I would say first that it's not possible to be free of all of the conditioning. I mean, certain of it is necessary biologically, the conditioning that makes my heart beat...

K: Ah, well...

RS: ...my lungs operate, and all that.

K: I admit all that.

RS: Now, then, the question is, how far can you take that? The necessary conditioning.

K: Dr. Hidley was saying - that's his whole point - I am conditioned to suffer, psychologically. Right, sir?

JH: Yes.

K: Or I am conditioned to go through great conflict in my relationship with my wife or father, whatever it is. And you are saying, either we investigate into that and free ourselves from that, or accept it and modify it.

JH: That's right.

K: Now, which is it? That's what I want - which is it as a psychologist you maintain? If I may put such a question to you?

JH: Yes. Well, I think generally the approach is to attempt to modify it; to help the patient make it work more effectively.

K: Why? I hope you don't mind my asking these questions.

JH: No, I think that part of the reason for that is that it's seen as biological and therefore fixed. A person is born with a certain temperament. His drives are the drives of the animal, and I think also because it isn't clear to therapists that the problem can be dealt with as a whole, it is clear that it can be dealt with as particulars.

K: Is it - I am not asking an impudent question -

JH: Okay.

K: Is it the psychologists don't think holistically? Our only concern is solving individual problems.

JH: Yes, they are concerned with solving individual problems.

K: So therefore they are not thinking of human suffering as a whole.

JH: Right.

K: A particular suffering of X who is very depressed.

JH: Right. For particular reasons.

K: For particular reasons. We don't enquire into what is depression, why human beings all over the world are depressed.

JH: Or we don't try and tackle that as a single problem. We try

and tackle it with this particular individual who comes in.

K: Therefore you are still really, if I may point out - I may be wrong -

JH: Yes.

K: - you are emphasizing his particular suffering and so sustaining it.

JH: Now, can we get clear on that?

K: I come to you.

JH: Yes.

K: I am depressed.

JH: Yes.

K: For various reasons which you know.

JH: Yes.

K: And you tell me, by talking to me, etcetera, you know the whole business of coming to you and all that, you tell me: my depression is the depression of the world.

JH: Yes, I don't tell you that. I tell you that your depression -

K: When you tell me that, are you not helping me to carry on with this individualistic depression? And therefore my depression, not your depression.

JH: Yes.

K: It's my depression which I either cherish or want to dissolve.

JH: Yes.

K: Which means I am only concerned with myself.

JH: Yes.

K: Myself, I come back to that.

JH: Yes, it's within the context of yourself.

K: Self.

JH: Yes...

K: So you are helping me to be more selfish, if I may...

JH: Yes.

K: More self-concerned, more self-committed.

JH: It is approached within the context of the self, but I would think that I am helping you to be less self-concerned because when you are not depressed, then you don't have to be self-concerned. You feel better and you're able to relate to people more.

K: But again, on a very superficial level.

JH: Meaning that I leave the self intact.

K: Intact.

JH: Yes.

DB: Yes, well, I feel that people generally wouldn't accept this, that the self is not there, you see, which is what you're implying, that the self is rather unimportant. But rather the assumption is that the self is really there and it has to be improved, you see, and if you say...

K: That's it, that's it.

DB: A certain amount of self-centredness people would say is normal...

K: Yes, sir.

DB: ...so you keep it within reason, right?

JH: Right.

K: Modify selfishness, right? Continue with selfishness but go slow.

DB: But I think you're saying something which is very radical, then, because very few people have entertained the notion of no self-centredness.

K: That's it.

JH: That's right; it isn't entertained.

DB: Maybe a few but...

JH: Yes. For biological reasons and because of the universality of the phenomenon? Because it isn't even seen as relevant, really.

DB: I think most people feel that's the way things are, it's the only way.

JH: Yes.

K: That means status quo, modified status quo.

JH: Yes.

K: To me that seems so irrational.

DB: But you must feel that it's possible to be different, you see, at least, more than feel, in some sense there must be some reason why you say this.

K: What?

DB: Why you feel so different from other people about it.

K: It seems so practical, first of all. The way we live is so impractical: the wars, the accumulation of armaments, is totally impractical.

DB: But that wouldn't be an argument, you see, because people say, we all understand that, but since that's the way we are, nothing else is possible. You see, you really are challenging the notion that that is the way we are; or we have to be.

K: I don't quite follow this. We are what we are.

DB: People say we are individual, separate and we'll just have to fight and make the best of it. But you are saying something different, I mean, you're not accepting that.

K: All right. Don't accept it, but will you listen? Will the people

who don't accept it, will they give their minds to find out? Right?

JH: Right.

K: Or say, please, we don't want to listen to you. This is what we think; buzz off. That's what most people do.

JH: Well, this question isn't even raised usually.

K: Of course.

JH: Now why do you think that the self, this selfish activity, isn't necessary?

K: No, sir, first of all, do we accept the condition that we are in? Do we accept it, and say, please, we can only modify it, it can never be changed. One can never be free from this anxiety, depression; modify it, always, from agony of life. You follow? This process of going through tortures in oneself. That's normal, accepted. Modify it, live little more quietly and so on, so on. If you accept that, there is no communication between us. But if you say, I know my conditioning, tell me, let's just talk about whether one can be free from it. Then we have a relationship, then we can communicate with each other. But if you say, sorry, shut the door in my face and it's finished.

RS: So, there are some people who accept it, say we can't change it. But there are other people, and I would say that some of the most inspiring leaders of the different religions of the world are among them, who have said we can change it; there is a way beyond this. Now since religions have wide followings and since their doctrines are widely dispersed, there are in fact large numbers of people in our society and in every society who do think it can be changed. Because all religions hold out the prospect of change, and of going beyond this conditioning.

K: Yes. But I would like to know, when you use the word 'religion,' is it the organized religion, is it the authoritarian religion, is it the religion of belief, dogma, rituals, all that?

RS: Well...

K: Or religion in the sense, the accumulation of energy to find whether it is possible to be free. You understand my question?

RS: Yes. Well, I think the second, but I think that if we look into the history of the organized religions and people within them, we see that much of the inspiration for them was in fact that second kind of religion, which still, within that framework, still survives, I think. But it's also something which has often been corrupted and debased and turned into yet another set of dogmas, conditioning, and so on. But I think that within all religious traditions that this second kind of religion you talk about has been kept alive and I think that the impetus in all great religions of the world has been that, though it's then been debased and degraded in various ways. But this vision has never left any of these religions, there are still people within them, I think, who still have it. And this is the inner light that keeps them going over and above the simple political part and all the rest of it.

K: I know, I know. But suppose a man like me rejects tradition. Rejects anything that has been said about truth; about god, whatever it is: the other side. I don't know; the other people say, yes, we have this and that. So how am I, as a human being who has really rejected all this: tradition, the people who have said there is, and the people who have said that's all nonsense; people who have said we have found (inaudible) - and so on, so on. If you wipe all that out and say, look, I must find out - not as an individual - can

this truth or this bliss, this illumination come without depending on all that? You see, if I am anchored, for example, in Hinduism, with all the - not the superficiality of it, not all the rituals and all the superstitions - if I am anchored in the religious belief of a Hindu, of a real Brahmin, I am always anchored, and I may go very far, but I am anchored there. That is not freedom. Because there must be freedom to discover this, or come upon this.

RS: Yes.

K: Sir, we are going little bit too far?

RS: No, but I would then go back and say, well, you put forward the question of a man who rejects all these traditions. You say, let us suppose that I am a man who has rejected all these traditions. I would then say, well what reason do you have for rejecting all these traditions in such a way?

JH: Well, that seems to be the problem that we've arrived at. We have said that man is conditioned biologically and socially by his family. The tradition is part of that. We've said that that's the problem that we're up against now. Is it possible for him to change his nature or do we have to deal with each of these problems particularly as they come up?

RS: Well, what I was saying is that the inner core of all the great religions of the world is a vision of this possibility of a transformation, whether it's called salvation or liberation or nirvana or what. There's this vision. Now there have always been people within those religions who had this vision and lived this vision; now...

K: Ah! Sorry. Go on, I'm sorry.

RS: Well, perhaps out of your radical rejection of all religions

you've always denied that. But if so, I would say, why? Why should we be so radical as to deny...

K: I question whether they really - I may be sacrilegious, I may be an infidel, nonbeliever - I wonder if I am anchored to a certain organized belief, whether I can ever find the other. If I am a Buddhist, for example, I believe that the Buddha is my saviour. Suppose I believe that, and that has been told to me from childhood, my parents have been Buddhists and so on, so on, so on. And as long as I have found that security in that idea, or in that belief, in that person, there is no freedom.

RS: No, but it's possible that you can move beyond that framework, you see, starting from within it that you can move beyond it.

K: That means I wipe out everything.

RS: It means you wipe it out, but there's a difference between an approach where you wipe it out from the beginning...

K: From the beginning, I am talking about.

RS: And there's an approach where you start within it and go beyond it.

K: You see that - wait, wait; yes, I know, the old argument. What is important, breaking down all the barriers at the beginning, not at the end. I am a Hindu, I see what Hinduism is, you know, all the rest of it, and why should I go through number of years to end it, why couldn't I finish it the first day?

RS: Because I think you'd have to reinvent and rediscover for yourself a great many things that you would be able to get through more quickly if you didn't.

K: No. His question is: I am a living human being in

relationship with him or with her. In that relationship I am in conflict. He says, don't go about religion and illumination and nirvana and all the rest of it. Transform this, live rightly here, then the door is open.

RS: Yes, but surely, isn't that easier said than done?

K: I know! I know it's easier said than done, therefore let's find out. Let me find out with him, or with you, or with her how to live in this world without conflict. Right, sir?

JH: That's what we're asking.

K: Can I find out, or is that impossible?

JH: We don't know.

K: No. Therefore we start, we don't know.

JH: Okay.

K: So let's enquire into that. Because if my relationship with life is not right - right in quotes for the moment - how can I find out something that's immensely beyond all this? Beyond time, beyond thought, beyond measure. I can't. 'Til we have established right relationship between us, which is order, how can I find that which is supreme order? So I must begin with you, not with that. I don't know if you are meeting me.

RS: No, I would have thought that you could easily argue the other way around.

K: Of course, of course!

RS: Until you have that, you can't get this right; because the whole history of man shows that starting just from...

K: Ah! Therefore you invent that. You invent something illogical, may not be true; may be just invention of thought, and you imagine that to be order, and hope that order will filter into

you. And it seems so illogical, irrational, whereas this is so rational.

RS: But is it possible?

K: That is it! Let's find out.

RS: But you've now completely reversed your argument to start with, you see. He started with the patient coming to the psychiatrist's office who wants to get his relationships right, get the human relationships out of this state of disorder and conflict into something that's more tolerable.

K: I'm not sure this way - forgive me, Doctor, if I'm blundering where the angels fear to tread - I question whether they are doing right.

RS: But they're doing just what you said now, starting with the relationship, and not going into these bigger questions.

K: But I question whether they are really concerned with bringing about a right relationship between human beings, fundamentally, not superficially, just to adjust themselves for the day.

JH: I don't think that you're denying that larger questions are involved in that, you are just saying that we shouldn't invent ideas about what a solution would be like.

K: Yes. I come to you with my problem: I cannot get on with somebody, or I am terribly depressed or something dishonest in me, I pretend. I come to you. You are concerned to tell me, become more honest.

JH: Yes.

K: But not find out what is real honesty.

JH: Don't we get into the problem of creating the idea of real

honesty at this point?

K: No. It's not an idea. I am dishonest. You enquire, why are you dishonest?

JH: Yes.

K: Go - penetrate into it, disturb me. Don't pacify me. Don't help me to say, well, be a little more honest and a little more this or that, but shake me so that I find out what is real honesty.

JH: Okay, that's...

K: I may break away from my conditioning, from my wife, from my parents, anything. You don't disturb me.

JH: No, that's...

K: That's just my point.

JH: I do disturb you.

K: Partially.

JH: Well, what...

K: You disturb me not to conform to little adjustments.

JH: Well, let's look at that.

K: Sorry.

JH: I disturb you to conform to little adjustments.

K: Yes. You don't say to me, look, you are dishonest, let's go into it.

JH: I do say that.

K: No but, go into it, so that he is totally honest.

JH: Well, how deeply do I need to go into it so that I have disturbed you totally?

K: Yes. So you tell me. Do it now, sir.

JH: Okay. You come in and in our talks we notice that the thing that you are up to is that you are always trying to find some other

person to make your life be whole.

K: Yes. I depend on somebody.

JH: Yes, deeply.

K: Deeply.

JH: And you don't even know that.

K: Yes.

JH: So I disturb you. I tell you that that's what going on and I show you you're doing it with me. I show you you're doing it with your husband. Now is that sufficiently deep?

K: No.

JH: Why?

K: What have you shown me? A verbal picture...

JH: No, not verbal; not verbal.

K: Wait, wait.

JH: Okay.

K: Verbal picture, an argument, a thing which tells me that I am dishonest. Or whatever you tell me. That leaves me where?

JH: Well, if it's verbal it just gives you more knowledge about yourself.

K: That's all. Knowledge about myself.

JH: Yes.

K: Will knowledge transform me?

JH: No.

K: No. Be careful, sir, careful. Then why do I come to you?

JH: Well, not so that I can give you knowledge. You come thinking that maybe somehow I have some answers, because the society is set up...

K: Why don't you tell me, do it yourself, don't depend on me.

Go into it. Find out, stir.

JH: Okay, I tell you that. I tell you, go into it yourself. And you say to me...

K: I can't do it.

JH: ...I don't know what you're talking about.

K: That's just it.

JH: Yes...

K: So how will you help me to go into myself and not depend on you? You understand my question? Please, I'm not the stage, the only actor. Sir, this is really a serious question. How will you help me to go into myself so deeply that I understand and go beyond. You know what I mean?

JH: No, I don't know what you mean. I understand how to help you go into it without depending on me.

K: I don't want to depend on you. I don't want to depend on anybody.

JH: Okay. I can help you do that. We can discover together that you are depending on me, but I don't know how deeply this has to go.

K: So you have to enquire into dependence.

JH: Okay.

K: Why am I dependent? Security.

JH: Yes.

K: Where is security? Is there such thing as security?

JH: Well, I have these experiences as I grew up that taught me what security is.

K: Yes, which is what? A projected idea?

JH: Yes.

K: A principle.

JH: Yes.

K: A belief, a faith, a dogma, or an ideal, which are all projected by me or by you, and I accept those. But they're unreal.

JH: Okay.

K: So, can I push those away?

JH: Yes. And then you are not depressed.

K: Ah! I am dependent and therefore I get angry, jealousy, all the rest of it. That dependence makes me attached and in that attachment there is more fear, there is more anxiety, there is more... you follow?

JH: Yes.

K: So can you help me to be free or, find out what is true security? Is there a deep abiding security? Not in furniture, not in a house, not in my wife or in some idea - find deeply if there is such thing as complete security.

JH: So you're suggesting that if I simply work on this with you and you come to understand that you're dependent that that's not sufficient because you won't have discovered any abiding security.

K: No. Because that's all I want. I've sought security in this house. And there's none, I've sought security in my wife, there isn't any; then I change to another woman, but there isn't any either. Then I find security in a church, in a god, in a belief, in a faith, in some other symbol. You see what is happening? You are all externalized, if I can use that word - giving me security in things in which there is no security: in nations, all the rest of it. Could you help us to find out if there is complete security which is unshakable?

RS: Are you suggesting that this is one of our most fundamental needs?

K: I should think so.

RS: Drives and activities?

K: I should think so.

RS: So indeed it's a fundamental question as to whether this sense of abiding unshakable security is possible.

K: Yes. Yes. Because if once you have that there is no problem any more.

JH: But this isn't clear, because then is it the individual that has that?

K: No. Individual can never have that security. Because he is in himself divisive.

OJAI 2ND CONVERSATION WITH BOHM, HIDLEY & SHELDRAKE 17TH APRIL 1982 'THE NATURE OF THE MIND'

TOM KRAUSE: This is one of a series of dialogues between J Krishnamurti, David Bohm, Rupert Sheldrake and John Hidley. The purpose of these discussions is to explore essential questions about the mind: what is psychological disorder and what is required for fundamental psychological change?

J Krishnamurti is a religious philosopher, author and educator who has written and given lectures on these subjects for many years. He has founded elementary and secondary schools in the United States, England and India.

David Bohm is professor of theoretical physics at Birkbeck College, London University in England. He has written numerous books concerning theoretical physics and the nature of consciousness. Professor Bohm and Mr Krishnamurti have held previous dialogues on many subjects.

Rupert Sheldrake is a biologist whose recently published book proposes that learning in some members of a species affects the species as a whole. Dr Sheldrake is presently consulting plant physiologist to the International Crops Research Institute in Hyderabad, India.

John Hidley is a psychiatrist in private practice who has been associated with the Krishnamurti school in Ojai, California for the past six years.

In the first dialogue the nature of the self was discussed, its relationship to suffering, to society, and to religion. Questions

raised were: can one discover or learn about these relationships and is the need for psychological security the root of the problem?

Today's discussion continues with these questions.

JH: We talked yesterday, we started with the question of the origin and nature of psychological disorder, and suggested that it has its roots in self-centred activity which is divisive and conflictual in nature and that biologically such factors as instinctual aggression and dominance drives, the facts of illness and death all contribute. I wondered if we could start this morning, David, by having you comment on the relationship between these biological factors and psychological security.

DAVID BOHM: Yes, well, biologically if you begin with the animal OJ82CNM2 they're fairly simple. They exist for a short period while the fact is there and then they generally disappear, leaving little trace. There may be a few cases in the higher animals where there's some memory, but it's in man that the memory becomes very significant, remembering all these experiences and anticipating the future you get a very different sort of behaviour. For example, with an animal he might have a bad experience with another animal and shortly afterward he'll be in fairly good state of equilibrium, but say we have a quarrel between two groups, as in Northern and Southern Ireland, this has been going on for 350 years and there is a specific effort to remember it which you can see going on. And I think this is the biggest difference.

JH: Memory being the...

DB: Yes, the effect of memory, the consequences of memory. You see memory by itself would obviously not cause any trouble, because it's only a fact, right? But memory has consequences: it

may produce fear, you see, it may produce anger, it may produce all sorts of disturbances to remember what did happen and to anticipate what may happen.

RUPERT SHELDRAKE: You mean thinking about it?

DB: Yes. Based on memory, right?

RS: I mean, obviously the animal that's been attacked by another animal remembers in the sense that when it sees the other animal again, it's afraid. It probably doesn't think about it in between.

DB: Yes, it can't form an image, you see, I don't believe that most animals can form images of the other animals, and I can base that on experience, that I have seen dogs fighting very hard, and as soon as they turn the corner, the dog sort of forgets what happened. He is disturbed but he doesn't know why he is disturbed, you see. Now, if he could remember the other dog after he turned the corner, he could continue the struggle over territory indefinitely. So the point about territory is, the animal maintains it in a certain limited context. But man remembers it and he maintains this territory indefinitely and wants to extend it, and so on, because of his thinking about it.

RS: So, are you suggesting that the basis of the specifically human kind of pain and suffering over and above the kind of suffering we see in the animal kingdom is this ability to remember, to brood over it, to think about it?

DB: Yes, the animal may have some of that, I've seen examples on television of a deer who lost its doe and it was pining away in the wild, but I think it's limited, that is, there is some suffering of that kind in the animal world but with man it's enormously

expanded, you know, it seems limitless. Yes, I think the major point is that with man the thing can build up like a tremendous explosion that fills his whole mind, you see, and it can become the major motive in life, to remember the insult and to, you know, to revenge the vendetta, in families over many generations. To remember that the bad experience you had with somebody and to be frightened of what's coming like the examination that the child may be frightened of, or something like that.

K: But have you answered his question, sir?

DB: Which is?

JH: How does the biological fact of illness or death or instinctual drive result in a psychological problem or disorder?

DB: By thinking about it. I say that the biological fact is no a serious problem, in the long run, but as soon as you begin to think about it, and not merely think about it but make images about it along with that thought, you know; and to revive the memory and anticipate the feeling of the future; and while you are thinking then it becomes a very serious problem because you can't stop it, you see. You will never attain security by thinking about it, but you are constantly seeking security. You see, the purpose of thinking is to give you security in practical affairs, technical affairs. Now, therefore you are doing a similar sort of thinking, saying how can I be secure against the possibility of suffering again? And there is no way to do that. You may take technical steps to make it unlikely, but as you think about it, you begin to stir up the whole system and distort the whole mental process.

JH: Well, it seems clear that by thinking about it we stir up the emotions and the associations that are those thoughts, but we're not

suggesting we shouldn't think about it, are we?

DB: Well, it depends on how you think about it. You see, this thinking gets to be directed toward giving you a sense of security, you see, an image of security.

JH: Right, I get hurt when I'm little or some time along the line and it creates a fear in me and I anticipate that kind of situation. I may not even remember the incident, but I want to avoid it in the future.

DB: Yes, and now, the point is this: the mind is always searching for how to avoid it, and searching out thoughts, images, you know, saying, that fellow is the one who did it, I must keep away from him; coming to conclusions and if any conclusion gives you an image of security, then the mind holds on to it, right? Without actually any basis.

JH: Could you elaborate on that a little?

DB: Well, if you have had a bad experience with somebody, you may conclude that you should never trust him again, for example. Although that might be quite wrong. But the mind is so anxious to have security that it will jump to the conclusion that it's not safe to trust him. Right?

JH: Yes.

DB: Now, if you find somebody else who seems to treat you well and reassures you and flatters you, then you may jump to the conclusion you can completely trust him. Now, the mind is now looking for thoughts that will give it good feelings, you see, because the feelings of the memory are so disturbing to the whole system that its first function is to make the mind feel better, rather than find out what is the fact.

JH: Okay, so we're saying that at this point the mind isn't interested in what's true, it's interested in getting secure.

DB: Yes, it's so disturbed that it wants to come to order first you see, and it's adopting a wrong way, as I see it.

JH: The wrong way being?

DB: To think about it and try to find thoughts that will make it feel better.

JH: So you're saying the thoughts themselves in some sense are taking the place of reality, that the person is trying to get certain thoughts in his head that make him feel better.

DB: Yes. And that's self-deception, you see.

RS: What makes you think that the primary drive is for security?

DB: Oh, we discussed that yesterday, of course, but I wouldn't be sure that's the only primary drive, but it's obvious for the animal it's a very important drive to want security, right? We also want pleasure, I think that's another drive - they are closely related.

RS: But to come back to this question of security, in its limited forms, security is clearly one goal that we have. People like to have houses and have them secure and cars and possessions and bank balances and that kind of thing. But there's this factor that comes in, when you've got that, there are two things, actually, that come in: one is maybe the fear that you'll lose it, but the other is boredom with the whole thing and the craving for excitement and thrill. And this doesn't seem to fit within this model of this primary and central craving for security.

DB: Well that's why I said it's only one of the drives, right? That there's also the drive toward pleasure, as an example, much of

what you said is included in the drive toward pleasure, right?

RS: I'm not so sure.

DB: Excitement is pleasurable and then people hope for pleasure and excitement rather than pain, as a rule.

RS: But don't you think there's a pleasure in itself in curiosity and there's a sense of freedom in discovery that you can get from certain kinds of exploration which is neither just straightforward pleasure, it's not a repetitive kind of pleasure, nor is it security.

DB: Yes, well, I didn't want to say that all our drives are caught in this thing, you see, I said that if you think about them and base them on memory, then they are going to get caught in this problem. Now there may be a natural, free interest in things which could be enjoyable, and that need not be a problem, right? But if you were to become dependent on it and think about it and say, if I don't have it I become very unhappy, then it would be a similar problem.

K: Could we go into the question, what is security? What does that word convey? Apart from physical security.

RS: I would have said invulnerability.

K: Not to be hurt.

RS: Not to be hurt at all, not to be able to be hurt.

K: Not to be able to be hurt and not to hurt. Physically we are all hurt, one way or another: operations and illness and so on, so on. When you talk about being hurt, are you talking about psychological hurts?

JH: Yes, I'm wondering how it is that when a person comes into my office, his complaint is his psychological hurts.

K: How do you deal with it?

JH: I try and...

K: Suppose I come to you. I am hurt from childhood.

JH: Yes.

K: I am hurt by the parents, school, college, university...

JH: Yes.

K: ...when I get married she says something, I am hurt. So this whole living process seems to be a series of hurts.

JH: It seems to build up a structure of self that is hurt, and a perception of reality that is inflicting hurt.

K: Yes. How do you deal with it?

JH: I try to help you see how you're doing it.

K: What do you mean, how I'm doing it?

JH: Well, for example, if you have built up in you the notion that you're one down; or that you're the victim. Then you perceive yourself to be victimized and you perceive the world to be a victimizer. And I help you realize that that's what you're doing.

K: But by showing me that, will I get rid of my hurt? My hurts, very deep unconscious hurts that I have, that make me do all kinds of peculiar actions, neurotic, and isolating myself.

JH: Yes. It appears that people get better, that they realize that they are doing it. And in some local area it seems to help.

K: No, but aren't you concerned, if I may ask, with not being able to hurt at all?

JH: Yes.

DB: What do you mean by that, not hurting somebody else or not hurting inside of you.

K: I may hurt others unconsciously, unwillingly, but I wouldn't hurt voluntarily somebody.

DB: Yes, you really don't intend to hurt anybody.

K: Yes. I wouldn't.

RS: Well, maybe not, but I don't see the connection between not hurting other people and not being hurt oneself. At least I'm sure there must be one, but it's not obvious. And most people's view of the best way not to be hurt would be to be in such a position that you can hurt others so much they'd never dare. This is the principle of nuclear retaliation and so this is a very common principle.

K: Yes, of course.

RS: So it's not obvious that not hurting others is related to not being hurt oneself. In fact, usually it's taken to be the reverse. It's usually assumed that if you're in a position to hurt others very much you'll be very secure.

K: Of course, I mean if you're a king or a sannyasi or one of those people who have built a wall round themselves...

RS: Yes.

K: ...naturally you can never hurt them.

RS: Yes.

K: But when they were children they were hurt.

RS: Yes.

K: That hurt remains. It may remain superficially or in the deep recesses of one's own mind. Now, how do you, as a psychologist, psychoanalyst, help another who is deeply hurt and is unaware of it and to see if it is possible not to be hurt at all?

JH: I don't address the question about is it possible to not be hurt at all. That doesn't come up.

K: Why? Wouldn't that be a reasonable question?

JH: Well, it seems to be what we are asking here. It is the essence of the question that we're asking. We ask it in terms of

particulars only in therapy, and you're asking it more generally, is it possible to end this hurt, period. Not just a particular hurt that I happen to have.

K: So how should we proceed?

JH: Well, it would seem that the structure that makes hurt possible is what we have to get at. What makes hurt possible in the first place, not this hurt or that hurt.

K: I think that's fairly simple. Why am I hurt? Because you say something to me which is not pleasant.

JH: Well, why should that hurt you?

K: Because I have an image about myself as being a great man. You come along and tell me, don't be an ass. And I get hurt.

JH: What is it that's being hurt there?

K: There, the image which I have about myself. I am a great cook, a great scientist, a great carpenter; whatever you will. I have got that picture in myself and you come along and put a pin into it. And that gets hurt. The image gets hurt. The image is me.

DB: I feel that that will not be totally clear to many people. I mean, how can I be an image, you see, many people will ask. You see, how can an image get hurt, because if an image is nothing at all, why does it hurt?

K: Because I have invested into that image a lot of feeling.

DB: Yes.

K: A lot of ideas, emotions, reactions, all that is me, my image.

JH: It doesn't look like an image to me, though, it looks like something real.

K: Ah, of course, for most people it's very real. But that is me, the reality of that image is me.

JH: Yes. Well, can we get clear that it's an image and not real?

K: Image is never real; symbol is never real.

JH: You're saying that I'm just a symbol.

K: Perhaps.

JH: That's a big step.

K: From that arises the question whether it's possible not to have images at all.

RS: Well, wait a minute. I don't think we've clearly established that I am an image.

K: Ah, let's go into it.

RS: I mean, it's not entirely clear. I mean, it's obvious that to some extent one is an image, that when I have a feeling about myself and so on. It's not entirely clear that this is entirely unjustified. You see certain aspects of it may be exaggerated, certain aspects may be unrealistic, but, you see, one approach would be, well, we've got to remove, shave off these unrealistic aspects, pare it down to sort of reasonable size. And then that which remains would be the real thing.

K: So, sir, are you raising the question, what am I?

RS: Well, I suppose so, yes.

K: Yes. What are you? What is each one of us? What is a human being? That's the question that's involved.

RS: Yes, that seems unavoidable.

K: Yes. What am I? I am the form, the physical form; the name, the the result of all education.

JH: Your experiences.

K: My experiences, my beliefs, my ideals, principles, the incidents that have marked me.

JH: The structures you've built up that are how you function.

K: Yes.

JH: You skills.

K: My fears, my activities, whether they are limited or my so-called affection; my gods, my country, my language; fears, pleasures, suffering, all that is me.

JH: Yes.

K: That's my consciousness.

JH: And your unconscious.

K: That's my whole content of me.

JH: Okay.

DB: But there's still that feeling of actuality that me is there, you see, I mean, you may say, you could reasonably argue that that's all there is to me, but when something happens there's the feeling of its actual presence, at that moment.

K: I don't quite follow you there.

DB: Well, you see if somebody reacts to being hurt or angry, he feels at that moment that there's more than that, you see, that there is something deep inside which has been hurt, right?

K: I don't quite see. My image can be so deep, that's my image at all levels.

DB: Yes, but how...

K: Wait, sir, I have an image of myself; suppose: that I am a great poet, or a great painter or a great writer. Apart from that image as a writer, I have other images about myself. I have an image about my wife, and she has a image about me, and there are so many images I've built around myself; and the image about myself also. So I may gather a bundle of images.

DB: Yes, I understand.

K: Partial.

DB: Yes, you are saying that there is nothing but this bundle of images...

K: Of course!

DB: ...but you know, the question is, how are we to see this as an actual fact?

K: Ah.

RS: But wait a minute, there is something but this bundle of images; and I mean I'm sitting right here, now, seeing you and all the rest of it. Now I have the feeling that there's a centre of action or centre of consciousness which is within my body and associated with it which has a centre and it's not you, and it's not you, and it's not David: it's me. And associated with this centre of action, my body, sitting here, is a whole lot of memories and experiences and without those memories I wouldn't be able to speak, to talk, to recognize anything.

K: Of course, of course.

RS: So there seems to be some substance to this image of myself. There may be false images associated with it, but there seems to be a reality which I feel as I sit here.

K: Sir,...

RS: So it's not entirely illusory.

K: ...are you saying that you are totally, basically different from the three of us?

RS: Well, I'm in a different place and I have a different body...

K: Of course.

RS: ...and in that sense I'm different.

K: Of course, I'll admit that, I mean you're tall, I' short, I'm brown, you're...

RS: Yes.

K: ...black or you're white or you're pink or whatever it is.

RS: Now at another level I'm not basically different in the sense that we can all speak the same language and communicate, so there's something in common. And at a purely physical level all of us have a lot in common with each other, the same kinds of enzymes, chemicals, and so on. And those indeed - hydrogen atoms, oxygen atoms - we have in common with everything else.

K: Yes. Now, is your consciousness different from the rest? Consciousness, not bodily responses, bodily reactions, bodily conditioning; is your consciousness: your beliefs, your fears, your anxieties, depressions, faith, all that?

RS: Well, I would say that many of the contents of my consciousness or many of the beliefs, desires, etcetera, I have, other people also have. But I would say the particular combination of experiences, memories, desires, etcetera I have are unique, because I've had a particular set of experiences as you have and as everyone has which makes a unique combination of these different elements.

K: So is mine unique?

RS: Yes.

K: So is his?

RS: Exactly.

K: The illusion makes it all common. It's no longer unique.

RS: That's a paradox. It's not immediately clear.

DB: Why isn't it clear? Everybody's unique, right?

RS: Yes, we're all unique.

K: I question that.

RS: We're not unique in the same way. Otherwise the word unique becomes meaningless. If we're unique, each of us is unique, we have a unique set of experiences and environmental factors, memories, etcetera.

K: That's what you just now said, that's common lot to all of us.

RS: Yes, we all have it, but what we have is different.

K: Yes, you brought up in England...

RS: Yes.

K: ...and perhaps another brought up in America, another brought up in Chile, we all have different experiences; different country, different views, different mountains, and so on.

RS: Yes.

K: But apart from the physical environment, linguistic differences and accidents of experience, basically, fundamentally, deep down, we suffer; we are frightened to death, we are anxious, we are agonizing about something or other, and conflict, that's the ground on which we all stand.

RS: But that doesn't seem a very startling conclusion.

K: No, it is not.

DB: But I think what you are saying really implies that what we have in common is essential and fundamental rather than just superficial, you see. And now, I've talked with people about this and they say, everybody agrees we all have these things in common but sorrow, suffering and so on are not so important, the really important point are the higher achievements of culture and things like that, as an example.

JH: Maybe the distinction is between the form and the content. Our contents are all different and they have similarities and differences, but maybe the form is the same, their structure.

K: I would say contents are the same for all human beings.

RS: But you see I can recognize that there is such a thing as common humanity but I would regard that quite possibly as an abstraction or a projection rather than a reality. How do I know that is not an abstraction?

K: Because you go around the world, you see people suffer, you see human beings in agony, despair, depression, loneliness, lack of affection, lack of care, attention, that's the basic human reactions, that is part of our consciousness.

RS: Yes.

K: So you are not basically different from me. You may be tall, you may be born in England, I may be born in Africa, I have dark skin, but deep down the river, the content of the river is the water. The river is not Asiatic river, or European river, it is a river.

RS: Yes, well that is clearly true at some level. But I am not quite sure at what level, you see.

K: I am talking basically, deeply.

RS: But you see it seems to me, why stop there? I can see something in common with all other human beings, but I can also by looking at animals see something in common with them. We have a great deal in common with the animals.

K: Surely, surely.

RS: So why stop at human beings?

K: I don't.

RS: Why not say...

K: Because I say if I feel - I don't like the word 'common' - one feels it is the ground on which all human beings stand. Their relationship with nature, animals and so on, and the content of our consciousness is again the ground of humanity. Love is not English, American or Indian. Hate is not - agony is not yours or mine, it is agony. But we identify ourselves with agony, it is my agony, which is not yours.

RS: We might go through it in very different ways though.

K: Different expressions, different reactions, but basically it is agony. Not German agony and Asiatic agony - British and Argentine, it is human conflict. Why do we separate ourselves from all this? The British, the Argentine, the Jew, the Arab, the Hindu, the Muslim. You follow?

RS: Yes.

K: Which all seems so nonsensical, tribal. The worship of a nation is tribalism. So why can't we wipe out all that?

RS: I don't know. You tell me, why can't we?

K: Because again we have come back to the question: I identify with my nation because that gives me a certain strength, certain standard, certain status, certain security. When I say, "I am British"! This division is one of the reasons of war, not only economic, social and all the rest of it, but nationalism, which is really glorified tribalism, is the cause of war. Why can't we wipe that out? It seems so reasonable.

JH: It seems reasonable on a level like nationalism, people don't think they are England.

K: Start from there.

JH: Okay. But then I have a patient and he does think that he is

married, and that it is his wife.

K: Of course it is his wife.

JH: Well, isn't that the same action that you are talking about?

K: No, no. Sir, just let's go into it slowly.

JH: Okay.

K: Why do I want to identify myself with something greater?

JH: Because I am not sufficient.

K: Like nationalism, like god.

JH: I don't feel sufficient.

K: Which means what?

JH: Insecure.

K: Insecure, insufficient, lonely, isolated, I have built a wall round myself. So all this is making me desperately lonely. And out of that conscious, or unconscious loneliness I identify with god, with the nation, with Mussolini, it doesn't matter, Hitler, or any religious teacher.

JH: Okay. Or I get married, I have a child, I make a place for myself. And that's all also identification.

K: Yes. Why do we want to identify with something? No, the basic question is too, why do we want roots?

JH: To belong.

K: To belong, in which is also implied to become. So this whole process of becoming, from childhood I am asked to become, become, become. From the priest to the bishop, the bishop to the cardinal, the cardinal to the pope. And in the business world it is the same. In the spiritual world it is the same. I am this but I must become that.

JH: Okay, what I am is not sufficient.

K: Why do we want to become? What is it that is becoming?

RS: Well the obvious reason for wanting to become is a feeling of insufficiency, inadequacy, in the state that we are. And one of the reasons for this is that we live in an imperfect world, our relationship with other people are imperfect. We are not content for a variety of reasons with the way we are. So the way out of that seems to become something else.

K: Yes. That means escaping from 'what is'.

RS: Yes. But it may seem 'what is' is something we have to escape from.

K: All right. Take the usual experience. I am violent and I have invented non-violence. And I am trying to become that. I'll take years to become that. In the meantime I am violent. So I have never escaped from violence. It is just an invention.

RS: Well you are trying to escape from it. You may escape in the end.

K: No, I don't want to escape. I want to understand the nature of violence, what is implied in it, whether it is possible to live a life without any sense of violence.

RS: But what you are suggesting is a more effective method of escaping. You are not suggesting abandoning the idea of escaping. You are suggesting that the normal way of escaping, trying to become non-violent, is one way of doing it which doesn't work. Whereas if you do another method where you actually look at the violence in a different way you can become non-violent.

K: I am not escaping.

RS: Well, you are changing then.

K: No. I am violent. I want to see what is the nature of violence,

how it arises.

RS: But for what purpose?

K: To see whether it is possible to be free of it completely.

RS: But isn't that a kind of escape from it?

K: No.

RS: Being free of something...

K: ...is not an escape.

RS: Why not?

K: Avoidance, running away, fly away from 'what is' is an escape, but to say, look, this is what I am, let's look at it, let's observe what its content is. That is not escape.

RS: Oh, I see the distinction you are making is that an escape in the normal sense is running away from something, like escaping from prison, or one's parents, or whatever, but they still remain there. What you are saying is that rather than escaping from violence, which leaves violence intact and still there, and you try and distance yourself from it, you try to dissolve violence, or abolish it.

K: Dissolve.

RS: Yes.

K: Not abolish it, dissolve it.

RS: All right. So this is different from escape, because you are trying to dissolve the thing rather than run away from it.

K: Running away, everybody runs away.

RS: Well it usually works to a limited extent.

K: It is like running away from my agony by going to football; I come back home, it is there! I don't want to go to watch football but I want to see what violence is and to see if it is possible to be

completely free of it.

RS: If I am in a very unpleasant society and I can escape from it by defecting, or leaving it and going to another one. And this does in fact mean I escape to some extent.

K: Of course.

RS: So these are always partial answers and they are partially effective.

K: I don't want to be partially violent. Or partially free from it. I want to find out if it is possible to totally end it. That's not an escape, that's putting my teeth into it.

RS: Yes. But you have to believe it is possible in order to put your teeth into it.

K: I don't know, I am going to investigate. I said for me, I know one can live without violence. But that may be a freak, that may be a biological freak and so on. But to discuss together, the four of us, and see if we could be free of violence completely means not escaping, not suppressing, not transcending it, and see what is violence. Violence is part of imitation, conformity. Right? Apart from physical hurts, I am not talking about that. So psychologically there is this constant comparing, that is part of hurt, part of violence. So can I live without comparison, when from childhood I have been trained to compare myself with somebody? I am talking comparison, not good cloth and bad cloth.

JH: Talking about comparing myself.

K: Myself, with you who are bright, who are clever, who have got publicity, when you say a word the whole world listens. And I can shout, nobody cares. So I want to be like you. So I am comparing constantly myself with something I think is greater.

JH: So this is where becoming comes from, comparing.

K: That's just it. So can I live without comparison?

JH: Doesn't that leave me in an insufficient state?

K: No. To live without comparison? No.

JH: Here I start of insufficient...

K: Am I dull because I compare myself with you who are bright?

JH: Yes, you are dull because you compare yourself.

K: By comparing myself with you who are bright, who are clever, I become dull, I think I am dull. But if I don't compare I am what I am.

RS: Well you may not compare but I may compare. I may say, you are dull.

K: All right. I say, all right. You say I am dull, I want to know what does it mean. Does it mean he is comparing himself with me who is - you follow?

RS: Very frustrating, that. I mean if one compared oneself with somebody and said, "You are dull", and then they said, "What does dullness mean?"!

K: The other day, after one of the talks in England, a man came up to me and said, "Sir, you are a beautiful old man but you are stuck in a rut". I said, "Well, sir, perhaps, I don't know, we'll go into it". So I went up to my room and said, "Am I?", because I don't want to be stuck in a rut. I may be. So I went into it very, very carefully, step by step, and found what does a rut mean, to stick in a groove along a particular line. Maybe, so I watch it. So observation of a fact is entirely different from escaping or the suppression of it.

JH: So he says you are stuck in a rut, then you observe it, you don't compare it.

K: I don't. Am I in a rut, I look. I may be stuck in a rut because I speak English. I speak Italian and French. All right. Am I psychologically, inwardly, caught in a groove, like a tram car?

JH: Motivated by something and not understanding it.

K: No, am I, I don't know, I am going to find out. I am going to watch. I am going to be terribly attentive, sensitive, alert.

JH: Now this requires that you don't react in the first place by saying, "No, that's horrible, I couldn't possibly be stuck in a rut."

K: I wouldn't. You may be telling the truth.

JH: To not have that reaction you can't have that self there that says, I am not the type of person that is stuck in ruts.

K: I don't know. Sir, is there a learning about oneself which is not - this leads to something else - which is not constant accumulation about myself? I don't know if I am making myself clear. I observe myself. And I have learnt from that observation something. And that something is being accumulated all the time by watching. I think that is not learning about yourself.

JH: Being concerned with what you think about yourself.

K: Yes, what you I think about yourself, what you have gathered about yourself. Like a river that is flowing, you have to follow it. That leads somewhere else. Let's get back.

JH: Maybe this is part of the question we are asking because we started with how does this disorder occur.

K: Yes, sir, let's stick to that.

JH: It occurs because I have the image of myself of someone who knows he is not stuck in a rut, I don't like to think that I am

stuck in a rut, and somebody says, yes you,you.

K: But you may be.

JH: Yes. I have to be open to looking, to see.

K: To observe.

RS: But then what about this approach: somebody says I am stuck in a rut, I look at myself and think, yes, I am stuck in a rut; then I can respond by thinking, well, what's wrong with that, being stuck in a rut?

K: Sir, that's just blind.

RS: No, you accept the fact, but then you think, well, why should I do anything about it? What's wrong with that as an approach?

K: Like a man stuck as a Hindu, he is stuck. He is then contributing to war.

RS: Well, I may say, well I am stuck in a rut, but so is everybody, it is the nature of humanity to be stuck in ruts.

K: You see, you go off, that is the nature of humanity. But I question that. If you say that is the nature of humanity, let's change it, for god's sake.

RS: But you may believe it is unchangeable. What reason have I for believing that we can change it? I may be stuck in a rut, so are you, so is everybody else, anyone who thinks they are not is deceiving themselves.

K: Cheating themselves. So I begin to enquire, am I cheating myself? I want to be very honest about it. I don't want to cheat, I don't want to be a hypocrite.

RS: You may not be a hypocrite, you may think I am stuck in a rut, and you may be a pessimist. The alternative to being a

hypocrite is a pessimist.

K: No, I am neither a pessimist or an optimist. I say, look, am I stuck in a rut? I watch all day.

RS: And you perhaps conclude yes. But then you can take the pessimistic cause and say, yes, I am, but so what?

K: If you prefer that way of living, go ahead. But I don't want to live that way.

JH: Well the person who comes into therapy usually comes in with both sides going on at the same time. He says that, I have this problem which I want to be free of, I don't want to be stuck in a rut; on the other hand when it gets down to really looking at that he doesn't want to look at it either because it becomes uncomfortable.

K: No, of course. To come back to your original question: the world is in disorder, human beings are in disorder, and we described what is disorder. And is there a possibility to live free from disorder? That is the real basic question. We said as long as there is this divisive process of life, I am a Hindu, you are an Arab, I am a Buddhist, You are a Muslim, I am British you are an Argentine, there must be conflict, war. My son is going to be killed, for what?

JH: For as long as I identify on a personal level with my job, or with my family and so on, there will be pain.

K: Of course.

JH: It is the same process.

K: So is it possible to have without identification responsibility?

JH: If I am not identified will I even go to work?

K: But I am responsible for the lady whom I have married. Responsible in the sense that I have to look after her, care for her,

and she has to care for me. Responsibility means order. But we have become totally irresponsible by isolating ourselves - British, French.

JH: We handle the problem of responsibility by developing a rut that we can work in.

K: Yes. That's it.

JH: And staying inside that.

K: If I see the fact that responsibility is order, I am responsible to keep this house clean, but as we all live on this earth it is our earth, not the British earth, or French earth and German earth, it is our earth to live on. And we have divided ourselves because in this division we think there is security.

JH: There is stability and security.

K: Security. Which is no security at all.

JH: Well it isn't clear, we have got to go slowly because I think that my job is security, I think that my family is security.

K: You may lose it.

JH: That problem keeps coming up.

K: There is great unemployment in America and in England - three million people unemployed in England.

JH: Well maybe I could get by without my job, but I need to think that I have some self respect.

K: What do you mean, self respect?

JH: What I am trying to say is that there is some place at which I put an identification.

K: Why should I want to identify with anything, sir? That makes immediate isolation.

JH: For stability's sake.

K: Does isolation bring about stability?

JH: It gives one a sense of something hard and firm.

K: Does it? Has it? There have been during the last five thousand years nearly five thousands wars. Is that stability?

JH: No.

K: Why don't we accept - well, I won't go into all that. What is wrong with us?

JH: Well, why don't we see this thing? You are saying that the root of the problem is that I continue to identify with one thing after another, if one doesn't work I just find something else. I don't stop identifying.

K: Yes, sir, which breeds isolation.

JH: But in your example about a person that is stuck in a rut, you say I don't have to identify, I can just step back and look at this thing and see if it is true.

K: Yes.

JH: So you are suggesting that there is something that is not identified, something that is free to look.

K: No. This leads to something else. Why do I want to identify myself? Probably basically the desire to be secure, to be safe, to be protected. And that sense, it gives me strength.

JH: Yes. Strength, and purpose, direction.

K: It gives me strength.

RS: But this is a biological fact. It is not merely an illusion. We again, to come back to the animal kingdom, we see it there: deer go round in flocks, birds have flocks, bees have hives and they are identified with the hive in which they work.

K: But bees don't kill themselves, species don't kill themselves.

RS: Well they kill other bees that invade their hide. They don't commit suicide. They kill others.

K: But we are?

RS: Yes and no, bees do fight other bees that come into the hive.

K: Yes, I know that.

RS: So we see even in the animal kingdom this identification with the group, in the social animals, but many social animals, and we are social animals...

K: Just a minute. Agree. Are we by identifying ourselves with India, or China, or Germany, is that giving us security.

RS: To a limited extent it is.

K: A limited extent.

RS: And by identifying ourselves with our families does because this whole question of responsibility seems closely linked to it. If I identify myself with my family, feel duties, and so on, towards them, protect my sisters, I rush to her defence and make a big fuss about it and threaten, if not actually kill the people who insulted her.

K: We have no sisters.

RS: So if I protect members of my family, defend, rush to their defence, so an insult to them, or an attack, is an insult to me, so I rush to their defence...

K: Of course.

RS: ...there is a reciprocal obligation on their part, if I fall ill or sick they'll feed me and look after me; if I get arrested by the police they will try and get me out of prison and so on. So it does give me a kind of security, it actually works.

K: Of course.

RS: And that is a very good reason for doing it, for most people.

K: Stretch it further from the family, to the community, from the community to the nation and so on, that is a vast process of isolating. You are English, I am German, and we are at each other's throat. And I say, for god's sake this is so damn stupid.

RS: Well it is not entirely stupid because it works to a certain extent.

K: It may work, but it is impractical, it is killing each other.

RS: We haven't killed each other yet, there are more human beings than there have ever been before. So the system so far has gone to the point where far from killing each other we have actually got to the point where we have got a bigger population than the world has ever seen. So the system works only too well, for some reason.

K: So you propose war to kill them off?

RS: No! But there is some aspect of it that does work, and some security that is genuine that these things confer.

K: Yes, sir. At a certain level identification has a certain importance. But at a higher level, if you can call it higher, it becomes dangerous. That's all we are saying. Of course if you are my brother you look after me.

DB: Well it is very hard to draw up a line, you see that starts spreading out.

K: That's right, spreading out.

DB: You know, it slips.

K: That's is what I am so objecting to.

RS: But you see the question is where do you draw the line

because if you are my brother then you have the tribal, the clan, or in India, the caste.

K: That's it. Extend it. And then we say, I am Argentine, you are British, he's French and we are economically, and socially, we are murdering each other. And I say that is so insane.

RS: But where do you draw the line, you see. If you say the nation state is wrong, then what is wrong with the tribe, or the caste, then you have got conflict between those.

K: I wouldn't draw the line. I say I am responsible as a human being for what is happening in the world, because I am a human. And so what is happening in the world is this terrible division, and I won't be a Hindu, I won't be a Catholic, Protestant, nothing. A hundred, or a thousand people like that, would begin to do something.

JH: So you are saying that the problem comes up because I mistake my local security, I think that it rests in some local identification.

K: Which is isolation. And therefore in isolation there is no security. And therefore there is no order.

OJAI 3RD CONVERSATION WITH BOHM, HIDLEY & SHELDRAKE 17TH APRIL 1982 'THE NATURE OF THE MIND'

TOM KRAUSE: This is one of a series of dialogues between J Krishnamurti, David Bohm, Rupert Sheldrake and John Hidley. The purpose of these discussions is to explore essential questions about the mind. What is psychological disorder, and what is required for fundamental psychological change? J Krishnamurti is a religious philosopher, author and educator who has written and given lectures on these subjects for many years. He has founded elementary and secondary schools in the United States, England and India.

David Bohm is professor of theoretical physics at Birkbeck College, London University in England. He has written numerous books concerning theoretical physics and the nature of consciousness. Professor Bohm and Mr Krishnamurti have held previous dialogues on many subjects.

Rupert Sheldrake is a biologist whose recently published book proposes that learning in some members of a species affects the species as a whole. Dr Sheldrake is presently consulting plant physiologist to the International Crops Research Institute at Hyderabad, India.

John Hidley is a psychiatrist in private practice who has been associated with the Krishnamurti school at Ojai, California for the past six years.

In the first two dialogues consideration has been given to the process of self identification. A range of subjects has been related

to this process, including the problem of suffering, the role of thinking and memory, images, and the uniqueness or commonality of consciousness. Can these processes be observed, and what is the relationship of observation to order, responsibility and change? Today's discussion focuses on the question: is there such a thing as absolute psychological security?

JH: We would like to talk about the question of whether there is a deep security, whether the self can be dissolved. You have suggested that if that's possible, then the problems that the individual brings to the office, the problems...

K: Sir, why do we seek security, apart from physical? Apart from terrestrial security, why do we want security?

JH: Well, we know moments of peace and happiness, and we want to stabilize that, hold that.

K: Then that becomes a memory.

JH: Yes.

K: Not actual security. A memory that one day we were happy, and I wish we could go back to it. Or you project an idea and a hope someday to achieve it. But why is it that human beings, probably throughout the world, seek security? What is the *raison d'etre*, I mean, what is the demand for security? What makes people ask for security, psychologically?

JH: Well, they're occupied, they're filled with their problems. There's the feeling that if I can solve the problem, if I can find out what the right answer is, if...

K: That's not security, surely. There is great uncertainty, great sense of emptiness in oneself, loneliness. Really, loneliness - let's take that for an example.

JH: Okay.

K: I may be married, I may have children and all the rest of it but I still feel isolated, lonely. And it's frightening, depressing, and I realize it is isolating. After all, loneliness is the essence of isolation, in which I have no relationship with anybody. Is that one of the reasons why human beings seek this desire for security?

JH: Yes, to fill that up.

K: Oh much deeper than that. To be secure in my fulfillment, to be free of fear, free of my agony. I want to be free of all those so that I can be completely secure in peace and happiness. Is that what we want?

JH: Yes.

K: Is that the reason why we seek?

JH: And we want that to be stable over time.

K: Stable, permanent - if there is anything permanent - is that the reason why we crave this, demand, crave for security?

JH: Yes.

K: That means to be free from fear and then I am totally secure.

JH: It feels like I have to be that way in order to function adequately.

K: Function adequately comes later.

JH: What do you mean?

K: If I am secure, I function.

JH: Yes.

K: If I am very anchored in something which I think is false or true, I'll act according to those principles. But is it that human beings are incapable of solving this deep-rooted fear. For example I am taking fear - and they have not been able to solve it.

JH: Yes, that's right.

K: Psychological fears. And to be free from that is to be so marvellously secure.

JH: You are saying that if we can solve these problems at a fundamental level.

K: Otherwise what's the point, how can I be totally secure?

JH: Yes.

K: So, is it the physical security, of bread, of shelter, of food and clothes, spilling over to the psychological field? You understand what I mean?

JH: Do you mean, is that where the psychological feeling of the need for security comes from?

K: Yes, partly. One must have food and clothes and shelter. That's an absolute essential, otherwise you four wouldn't be sitting here. In the search of that, psychologically also I want to be equally secure.

JH: They seem to be equated.

K: Yes, I'm questioning whether it is so.

JH: Yes.

K: Or, the psychological desire to be secure prevents physical security.

JH: It seems like the psychological desire to be secure arises out of the necessity to function in reality.

K: I want to be psychologically secure.

JH: Yes.

K: So I am attached to a group, a community, a nation.

JH: Yes.

K: Which then prevents me from being secure. Security means

long-lasting security. But if I identify myself in my search for psychological security and attach myself to a nation, that very isolation is going to destroy me. So why do we seek this?

JH: Okay, then you're saying that there is a mistake, which is that we identify ourselves, attach ourselves to something and seek security in that, and that that's fundamentally wrong.

K: Yes, no, not fundamental. I won't say right or wrong.

JH: Okay.

K: I am asking why? Why do human beings do this? A fact which is right through the world, it's not just for a certain community, all human beings want to be so unshakably security.

JH: Yes.

K: Why?

DB: Well, I think people have some answer. You see, if you say there's a young child, or a baby, he feels the need to be loved by his parents and it seems that at a certain stage the infant has the need for a kind of psychological security, which he should grow out of perhaps, but since he isn't properly taken care of by his parent very often, he begins to feel lost, as you say, alone, isolated, and there arises a demand that he become inwardly secure.

K: A baby must be secure.

DB: Yes, psychologically as well as physically, would you say.

K: Yes, there must be.

DB: Now at some stage you would say that it would change.

K: Yes.

DB: I don't know what age.

K: Why. At a certain age, a small baby or a young child, it must be protected.

DB: In every way, psychologically...

K: Psychologically...

DB: ...it must not be shocked psychologically.

K: ...you protect it with affection, taking it in your lap, cuddling him or her, and holding his hand, you make him feel that he is loved, that he is cared for. That gives him a feeling, here is somebody who is looking after me, and there is security here.

DB: Yes, and then I suppose he will grow up not requiring that security.

K: That's it. I am questioning, as he grows up, and as he faces the world, why does he crave for security?

DB: Well, I think very few children ever have that love to begin with, you see.

K: Oh, that's it. So is that the problem?

DB: Well, I don't know, but that's one factor.

K: That we really don't love? And if one loves, there is no need for security. You don't even think about security. If I love you... not intellectually, not because you give me comfort, sex, or this or that - I really have this deep sense of love for another. What is the need for security? It's my responsibility to see that you are secure. But you don't demand it.

JH: Yes.

K: But human beings do. And does that mean we don't love another?

JH: Yes, it means that what we love is the...

K: I love you because you give me something.

JH: Yes. You make me feel like I'm going to get that security which I crave.

K: No, we are skirting around this. Why? Why do I want security so that I feel completely content, without fear, without anxiety, without agony and so on? Is fear the root of all this?

JH: We seem to have mentioned already several things that are the root of it? As the baby grows up and isn't loved, he feels the need for that, he remembers that, he tries to return to that or get that as an adult, he's afraid because he's not protected, and as an adult he tries to get that protection.

K: Or, sir, is it unconsciously we know that the self, the me, the ego, is really totally unstable.

JH: You are saying that in its nature it's totally unstable?

K: In its nature unstable. And therefore there is this anxiety for security outside and inside.

JH: Why do you say it's totally unstable?

K: Isn't it? Isn't our consciousness unstable?

JH: It seems to have two sides to it. One side says that if I could just get such and such, I would be stable.

K: Yes. And there is a contradiction in that. I may not be.

JH: I may not be.

K: Yes, of course.

JH: I'm not yet, but I will be.

K: Will be.

JH: Yes.

K: No, much more fundamentally, is not this the self itself in a state of movement, uncertainty, attached; fear in attachment; all that? That's state of lack of stability. Therefore I am asking, is that the reason that human beings unconsciously knowing the instability of the self, want security, God, the saviour?

JH: Wanting something absolute?

K: Yes, that'll give complete contentment. Our consciousness is its content. Right?

JH: Yes.

K: And the content is always in contradiction. I believe...

JH: That's right.

K: ...and yet I'm frightened of not believing.

JH: That's why you're saying in essence it's unstable.

K: Obviously it is unstable. So clearly unstable. I want this thing and some other desire comes along and says, don't have that, for God's sake; there is this contradiction, this duality, all that exists in our consciousness: fear, pleasure, fear of death, you know all the content of our consciousness, all that. So that is unstable.

JH: Now sensing all of that, people generally say this problem is too deep or too complex, there's no way to solve it, we can maybe just make some adjustments.

K: Yes, yes. And in that adjustment also there is lack of stability. So unconsciously there must be craving for security. So we invent God.

JH: We keep inventing lots of different things we hope will give us that security.

K: We create God, he's our creation. We are not the creation of God, I wish we were. We would be totally different. So there is this illusory desire for security.

JH: Now wait a minute, why do you say that it's illusory?

K: Because they invent something in which they hope they'll be secure.

JH: Oh, I see. Yes.

K: So, if the content of our consciousness can be changed...
quotes, changed - would there be need for security?

JH: If we could eliminate all these contradictions?

K: Yes, contradictions.

JH: Then maybe we would have the security because our consciousness would be stable.

K: So that maybe it. We may not call it security. To be secure, which is a really disgusting desire, sorry. To be secure in what? About what? Personally I never thought about security. You might say, well, you are looked after, you are cared for by others and all the rest of it, therefore there is no need for you to think about security, but I never - I don't want security. I need, of course, I need food, clothes and shelter, that's understood, somebody to...

JH: We're talking about psychological security.

K: I'm talking much deeper issue.

JH: And you're saying that that occurs because the contents of consciousness are no longer contradictory.

K: It may not be what we know as consciousness, it may be something totally different. All that we know is fear, reward and pleasure, and death and constant conflict in relationship: I love you but...

JH: Within limits.

K: Within limits. I don't know if that's called love. So there is the content of consciousness is all that; which is me. My consciousness is me. In this complex contradictory dualistic existence the very fact creates the demand for security.

JH: Yes.

K: So can we eliminate the self?

JH: Well, have we got to the self? It seems like there's somebody in there, in here, who's going to juggle all these things and get rid of the contradictions.

K: But that means you are different from this; from consciousness.

JH: Right.

K: But you are that! You are pleasure, you are fear, you are belief, all that you are. Don't please agree with what we are talking about, what I'm saying. It may be all tommyrot.

JH: I think there are a lot of people who wouldn't agree with that. I think that they would say that...

K: I know there're a lot of people wouldn't because they haven't gone into it. They just want to brush all this aside.

JH: Well, let's look at this. Is there a self that separate, that's going to be able to somehow iron out these contradictions?

K: No!

RS: How do you know? I mean it seems to me that there is - well, at least it may be illusory, but it's very easy to think that one is separate from some of these problems and that there's something inside one which can make decisions.

K: Doctor, am I separate from my fear? Am I separate from the agony I go through? The depression?

RS: Well, I think that there's something within one which can examine these things and that's how it indicates there is some kind of separation.

K: Because there is the observer separate from the observed.

RS: Yes.

K: Is that so?

RS: Well, it seems to be so.

K: It seems to be so!

RS: Now, this seems to be the problem, that it does seem to be so, I mean, in my own experience, of course, and many other people's it does indeed seem that there is an observer observing things like fear and one's own reactions. And it comes out most clearly, I find, in insomnia, if one's trying to sleep there's one part of one that going on with silly worries and ridiculous thoughts round and round; there's another part of one that says, I really want to sleep, I wish I could stop all these silly thoughts. And there one has this actual experience of an apparent separation.

K: Of course, of course.

RS: So this isn't just a theory, it's an actual fact of experience that there is this kind of separation.

K: I agree, I agree. But why does that division exist? Who created the division?

RS: It may just be a fact.

K: What may?

RS: It may just be a fact.

K: Is that so? I want to examine it.

RS: Yes, so do I. I mean, is it indeed a fact that consciousness, as it were, has levels, some of which can examine others, one at a time?

K: No. Would you kindly consider, is fear different from me? I may act upon fear, I may say, I must suppress it, I may rationalize it, I might transcend it, but the fear is me.

RS: Well, we often...

K: You only invent the separation where you want to act upon

it. But otherwise I am fear.

RS: The common and ordinary way of analyzing it would be to say, I feel afraid, as if the afraidness was separate from the I. I want to get out of this state of feeling afraid, so I want to escape from it, leaving the fear behind and the I will pass beyond it and somehow escape it. This is the normal way we think.

K: I know.

RS: So what's wrong with that?

K: You keep up this conflict.

DB: But I think he is saying it may be inevitable.

RS: It may be inevitable, you see...

K: I question it.

DB: Yes, well, then how do you propose to show it's not inevitable?

K: First of all, when there is anger, at the moment of anger, there is no separation. Right?

RS: When you're very angry...

K: Of course.

RS: ...what we normally say is you lose control of yourself and the separation disappears, you become the anger, yes.

K: At the moment when you are really angry, there is no separation. The separation only takes place after. "I have been angry." Right? Now, why? Why does this separation take place?

RS: Through memory.

K: Through memory, right. Because I have been angry before. So the past is evaluating, the past recognizing. So the past is the observer.

DB: That may not be obvious, you know. For example, I may

have physical reactions that go out of control, like sometimes the hand or the body, and then I say I am observing those physical reactions going out of control and I would like to bring them back in, right?

K: Yes.

DB: I think somebody might feel the same way, that his mental reactions are going out of control and that they have momentarily escaped his control and that he's trying to bring them back in. You see, now, that's the way it may look or feel to many people.

K: So, what?

DB: Well, then it is not clear. Have we made it clear that that is not the case, you see.

K: Sir, I am trying to point out, I don't know if I am making myself clear: when one is frightened, actually, there's no me separate from fear.

JH: But then there seems...

K: When there is a time interval, there is the division. And time interval, time is thought. And when thought comes in then begins the division. Because thought is memory; the past.

RS: Thought involves memory - yes.

K: Yes, involves memory and so on. So thought, memory, knowledge, is the past. So the past is the observer; who says I am different from fear, I must control it.

JH: Let's go through this very slowly because it seems like the experience is that the observer is the present. It seems like he's saying, I'm here now and what am I going to do about this the next time it comes up.

K: Yes. But the 'what am I going to do about it' is the response

of the past, because you have already had that kind of experience.

Sir, haven't you had fear?

JH: Surely.

K: You know, something, a fear that has really shaken you.

JH: Yes.

K: Devastating one.

JH: Yes.

K: And at that second there is no division, you are entirely consumed by that.

JH: Yes.

K: Right?

JH: Right.

K: Now, then thought comes along and says, I've been afraid or because of this and because of that, now I must defend myself, rationalize fear and so on, so on, so on. It's so obvious, what are we discussing?

DB: You see, I think that, coming back again to the physical reaction which can also consume you and you say at the next moment, you say, I didn't notice it at the time, thought comes in and says, that's a physical reaction.

K: Yes.

DB: Now I know it, you see, what is the difference of these two cases, you see, that in the second case it would make sense to say, I know that I have reacted this way before, right? You know, I can take such an such an action.

K: I don't quite follow this.

DB: Somebody can feel that, it's true I get overwhelmed by a reaction and thought comes in. But in many areas that's a normal

procedure for thought to come in if something shattering happens, and then a moment later, you think, what was it? Right? Now, in some cases that would be correct, right?

K: Quite right.

DB: Now, why is it in this case it is not, you see.

K: Ah, I see what you mean. You answer it. You see, you meet a rattler on a walk.

DB: Yes.

K: Which I have done very often. You meet a rattler, he rattles and you jump. That is, physical self-protective intelligent response. That's not fear.

DB: Right. Well, not psychological fear.

K: What?

DB: It has been called a kind of fear.

K: I know, I don't call that psychological fear.

DB: No, it's not psychological fear, it's a simple physical reaction...

K: Physical reaction...

DB: ...of danger.

K: ...which is an intelligent reaction not to be bitten by the rattler.

DB: Yes, but a moment later I can say, I know that's rattler or it's not a rattler, I may discover it's not a rattler, it's another snake which is not so dangerous.

K: No, not so dangerous, then I pass it by.

DB: But then thought comes in and it's perfectly all right.

K: Yes,

DB: Right?

K: Yes.

DB: But here, when I am angry or frightened...

K: Then thought comes in.

DB: And it's not all right.

K: It's not all right.

DB: Yes.

K: Oh, I see what you are trying to get at. Why do I say it is not all right. Because fear is devastating, it blocks one's mind and thought and all the rest of it, one shrinks in that fear.

DB: Yes, I think I see that. You mean that possibly that when thought comes in it cannot possibly come in rationally in the midst of fear, right?

K: Yes.

DB: Is that what you mean?

K: That's what I'm trying to say.

DB: So in the case of physical danger, it would still come in rationally.

K: Yes. Here it becomes irrational.

DB: Yes.

K: Why, I am asking, why? Why doesn't one clear up this awful mess?

JH: Well, it isn't clear.

K: Look, sir, it is a messy consciousness.

JH: Yes, it's a messy consciousness.

K: Messy consciousness, contradicting.

JH: Yes.

K: Frightened, oh, so many fears and so on, it's a messy consciousness. Now, why can't we clear it up?

JH: Well, it seems we are always trying to clear it up after the fact.

K: I think the difficulty lies in that we don't recognize deeply this this messy consciousness is me. And if it is me, I can't do anything! I don't know if you get the point.

RS: You mean we think that there's a me separate from this messy consciousness.

K: We think we are separate. And therefore we are accustomed, it is our conditioning, to act upon it. But I can't very well do that with all this messy consciousness which is me. So the problem then arises, what is action? We are accustomed to act upon the messy consciousness. When there is realization of the fact that I can't act, because I am that.

JH: Then what is action?

K: That is non-action.

JH: Okay.

K: Ah, that's not okay, that is the total difference.

JH: Yes, I think I understand. On the one hand there's the action of consciousness on itself which just perpetuates things.

K: Yes.

JH: And seeing that, then it ceases to act.

K: It's not non-violence.

RS: Sorry sir, you're saying that normally we have the idea that there's a self which is somehow separate from some of the contents of our consciousness.

K: That's right, that's right, sir.

RS: If someone tells us we're wonderful, we don't want to be separate from that, but if we feel afraid and if somebody tells we're

awful, we do want to be separate from that. So it's rather selective. But nevertheless we do feel there's something in us which is separate from the contents of this messy consciousness. We normally act in such a way as to change either the contents of the consciousness or our relation to the world, and so on. But we don't normally examine this apparent separation between the self, the me, and the contents of the messy consciousness. That's something we don't challenge. Now you're suggesting that in fact this separation which we can actually experience and do, most of us do experience, is in fact something we ought to challenge and look at and we ought to face the idea that we actually are the messy consciousness and nothing other.

K: Of course. It's so obvious.

RS: Well, it isn't obvious, it's very non-obvious and it's a very difficult thing to realize, because one's very much in the habit of thinking one is separate from it.

K: So can we move away from our conditioning? Our conditioning is me. And then I act upon that conditioning, separating myself. But if I am that, no action, which is the most positive action.

JH: The way that that would be heard, I'm afraid, is that if I don't act on it it's just going to stay the way it is.

K: Ah!

RS: You're suggesting that by recognizing this, the process of recognizing it, facing up to...

K: It's not facing up. Who is to face up? Not recognize. Who is to recognize it? You see, we always think in those terms. I am that, full stop. We never come to that realization, totally. There is some

part of me which is clear and that clarity is going to act upon that which is not clear. Always this goes on.

RS: Yes.

K: I am saying the whole content of one's consciousness is unclear, messy. There is no part of it that's clear. We think there is a part, which is the observer, separating himself from the mess. So the observer is the observed. Gurus, and all that.

DB: You were raising the question of action, though; if that is the case, how is action to take place?

K: When there is perception of that which is true, that very truth is sufficient, it is finished.

DB: You have said also, for example, that that-ness itself realizes its own messiness, right?

K: Yes. Messiness, it's finished.

RS: Sir, are you suggesting that the realization of the messiness itself in some way dissolves the messiness?

K: Yes. Not a separative realization that I am messy. The fact is consciousness is messy, full stop. And I can't act upon it. Because previously acting upon it was a wastage of energy. Because I never solved it. I have struggled, I have taken vows, I have done all kinds of things to resolve this messy stuff. And it has never been cleared. It may partially occasionally...

JH: Well, I think that's another aspect of this. In therapy or in our own lives we seem to have insights that are partial, that we clear up a particular problem and gain some clarity and order for a time. And then the thing returns in some other form or...

K: Yes, yes.

JH: ...the same form. You're suggesting that the thing needs to

be done across the board in some way.

K: Before the observer acts upon it, upon the messy consciousness, right? Say, I'll clear this up, give it time, you know all the rest of it. But that's a wastage of energy.

JH: Right.

K: When the fact that you are that - you are not wasting energy. Which is attention. I don't know if you want to go into this.

RS: No, this is very interesting. Please do.

K: Would we agree that acting upon it is a wastage of energy?

JH: Yes. This creates more disorder.

K: No. It creates much disorder, and there is this constant conflict between me and the not me. The me who is the observer and I battle with it, control it, suppress it, anxious, worry, you follow? Which is all essentially wastage of energy. Whereas this messy consciousness is me. I have come to realize that through attention. Not I have come to - sorry.

DB: Would you say that the consciousness itself has come to realize it?

K: Yes.

DB: I mean, it's not me, right?

K: Yes. Which is total attention I am giving to this consciousness - not I am - there is attention and inattention. Inattention is wastage of energy. Attention is energy. When there is observation that consciousness is messy, that fact can only exist when there is total attention. And when there is total attention, it doesn't exist any more, confusion. It's only inattention that creates the problems. Refute it!

RS: But, sir, I don't understand entirely what you're saying. This

total attention that you're talking about would only be able to have this effect if it somehow was something completely in the present and devoid of memory.

K: Of course, of course, attention is that. If I attend to what you have said just now, devoid of memory, which is attention, I listen to you not only with the sensual ear, but with the other ear, which is, I am giving my whole attention to find out what you are saying; which is actually in the present. In attention there is no centre.

RS: Because the attention and the thing attended to become one, you mean. You mean there's no centre in the attention because the attention is all there is, the thing attended to and the attention is all there is.

K: Ah, no, no. There is messiness because I have been inattentive. Right?

RS: Yes.

K: When there is the observation of the fact that the observer is the observed, and that state of observation in which there is no observer as the past, that is attention.

Sir, I don't know if you have gone into the question of meditation here. That's another subject.

JH: That may be a relevant subject. It seems that what you're talking about may happen partially.

K: Ah! It can't happen, then you keep partial mess and partial not mess. We're back again the same position.

JH: Yes.

RS: But do you think this kind of attention you're talking about is the sort of thing that many people experience occasionally in moments of great beauty, or occasionally a piece of music they're

really enjoying, they lose themselves, and so on - do you think that many of us have had glimpses of this in these kinds of experiences?

K: That's it. That's it. When I see a mountain, the majesty and the dignity and the depth of it drives away myself. A child with a toy, the toy absorbs him. The mountain has absorbed me; toy has absorbed the child. I say that means there is something outside which will absorb me, which will make me peaceful. Which means an outside agency that'll keep me quiet: God, prayer, looking up to something or other. If I reject an outside agency completely, nothing can absorb me. Let's say, if you absorb me, when you are gone I am back to myself.

JH: Yes.

K: So I discard any sense of external agency which will absorb me. So I am left with myself, that's my point.

JH: I see. So you're suggesting that when this happens partially it's because we're depending on something.

K: Yes, of course.

JH: I see.

K: It's like my depending on my wife.

JH: Or my therapist or my problem.

K: Something or other.

JH: Yes.

K: Like a Hindu, Catholic or anybody, they depend on something. Therefore dependence demands attachment.

JH: Now it's possible to listen to you say this and have the idea of what you are talking about and try and do that.

K: Ah, you can't do it! That means you are acting again. You

want something out of it. In exchange I'll give you this, you give me that. Just a trade. Here it's not like that, you are enquiring into something which demands a great deal of thought, great deal of intelligence and attention. I say, look, why is there this division, this mess in the world? Because our consciousness is messy and so the world is messy. So from that arises, is it possible to be free of the self? Consciousness, the messy consciousness, is the self.

RS: It is not possible to be free from the contents of consciousness, different experiences, as long as my eyes are open, I'm looking, I see all sorts of different things. Now what you were saying about the attention when one's looking at a mountain, for example, are you suggesting that if I have that same kind of attention to everything I experience, that then this is the...

K: You see, again you experience.

RS: Yes, well, all right, but...

K: You are the experience.

RS: Yes.

K: Right. That means, there is no experience.

RS: There's just attention, you mean.

K: Experience involves remembrance. Time, which is the past. Therefore the experiencer is the experienced. If I seek illumination, enlightenment, or whatever you might call it, I am then trying to do all kinds of things to achieve that. But I don't know what illumination is. I don't know. Not because you said it or Buddha said it or somebody has said it: I don't know. But I am going to find out. Which means the mind must be totally free: from prejudice, from fear, all the rest of that messy business. So my concern is not illumination, but whether the content of my consciousness can be

cleansed - whatever word you use. That's my concern - not concern, that's my enquiry. And as long as I am separate from my consciousness, I can experience it, I can analyze it, I can tear it to pieces, act upon it - which means perpetual conflict with me and my consciousness. I wonder why we accept all this. Why do I accept that I am a Hindu? Why do I accept I am a Catholic? You follow?

RS: Yes.

K: Why do we accept what other people say?

JH: Well, we say it ourselves.

K: Yes. No, not only we say it but it's encouraged, sustained, nourished by people outside. Why? Why do we accept it? He is a professor and he is teaching me, I accept that. Because he knows biology much more than I do, I go to his class, and I am being informed by what he says. But he's not my guru, he's not my behaviour guide. He is giving me information about biology and I am interested in it. I want to study it, I want to go out into the field and do all kinds of stuff. But why do we accept authority, psychological authority, spiritual - quote spiritual - authority? Again we come back to security. I don't know what to do but you know better than I do; you are my guru. I refuse that position.

RS: But don't we arrive at the same set of problems if we start not from authority but from responsibility; say I'm the father, I have this child - we've agreed some time ago...

K: You have to instruct it, of course.

RS: You have to look after this baby.

K: Of course, of course.

RS: Fine. But now in order to feed the baby you become

preoccupied with security: job tenure, you know, house...

K: Of course, of course.

RS: ...protecting the house against marauders and so on.

K: Of course, of course.

RS: Don't you get into the same lot of things about preoccupation with security starting not from authority but from responsibility for others, for children, for example.

K: Of course.

RS: So then what is the answer to that. It's easy to say you should reject responsibility.

K: Of course, I have money, if I earn money, job, so on, I have to look after myself, I have servants, I have to look after servants, my children, perhaps their children too. I am responsible for all that.

RS: Yes.

K: Physically I am responsible. To give them food, to give the right amount of money, allow their children go to a proper school like my children, I am responsible for all that.

RS: But isn't that going to bring you back to the same position of insecurity and so on that you were trying to dissolve by this rejection of authority?

K: I don't see why I need spiritual or psychological authority. Because if I know how to read myself, I don't need anybody to tell me. But we have never attempted deeply to read the book of myself. I come to you and say, please, help me to read. And then the whole thing is lost.

JH: But I think what Rupert is asking is that if we start by assuming responsibility for other people, that entails...

K: What? My earning capacity.

JH: Which must be secure.

K: Yes, secure as much as possible. Not in countries where there's tremendous unemployment.

JH: So you're saying that that doesn't entail any psychological insecurity.

K: Of course not. But when I say, he's my servant, I'm going to keep him in that place, you follow?

JH: No. Tell me more.

K: I mean, I treat him as a servant.

JH: Yes.

K: Which becomes irresponsible. Naturally.

JH: But if it's a servant, he can come and go. But if it's a child...

K: Ah!

JH: ...he can't come and go.

K: He's part of my family.

DB: I think the question is something like this, that suppose you are responsible for a family and the conditions are difficult, you may not have a job and you may start to worry about it and become insecure psychologically.

K: Yes.

DB: Right?

K: I don't worry about it, there it is, I have no more money. So, my friend, I have no more money, if you want to stay, share the little food I have, we'll share it.

DB: You're saying that even if you are unemployed and you are responsible for a family it will not disturb the order of the mind, right?

K: Of course not.

DB: You will find an intelligent way to solve it.

K: Deal with it.

DB: Yes.

RS: But this kind of worry as a result of responsibility is relative.

K: I don't call it worry. I am responsible.

RS: Yes.

K: And therefore I look after as much as I can.

RS: What if you can't?

K: You can't. Why should I worry and bother, I can't, it's a fact.

DB: You're saying that it's possible to be completely free of worry, for example, in the face of great difficulties.

K: You see, that's what I am saying. Where there is attention, there is no worry, because there is no centre from which you are attending.

RS: There are still problems and there may still be responsibilities that one has.

K: Of course I have problems, so I resolve them.

RS: But if you can't resolve them.

K: Then I can't.

RS: If your family is starving.

K: I can't. Why should I worry about it? I can't be Queen of England.

RS: No.

K: No.

RS: But if you're a poor Indian, unemployed, your family is starving, there's nothing, you've tried everything, you've failed.

And you don't worry. Actually, surprisingly enough, a lot of poor Indians in just that situation don't worry, that's the most amazing thing about India. But then of course people coming along looking from outside say, well, this is fatalism.

K: Yes, that's right.

RS: And it's often regarded as the disease of India, the very fact that so many people manage not to worry in those circumstances... to the degree that we would expect.

K: I'd like to ask you a question. You've listened to all this: messy consciousness - does one realize it, and empty the content: fear, you know, the whole business? Does it interest you?

JH: Yes.

K: Totally?

JH: Yes.

K: That means what?

JH: It means you just listen.

K: No, it means a conversation, dialogue between us. Penetrating deeper and deeper and deeper. Which means you must be free to examine. Free from your prejudice, from your previous experience. Of course, otherwise you can't examine. You can't investigate... 'investigate' means explore, you know, push, push, push it further and further. Now, are you, are we willing to do that, so that actually the self is not? But when the self is not it doesn't mean you neglect your wife, your children - you follow? It becomes so silly, like becoming a sannyasi, going off to the mountains, a monk going off into a monastery. That's an extraordinary escape. The fact is I have to deal with my wife and children and if I have a servant. Can I be so totally without the self

that I can intelligently deal with these problems?

OJAI 4TH CONVERSATION WITH BOHM, HIDLEY & SHELDRAKE 18TH APRIL 1982 'THE NATURE OF THE MIND'

K: I don't capture the depth of your meaning, what is implied. You have gone into it and you can say that, absolute attention. I hear it and make it into an idea. And then I pursue the idea.

JH: That seems to be the process.

K: That's what we do all the time.

RS: Yes.

K: So it's gone. Idea is not what you said. What you said had depth in it.

JH: But we don't know that we're pursuing an idea.

TOM KRAUSE: This is one of a series of dialogues between J Krishnamurti, David Bohm, Rupert Sheldrake and John Hidley. The purpose of these discussions is to explore essential questions about the mind: what is psychological disorder and what is required for fundamental psychological change?

J Krishnamurti is a religious philosopher, author and educator who has written and given lectures on these subjects for many years. He has founded elementary and secondary schools in the United States, England and India. David Bohm is professor of theoretical physics at Birkbeck College, London University in England. He has written numerous books concerning theoretical physics and the nature of consciousness. Professor Bohm and Mr Krishnamurti have held previous dialogues on many subjects.

Rupert Sheldrake is a biologist whose recently published book proposes that learning in some members of a species affects the

species as a whole. Dr Sheldrake is presently consulting plant physiologist to the International Crops Research Institute in Hyderabad, India.

John Hidley is a psychiatrist in private practice who has been associated with the Krishnamurti school in Ojai, California for the past six years.

The first three dialogues have focused on various processes of self-identification, and their effects. The need for psychological security has been discussed as growing out of a basic division in which the contents of consciousness appear to be separate from consciousness itself. Today's discussion begins with the importance of attention.

K: What is analysis? And what is observation? In analysis there is the analyzer and the analyzed. And so there is always that difference maintained. Where there is difference there must be conflict, division, and that's one of the factors that really is very destructive to the whole psychological freedom: this conflict, this division. And analysis maintain this division. Whereas if one observes closely - I'm not correcting you, sir, I'm just enquiring... the analyzer is the analyzed. Again the same problem, thought has divided the analyzer and the analyzed. The analyzer is the past who has acquired a lot of knowledge, information, separated himself, and is either correcting the observed, the analyzed: make him conform, he is acting upon it. Whereas the analyzer is the analyzed. I think if that is really understood very deeply, the psychological conflict ends, because in that there is no division between the analyzer and the analyzed, there is only observation. Which Dr Bohm and we discussed at considerable length last year.

So if that is clearly understood - I am not laying down the law, but as one has observed this whole business of conflict - whether one can live the whole of one's life without conflict. That means the controller is absent; which is a very dangerous question. I feel where there is inattention, lack of attention, is the really the whole process of conflict.

RS: Yes, I can see that if both sides saw this with the utmost clarity...

K: Yes. That means they are giving intelligence to the whole problem.

RS: What happens if only one party in a conflict sees it with that utmost clarity?

K: What happens? One gives complete attention in one's relationship between man and woman; let's begin with that. You have given complete attention. When she insults you, when she flatters you, when she bullies you or when she is attached to you, all that is the lack of attention. If you give complete attention and the wife doesn't, then what happens? That is the same problem. Either you try to explain day after day, go into it with her patiently. After all, attention implies also great deal of care, affection, love. It's not just mental attention. It's attention with all your being. Then either she moves along with you, comes over to your side, as it were, or she holds on to her separative contradictory state. Then what happens? One is stupid, the other is intelligent.

RS: But the conflict...

K: So there is always the battle between the stupid and the ignorant. I mean between the ignorant, the stupid and the intelligent.

JH: A thing that seems to happen in that situation is that the one's intelligence makes room in which the other person who is caught in some attachment may have freedom to look.

K: But if the other refuses to look at it, then what is the relationship between the two people?

JH: There is none.

K: That's all. You see tribalism is deadly, destructive. You see it basically, fundamentally, and I don't. You have seen it probably immediately and I'll take many years, a long time to come to that. Will you have the - I won't use the word patience - will you have the care, affection, love, so that you understand my stupidity? I may rebel against you. I may divorce you. I may run away from you. But you have sown the seed somewhere in me. But that does happen, doesn't it, really, in life?

RS: Yes.

JH: You said something that interests me here, you said that if you have seen it immediately and the other person may take a long time to come to seeing it. And it seems like in this attention that you're talking about, perception is immediate.

K: Of course.

JH: It isn't built up out of...

K: Oh, no, no, then it's not perception.

JH: Well, that may be part of the reason the other person is having difficulty seeing it, is that they want it to be proved to them.

K: You see conditioning...

JH: Yes.

K: ...is destructive. And I don't.

JH: Yes.

K: What is our relationship between us two? It's very difficult to communicate with each other...

JH: Yes.

K: ...verbally or with care, it's very difficult.

JH: You won't know what I'm talking about.

K: And also I'm resisting you all the time. I'm defending myself.

JH: You're defending what you think you see.

K: What I think is right. I have been brought up as a Hindu or a British or a German or a Russian, whatever it is, and I like it. And I see the danger of letting that go. I might lose my job. People will say I'm little-minded. People might say I depend on public opinion, so I'm frightened to let go. So I stick to it. Then what is your relationship with me? Have you any relationship?

JH: No.

K: No, I question whether you have no relationship.

JH: I can tell you what I see.

K: Yes. But if you have love for me, real, not just attachment, and sex and all that business, if you really care for me, you cannot lose that relationship. I may run away, but you have the feeling of relationship. I don't know if I am conveying what I mean.

JH: In other words, I don't just say, well, I see it and you don't, and if you're not going to listen, the heck with you.

K: No. Sir, you have established a kind of relationship, perhaps very profound, when there is love. I may reject you, but you have that responsibility of love. And not only to the particular person, but to the whole of humanity. What do you say, sir, about all this?

DB: Well, I can't say. I think that this care and attention are the essential points. For example in the question of the observer and

the observed or the analyzer and the analyzed, the reason why that separation occurs is because there has not been enough attention.

K: Attention, that's what I'm saying.

DB: So that one has to have that same attitude even in looking at one's own psychological problems.

JH: An attitude of care?

DB: Care and attention to what's going on, you see, one starts to analyze by habit, and one might condemn that, for example, that would not be the right attitude. But one has to give care and attention to exactly what is happening in that just as in relationship with people, right? And it's because that there was no attention or not the right kind of attention that that division arose in the first place, and was sustained, right?

RS: But it's possible to have perhaps this kind of attention towards people that we know: wives, children, friends, etcetera, but what about people we don't know? I mean, most of us have never met any Russians, for example, and we feel, many of us, there's this terrible fear of Russia and Russian nuclear weapons and the Russian threat and all the rest of it. And so it's very easy to think, well, we've got to have all these bombs and so on because the Russians are so terrible. We can think all these things about Russians, we've never met them. So how do we have attention to enemies or imagined enemies that we don't know?

K: What is an enemy? Is there such thing as an enemy?

RS: Well, there are enemies in the sense that there are people who...

K: ...who disagree with you...

RS: ...not only disagree.

K: ...who have definite idealistic ideological differences.

RS: Well, they're usually people who are afraid of us, I mean, the Russians are afraid of us and we're afraid of them. Because they're afraid of us they're in a position of being our enemies.

K: Because we are still thinking in terms of tribalism.

RS: Yes, certainly.

K: Supposing you and I move out of that. I'm Russian, you are English or British or German or French. I move, I despise this sense of tribalism. What's my relationship then with you?

RS: Well, we...

K: I'm not Russian then.

RS: No.

K: I'm a human being with all my psychological problems and you are another human being with all your psychological problems. We are human beings, not labels.

DB: Of course the Russians may reject this, you see, that is, suppose we're in this situation...

K: We are in that...

DB: ...and the Russians will reject this, right. Then what's the next step, right?

K: So what shall we do? You see, I represent all humanity. I am all humanity. I feel that way. To me it's an actuality, not just an emotional explosion, emotional, romantic idea. I feel I am the rest of mankind; I am mankind. Because I suffer or I enjoy, I go through all the tortures and so do you, so do you. So you are the rest of mankind. And therefore you have terrible responsibility in that. So when you meet a Russian or a German or a British or Argentine you treat them as human beings, not labels.

RS: Then does this simply mean that in this largely tribal society with governments and bombs and weapons of war, there'll just be a few individual scattered here and there who've dissolved tribalism in themselves?

K: Yes. If a hundred of us all over the world really had a non-tribalistic attitude towards life, we would be acting like a - I don't know - like a light in the midst of darkness. But we don't. This just becomes an idealistic romantic idea and you drop it because each pursues his own way.

RS: Yes.

K: Sir, I think we ought to differentiate between attention and concentration. Concentration is focussing your energy on a certain point; and in attention, there is no focussing on a certain point. It's attention.

JH: Concentration seems to have a goal in mind.

K: A goal, motive; it's a restrictive process. I concentrate on a page, but I am looking out of the window and I'll pull it back and keep on this business. Whereas if I give complete attention to what I am looking out of the window, that lizard which is going along the wall, and with that same attention I can look at my book, look what I am doing.

JH: Concentration presupposes that there's a controller in there pulling back.

K: That's just it.

RS: But then, if there's no controller of the attention, the attention is simply a response to whatever the present circumstances are.

K: You insult me; I'm attentive. There is no recording that

insult.

DB: Yes, that's it.

K: You flatter me: what a marvellous talk you gave the other day. I've heard this so often repeated. And I'm bored with it, so - I'm not only bored, I see - what? You follow, sir? Is it possible... really, that's the much more difficult question - is it possible not to record, except where it is necessary? It's necessary to record when you are driving. To learn how to drive. Record when you do your business and all the rest of it. But psychologically, what is the need to record?

RS: Isn't it inevitable? Doesn't our memory work automatically?

K: Memory is rather selective.

JH: We seem to remember things that are important to us...

RS: Yes.

JH: ...have some connection with who we think we are and what our goals are.

DB: It seems to me that when there is paying attention then in general attention determines what is to be recorded and what is not, that is, it is not automatic any more.

K: It's not automatic any more. Quite right.

DB: If it comes from the past, from the concentration or from the analysis, then it will be automatic.

K: Another problem which we ought to discuss - we said yesterday we would - religion, meditation, and if there is something sacred. We said we would talk about that.

Is there anything sacred in life? Not thought creating something sacred, and then worshipping that sacred, which is absurd. The symbols in all the Indian temples, they're religious, like in the

Christian church, or in the Muslim mosque there is this marvellous writing, which is the same. And we worship that.

JH: That's idolatry.

K: No. Thought has created this. The thought has created the image and then it worships it. I don't know if you see the absurdity of it.

RS: Well, that's manifestly absurd, but the more sophisticated members of different religions would say that it's not the thought, the image created by thought that's being worshipped, but the image points to something beyond thought which is being worshipped.

K: Wait a minute, let's look at it. That is, the symbol, we know symbol is not the real, but why do we create the symbol? Please answer it. If there is something beyond, why do we create the intermediary?

RS: Well, I think that this is a question which in certain religions has been central to them: the Jews, who were against all idolatry for exactly this reason, and the Muslims, who don't have images in the mosques.

K: No but they have these scripts.

RS: They have writing.

K: Of course.

RS: But they think writing is what tells them about what lies beyond all symbols, you see.

K: Yes.

RS: Now you could say the writing simply becomes a symbol, but I mean, these are words, and words can help us. We're having a discussion, and these words that we're having, your words may

help me, for example. If they're written down, then they're written words like Muslim words.

K: So; why do I have to have an intermediary at all?

JH: Because I think I'm here and it's over there and I don't have it. I need some way to get there.

K: No, you're not answering my question. Is it that you, the intermediary, understand or realized or follow truth or whatever it is, therefore you are telling me about it?

JH: Well, maybe I've seen something and I want to tell you about it.

K: Yes, tell me about it, but why do you make yourself interpreter? Why do you become the intermediary between that - I don't know what that is - and me, who is ignorant, who is suffering? Why don't you deal with my suffering rather than with that?

JH: I think that that will deal with your suffering. If I can get you to...

K: That has been, sir, that has been the old trick of all the priests in the world. We have had priests from time immemorial, right?

JH: Yes.

K: But you haven't released my sorrow. I am still suffering after a million years. What for? Help me to get rid of that. Help me to be free, without fear, then I'll find out. Is it that you want position, power, status, like the rest of the world? Now this is really quite serious.

DB: I think, you know, if we try to give the priests the most favourable interpretation, that they may have considered, at least, the best among them, that as a kind of poetic imagery that people

may use to point to something beyond that, right, in a communication, and they are trying to point to this sacred which we were talking about. That's perhaps the way they would look at it. Now would you say that that would that make no sense, you know, to have a poetic image to point to the sacred.

K: But, sir, why don't you help me to see what is happening to me?

DB: Yes, that's your point, don't point to the sacred right away but look at this first.

K: Help me to be free of it, then I'll walk.

DB: Yes, I understand that.

K: We have never talked - nobody has gone into this like that. Always god, some saviour, some Brahma, and so on, so on. And this is what we call religion. All the rituals are invented by thought, marvellous architecture by thought, all the things inside the churches, temples, mosques, created by thought. And thought creates it, then thought worships it. But thought is not sacred.

JH: Yes, I see that. So you are saying, is it possible to put a stop to thought?

K: Thought. Is it possible?

JH: And thought is the thing that gets in the way by creating the images...

K: Of course.

JH: ...which we take for something really valuable.

K: I start out looking for something sacred. You come along and say, I'll tell you all about it. Then you begin to organize it. It's all gone by then, it's finished.

JH: Then I just stay within thought, that's all I have.

K: So, if we reject or understand that thought is not sacred, there's nothing holy about thought, but thought thinks that what it has created is holy. Right, sir?

DB: Right. Would you also add that time is not sacred.

K: Nothing in time, of course not.

DB: Nothing in time, or people would say that.

K: Tomorrow is not sacred!

DB: They always say only the eternal is sacred.

K: But to find out what is eternity, time must stop.

JH: But we get into a real subtle place here, because you have said things like, absolute attention dissolves the self. Then absolute attention can become a thought.

K: Idea of it, yes.

JH: Yes, the idea of it. So we may go the route of creating the idea. That seems to always be the danger.

K: You make a statement: absolute attention. I don't capture the depth of your meaning, what is implied. You have gone into it and you can say that, absolute attention. I hear it and make it into an idea. And then I pursue the idea.

JH: That seems to be the process.

K: That's what we do all the time.

RS: Yes.

K: So it has gone. Idea is not what you said. What you said had depth in it.

JH: But we don't know that we're pursuing an idea. We don't realize at the time that we're pursuing an idea.

K: Of course not, because I am used to this reducing everything to abstract ideas. So could we try to find out or realize that

anything though does is not sacred?

RS: That seems self-evident to me.

K: All right. That's self-evident. In all the religions as they are now, there is nothing sacred. Right?

RS: No, there's nothing sacred in itself in the words or the buildings or so on. But in a sense all these religions are supposed to point beyond themselves.

K: Yes. And to help me to go beyond all this, I must start with my being free from my agony, understand my relationship with people. If there is confusion here, in my heart and my mind, what's the good of the other? I am not materialistic. I am not anti the other. But I say, look, I must start where I am. To go very far, I must start very near. I am very near. So I must understand myself. I'm the rest of humanity. I am not an individual. So, there is the book of humanity in me. I am that book. If I know how to read it from the beginning to the end, then I can I find if there is a possibility, if there is really something that is immense, sacred. But if you are all the time saying, look, there is that, that will help you, I say, it hasn't helped me. We have had these religions for millions of years. That hasn't - on the contrary, You have distracted from 'what is'.

So, if I want to find out if there is anything sacred, I must start very near. The very near is me. And can I free myself from fear and agony, sorrow, despair, all that? When there is freedom I can move, I can climb mountains.

RS: Sir, are you saying that the sacred would become apparent if we dissolved fear and all these other things.

K: Obviously, sir. That's real meditation, you see.

RS: Through attention to what is really happening in us.

K: That's it.

RS: And what is really happening between us and other people and all the rest of it.

K: Between our relationships.

RS: Yes. Through attention to this, this action...

K: ...attention and we have discussed too with Dr Bohm, some time ago, having an insight into the whole movement of the self, which is not a remembrance. Insight is total perception of what you are, without analysis, without investigation, all that, total immediate perception of the whole content of your consciousness, not take bit by bit by bit, that's endless.

JH: Oh, we're broken up so we look at each little piece.

K: Yes. And because we are broken up we can never see the whole. Obviously, that seems so logical!

JH: Okay.

K: So, is it possible not to be broken up? What is to be broken up? This confusion, this messy consciousness, which we talked about yesterday. You see nobody wants to go so deeply into all this. Right, sir? First of all, one hasn't the time; one is committed to one's job, to one's profession, to one's science, to one's whatever one is doing. And you say, please, this is too difficult or too abstract, not practical. That's the word they all use. As though all this, what you are doing and all is terribly practical. Our armaments, is it practical? Tribalism, is - oh well, you know all about it.

So, sir, let's move from there. Is silence of the mind a state of attention? Or is it beyond attention?

DB: What would you mean by beyond attention? Let's try to get into that.

K: Is attention an act of will? I will attend.

JH: No, we said that's concentration.

K: Sir, I am asking you, where there is attention is there any kind of effort? Struggle? I must attend. What is attention? Let's go into it a little bit. What is attention? The word diligent is implied in attention; to be diligent. Not negligent.

RS: What does diligent mean? Careful? You mean careful?

K: Yes. Care. To be very precise. Diligent.

DB: The literal meaning is taking pains.

K: Pains, that's right. Taking pain. Which is to care, to have affection, to do everything correctly; orderly; not repetitive. Does attention demand the action of thought?

RS: Well, it doesn't demand the action of analysis, in the way you've explained it.

K: No.

RS: ...and insofar as thought is analytical, it doesn't demand that. And it doesn't demand the action of will insofar as will involves a separation, an attempt to, by one part of the mind, to force another part to do something else. It doesn't imply any sense of going anywhere or becoming anything because becoming leads one out of the present.

K: That's right. You can't become attentive.

RS: But in the act of attention...

K: Just see what is implied. You can't become attentive. That means in attention there is no time. Becoming implies time.

RS: Yes.

K: In attention there is no time. Therefore it is not the result of thought.

RS: Yes.

K: Now: is that attention silence of the mind? Which is a healthy, sane mind: uncluttered, unattached, unanchored, free mind, which is the healthiest mind. Therefore I am asking, in that attention, is the mind silent? There is no movement of thought.

RS: Well, it sounds like it, yes. It sounds like a state of being rather than a state of becoming because it's not going anywhere, or coming from anywhere.

K: Again, when you say being, what does that mean? Being what?

RS: Well, being what it is. It's not being something else.

K: No, what does that mean, being? Are you putting being as a opposite to becoming?

RS: Yes.

K: Ah, then. The opposite has its own opposite.

RS: Well, by being I simply mean a state which is not in a process of going somewhere else in time.

K: Which means non-movement.

RS: I suppose so.

DB: You could say that, yes.

K: Non-movement.

DB: If you say what you mean by movement, that it doesn't mean it's static to say it's non-movement.

K: No, it's dynamic, of course.

DB: But you see it's a little difficult...

K: There is no moving from here to there.

DB: But there is another kind of movement, perhaps.

K: That's what I want to go into. If we use the word being without movement, it is without thought, without time, which is the movement which we know. But the other has its own dynamism, its own movement, but not this movement, the time movement, the thought movement. Is that what you call being?

RS: I suppose it is.

K: Is that being silent? You follow, sir? We have various forms of silence. Right?

RS: Yes. It may not be silent in the sense of soundless.

K: I am using the word 'silence' in the sense, without a single movement of thought.

RS: Well, in that sense it must be silent almost by definition.

K: Yes. So, has my mind - the mind - has it stopped thinking? Has it - not stopped thinking - has thought found its own place and therefore it's no longer moving, chattering, pushing around. Because there is no controller. You follow? Because when there is a great silence, then that which is eternal is. You don't have to enquire about it. It's not a process. It isn't something you achieve, my God! By fasting, by rituals, by all these absurdities. Sir, you hear that.

JH: Yes.

K: You hear X saying that. What value has it? Value in the sense, what do you do with it? Has it any importance or none at all? Because you are going your way. You are a psychologist, you'll go your way, I'll go my way, I have said what I have to say and there it ends. Then somebody comes along and says, I'll tell you what he means. You haven't the time. He has a little time, he

says, I'll tell you all about it. And you are caught. This is what is happening. From the ancient of times, the Sumerians, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, they have played this. And we are doing still the same kind of nonsense. And what has religion done to man? It hasn't helped him. It has given him romantic illusory comfort. Actually look - we're killing each other - I won't go into that.

So, sir, let's begin. What is a healthy mind?

JH: It's a mind that's not caught so in this...

K: A mind that's whole, healthy, sane, holy; h-o-l-y, holy. All that means a healthy mind. That's what we started discussing. What is a healthy mind? The world is so neurotic. How are we going to tell you, as an analyst, as a psychologist, how are you going to tell people what is a healthy mind, nobody's going to pay attention. They'll listen to the tape, to television, and they'll agree, but they'll go on their own way. So what do we do? First of all, do I have a healthy mind? Or is it just a lot of pictures, words, images? A mind that's totally unattached, to my country, to my ideas - all totally dispassionately unattached.

JH: And you are suggesting that only then am I in a position to talk to anybody?

K: Obviously! Obviously. I may be married. I may, but why should I be attached to my wife?

JH: Then it's an idea of marriage, it's not a marriage.

K: But love is not attachment. So have I realized that? A healthy mind that says, I love, therefore there is no attachment. Is that possible?

RS: Sir, you make it sound so easy and so difficult at the same

time because...

K: I don't see why it's difficult.

RS: Because you see, I hear what you say, I think this is absolutely wonderful stuff. I want to have a healthy mind, I want to be in a state of being, and then you see I realize that it's back into this, that I can't become in a state of having a healthy mind and I can't move by an act of will or desire into this state. It has to happen. And it can't happen through any act of my will.

K: No. So.

RS: I have to let it happen in some sense.

K: So we begin to enquire. You begin to say, now, why? Why am I not healthy? Am I attached to my house? I need a house, why should I be attached to it. A wife, relationship, can't exist without relationship, life is relationship. But why should I be attached to a person? Or to an idea, to a faith, to a symbol, you follow? The whole cycle of it. To a nation, to my guru to my god, you follow? Attach mean attached right through. A mind can be free of all that. Of course it can.

RS: But not just by wanting to be free of it.

K: No. But seeing the consequences of it, seeing what is involved in it: the pain, the pleasure, the agony, the fear, you follow, all that is involved in that. Such a mind is an unhealthy mind.

RS: Yes, but one can even agree with that, one can even see it, one can even see the movements of one's attachments, one can even see the destructive consequences of all this. But that doesn't in itself seem automatically to dissolve it.

K: Of course not. So, it brings in quite a different question.

Which is, sir, do you hear it, merely with your sensory ears or do you really hear it? You understand my question.

RS: Yes.

K: Is it just casual verbal sensory hearing, or hearing at depth? If you hear it at the greatest depth, then it's part of you. I don't know if...

DB: Well, I think that generally one doesn't hear at the greatest depth and something is stopping it, you see. All the conditioning.

K: And also probably we don't want to hear it.

DB: Well, but the conditioning makes us not want to hear it.

K: Of course, of course.

DB: We're unwilling to do so.

K: How can I say to my wife, I love you but I am not attached? She'll say, what the hell are you talking about? But if one sees the absolute necessity to have a healthy mind, and the demand for it, not only in myself, but in my children, my society.

JH: But you don't mean by that going around demanding of myself and other people that they become healthy.

K: No, no, no. I demand in myself. I ask why is not my mind healthy? Why is it neurotic? Then I begin to enquire. I watch, I attend, I am diligent in what I am doing.

DB: It seems to me that you say that we must have to see the absolute necessity of a healthy mind, but I think we've been conditioned to the absolute necessity of maintaining attachment. And that's what we feel, right?

RS: Well, we haven't necessarily, you see, there are many people who've seen that there are all these problems, there's something wrong with the mind, they feel that something could be

done about it and all that, and then take up some kind of spiritual practice, meditation, what not. Now you're saying that all these kinds of meditation, concentrating on chakras and what not are all just the same kind of thing.

K: I have played that trick long ago.

RS: Yes.

K: And I see the absurdity of all that. That is not going to stop thought.

RS: Well, some of these methods are supposed to. I don't know if they do or not, you see. They've never done it for me.

K: No

RS: But I don't know if that's because I haven't done them right.

K: So instead of going through all that business, why don't you find out. Let's find out what is thought, whether it can end, what is implied, you follow? Dig.

Sir, at the end of these four discussions, have you got healthy minds? Have you got a mind that is not confused, groping, floundering, demanding, asking? You follow, sir? What a business! It's like seeing a rattler and saying, yes, that's a rattler, I won't go near it. Finished!

JH: It looks from the inside like this is a tremendous deep problem that's very difficult to solve, and you're saying from the outside that it's just like seeing a rattler and you don't go near it, there's nothing to it.

K: It is like that with me.

JH: Yes.

K: Because I don't want to achieve nirvana or heaven or anything. I say, look - you follow?

JH: Well, I think it's interesting why it looks so deep when in fact it isn't.

K: No, sir, we are all so very superficial. Right? And that seems to satisfy us. That's our good house, good wife, good job, good relationship, don't disturb anything. I'll go to church, you go to the mosque, I'll go to the temple, keep things as they are.

JH: Well then you're saying we don't even want to look at it.

K: Of course not.

JH: But say we come with a problem...

K: Sir, if Mrs Thatcher and the gentleman in Argentina looked at it, how tribalistic they are, they would stop it. But they don't because the public doesn't want it. British - you follow? We are educated to be cruel to each other. I won't go into all that.

So, a healthy mind is that, sir. A healthy mind is without any conflict. And then it is a holistic mind. And then there's a possibility of that which is sacred to be. Otherwise all this is so childish.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 2ND MAY 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning? For those who were not here yesterday may we repeat something of what we said? We were saying yesterday morning how the world is broken up, divided through nationalism, which is really a form of tribalism, how religions have divided man, with their dogmas, with their beliefs, with their superstitions, illusions, how human beings have created sects, each one believing that they are going to lead mankind to a different kind of physical world and a so-called spiritual world. There have been various gurus, both in the West and in the East, with their peculiar beliefs and meditations and all that business. It is really good business! And also how man has created armies and all the implements of war to destroy each other in the name of their country, honour, prestige, freedom, anything, an idea to destroy each other. And also ideologically man again has divided himself as the as the totalitarians and the democratic group. While in one country there is absolutely no freedom, it is like living in a prison, and the others are free to do what they want to do. And also man had divided himself with his beliefs. Take in this little valley; if you observe, or if you have gone around, there are so many little sects, so many different congregations, different beliefs, different ideals, different prejudices, bias, and so on. They represent the world which is similar, with their bias, conclusions, ideals, faiths, following this person and worshipping that person, that symbol or another kind of symbol in the East or in the West. Wherever you go you see this extraordinary phenomenon; that man throughout his life has broken

not only the earth, the American earth, the English earth, the French and the Russian and Asiatic world; whatever he has touched has brought about misery. And also technologically, he has brought about great benefits. Technologically also, he has created wars.

And so we were saying yesterday the scientists have not helped man; he has helped him technologically, but also he has helped to further wars, the atomic bomb and the conventional war. So the scientists have not basically, fundamentally brought about a mutation in man's conditioning. Nor the politicians; nor the religious leaders, the organized belief, the organized faith, the organized conventional worship of a symbol, of a person, of a saviour. None of those people have helped man to end his sorrow, his loneliness, his despair, anxiety; nor local priests nor the gurus. Apparently throughout the ages man has been led. There have always been political leaders, religious leaders, and of course national heroes, who kill the most.

And observing all this, which is not a Western phenomenon, but also in the Asiatic world, observing all this, if one is at all serious, if one is at all concerned with man's mind, his heart, his whole existence; he must either escape from it all through another form of isolation, commune, or become a monk or escape through some form of entertainment, amusement. Or, if he is at all serious, he has to answer for all this, he is responsible for all this. I do not know how serious the listeners are, but if you are serious, what is your responsibility towards all this. How far will you go in your responsibility, how deeply, how widely; or limit oneself to one's own little life, one's own little experience, pleasures, and forget the

vast human suffering, poverty; not be concerned or be concerned with one particular type of war, or be concerned with the ending of all wars, not only outward war but also the inward struggle of man, his eternal conflict within himself and with his fellow man. This has been the history of man, thousands and thousands of years of evolution, man still remains as he was, slightly, probably, a little modified, but basically he is cruel, violent, antagonistic, competitive, and so on.

And, as we were saying yesterday also, each one of us thinks we are independent individuals with his own narrow problems and limited points of view. But when one begins to enquire deeply, as we are doing now, and I hope we can do this together, when we are enquiring deeply why human beings, after so many million years, why have we become like this, divided, fragmented, contradictory, confused, everlastingly seeking pleasure, never ending sorrow, never comprehending his relationship to the world and to each other. Why there is this infinite conflict between man and man.

We were saying also yesterday morning that our consciousness, that is, what you are; what you think, what you feel, your reactions, your beliefs, your conclusions, your experiences, your knowledge, your fears, anxieties, loneliness, despair and sorrow and the fear of death is common to all mankind. Wherever you go, man is conditioned to this state. Wherever you live, whether in the affluent society or in some poor village in a hamlet far from civilization, there too man suffers, is desperately lonely; anxious, insecure, like the rest of the mankind. As we were saying also, seeing this, one begins to question whether there is individuality at all. Or, there is only humanity and you are humanity. Essentially, deeply you are

the rest of mankind. But unfortunately we have been educated, conditioned, both religiously and environmentally, educated to the idea that we are separate individuals, each one seeking his own particular salvation, particular happiness, particular enjoyment of life. And this has given a great sense of freedom, each one doing what he wants to do. That is choice. He thinks he is free, because he can choose. But the movement of choice is in the same field from one corner to another. This is not freedom. So we were saying yesterday our consciousness, which is our human daily existence is the rest of humanity. And that consciousness in itself is contradictory; in itself broken up, fragmented.

As we were saying also, this is not a lecture. Lecture being talking about a particular subject in view of giving further information about that subject. In that sense this is not a lecture. But we are thinking together, if that is at all possible. Thinking together, observing together this extraordinary phenomena, what man has become, and what he has done with the world, with his own life, and with the life of the world around him. And so we are observing very closely, impartially, dispassionately, what we are and what we have made of the world. So please, if you are at all serious, and one must be serious because the world is in a terrible state; there is tremendous danger for each of us. And so we are thinking together, observing together, not agreeing together, not seeing things as I see it or as you see it, with our own particular bias, our own prejudices, our own nationalistic, idiotic points of view; but rather be free to observe. Free to observe implies not to have any bias, to see exactly what is going on outwardly. If we do not see that accurately, then we will not be able to relate ourselves

to that accurately, precisely. If one observes clearly, without any motive, without any direction, just to observe as you would observe a mountain; it is there, majestic, silent, immovable. In the same way, to observe this extraordinary phenomena of man.

So we are together observing closely, hesitantly, attentively, this movement, this tide that goes out and comes in, which is what we are, we create the world, and then by the world we are trapped. We have created this society; not each one of us, but our past generations, those and us have created this present immoral, destructive society. And we are trapped by that society. That society is made by each one of us. So we are responsible for that society. Whether is possible, not to change society, but is it possible to radically, deeply transform our conditioning, which is, understand deeply our consciousness, which is what we are? Is it possible to transform, not into something, but to bring about a mutation in the very structure and nature of our consciousness. That is the problem. That is the crisis. it is not a political crisis, economic crisis, or the crisis of war, but the crisis is in ourselves. And we apparently cannot face that crisis, are unwilling to face it. And so we try to escape from that fact through various forms of entertainment religious, political, football, and all the rest of it.

Also, as we were saying yesterday morning, the content of our consciousness, the content being what you think, what you feel, your reactions, your longings, your despairs, your pleasures, your depressions, your faith, your dogmas, your sorrow, your beliefs, your desperate loneliness, and the fear of ultimate death; all that is your consciousness. That is what you are. And we are asking together whether the content can end. That is, the conditioning of

the human mind, human existence, can that be transformed. So we took yesterday the whole question of belief; which is part of our consciousness. The ideals, the faiths, that divide man against man; the totalitarian ideology and the democratic ideology; the Catholic ideology and the protestant ideology; their belief, their dogmas, their violence is the same in the Asiatic world. That's part of our consciousness, as nationalism, is part of our tribal consciousness. Whether that belief can end totally, completely, having no belief, ideals at all; but actually face facts as they are, not as they should be. Like each one of us seeing the fact of it, the truth of it, the reality of it, the logic it, whether we can be free totally from belief, from ideals, ideology. This requires a great deal of investigation, attention, energy to find out how our minds are crippled with beliefs and ideologies; which is an actual escape from that which is. And being incapable of meeting 'what is', we try to escape into some ideal; which we will go into more in detail as we go along.

And also we took yesterday this question of hurt, psychological, inward hurt of human beings; how each one of us from childhood till we die, we are always hurt by something or something or other. If you are aware of it as you are sitting there, I hope comfortably, whether one is aware that one is hurt, deeply hurt; by the parents, by the school, through comparison, through some kind of harsh word, through a gesture. And as we grow older we carry that hurt, consciously or unconsciously, deeply. And the consequences of that hurt are incredibly complex; because when one is afraid of getting more hurt, and the action from that hurt, either neurotic, defensive, and to defend oneself further from being hurt and therefore fear involved in that hurt. That's part of our

consciousness.

As we said, that hurt is the image we have built about oneself. Each one has an image about himself: various types of masks, various qualities and variety of images he has himself, built himself or society has given him the images, because it is one of these images that gets hurt. The image is me; the image is not different from me. We went into that yesterday. So whether it is possible to be totally, completely free from all hurts; never to be hurt; then only the mind can flower; then only there can be proper human relationship with each other. So it is very important to find out whether it is possible to be entirely free of an image about oneself; and it is that image that gets hurt. We went into it somewhat in detail yesterday.

So we should also go into the examination of the further content of one's consciousness. That is, relationship with our fellow man, relationship with another, relationship with the most intimate person; in that relationship, as one observes in daily life, there is a great deal of conflict. There is a great deal of struggle, happiness, ultimately ending in divorce and finding another and beginning same song again. This perpetual conflict between man and man between man and woman; why? We accept this conflict, or if we do not accept it and want to find a solution for it, we go to the professionals to help us, the psychologists, the priest, some authority, some specialist that will help us to get over our particular conflict with another. And apparently, as one observes, if you have also observed, this conflict doesn't end. You may cover it over, you may run away from it, you may somehow forget it and accept it, but there is the conflict, inwardly, in our relationship with all

human beings, however intimate, however distant. We have never asked why. Whether that conflict between human beings, intimate or otherwise, can ever end. This is an important question to ask, because all life is relationship, whether you live in a monastery or in a commune or live by yourself in a little flat. You are still related. Life is a movement in relationship. And in that movement there is apparently a great deal of conflict and misery. This is part of our consciousness, submerged or on the surface. Why, after a million years with all the information that we have, all the information which has become our knowledge, why has it not prevented us from this sorrow, conflict of this relationship? Please ask yourself this question. I am not asking you to ask this question. It is a natural question. We have to face this problem and resolve it. If it is not resolved, if we live in conflict, we'll inevitably create a society that will perpetuate this conflict. So please be serious, if you will, with regard to this question. Because it is very important; we are facing wars, war is this ultimate result of our endless conflict within ourselves, conflict with our most intimate persons. So this a very serious question which one must find an answer and resolve it. It is not an academic question, a theoretical question. It's a human question, in which we are all involved, every day of our life; why we live in conflict with our neighbour, whether that neighbour be far away or close by; why we have this struggle, this conflict between man and woman; various forms of struggle - sexual, the struggle of each one pursuing his own desire, his own ambition, his own fulfillment or her fulfillment, each one trying to become something different from each other. This is an obvious daily fact. You may meet in bed, but each one is pursuing different

lives, like two parallel lines never meeting; and this is called relationship, in which there is no actual sense of love.

We will go into: love is not pleasure, love is not desire, love is not seeking fulfillment, but we have made our relationship with each other a sense of fulfillment, pleasure, something to be desired and so on. So why do human beings so technologically intelligent, such extraordinary capacity and energy, why human beings have not solved this most essential question, problem. You may meditate. You may seek enlightenment. You may follow the latest guru, the latest expression of whatever you are following, but if you have not solved this problem, all your spiritual attainments and technological achievements have no value at all. Because our life is relationship, our life is something that cannot be lived by yourself in isolation, and because we live or attempt to live in isolation, we are bringing about great catastrophe. As a group, as nations which are isolating themselves - the American, the British, the French, the Russian, the Indian, and so on. This is a form of isolation, and in that isolation they are trying to find security. There is no security whatsoever in isolation. Because ultimately human beings are being destroyed. Similarly, if we have not resolved this essential basic question of relationship, which is at present isolating us from each other, this isolation must inevitably breed all kinds of misery, confusion, hatred, anger. So is it possible to have a relationship in which there is no conflict whatsoever?

What is relationship? What does it mean to be related to another, not physically only, but much more psychologically, deeply, which conditions our physical activity. We always forget that: that we want to improve the environment as society, and we

do all kind of legislative laws and so on, and so on, and so on. We never realize that psychologically if we are not clear what we do, we'll bring about a rotten society. Psychologically it is more important to transform our own conflicts, not end merely the outward conflicts. I hope we understand this deeply. The psychological conflicts will inevitably produce world conflict. But we are trying to change the outward structure without fundamentally psychologically, if I may use that word which is so abused, spiritually - if there is no fundamental basic transformation of the psyche, do what you will outwardly, what you have done outwardly will always be overcome by the psyche; as you see in the recent revolution of the Communists. They hoped through changing of the outward structure of society they would change man. And it has been totally the other way, which is so observable.

So relationship is extraordinarily important. And why is there this division between man, woman, between himself, within himself, and with his neighbour; the whole process of relationship? Are you waiting for the speaker to explain it away? Why we live in conflict with each other, man, woman, and so one. Or, we are together observing this phenomena; observing, not trying to resolve it; to observe first and to understand how to observe. Not how to resolve the problem, you understand? There is the problem; I am not married, suppose I am married, I am pursuing my own desires, my own ambition, my own success and so on, and she also is doing the same thing, in different forms, and we may have sex, and all that, children, but we two are separate entities, pursuing our own goals, our own way, our own fulfilment, doing our own thing, as you call it. And naturally, my wife and I are in contradiction,

irritated, not able to adjust, or not wanting to adjust. Because where there is love there is love there is no adjustment. So what shall I do? What is my action, or non-action - please listen carefully, action or non-action, because non-action will be far more important than action. The negation is the most positive action. That is, to see the false and see the truth in the false, is to end the false. Just to observe. But we are all so eager to act, to do something about it. My wife and I quarrel, we disagree, you know all the rest of the ugly business that goes on; you are probably much more aware of it than I am. The terrible tension; the loneliness; the ugliness of it all.

Now; together, we are going to observe, not to resolve the problem - please listen carefully - not to resolve, not to end it, or try to find a solution for this; but together we will observe. That is, how you approach the problem, that is, how you look at the problem; you understand? The approach is far more important than the problem itself; isn't it? If I am frightened of losing my wife; or, you know, all that business, I don't have to go into details of all that, my approach then is conditioned by my fear. And the solution then of the problem is conditioned by my fear; so it's not resolved. You understand? So, the approach matters far more than the problem itself. If we could understand this one simple thing. We are always concerned with the problem; the complexity of it, the analysis of the problem. Our mind is directed to the solution of the problem. We are saying - the speaker is saying - don't bother with the solution, but how you approach, how you come close to the problem, how you observe the problem is much more important than the problem itself. Have you got this? Even intellectually see

this; verbally: that the solution is not important; what is important is how you come to the problem, how you look at the problem. Is the problem out there and you are approaching it, or - please listen - or, the problem is you. You understand? I won't go into that for the moment, for that leads us somewhere else. So, as we are saying, the approach to the problem is all important. Right? Can we move from there? You are moving, I am not moving. We are saying, how you come to the problem, how you look at the problem, how you gather your energy to look at the problem. Is your approach directed, which means trying to resolve the problem, or have you a motive, and if you have a motive, you approach with that motive. So, when you approach with a motive, the motive is going to decide how you will deal with the problem. Whereas, if you have no motive - please, this demands accurate observation - when you have no motive and therefore no direction, then you are observing the problem purely, without any bias, without any discoloration. You are just observing it. Right? Are we doing this now as you go along? Please, this is not a game we are playing. It's not an intellectual amusement on Sunday morning. This is very, very serious, because life is relationship; if we don't understand that relationship, then we create havoc in the world; we destroy our children; we destroy each other, which we are doing now, through competition, through wars, through all the horror that man is doing.

So together we are observing, why human beings cannot live at peace with each other. That is the fact, that's an actual statement, not exaggerated; and our approach to it is either pure non-personal objective observation or you are approaching it with a personal

reaction. If you are approaching with a personal reaction, it'll go on forever, the conflict. But if you approach it objectively, dispassionately, without any direction; you understand - what is then the state of your mind - please follow this - what is then the state of your mind which looks at the problem? You have understood this? Have you understood, somebody? All right, let's put it the other way. Why is there conflict between man and woman, between man and man, you know, the whole relationship; why? Look at it please; answer it yourself, go into it yourself; don't depend on me, on the speaker, it's not worth it. It has no value. He is just a verbal entity, a telephone. But you have to find the answer; why. Is it - we are observing together, so you are not learning it from the speaker, he is not teaching you anything; please understand this. He is not teaching you a thing. Therefore you are not his followers; he is not your authority, he is not your guru. They have all led you astray. Because they have never been able to solve this problem, or never tackled this problem.

So; in observing together, we are going to discover why this conflict exists, whether it is possible to end it completely; not theoretically, not for a day; end it. This conflict exists, must exist - I don't want to tell you, because it becomes so silly. If I tell you, you'll say, yes, that's quite right; and then you are back. It isn't something that you yourself have discovered. You know what happens when you discover something for yourself psychologically? You have immense energy. And you need energy; to free the mind of its conditioning. I quarrel with my wife, if I have one, or a girl friend, whatever it is - quarrel with her because I am a lonely man; I want to possess her. I want to depend

on her, I want her comfort, her encouragement, her companionship; I want to have somebody who will tell me that I'm marvellous. So I am building an image about her; and she also wants to be possessed, wants to fulfil in me; sexually; wants me to be something different from what I am. So, there is this, each one living it may be for a week, or a day, or years, has built an image which becomes knowledge. Follow this, please follow this; knowledge about each other. Knowledge - may I go into it a little bit? This is serious. Knowledge is destructive in relationship. Right? If you once understand this: I say I know my wife because I have lived with her, I know all her tendencies, her irritations, impetuosity, her jealousy, which becomes my knowledge about her; how she walks, how she does her hair, how she moves - you follow? I have collected a lot of information and knowledge about her. And she has collected a lot of knowledge about me; so the past - you follow - knowledge is always the past. Right? There is no knowledge about the future; predictable. Predictable; you understand? So, I have knowledge, we have knowledge about each other. Right?

So we have to enquire a great deal into the question of knowledge; what place has knowledge in life? Are we together in this observation? Will knowledge transform man? What place has knowledge in the mutation or in the ending of conditioning? This is conditioning; I have conditioned through knowledge her, and she has conditioned me through knowledge. You are following all this? We are together in this? We are observing together? Please, I am not teaching you. You are observing with all your energy, with capacity to see this fact: that where there is knowledge in

relationship, there must be conflict. I must have knowledge how to drive a car; how to write a sentence; how to speak English, or French, or whatever language it is. Or I must have technological knowledge; if I am a good carpenter, I must have knowledge about the wood, tools I use and so on; but in relationship with my wife; or with a friend, whatever it is; that knowledge which I have gathered together, put together through constant irritation, constant separation, ambitions, this knowledge which I have acquired, that knowledge is going to prevent actual relationship with another. Right? Is this a fact, or is this merely a supposition, a theory, an idea? An idea is an abstraction of a fact. Right? The word idea in Greek means to observe, to see, to come very close to perception; not make an abstraction which becomes an idea. So we are not dealing with ideas. But we are dealing with the actual relationship, which is in conflict; and that conflict arises when I have accumulated lots of information about her and she has acquired a lot about me. So, our relationship then is based on knowledge; and knowledge can never be complete, about anything in life. Please realize this. Knowledge must always go with the shadow of ignorance. Right? You can't know about the universe. Astrophysicists may describe it, but to be aware of that immensity, no knowledge is required through information; you have to have that mind that is so vast, so completely orderly, as the universe is, then that's a different matter.

So similarly, knowledge in relationship brings about conflict. See the fact. Not accept the fact; see the fact that knowledge has importance in one direction, in the other it has not. The negation is the most positive; you understand? Right? Can we go from there a

little more? That is, do we exercise will to end conflict? That is, to enquire whether will, that is, positive action, I want to end this conflict, whether that will bring about the cessation of conflict. Which we have done before.

So, it's very important to understand the place of knowledge and knowledge as an impediment in relationship. Love is not knowledge; love is not remembrance. When there is no knowledge about her, I look on her as a fresh, new human being, each day new. You know what it does? You are too learned, you are full of book knowledge, what other people have said. And that's why this becomes awfully difficult to comprehend, a very simple thing like this.

Again quarter to one. I'm sorry. We'll continue next Saturday and Sunday; because we are dealing with a very complex problem of living. And that living is the understanding of our content of our consciousness. As long as we have not comprehended the totality of that consciousness we'll always be in disorder. And disorder is the very nature of our consciousness. And that's why we took faith, belief, hurt, relationship, it's part of our consciousness. And out of this disorder order can be brought about, which we'll talk about next Saturday and Sunday.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 4TH MAY 1982

One has been handed lot of questions. And I don't think it is possible to answer all of them. So we have chosen some out of those.

It is not possible to have a discussion with such a large group; nor have a dialogue, which is a conversation between two people. And so we have resorted to questions written down and to be answered. I don't know by whom, but I believe the questions have to be answered. I do not think that the speaker is going to answer the questions. But together we are going to investigate the question; its import, whether it can be answered superficially or go into it deeply. We are together going to find the answer; not that the speaker is going to reply to your questions, but together we are going to approach the question and see the implications of the question and find for ourselves the answer; which is much more reasonable, rational, and worthwhile. If one expects someone else to answer the questions, then one is not taking the responsibility at all. You are depending then on someone else, whereas if we could this morning together explore the question by carefully going into it, not analytically, but observing the quality, the nature, the structure of the question. If that is clear, that we are together going to investigate and find the answer for ourselves.

1st QUESTION: Our children are aware through television and other means of the threatening world they live in. The violence of crime, wars, nuclear danger. How do we help them to face this?

How do we face the problem, rather than the children? Because

after all the parents are also the educators; not merely the teachers of a school, the parents, though they have brought them into the world, they are also really deeply responsible people to teach them. So, what is our responsibility? How do we meet these problems ourselves? The wars, the violence, the terrible things that are shown on television; the terrorism, and all the rest of it, how do we meet it. as parents, as human beings? I wish we could have a conversation about it, a dialogue, but that's not possible.

So how do I or you meet this terrible world? Do we accept things as they are, adjust ourselves to things as they are, modifying our lives but accepting things, status quo, as they are? Do we accept it? Or, if we do not accept them, how do we face the problem? How do I or you personally face the issue? Please, I am asking this question; don't just sit back and let me answer it. Let's find out together how do we face these problems.

What is our action? What shall we do? If I am a parent and I have several children, and I see the things that are going on in the world, the tribal wars, the terrorism, kidnapping, all the rest of it; as a parent how shall I educate him to face this life? First of all, how do I as a parent face these problems? Is my response casual; is my response traditional; my response that I cannot do anything about it, it's too vast, too complicated, and so I leave it to others; the politicians, the economists, the social reformers, and so on. Or, do I take the total responsibility of what is happening in the world?

If I am violent, dishonest, have no sense of a world, global outlook, not parochial attachments; is that possible? That is, to have a global relationship; psychologically; is that possible? Or, I live in a particular country and I have to obey its laws, follow its

rules and so on, so I am committed to the limited outlook on life. Is it possible for me as a parent, and so a teacher, is it possible for me to break away from all this, break away from the usual mediocre tradition? And I am afraid most of us are mediocre - and is it possible, can I undertake to educate my children to have a global attitude towards life? What do you say to it? Or shall I leave it all to the teachers, in a school, however advanced, and let them educate my children? Not undertake the responsibility of educating them at home as well as in their holidays and so on.

By nature, by inheritance we are a violent people: aggressive, competitive, arrogant, we have come to that, through various biological demands and also psychological, perhaps necessities which have become habitual. And as we are violent people, we create a violent society and can I educate my children not to be violent? Come on, answer! Perhaps I can talk to them about it, if I have time. Probably we have not time; we are worried about our own problems; and get home rather tired after a long day and want to brush off the children; but if I have taken the responsibility to teach them, to help them, to understand this cruel world; I may talk to them, I may point it out to them. But the televisions, the children's friends, are all encouraging violence. So at home I tell them one thing, and when they go outside they are being gregarious, wanting to follow the tradition, not to be abnormal, different from others, they become like the rest of them, mediocre, cruel, thoughtless; you know what is happening. So, what shall I do? Please, it's your problem. What shall I, as a parent, do?

Can I give up my pleasures? I am in the habit of smoking - suppose; I am not - suppose I am in the habit of smoking, drinking,

taking drugs, mildly, marijuana or whatever it is, and I tell my children not to do it; they won't believe me. They'll say, you're a hypocrite. Even though they may not tell me that. So will I give up all those things for my children? Go into it, sir, it's your problem. Will I give up my drink, my irritations, my anger, my drugs and alcohol for the sake of my children? I have heard several parents in Europe and elsewhere say, why should I give up my pleasures for my blasted children? Do you understand the attitude? They have to face the world; and if we make them soft they will be destroyed. So we must make them hard. And all the rest of it. So what shall I do?

Am I educating my children, as a parent at home, or am I educating myself as well as the children? You follow my question? I, as a parent, I feel I have to educate them; but I carry on my own ways; dishonest, having no integrity, occupied with my own problems, with my own ambitions and so on, can I, as a parent and a teacher of my children, educate myself as well as my three or four children? That means I have to break up the pattern in which I have been living. If I love my children, I have to. Because perhaps the influence of the home is far more important than the influence of the school, where the parents are supposed to love their children, care for them, look after them, see to their behaviour, the language they use; cultivate their good taste, appreciation of beauty; that means I myself am educating, all the time. Educating in the sense that, not live in the same old pattern; the same old habits of past generations and amusements and pleasure. Obviously I must give them up. But will the parents do this? Will you do it for your children? And will you help as a parent to bring about a new school?

This has been a problem with which the speaker has been associated for the last 60 years. There are several schools in India, here there is one here, and England. And this is a problem. Not only the biological sexual problem of an adolescent; and also the society is so brutally strong, the outward environment; you may bring them up very, very carefully, but the structure of society is so powerful.

From this arises rather an interesting question: society now demands engineers, scientists, businessmen; computer experts; architects; builders of roads, engineers, society demands that. So there lies the money and all the rest of it. If the society demanded a totally different group of people, you are following? - that is, a group of people who are not concerned with nationalism, with violence, with drugs, alcohol, all those things; but are deeply integrated, have integrity - you follow? Will society demand such a people? Obviously not. Some years ago speaking in Switzerland, where we have been for the last 21 years, at the beginning the particular place where we were speaking, Saanen, didn't want us, at all, in the place. Because - the majority of the people who came there didn't smoke, didn't go to the butcher, didn't drink; so the village people said, why do you come here if you don't spend money? You follow the point of this?

As society does not demand a group of people who have this sense of integrity, the sense of wholeness in their life, a profound religious life, not the traditional religious which has no meaning at all. As society does not demand such people, can we as a group be those people? Do you understand my question? It is a very interesting point. Then we'll have such a person, such a human

being, who has such strength, such vitality in himself. And such a group becomes essentially important. They are like a light in darkness. So are there such parents who will be that?

Or, we are all so casual, sloppy, indifferent; please, sirs, this is a very, very serious question because you are bringing about a new generation of people. If that generation is merely the continuation of what you are, with all the violence and all the stupidities of war, society will then become more and more immoral, more and more destructive. So, as a group of parents, is it possible that we demand of ourselves the highest excellence in behaviour, in conduct. Right? So we educate our children in a totally different way.

2nd QUESTION: Great teachers have been on earth; Buddha, Jesus. Do you think there will be less conflict, more understanding when you also depart, or is the world moving in an unalterable direction?

Have we ever noticed that the followers destroy the leader and the leader or the teacher destroys the followers? Have you ever considered that? The Buddha, two thousand five hundred years ago, before Christianity came into being, talked about love, conduct, and so on, not to worship anything. And his followers made images of him, followed him, and so destroyed him. Right? There are various scriptures written down from memory, but the disciples always either exaggerate, distort, or extol; and lose the real depth of his teaching. And the Christian world - I hope I am not treading on anybody's toe - the Christian world, I am sure, have also made up that person into something incredible. And probably when the speaker kicks the bucket, dies, there will be the same phenomena going on.

All this points to something extraordinary. Why have human beings all over the world created symbols and worship the symbols? The symbols have become far more important than the truth of any of those people who have said things which are utterly true. Why do we want interpreters? The mediators between that truth and yourself; you understand my question? The priest; the priests have existed from the ancient of times. The Sumerians, 7,000 or 8,000 years ago, had the priests; so did the Egyptians, the ancient Egyptians. And there are these modern priests: the evangelists, the local priests, the priests at Rome; they will all tell you or interpret or come between you and that. Why do we allow all this? You understand my question? Why can't we as human beings look to anybody? Because the whole history of mankind, his suffering, his agony, his desperate uncertainty, loneliness, it's all in the book. Not in sacred books and holy books and all that; in the book which we are. We are the history of mankind. And if we can read that book ourselves, we will need nobody outside to help.

Our difficulty is we want others to read it and tell us what we are, what we should do. And the difficulty is to read the book of ourselves. And to read that book we need careful observation of every movement of thought, feeling, reactions; and we don't do it because we want something, an easy way to everything. So: thought then invents all the rituals, the marvellous architecture of ancient cathedrals, temples and mosques; and the things that are in the temples, in the mosques, in the cathedrals and churches are put there by thought; invented by thought. And thought is not sacred, which we will go into when we talk about it. And as long as we depend on others, whether it be Buddha and so on, we shall always

live in conflict, our life will become hypocritical. Is this so or not? Or, the speaker is merely fantasy. The accuracy of investigation demands that you have flexible scepticism.

So that the outside agency, whether it's the Saviour, the Buddha, or in India, Krishna and so on, as long as that exists there'll be division among people and that division will inevitably bring about conflict. Truth is not Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, or Islam; it is truth, and it doesn't belong to anybody. Like love doesn't belong to you or to me, it is love, compassion. And our minds are so conditioned - two thousand years of Christianity, of propaganda, very clever, thought-out propaganda; and the same thing in the Asiatic world. So, is it possible to be totally, completely free from all dependence? To have one's own deep abiding unshakeable integrity; which involves no fear and so on. Otherwise we create gods, saviours.

3rd QUESTION: My behaviour indicates that I am afraid. Yet the actual perception of fear is elusive. How do I reach and deal with this deep-rooted but unconscious emotion?

Do you want to go into this now? I was going to deal with it on Saturday. It doesn't matter, we'll deal with it on both days.

If one has observed, this problem of fear has existed from time immemorial. Right? It has existed with man. And man has lived with it; both consciously or hidden deep down; its roots very, very deep. And either we have escaped from it through logic, through analysis, through any form of entertainment that helps us to avoid coming directly into contact with it, and holding it; or we have suppressed it. Right? We are doing this. Or we neglect it; we say, what, we have lived with fear for million years, say, what does it

matter now? And one knows the consequences of fear. The physical shrinkage, a tendency to be hypocritical, resistance, an avoidance of the fact that one is really afraid.

So if one really profoundly wants to be free from that reaction called fear, one has to go to the very root of it. There are biological fears: the body, the organism, which must protect itself; and the fear of disease, old age, death, and the fears of past memories. So fear is again a common ground upon which all human beings stand. So either we deal with it superficially or enquire into it very, very deeply.

What is the root of fear? I know - one knows various forms of fear: death, old age, fear of tomorrow, fear of uncertainty, fear of insecurity, fear of not being loved or loved and not receiving that love, fear of loneliness; fear of loss, fear of not having anybody to depend on, and so on. There are various forms of fear; the fear of the dark, the fear of light. Do we deal with the outward forms of fear: That is, I am afraid of my wife, or I am afraid of a bully; a bully bullying all the time, you lie, you do all kinds of things; and there is the fear of that constant pressure of an aggressive, slightly demented person. So do we want to deal with fear superficially, which is intellectually, verbally, or do we want to go into it very, very, very deeply? Or, you go into it observing its very nature, structure, how it comes into being.

When we want to deal with it deeply, go to the very root of it, what is the root of fear? Please, I am not telling you; the speaker is not pointing out; we are together investigating into a tremendous complicated problem, which has crippled humanity. And out of fear we have done all kinds of things; invented all the gods on

earth. If there is absolutely no psychological fear, then you are beyond all gods. So what is basically the root of fear?

Is it time and thought? Please, we are investigating, I am not telling you; I am questioning. Is it time, the future; or the past; and is it also thought, thinking about the future; thinking about the past; thinking what might happen, or what has happened. The future is time. The past is time. The past modifying itself in the present moves towards tomorrow, the future. The remembrance of an incident, which has caused fear, and the future of that incident awakening the new fear - you are following all this? Am I talking to myself, or we are meeting each other? So there is horizontal fear and vertical fear. Right?

So I am - we are asking, is it time? The past, the present and the future. I am afraid - one is afraid of the present: the instability, the threat of war; the bomb that some country, another great tribal country, might put on this, and so on. So one is afraid of the past, the present, and the future. It is a movement. Right? This is not something that is static, it is a movement. And so a movement means time; from here to the village requires time to travel, to go to the village. From one point to another point means time. So we are asking if time is one of the factors of fear. Logically, it seems so; rationally, sanely. And is thought also the root of fear? I think tomorrow might bring me unemployment, I will be unemployed tomorrow. The thinking about it while I am employed, thinking about tomorrow is also the beginning of fear. Right, you are following? Thinking about the past, the incidents, the psychological accident which has brought about certain forms of fear; thinking about the past, thinking about the future, thinking

about the actual moment of life in which there is such tremendous uncertainty, thought breeds fear. Right? You are following all this?

So time and thought are the major factors of fear. And if they are, and as in reality they are, what is one to do? You understand my problem? Are we meeting each other? You have explained this to me; that time and thought is the root of fear, you have gone into it, you have explained it; not in great detail, but I've captured the meaning of what you have said. Now, then you ask me, is it an idea that you have accepted, the words that you have accepted, or listening what you have said to me, from that listening I have made an abstraction of it into an idea and I'm struggling with the idea. Then I ask, how am I to put that idea into action? You see the difference? Vous avez compris? You have understood what I am saying? Is this clear?

We have the habit of making abstractions of a fact. Those abstractions become ideals, ideas, concepts, conclusions; all verbal. And then I ask myself, how am I to carry out these ideals, these ideas, these concepts, that time and thought are the root of fear. You've understood? I have made an abstraction of what you have told me; time and thought are the root of fear; and I am pursuing the idea, how am I to carry it out in life. The speaker says, please don't do that. Don't make an abstraction of what you have heard, that time and thought are the root of fear. Don't translate into an idea, but find out the truth of it, the actuality of it. That is, I see that I really am afraid of the past, which is so. Also I am afraid of the present, because the things are so incredibly destructive around me. And also I am afraid of tomorrow, the future: the atom bomb, the nuclear bomb, the mugging, the mad terrorists and the politicians

with their game; that's the present, so also the future. So, I see the fact, not the idea, that time and thought are the root of fear. On next Saturday, I'll go into it much more, in a different way, but this is the root of fear. Now what shall I do? I realize, I see the fact. I see the truth of what you have told me. Not romantic, idealistic, all that; that has no meaning. I see the truth, the actual truth, of what you have told me.

Then the difficulty arises, if you have gone that far, who is the observer who actually sees the fact? You understand all this? Or is this too difficult? All right, who is the observer says, ah yes, I see the truth of it? Is the observer different from what he sees? You understand my question? When I say, yes, I see the truth of what you have told me, I have already played a trick, which is: I see the truth of it; that means I am different from the truth. You are following? Right, is this clear? Wait a minute, let me put it much more simply. When I am angry, is that anger different from me? Or, at the moment of anger, there is no difference. There is this tremendous reaction. A few seconds later I say, I have been angry, therefore I have divided myself as the 'me' who has been angry. Right? You see this? So, when you have told me the truth, the fact, that time and thought are the factors of fear, I listen to it very carefully and I say, yes, I see the truth of it; and the perception of that truth is something out there and me watching it. You are following? Or, there is no observer but only the fact of it. You understand the difference? Are we meeting somewhat? I observe that tree. In that observation words spring up, that's an oak tree, and the very naming of that tree prevents me from actually looking at it. You have understood? If I go to a museum and see a picture, a

painting by the old masters - I don't like modern paintings - and I go there and look. When I compare one master against another master, I am not looking at the actual painting of a particular master. Right? I am comparing, judging, I am never observing very closely without any sense of other painters, looking. So, when I observe, when I see the truth of what you have told me, there is no division between the observer and the observed. There is only the truth of it, not, I see it. And that perception, which is holistic, frees the mind from fear completely. Have you got this? Don't look, please, so puzzled.

You are not tired? Can we go on with this? It's very important to understand this. I am afraid - suppose I am afraid, psychologically - I then try to control it, I try to rationalize it, I try to escape from it, I go to somebody to help me to resolve it, so I am always acting on it. Right? Is that clear? That's what we are all doing: acting upon it either to dissipate it or to control it or to run away from it or to suppress it This is what we do, acting upon it. So there is always this conflict. Right? Is that clear? The struggle not to be afraid; which is a conflict. Now, can that conflict end? You understand, I am putting the question differently. Can that conflict between me and the fear, me controlling the fear, suppressing and so on, and thereby this division which inevitably brings conflict, can that conflict end? You get the point? That's my question. I say, how can that conflict end? Why does this division between the 'me', the I who is trying to suppress, control, dominate fear, why is there this division? Is this division actual? Or is it merely semantic? Verbal? Or, not being able to solve the problem, thought has divided itself as the 'me' and the fear. You understand?

Am I talking to myself or can we go on? Sorry, you probably have never thought about all this. So, it is important to resolve this conflict, because we live in duality; I am this, I should not be that, I should be that. So there is always this duality which brings about conflict. Right? Now; I want to find out - no, I won't use that, I want to - can this conflict end? Is there - please listen to it - is there an opposite? I am afraid, the opposite is, not to be afraid. Right? Or have courage. Is there an opposite to fear? Or, there is only the ending of fear, not the opposite of fear. I wonder if you see all this. So, is there an ending of fear - the ending being no conflict? Right? If I end it through conflict, that means I'll go on, it'll be perpetual. You get this? So, can this end. To end something, there must be no me who is trying to end it. Right? If I try to end it, I am in conflict with it. Right? But is there an observation of this reaction called fear without the past interfering with that observation? The past being the remembrances, the many fears I have had. So the past, can it abstain from looking at the fact without the memory of yesterdays? You haven't understood?

Look, sir; if I am married, I meet my wife every day. Every day, rather boring, every day. Listen carefully please, don't laugh. Every day. So, I begin to know her; I know how she looks, what her gestures, all the rest of it, words, so gradually I have built up a knowledge about her, and whenever I look at her all the knowledge comes out. Right? The knowledge is the past. Right? Because I have built the knowledge day after day, day after day, day after day, accumulated it through various incidents and so on and so on. So, whenever I see her, this knowledge which is the past looks at her. Right? You are doing this! This is nothing new. Only we are

putting into words. And so this knowledge is the remembrance of things past meeting the present and so dividing. Right? Physically of course my wife is not like me; male and female. But psychologically I have divided myself. You understand? The remembrance of the accumulated memories, which is knowledge about my wife, has separated as the 'me' and her. Got this? The past has brought about this division. Now, similarly, the past remembrances of fears, past remembrance of accidents of fear, the happenings of fear, is stored in the brain. And that brain is remembering the past and so when the present reaction, when it comes, you name it immediately as fear, and record it as fear.

You follow this? Right, is this clear? No, don't tell me this is not clear. I can't help it, sorry. I'll try to put it three or four different ways

The past is time. The past is the observer. And so the observer says, yes, that is fear. I know it's fear, because I have had it so many times. So, the moment it recognizes, it's part of the past. Right? You see this fact. So, can you look at that reaction, is there an observation of that reaction, without the past? And when the past observes you maintain the same movement. But when there is an observation without the past, you are looking it afresh. Which is, when you observe fear from the past, you are using an energy which has already been employed year after year. Right? That's a wastage of energy. Is there a new energy that meets this fear without the past? You understand the question now? Oh, for God's sake!

You see, fear exists only - I realize, one sees the truth that time and thought are the root of fear. Fear exists when there is

inattention, when there is no attention. Right? If I give complete attention to fear, it doesn't exist. But my brain has been conditioned not to give attention to this reaction. When you have sexual feeling you - right? Whereas, what do you call it, fear, if you give total attention to it, which is not to analyze it, not to rationalize it, not to escape from it, not to observe it from the past, attention means giving your whole energy to look. Right? Then when you do, fear is not.

I can't go on into this. We can go into it in a different way; on Saturday we'll go into it very much more. Because the mind that has fear is a destructive, aggressive, neurotic mind. Whereas a mind that is utterly free of fear, psychologically, is an extraordinary mind.

We had better stop. We meet again Thursday, if you want to.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 6TH MAY 1982

You are very punctual!

Now in answering these questions we are both of us answering them, you and the speaker. So we are going into it together, and I think what is important is how we approach the problem. We talked a great deal about it the other day, in what manner we approach a problem; whether it is a prejudice, bias or from a fixed point of view; then the question will be directed or shaped by our motive. Can we approach the problem without a motive, without a direction, so that the problem itself reveals the whole content of itself and therefore it is already answered when the whole content of it is shown.

1st QUESTION: The act of attention for most of us is difficult to maintain. Only a small part of one is willing, interested seriously. What can one do to nourish this attention?

I wonder if we can go into this question together: what do we mean by attention? What is the difference between awareness, concentration, and attention? Could we go into that together? To be aware; as one is sitting under these beautiful trees on a lovely morning, nice and cool, not too hot, one is aware of that woodpecker pecking away, one is aware of the green lawn, the beautiful trees and sunlight, the spotted light; and if you are looking from that direction, you are aware of those mountains. How does one look at them? How do you look at this marvellous sight? The beauty of this place. What does it mean to you? Do you observe it, aware of it without any choice, without any desire, or

just to observe the extraordinary beauty of the land. And when you observe so easily, aware of all this; the light and the shade; the branches, the darkness of the trunks and the light on the leaf; and the extension of this marvellous earth, how does one react to all that? What is the feeling behind that awareness? Is it that beauty of that land and the hills and the shadows, is it related to our life; is it part of our life; or it is there to be observed; if you are a poet, you write about it, if you are an artist you paint it, or if you are good at conversation or description you put it into words, but this beauty, this awareness of this, what is its relationship to one's life? That's part of awareness, the awareness of the external and the awareness of one's own reactions to the external, and to be aware of the movement of this. As you are sitting there, are you aware of the colours of the shirts or robes or whatever the ladies wear, are you aware of all that?

Or when we are aware is there always a choice? I prefer this land to another land, I prefer this valley to other valleys, so there is always memory and choice operating. And can one be aware without any choice at all, just to be aware of the extraordinary sense of the blue sky, the blue sky through the leaves, and just move with it all? And is one aware of one's reactions, and when one is aware of one's reactions is there a preference; one more desirable than the other, one is more urgent than the other, one is more continuous, habitual, and so on; and so from the outer move to the inner - you understand what I am saying - so that there is no division between the outer and the inner; it's like a tide going out and coming in. That's an awareness of this world outside of us and an awareness of the world deep inside of us, conscious as well as

the unconscious. When one is really deeply conscious or aware, there is no remnant or hidden unconscious movement. I don't know if you have gone through all this, if you have done it; not merely listened do a lot of words. So awareness is this movement of the outer and the inner and to discover for oneself whether there is division between the outer and the inner. Of course there is a division between the tree and myself; I am not the tree, I hope. But in observing that thing which we call 'tree,' to discover our reactions to it; how we react to beauty, to ugliness, to brutality, to violence, to competition and quietness and so on.

And what do we mean by concentration? Because they are all related: awareness, concentration, and attention. What is concentration? To concentrate upon a page, upon a picture; to concentrate all one's energy on a particular point: in that concentration is there not the effort to concentrate? Whereas, effort to concentrate, that is, you are trying to read a particular page and out of the window you see a marvellous light on a flower and your thought wanders off to that, but you try then to pull that thought back, and concentrate on something. So there is this constant struggle to focus one's energy, visual, and so on, so there is a resistance, a struggle, and all the time trying to focus on a particular point. Are we meeting? This is right, isn't it, when we talk about attention, about concentration.

The questioner asks, attention happens occasionally and how is one to nourish that attention so that it is continuous, not haphazard? So we are asking: what is attention; to attend. Are you interested in this question? To attend; to attend to that woodpecker. Did you listen to that woodpecker? There it is!

In concentration there is always the one who tries to concentrate, and in that concentration there is an effort and control. So there is a controller and a controlled in concentration. Oh, I hope you see this for yourself. There is the controller who is trying to focus his thought on a particular subject, but thought is all the time moving, wandering around, and so he tries to control it; and in that control there is a form of resistance. There is a division between the controller and the controlled. And so there is an effort, a sense of division. Where there is division there must be conflict between the controller and the controlled; that is generally what we call concentration. Now is there in attention this division? You follow? The controller trying to attend; and therefore there is a division between the thought that says, I must attend, I must learn how to sustain attention or nourish it. I hope you are following all this. So, is there in attention a centre from which you attend, or when you listen to that woodpecker, you are listening.

So is there in attention an entity who is attending or there is only attention? Which means attending with your listening, perception, seeing and giving all your energy to attend to something. Are you listening attentively now? Listening to the speaker, what he is saying about attention; are you actually listening? And when you really listen, there is no centre as the 'me' who is listening. You are following this? Is this right? Whereas, there is always a centre in concentration. We are saying attention has no centre and therefore extends it. And it cannot be nourished; you attend if you are listening, if there is an intensity, you can't, it is attending.

Is this fairly clear? May we go on? So, really, awareness

without choice, a choiceless awareness, and concentration, and this sense of extensive, vast attention; attention has no periphery, whereas concentration has; it is limited.

2nd QUESTION: What is an action and state of being that is completely pure?

I wonder what we mean by action. What does action mean to you? To act; does one act according to a principle, according to a prototype or an ideal, or according to some preconceived idea and act approximating that action to that ideal, prototype, to a concept, to a conclusion. Please follow all this, if you are interested in all this. When we talk about action, do we not mean, we are acting either with a motive or with a conclusion which we have come to through experience and set a pattern according to which you are acting; or act according to an ideal, a projected ideal - all ideals are always in the future - or, you act according to some bias, prejudice, or a pattern set by an authority, specialist, and so on. We generally act in that manner. And we are asking, is that action?

Action means the doing now. Not according to something that you have remembered or projected. Then you are acting according to a pattern which has been set by an authority, by your own experience and so on. Right? Are we clear on this matter? So action is always apparently an act according to something or other. I act: I do something through habit, through my conditioning, through my various accumulated prejudices, which I call knowledge; and for most of us that is action. My father, my country has told me what to do, and I do and I act according to that, or I revolt against the pattern, set my own pattern, and act according to that; patterns are the same - given to me or I have

made for myself; patterns are patterns. A mould, a norm is a norm. It's not a Christian norm or Indian norm or Buddhist norm, it is a norm; a framework within which I act. Right? Now, we are asking, we are exploring together, I am not telling you how to act, because that would be too silly.

Then what do we mean by action? Does action vary according to circumstances; according to climate, to pressure? All these are involved in that one that one word, action. I don't know if you are exploring it with the speaker. So is there - we are investigating - is there an action which is correct, precise, not changing according to one's mood, according to one's temperament, pleasure, and so on, action that is true; not dependent on the past as a memory or the future as an ideal. You are following all this? This is involved in that one word. So we are asking, is there an action totally free from all conditioning? Conditioning is to have an ideal which then dictates or tries to impose upon 'what is'. Right? I am greedy, and I have an idea of not being greedy. And I try to act according to 'what should be', not 'what is'. Or, I have been so conditioned by commercialism, by television, greed is nonexistent; I want to buy and I buy. They tell me to buy this or that, and I buy.

So, can we find out what is right behaviour, which is action, what is right movement which will not change according to various circumstances. That is really the problem, one of the problems in that question. You have understood? One has exposed the full meaning of that word. Right? The implication of that word, the wide significance of that word. Then is it possible to act without a motive, without an ideal, without any form of conditioning? Conditioning is environmental; conditioning is religious,

conditioning is according to what one has read, educated and so on; conditioning. So the problem there is, can the mind, the brain - let's keep to the word mind for the moment - can the mind be free from all conditioning so that it acts? That requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of watching: to be aware that one has ideals and is conforming our actions according to that. I am this, I should be that, which is called self-improvement. Lovely phrase! That is, the self, which is selfishness, trying to improve itself, so it is becoming more selfish. So, is it possible to put away all this and see actually what is and act. You understand?

I don't want to go more into this - shall we go more into it? Is there an action which is not born out of knowledge? Careful now. There is a technological action; physical action; where I must have a great deal of knowledge if I am to be a good engineer; a specialist in computers, I must have a great deal of knowledge about it. Or a good carpenter, a good builder; there knowledge is necessary. And if I act psychologically according to knowledge, I am accumulating knowledge and acting according to knowledge which is incomplete, therefore it is always in conflict; right? Do we see this or am I going too fast? That which is incomplete must always be fragmentary in its action; obviously. Is it right? Shall we go on?

So is there an action - please, enquire with me, don't accept, be a little sceptical about this - is there an action - rationally sceptical - is there an action which is not born of psychological memory? If I act according to my psychological knowledge which I have gathered about myself and I know that knowledge is always limited, my actions then will be limited. Right? And therefore any limited action must invariably bring about its own contradiction.

Right? So my action must breed regret, pain, contradict that action the next day and so on, so on. So is there an action that is free - please just find out, don't accept all this - is there an action free from the past recollections, past memories, past accumulation of all psychological information which is knowledge, and that knowledge, which is me, and therefore that me is limited, and when I say, I will do this and act in this manner, that act on will invariably be limited and contradictory; and therefore confusing and so on.

Right? If this is understood clearly, then is there an action apart from the technological and all the rest of it, is there an action which is totally free from the accumulated experience of the past as me, as memories, recollections? Probably nobody has asked this question. Not that I am the original, but probably we have not asked that question. And we are asking it now. It is a very interesting question, it is really, because that involves - do you want me to go into all this? Is it an amusement for you? As I was saying, if you are interested, I will go into it. If you are interested in it. The brain is always accumulating, recording, every experience is recorded, the accident or some happening is recorded; and according to that record you act; naturally. If I have had a motor accident, I am very careful next time. There it is necessary; but I am asking, we are asking, is there an action which is not previously recorded? You understand? Right? You see? Does it interest you, this?

Ask yourself this question, sir: our actions are based on past records; like a gramophone, you play the disk over and over and over again; that is your record; the record and action according to

that past noise. Now, is there an action which is not born out of psychological recording? You are following all this? How do you find out? Here is a problem put to you; you may reject it, say, that's nonsense, that can never happen; that's a possibility. Also, the other possibility, it may happen. Right? It may be true, or it may be false, but you have to investigate it. To investigate it, you can't assert one or the other. Right? So, one must let those two go, the assertive statement that it is not possible, or the negative assertion that it is possible. So they are both put aside. Then, what is the state of your mind - are you interested in all this - what is the state of your mind which is freed from the sense of past recording, and acting according to that? It's free. If it is free, and if it's possible to be freed, then what is the quality of perception, the insight, that is instant action? You are following? You understand? Just listen to it, and I'll explain little more, if I may, and if you are interested in it; if you have the patience to go into it.

I am walking along the mountain, and I suddenly come to a precipice. The action there is instantaneous. The action is brought about by self-preservation; which is intelligence. Right? Self-preservation is natural, a bodily response, which says, guard yourself. There it is also cultivated. It has been the experience of mankind not to fall over a precipice. That past continuous self-preservative motive is recorded, unconsciously or consciously. And the response there is a natural intelligence; now, similarly we have recorded psychological preservation. Are you following this? That is, what am I if I have no memory? If there is no recording, I am nobody. So, the fear of being nobody, and the knowledge of that, gives a central feeling that you must preserve yourself. Right?

You are following all this? And from that you act; therefore, memory, knowledge, is necessary; and there it's the same movement carried over into the psychological field. Is this clear; or am I muddling it? I am afraid I'm muddling it. Clear as mud!

Now I want to find out - I'm serious in this matter; I'll meditate for hours or think, work, I must find out whether there is an action which is not born out of previous records. If that is your intense demand, that is what you want to find out, then one has to watch very carefully any recording taking place. And the recording will not take place when there is complete attention. It's only inattention, lacking attention, that creates - what was I going to say? - that creates the recording. Have you noticed this? When you are looking at those mountains or this landscape with all the trees and the sunlight, and you are giving complete attention to it, that is, watching, watching all the trees, all the movement of the leaves and the light on the leaves and the shadows - complete attention, there is no recording. Please experiment as we are sitting here.

So it is possible not to record; which is an action born out of remembrance, an action born of an insight into an insight; and from that insight there is action. I'll take one example, I hope that'll help; I don't like taking examples, but I will go into it.

One perceives logically that organized religions all over the world, with their beliefs, with their dogmas, with their rituals, with their superstitions, with their particular form of worship, and so on and so on and so on, is just born out of fear, born out of propaganda, born out of the threat of society; threat of society is, if you are a Protestant in a Catholic country, you find it rather difficult. Right? So, to have an insight into the whole nature of the

religious organized structure; to have complete insight into it, which means you're neither a Hindu nor a Catholic, Protestant, whatever it is. You see the content of that structure instantly, and that perception, immediate perception, frees you from all organized religious constructed organization. Right? That no so-called spiritual structure, spiritual authority will ever free man from sorrow. To have an insight into it means that you don't belong to anything. There is immediate freedom from all that, as when you come to a precipice, there is instant action. You are getting all this? Are we meeting each other somewhat? It can't be somewhat, it must be entirely understood.

So, there is an action that is not born out of past remembrances or future hopes and ideals; it is being totally aware of 'what is', and having an insight into 'what is', is the ending of 'what is'. I wonder if you see that? Shall I go on to the next question?

3rd QUESTION: Since the word is not the thing, can we truly be enlightened through words? Can symbols undo the damage done by symbols, or are we being seduced by illusions of enlightenment?

I wonder if most of us realize that the word is never the thing. My wife is never the woman, or my husband. The word, you know if you go into this problem of the word - do you want to go into all that? If we realize the word is not the actual thing, the description is not the actuality, the symbol is never the fact; the ideal is never 'what is; and if you observe, if you are aware, our brain is caught in words; network of words. I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am an American, you follow? They are all symbols, they are all words, pictures; and the brain is caught in that. That is, thinking is a word;

without a word, is there a thinking? I don't want to go into all this.

It is very interesting for you to find out all these things, because then your mind becomes extraordinarily alert; naturally. To be free of the word, but yet use the word accurately. So the word is not the thing; and the symbol is never the actual. Fear, the word fear, is not the reaction; right? But the word 'fear' shapes our action. Not the feeling of fear, but either the word creates the fear, or, the word shapes the fear; and is it possible to look at that reaction without the word. This is quite simple. 'Can we truly be enlightened through words?' Good God! I wonder why we use the word 'enlightenment'? Obviously - we'll go into the word enlightenment, it's very interesting to go into what we mean by enlightenment, which all the gurus talk about. It is a word to some people that is a sacred word, to be enlightened; not through books; not through knowledge; not through time. You understand? It isn't a thing that you gradually work up to; by practice, by meditation, by doing all kinds of tricks. So: obviously, the word 'love' is not love. And, similarly, what is enlightenment? Who is enlightened? Enlightened of what? Enlightened about what? You follow? Enlightened - I feel funny about it. Surely a mind that is enlightened is free from all conditioning. A Hindu, with his superstitions, with all the business of his religious conditioning, as well as psychological and environmental conditioning has made him call himself a Hindu. How can such a mind, which has been so conditioned, ever be free? Is enlightenment complete freedom from conditioning? Can a Catholic - I hope I am not treading on anybody's toes - can a Catholic, with all his superstition, with his saviours, with his rituals, and the hierarchical authority and so on, can he ever be

enlightened? With his conditioning, baptism, you know the whole intellectual, cunning business that holds the people to a pattern. You answer it yourself. Can a mind - can a human being be enlightened when he is frightened? When he is seeking power, position, accumulating money in the name of enlightenment; which is what some of the gurus are doing, vast sums of money; and they talk about enlightenment.

So the word is not the thing. And, the questioner asks, have the symbols done damage to the human psyche? Obviously. If I am a Hindu - personally, I am not - if I am a Hindu - I was born in India, but that has no meaning - if I am a Hindu, I have got innumerable symbols; like the Christian world; their goddesses, their gods, tribal gods and smaller gods and higher gods. I have been conditioned in that. Those conditionings, those symbols, have damaged the clarity of a mind, of the psyche. Right? That is obvious. Symbols obviously have done damage. Because that prevents a human being going directly to truth, to the fact; not worship the symbols.

The questioner also asks: are we being seduced by the illusion of enlightenment? Obviously. That sounds lovely. But enlightenment is not of time. It's not a process. It's not something that you gradually come to. To be free from all conditioning, which also implies to be a light to oneself completely; and not depend on any person, any idea, any particular - a light to oneself. So wholly from that light there is action.

Ah, this is a lovely question, the next one.

4th QUESTION: Why do we not change?

Yes, sir. I was going to ask that question myself. I see people

here whom I have known for many years come year after year, and I have asked them, too, why do we not change? What will make us change? Do ask this question yourself? What is the energy, the drive, the intensity, that will make us change? Change; what do we mean by that word, change? Change from this to that. Right? That is preconceived; therefore, it's no change at all. I wonder if you see this? Do we see this? If I change according to some pattern which I have carefully established, it is not change. It's a continuation of 'what is', modified, which I hope will lead me further, and further modification, but it is the same chain. Right? The same movement. So, what do we mean by change? To the speaker it means the ending, not continuation of 'what is' modified. You understand? Take for instance, physical revolution; the Communists, the Leninists, the Trotskyites, change. Their idea of revolution is to change the whole structure of society, therefore they are violent, hoping thereby to bring about a different human being. That is, the outside pressure of change from the Czar to the Communist, Bolshevik and so on, will ultimately or as soon as possible make man different. So, they have not succeeded; on the contrary, they have done terrible things.

So we are talking about change psychologically; change completely the content of our consciousness. Right? Not change consciousness into a better consciousness; into a more polished consciousness; less violent but occasionally violent; and so on and so on. The ending of the content of consciousness is radical mutation. I won't use the word change there. So, why don't we change? Move away from this totally. Have we made the question clear? Why, after millions and millions of years, we human beings

have reduced ourselves to the present appalling condition - it is appalling, frightening, the violence, the brutality, the killing for a piece of land, for god's sake! Why? And the question is, why don't we bring about an ending to all this? Please answer this. You are all educated, workers, intelligent in a certain direction, making money, going to work, and all the rest of it, but you haven't solved the real issue. Why? Will outside pressure change you, bring about a mutation of the psyche? Mutation means total change, that which has been is not. Not change to something. That which has been, that is, my anger, my violence, my stupidity, my holding onto some idiotic illusion, some symbol which perhaps will save me from something or other. What will make us change?

Outside pressure obviously has not done it. Right? That's very clear. Is that clear to you? By changing society, you are not going to be changed. Because you have created the society. That's clear? We have made this society what it is: wars; killing each other for some national prestige, honour; a piece of land. You understand what all this is?

And after thousands of years we are not free from fear. What will make us change? More knowledge about yourself? More knowledge of the world, outside of us? Knowledge that we must not kill and we kill? We have accumulated thousands of years of knowledge which has helped us to kill people; and also we have knowledge that we shouldn't kill; where does it lead us?

Right? So, will suffering, pain, attachment, pressure, the carrot - reward and punishment? You follow? Will all that change us? Apparently it hasn't. So what will make us change? Not change, what will make us transform, what will make us end this terrible

confusion, sorrow, pain, anxiety, lonely, all that; end? Tears? We have cried enough. Sorrow? Nothing outside. I wonder if we realize that. No gods, no saviours, no external force, agency is ever going to change us. We are much too clever for all that. Much too cunning.

I think this is a very serious question. One should ask oneself: will time bring about this mutation? You have had time, million years, obviously, time will not. So, nothing outside will change us, will bring about mutation. What will change us is only our own attention, our own awareness of the confusion in which we live; and watching that, remaining with that completely, not trying to change it, not trying to do something about it, you understand this? It is very interesting; we reject - if we do - outside agency altogether; gods and all; reject it, any intelligent man does reject it. But he doesn't reject the operator inside. You understand? The actor who says, I will do this. That actor is the past memory; past remembrance, past knowledge. If that could be completely transformed, then you observe 'what is' completely freely; and when you observe so totally with complete attention, that which is, has completely ended.

So it must be one's own perception of one's misery, confusion, and live with it wholly, not trying to act upon it.

It is now an hour and ten minutes, can you stand some more of this?

5th QUESTION: Can you speak more deeply about the meaning of holiness and especially its place in the modern world?

The word holy is not the reality. Right? Is thought holy, h-o-l-y, sacred? Go on, sir, investigate it. Is thought, thinking, which has

created the architecture, the cathedrals, the most marvellous 10th, 12th century, extraordinary beauty. If you have been to some of those ancient temples, the ancient cathedrals in Europe; the extraordinary sense of vitality of those pillars, the beauty of the high ceiling. Thought has done all that. And thought also has created all the content within that structure; that marvellous stone structure. Right? That's obvious, isn't it? Right? So what is sacred? That is, what is that which is holy, whole? If thought is sacred, then everything that it creates is holy: the cannon, the atom bomb; the killing of each other; the computer; the saviour; your saviour; the rituals, the beating of somebody. You follow? Then, if you once admit thought is sacred, everything it does is sacred. Right? And, thought has invented that which is not sacred and that which is sacred. It has divided the world as the world and that which is sacred, which is not the world: the saint and the sinner.

So please, this is a very serious question, it's not just a casual question at the end of several other questions. It's very, very serious, this, because thought is tearing man apart: the British, the French, the American, the Russian, the Argentine. You follow? So if you once admit or acquiesce or accept that thought, whatever it does, is sacred, then you have nothing to worry about. Then you will kill each other, you will carry on as you are. That may be what you want. That may be what humanity wants.

If you want to find out that which is most holy, you cannot measure it by words. To measure that which is measureless by words has no meaning. But to come upon that which is holy, sacred - is love thought? Then is love desire? Without love, that which is sacred cannot be.

So all these explanations are not that which is. That which is eternal cannot be put into words. But when time and thought have come to an end, that which is most sacred is. But if you say, how am I to end my thought, how is time to stop, then you are back to the good old... But to find out, to go into it, what is thought, whether it can end, thought cannot end as I am going from this place to that place, when I drive a car, or in the very usage of language, in communication. But, inwardly, can time stop? Can thought come to an end? Not through control, not through will, but the urge to find out that which is from the beginning, which has no end. To go into it, to find out, requires - this is real meditation; which is the whole movement of life.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 8TH MAY 1982

May we continue where we left off last Sunday? We were talking about right kind of relationship. Most of our relationship, in that relationship there is a great deal of conflict, struggle, lack of understanding each other and so on. We went into it very carefully. If you do not mind, we won't go into it again today. That's where we left off last Sunday when we met here. We pointed out how important it is to have right kind of relationship: man, woman, or with people who are far away from us. Because life is a relationship, is a movement in relationship; and apparently we have never been able to solve the problem of not having conflict in relationship. And we went carefully into that problem. And this morning we ought to talk about two things, order and fear.

What is order? That word has a great deal of significance; order from a general, to his soldiers, order, ecclesiastic order, monastic order, order in one's house, order in a garden and so on. That word has extraordinary meaning. We have tried to establish order in society, by laws, by authority, by policemen and so on. Society, the thing in which we are caught, is created by each one of us, by our parents, past generations, and that society is in disorder, confused, that society has almost become immoral, that society is breeding wars, enormous sums are spent on armaments. In that society there is division, conflict; there is the totalitarian society, and the so-called democratic society; whether it is the totalitarian or democratic it is still disorder, confusion, each individual asserting himself aggressively against others, and so there is general disorder. That disorder is created by all of us because we live in

disorder. Our house is in disorder, not the physical house, but the psychological house, which is our consciousness is in disarray, disturbed, broken up; contradictory.

If one may point out, this is not an entertainment, intellectual or otherwise. We are talking about human problems. And this is - if I may again point out - this is not a lecture, a lecture being giving certain information, having a discourse on a particular subject, with a view either to convince, or to do some kind of propaganda, and so on. This is not a lecture in that sense; but together we are investigating, we are exploring into the question of order and disorder. Our minds are in disorder; can such a mind create order, bring about order? That's the first problem we have to face. Most of us, in our daily life, are in confusion, uncertain, contradictory; psychologically deeply wounded; psychologically having no right relationship with another; and in that relationship there is contradiction, disorder, disharmony, and so our life, probably from the moment we are born till we die, we live in disorder. One wonders if one is aware of it.

We went into the question of what is aware, to be aware, to be conscious, to recognize the fact that one is in disorder. If one is at all aware of that fact, and if one is, do we escape from it, seeking a solution, or accept a pattern of order, a design of order and therefore conform to a particular norm. Are we aware of all these psychological movements born out of disorder? And how does this disorder come about? Why, after so many millennia upon millennia, we live psychologically in disorder, and therefore outwardly in disorder. Outwardly our disorder is expressed in multiple forms, as nationality, division among people, religious

divisions; wars and so on.

So, we are asking is it possible to be free of this disorder, the ending of, disorder and therefore the very ending is order. Order is virtue. You cannot possibly discipline the mind to become orderly. Because the entity who desires order, that entity himself is the result of confusion, and therefore whatever order it creates must bring about disorder. I hope we are all serious this morning, as we have pointed out over and over again, this is a serious affair. Life is becoming so terribly dangerous, uncertain; it's an actuality. And any serious person concerned with the whole problem of living must question all of this: how disorder come about, what is the root of it? When we ask a question of this kind, you are asking the question, not the speaker. You are asking the question of yourself. And trying to find out the root of this disorder. Is it desire? Is it, the very nature and the structure of thought itself disorder? That is, thought itself is disorder. We are asking that question. Does disorder arise out of desire? Does disorder arise out of the very act of thinking? That is, is thought the source of disorder? Probably most of us have not even asked such a question. We accept and live in disorder; we say that is our conditioning, and we must accept that conditioning. And so we become used to disorder, accept it and try to modify it. But we never ask of ourselves why we live in disorder psychologically, inwardly, within the skin, as it were, and what is the root of it, the very substance that brings about disorder? Is it desire? Desire in itself is contradictory: wanting one thing and resisting something else. Desire for happiness and doing everything that brings about unhappiness. Pursuing pleasure, the desire for pleasure and that very desire creates disharmony.

So we are asking seriously, is desire itself the root, the origin, the beginning of disorder? And then, if it is, we are not saying it is, because we are enquiring; we are going deeply into this very, very complex problem of desire. Desire has great energy, drive; desire for so many things; for power, position; for wealth, for freedom, for heaven; desire to live happily, comfortably, and this desire accumulates itself into will. Will is the essence of desire. So we must enquire, what is desire, which may bring about disorder. We desire to have food, that is quite natural. We desire to have a house, a shelter, that's also quite natural; to be clothed, that is quite natural. But are psychological desires, for power, position, to become something beyond what one actually is, to achieve some idealistic state. There are so many kinds of desire, contradicting each other, and sometimes working together. So we should very carefully go into the question of why and what is the origin of desire. And whether it brings about disorder.

Please, we are not telling you what desire is, with which you agree or disagree; we are having a conversation together, we are as two friends talking over together the very, very complex problem of desire. So you are enquiring, not the speaker. The speaker is only verbalizing, putting into words the enquiry which you are making. And if your brain is not active, merely listening to what is being said, then, it's a verbal communication which has very little meaning. Explanations are not the actuality. The speaker may explain very carefully, as we go into it in detail, but those explanations are verbal, have no meaning. But the verbal explanations are means of your own discovery which the speaker is putting into words, I hope this is perfectly clear, that the speaker is

not conveying certain ideas, certain conclusions, but rather together we are observing the whole movement of desire, the nature of it, the inwardness of it, the origin of the beginning of desire.

In all religions throughout the world, organized religions, the accepted authoritarian orthodox religions, they have all said, suppress or transmute desire; identify your desire with that which is great, with that which is the saviour, with that which is something you want to achieve, identify yourself with it. And so gradually suppress any contradictory, any sensual desires. This has been the edict of all religions; monasteries are based on it, the monks pursue it; and the Asiatic monks, the sannyasis, do it in their own way. So desire has been condemned. We are not condemning it. We are not saying it must be suppressed or transmuted, or play around with it. We are together going into this very complex problem, observing, without motive, that is the whole point, without motive, just what is desire, which drives most of us, both commercially and psychologically. Please, don't wait for me to think it out, to explain, if you are serious, you are going to go into this. Because we have to find out, if we can, whether it is possible to live an orderly, sane, rational, a holy life; not this conflicting, destructive, warlike existence.

So what is desire? Why has it such enormous power in our lives? As we said, order is virtue. To become virtuous is desire; to have values established is a form of desire. You may have values, patterns, ideas, and so on, but if we do not understand the very movement of desire, whether it's contradictory, whether it's the origin of disorder, we must enquire very, very deeply what is desire. Is not desire born out of sensation? Sensory responses are

part of desire. Sensation, that is, through observation, through optical perception, seeing, then contact, then sensation. Right? One sees a beautiful house, a lovely garden; and that very seeing brings about a sensation; from that sensation there is a desire to own that house. Right? That is, the seeing, then the contact, then from that physical contact, sensation. This is obvious. Right? Can we go on from there? You see a woman or a man who is nice, nice-looking; especially as it is advertised in this country; and there is the very seeing, then the contact, then the sensation. Then - please watch carefully yourself - then thought creates the image; then when thought creates the image, then desire arises. Right? That is, one sees a shirt, a robe in the window of a shop; goes inside, touches the material; then the very contact of it creates a sensation; then thought says, how nice that shirt or robe would look on me. At that moment desire begins. Have you understood this?

Have we understood this clearly; that thought with its image creates desire when there is sensation. Right, sir? Are we together in this? And, if this is clear - don't please accept what the speaker is saying, it may totally be wrong - but carefully look at this movement of desire, so that you yourself discover for yourself the whole nature of desire; how it begins, and whether disciplining desire is not the very act of confusion, disorder. Do you understand all this? Because in this there is the entity who controls desire, the entity who is separate from desire. Is desire itself not the observer, who wishes to change what he observes? I wonder if you see all this? May I go on with this? Please sirs, don't look at me. That's not important. Find out for yourself the actuality of the beginning of desire; not how to discipline desire; we'll come to that presently.

But we are just observing the whole movement of desire - the seeing, the contact, then the sensation, then thought creating the image which is the beginning of desire. I see your beautiful shirt, good material, well-made; then, if you'll allow me to touch it, there is a certain sensation out of my sensory responses. Then I want that shirt; thought says, how nice it would look on me, that shirt. That thought creating the image of me in that shirt is the beginning of desire. Clear?

Now, the question is, if that is so, which is logically so, there is no question of refuting that, that is a fact, not because the speaker says so, it is so. If you observe it, it's the movement. And then the question arises, why does thought interfere with sensation? You follow? I see you have got a marvellous car, that I think, I am quite sure will appeal to all of you; a highly polished car. You see it on the road as you pass by, look at it, go round it, touch it; there is that sensation out of it. Then you imagine you sitting in the car and driving it. Then the imagination is the action of desire. Right? Is this clear? Now the question is, is it possible for thought not to interfere with its imagination? See the car, the sensation, and not allow thought creating the image of you being in there. You understand? That requires intense alertness, watchfulness. So there is no discipline, to control desire, but on the contrary, the intelligent observation of desire is in itself an act which frees the mind from the urgency of desire.

I hope you understand all this; because we have got to talk about something much more complex. If this is understood, then we should go on to ask, what is fear? What is the origin of fear, whether the mind, psychological state, can ever be free totally,

completely from fear. Not say, it is possible or it is not possible. If you say either one or the other, that conditions your own state of enquiry. But, if there is the intelligent demand whether the mind, whether the human being, his psyche, his consciousness, can ever be free, completely, not partially, not one day free of fear, the next day full of fear; but the entire movement of fear, conscious as well as deeply rooted fear; whether it is possible for the human mind to be utterly free of it? Because fear is one of the factors of disorder; not only desire, but also fear. Most human beings are afraid; either physical fears or psychological, complicated fears. Fears of not fulfilling, fears of not becoming, fears in their relationship, fears of not having jobs, especially now, in this country you have 10 million people unemployed; fear of darkness, fear of death, fear of the very act of living. There are so many, many forms of fear. Naturally, as one observes fear, the state of fear as one goes into it, one can see how fear creates disorder: fear of being secure and not being secure; fear of the past, fear of the present, fear of the future; which we all know. Most of us have experienced some kind of fear, urgently, very deeply, or superficially. When one is afraid, the whole psychological state becomes tightened, strained, you know all that. And where there is fear there is darkness and escape from that darkness. Then the escape becomes far more important than the fear itself. But fear always remains.

So one asks, why human beings, who have lived on this earth for million of years, who are technologically intelligent, why they have not applied their intelligence to be free from this very complex problem of fear. That may be one of the reasons for war, for killing each other. And religions throughout the world have not

solved the problem; nor the gurus, nor the saviours; nor ideals. So if this is very clear: no outside agency, however elevated, however made popular by propaganda; no outside agency can ever possibly solve this problem of human fear.

So we must find out - again, if one may repeat, you are enquiring, you are investigating, you are delving into the whole problem of fear; the speaker may only explain, but the explanation has no value unless you yourself go deeply into this question. And perhaps we have so accepted the pattern of fear we don't want even to move away from it. So, what is fear? What are the contributory factors that bring about fear? Like many small streams, rivulets that make the tremendous volume of a river; so what are the small streams that bring about fear? That have such tremendous vitality of fear. Is one of the causes of fear comparison? Comparing oneself with somebody else, psychologically. Obviously it is. So, can one live a life comparing yourself with nobody? You understand what I am saying? When you compare yourself with another, ideologically, psychologically or even physically, there is the striving to become that; and there is the fear that you may not. it is the desire to fulfil and you may not be able to fulfil. You understand? Where there is comparison there must be fear.

And so one enquires, asks whether it is possible to live without a single comparison, never comparing, whether you are beautiful or ugly, fair or not fair, physically, psychologically, approximating yourself to some ideal, to some pattern of values, there is this constant comparison going on. We are asking, is that one of the causes of fear? Obviously. And where there is comparison there must be conformity, there must be imitation, inwardly. So we are

asking, is comparison, conformity, imitation, are they contributory causes of fear? And can one live without comparing, imitating, conforming psychologically? Obviously, one can. If those are the contributory factors of fear, and you are concerned with the ending of fear, then inwardly there is no comparison; which means there is no becoming. Right? Comparison entails - the very meaning of the comparison is to become that which you think is better, or higher, nobler and so on. So, comparison, imitation, conformity, which is becoming, is that one of the factors of fear? We are not saying it is. But you have to discover it for yourself. Then if those are the factors, then if the mind is seeing those factors as bringing about fear, the very perception of those ends the contributory causes. Where there is a cause, there is an end. I hope you understand this. If there is physically a cause which gives you a tummy ache, there is an ending of that tummy ache by discovering what's the cause of the pain. Similarly, where here is a cause there is an ending of that cause.

And, is time a factor of fear? That is, time as of the things or incidents or happenings that have taken place in the past, or that might happen in the future, and the present. Time is a movement; physically from here to that place; from one point to another point, a movement from one point to another point requires time. To learn a language requires time. To learn any form of technique requires time. But when we think about the future, what might happen - I have a job, I might lose it; my wife might run away, leave me - future, so is time - we are talking of not physical time, sunrise, sunset, movement of the watch, clock, chronological time, but we are talking about psychological time. I am, I shall be; and I might

not be. So, is time a factor of fear? Not how to stop time, you can't stop time, but to observe it first - we will go into it - but first observe the fact that one of the factors of fear is time. Let's say I'm afraid of death. That's in the future; so is time a factor of fear? Obviously it is. Then is thought a factor of fear? Do you understand all this? We said there are various contributory causes of fear, comparison, imitation, identification. And this act of becoming something else - I am this, I must be that; and I may not be that ever. And is time a factor in the movement of fear? Obviously it is. There is a distance between now, the living, and the dying, a distance from this point to that point; to move from this point to that point is fear. Right? Time is fear.

So next we are asking, is thought fear? It's very important to find out. Is thought the root of fear? Time is the root of fear, obviously, as comparison and so on. And is thought also the root of fear? So, time and thought, are they not together? Are you following all this? Is this getting too complicated? Are you getting tired? It's up to you. We are not trying to convince you of anything. We are not trying to ask you to follow the speaker. The speaker is you; the speaker is only pointing out the nature of fear. If you don't see it for yourself, either your mind is dull; because you have drunk too much last night, smoked too much, indulged in various forms of entertainment, sexual or otherwise; so your mind, your capacity, your energy is lacking, and therefore you'll just listen, as a form of verbal entertainment, which will not affect your life. But if you are serious, if your brain is active, not just romantically watching the trees and you know, playing with words. If you are really demanding to find out then you have to apply. Application

means looking at it actually now. Probably sitting here quietly under the trees you may not be afraid. But fear is going on unconsciously, deeply, whether you are aware of it or not now.

So we have said time, becoming, comparison, with all the implications of that are the factors of fear. And we are asking now whether thought itself is not one of the factors or perhaps the very major factor of fear. What is then thought? Thought compares; thought imitates; thought says, I am this, I must be that. I must fulfil, I must identify myself, I must be something. It's all the movement of thought. And thought itself may be disorder. We are enquiring, please, go into it. We are not denying thought. We are not trying to point out that thought must be controlled. See that thought may be one of the, probably the major factor of fear. I was last healthy last year, and I am not this year but I hope to be in perfect health next year. There is in that movement the thinking about the pain of last year, hoping not to be this in the future, is the movement of fear; thought. Right? So what is thought? Not, can thought ever not stop and let nature take its own course, but we are enquiring into what is thought, what is thinking? There are several factors in that too. Just look at it simply. When you are asked your name, you respond immediately. Why? Because you have repeated your name so often there is no thinking about it. You may have thought about it at one time, but the constant repetition of your name is without thinking. If you are asked a complicated question, then you are searching, thought is looking all over the place, enquiring till it finds an answer. And when you are asked a very, very complex, or a question of which you have never even thought about, you say, I don't know. Right? Very few people say, I don't

know. You understand? That requires a great sense of humility not to know, which we'll go into some other time, that's not important now.

So what is thinking? Thought has created the extraordinary beautiful pictures, paintings, out of stone created something exquisite; the Pieta of Michelangelo, the great cathedrals. And also it created the submarines, the missiles, the atom bomb; thought has created the war, the wars, nationalities; thought has created all the rituals, religious rituals, thought has invented the saviour; whether the Hindu saviour or the Christian saviour. So thought has done the most extraordinary things. The computer, which may take the place of human brain, and what's going to happen to your brain when the computer does it? Which is again a different matter.

So we must find out what is thinking. And whether that thought itself may be the origin of disorder and fear. We give such extraordinary importance, to thought, to the intellectuals, to the scientists, to the people who create marvellous technological things. But those very people who have invented all this, the great scientists, they themselves live in disorder. They have never possibly enquired into why thought is given such an extraordinarily important place. Why thought may be in itself the origin of disorder and fear. We are going to enquire. You are going to enquire, not the speaker. He may explain - I must repeat this over and over again, he may repeat but if you yourself don't apply, go into it, your sitting there listening to the speaker is utterly meaningless. It is a waste of time and your energy. From the ancient of days man has experienced an accident, a sensation, a danger, a pleasure, and this experience has left knowledge. He

derives from that experience knowledge. Right? That knowledge is stored in the brain as memory. And from that memory thought arises. Right? So, thought is limited because experience is limited, knowledge is limited. So thought is limited. Thought is a material process; because experience is a material process; there is an accident in a car, and that experience is remembered, which is knowledge, the remembrance of it is pain, which is thought. Right? So thought is a movement, from experience, knowledge, memory, thought. Again there is no question of anybody disputing that fact. If you have no experience, if you have no knowledge, no memory, then you are not thinking, you are just in a state of amnesia. But we are supposed to be thinking human beings.

So, knowledge is always limited about anything. That is so. Thought has created the things in the cathedral, in the church, the rituals; and yet thought worships them. You follow all this? Thought has created all the things that you call religious activity, thought has invented it. And then thought says, you must worship it. So one asks, thought is never sacred. It can never be sacred. But we have made certain things of thought sacred. Like god is an invention of thought. I know you won't like this, but there it is.

And so, is thought the beginning, the origin of fear? Thinking about the future, thinking about some happiness which I have not; thinking about death; thinking I might become that, paralysed; all the rest of it. I might have cancer. So thought, time, are the same. Time and thought are the same. And the contributory causes of all this is thought. Now the question then is, if thought is the origin of all fear, and therefore all disorder, if thought is the origin of disorder, fear, then what is one to do? You cannot stop thinking.

thinking has its place. When you leave here you go to your house, that movement from here to there is an action of time and thought. Thought and knowledge are necessary when you are writing a letter, speaking a language, driving a car, any technological business and so on, thought and knowledge are absolutely necessary. But we are asking: the accumulation of knowledge about the psyche, about yourself, and thinking from that knowledge, is that necessary? You understand this question? Please give your thought a little bit, attention a little bit. Is it necessary to record psychological events? The insult, the flattery, the hurts, the contents of your consciousness, which is nationality, fear, belief, faith, rituals, habits, you know, the content of your consciousness, which is the psyche, which is you.

Can there be no psychological recording? Please ask yourself this question. Perhaps you have never asked it; because we record. We record an insult, we record a flattery. We record the hurts that one has received from childhood; you record your pleasurable activities; you record your fears. So is it possible for a brain to record what is necessary, that is, learning a language, doing business, being a good carpenter and so on, engineer and so on, there you need to record everything very clearly, scientifically, and so on. But is it necessary to record psychological events; do you understand? That is, to carry psychological burdens all your life, psychological problems all your life; the conflict, the misery, the confusion, the agony, the loneliness, the despair. Is it necessary to carry all that? Which are the activity of thought. To find that out, whether it is possible not to record at all psychologically, that means to have no problem - you understand sir? Fear is a problem

to us. Order is a problem to us. Not to be something is a problem, our life is a bundle of problems, both psychosomatic, physical, psychological, the whole thing, living is a problem to us. Which is the recording of everything, pleasure, pain, the loneliness, the fears and so on. We are asking can the brain not record the incidents of fear? That is to be aware of the whole pattern of fear, which is very complex, as we pointed out, it is very complex and intricate and one has to observe it very subtly, sensitively.

Then if you observe it carefully, is the observer different from that which he observes? What he observes is himself, the observer is the observed. Where there is a division between the observer and the observed, there is conflict. Now, is the observer which is the past accumulation of knowledge observing the present fear, there is a division, and then the past tries to overcome the present, control it. Whereas the thing that is observed is the observer. When that is absolutely clear conflict ceases. Therefore where there is the observation of fear as me, I am fear, obviously, there is no division between me and fear, I am totally fear, not that there is part of me which is not fear, I am that. And when there is total perception of that, which means giving all your energy to that there is the complete cessation of fear. There is the total ending of psychological fears completely - not for a day; but that which is ended has a new beginning.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH MAY 1982

May we continue from where we left off yesterday? We were talking about disorder and the causes of disorder and the very detrimental, destructive nature of fear. We went into it very carefully yesterday, step by step, and that it is possible to be totally free psychologically of the burden of fear. And we also slightly touched upon the subject of conflict, human conflict. If I may suggest, this is not an entertainment, a Sunday morning outing because you have nothing else better to do. Nor is it an intellectual amusement. Life has become, has always been, very, very serious. Serious in the sense that one has to respond fully to all the things that are happening around us; the dreadful wars that are going on; the religious divisions; the various types of gurus with their peculiar entertainment. And as this is a serious gathering, one hopes, it becomes rather necessary that one must exercise one's own brain, one's own capacity, one's own energy, not stimulated by others or by these talks, but rather, as we are together examining the present state of human affairs, it becomes necessary that this gathering should not be treated as a lecture; a lecture being to inform or to have a discussion, transmitting ideas, certain judgments and evaluations. So this is not a lecture, as we have been pointing out over and over again here. The speaker is merely acting as a mirror in which one sees one's own condition, one's own fears, anxieties, loneliness, and the agony of life; with its occasional flare of joy.

So we talked about yesterday morning, fear, disorder, and the other mornings we talked about how human beings are hurt from

childhood and that hurt they carry on throughout life. And that it is possible to be free of all those hurts. And also we talked about relationship, human relationship. Why, in that relationship there is so much conflict. And whether it is possible to live a life, not only in all these matters, but essentially, deeply to live without conflict.

Why do human beings, after so many millennia, so astonishingly intelligent in one direction, technological direction, why human beings do not apply that quality of intelligence to their own lives and see whether it is possible to live without conflict. What are the causes of human conflict? Why does one live a daily life, in our relationship, in our actions, why there is such conflict, struggle, such pain? Please, as we pointed out, you are asking this question, not the speaker. The speaker is only putting into words the state of one's own mind, the state of one's own life; the enormous contradictions, saying one thing, doing another; thinking one thing, and acting quite differently. Why human beings after so many centuries, having acquired information outwardly about almost anything, inwardly, psychologically, they have not investigated into their own problems, into their own travail, into their own anxieties, pain, grief? Is it that we have always looked to authority, to somebody to tell us what to do? There is in this country, as one has observed, specialists of various types; religious, psychological, and so on. They are telling us what to do, what to think. And we are gradually becoming dependent upon them; and so losing our own capacity, our own intrinsic energy of intelligence to explore and discover the causes of our conflicts, struggle, pain, and so on.

And this morning we ought to talk over together the cause of

conflict. There are various types of conflict, both outward and inward. The inward conflicts express themselves in the outward conflicts, you cannot have in a society, an orderly society unless we human beings live an orderly life, sane, rational, healthy, holy life. And so we ought to, together to think why we have all become like this, what we are.

As we have been pointing out in previous talks, our consciousness with its content, the content being hurts, beliefs, conclusions, judgments, evaluations, fears, pleasures, various types of acquisitive attachments; fear of death, seeking something beyond the ordinary events of life; that is the content of our consciousness. That's what we are. We, or the I, is not different from the content. I think that should be made clear. I may be that one is so conditioned to analysis, we want to find out why we human beings live as we do, and so we begin to analyze, try to discover the various causes for this unfortunate troublesome existence. But we have never enquired who is the analyzer and the analyzed. Is the analyzer different from the analyzed, and can the analyzer merely verbally find the cause and the analyzer then dissipate the cause? And we have done this for thousands of years. We know the causes. Most intelligent people, most people who are aware of their own turmoil, they can easily through analysis find out the cause, or the causes. And so, we have separated the analyzer, who is investigating the consciousness of himself. I hope this is clear. My consciousness and yours is its content. Without the content there is no consciousness as we know it. The content of one's consciousness, one wants to investigate, one wants to look, one wants to find out why that consciousness is in conflict, in

contradiction, so one separates oneself from the thing that is being examined. Please follow this, if you will, a little bit. Thought separates itself as the analyzer; that analyzer tries to examine, analyze, that confusion, that turmoil, that loneliness, that despair, and then begins to discover the cause. Then he tries to dissipate the cause, hoping thereby to wipe away the effects of the cause. So there is this division, as the analyzer and the analyzed, and hence wherever there is psychological division in oneself there must be conflict. This is a law, as gravity, that wherever inwardly there is a contradiction, a division, a separation from the analyzer and the analyzed as the observer and the observed, there must be conflict; as the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu and the Muslim; the ideological differences of the capitalist society and the totalitarian society; there must be conflict. And that conflict brings about this division, brings about the feeling of not being whole, because in us, in ourselves there is the division.

So is it possible to realize, not intellectually, but actually see the fact, as one sees a fact of pain; as one has this pain of a toothache and so on, actually realize, see, perceive, that where there is psychological division there must be, inevitably, logically, conflict. And this conflict denies the feeling of being whole. That is, the feeling of whole is the freedom from error; to err, you understand the word, error. So, feeling whole, the feeling of being whole, means not inwardly fragmented, broken up as we are. That is, all problems, psychological problems, are interrelated; the hurt, the lack of order, disorder, the conflict in relationship, all these problems are interrelated. We treat them as separate. And the perception, or the seeing logically, truthfully that all problems,

psychological problems, whatever they be, are interrelated, you cannot take one problem separately from other problems. And to perceive the feeling of the whole movement of problems is one problem. A problem means, according to the dictionary, something thrown at you; that's the meaning of a problem. Something thrown at you which is a challenge; that's the meaning of that word, 'problem' means that. It's a challenge, something put before you. You have to meet it rightly. But we meet every problem as though it were separate, to be resolved, unrelated to other problems, as we do in life; religion, which is no religion at all as it is now, is separate from your intellectual, technological life. If you are a great surgeon, you are not concerned about your daily life, what you are inwardly; you are concerned about your technique, about your method of operation and so on and so on.

So we live a life, both outwardly and inwardly, with a sense of fragmentation; which means we never feel the wholeness of life. That life is a movement, not your life and other people's life, life as a whole is one. It's not American life, or Indian life, or a Buddhist life, or a Muslim life, it is life, to be lived on this earth sanely, rationally, not divided as nations; which is a tribal adoration of an idea. That's what is happening in South Atlantic, this tribal war that is going on.

So, we all want to be safe; that is natural. Physically, we want to be safe; to have a house, a shelter, clothing, food. That's natural, healthy, sane, rational, for all of us; not for only for the affluent people. There is a great deal of poverty throughout the world, even in this country. This poverty, this lack of relationship to the whole of the world, is brought about by national divisions, religious

divisions, economic divisions. There is no feeling of global relationship. Please listen to all this. And our outward problems will never be solved, never, unless we have this global relationship. That is why it is important to understand very carefully that our consciousness, which is with all the beliefs, dogmas, judgments, loneliness, despair, anxiety, fears, hurts, is common to all mankind; to all mankind, whether they live in Russia, China, or in this country. And because it is common to all mankind, you are mankind. You are not a separate individual. This is hard to realize. Because you suffer, so does a man in the Far East; there he is uncertain, confused, trodden down, and you too, you are confused, uncertain, seeking security, safety; this is the problem of all human beings. And so it is hard to realize, to see the fact, because we are so conditioned to individuality, to see the actual fact that we are like the rest, we are the humanity, we are the whole of humanity. And therefore our actions then will be a global relationship in which national divisions, religious divisions do not exist.

So we should consider this morning whether it is possible for a human mind to be safe, safe from error. Do you understand my question? Human beings have sought security; not only physically through family, group, community, nationality, and so on, but also tried to find safety, to be safe in ideas, collective ideas, collective group, having the same conclusions, same beliefs, same frontiers. Man has sought his safety in isolation. That's what each one of us is doing. We want to be safe in ourselves, separate from the rest of mankind. Safe means to have this feeling of wholeness, of being whole, then you are completely safe. But you cannot be whole or have that extraordinary feeling of total completeness if there is any

sense of fragmentation. Now, this statement from the speaker may be false. One must doubt; question. It may be his own peculiar invention or illusion. But, having heard it, one must find out if it is possible or not possible to live a life which is whole, therefore safe. That means you, who have listened to this statement, you have to apply your mind, not agree. You have to question, you have to question your life, your existence, your whole activity, find out for oneself whether it is possible to be totally safe. You cannot possibly be safe in isolation; it doesn't matter whoever says it, it is a law. And so what happens if you cannot be safe in isolation, why is the world divided up like this? The British, the Argentine, the French, the Russian, you follow? And religiously, too; those who are Christians, and the Christianity broken up in their beliefs thousands of different beliefs in Christianity; the same thing in India, all over the world is the same phenomena.

So, we are asking, when one realizes this fact, can one live in the modern world, do your business, whatever one does, with a sense of feeling of being whole not fragmented. Specialization is one of the factors of fragmentation. One has to have specialists; doctors, carpenters, the postman, and so on. But psychologically, inwardly, what is the need to be a specialist? You are following all this? We are human beings.

So, we ought to discuss also the nature of pleasure, as we talked about fear. And also we should go into the question of suffering, whether it is possible for us as human beings who have lived on this earth for so many millennia, whether it is possible to end our sorrow. Please, as we have pointed out, this is a serious question. It's not just a Sunday morning sermon. Thank god we are not in a

church or a cathedral, you are under lovely trees. We ought to be serious enough to enquire into all these matters. So we are going to enquire first why man has pursued pleasure at any price, why it has become such an important thing in life. When you emphasize one thing, you deny the others. You are merely pursuing pleasure, pleasure in so many forms; pleasure of possession; pleasure in attachment; pleasure in becoming something; pleasure in having knowledge; pleasure in having a piece of earth; pleasure in feeling that you have achieved something, you have been able to have a very good body; pleasure in drink - you know, so many forms of pleasure. Not only sexual remembrance of pleasure, but the pleasure of seeking, finding, achieving, being somebody. So why has pleasure become so extraordinarily important in life?

What is pleasure? As we examined very carefully into the nature of fear, went into it in great detail, we should also regard, examine pleasure. What is pleasure? Please, you answer the question, not the speaker. Is it a remembrance? Pleasure in prayer, pleasure in worship I don't know what you pray to, what you worship, but it's a pleasure. Is it a remembrance of things that are past, over? Or, is it something in the future? Thinking about that which might give you pleasure. Or, the remembering of something which gave you a delight yesterday. Does pleasure as fear exist now, in that sense of having pleasure at the moment? It's like a man saying, I am happy. The moment he says that, he is not. It's only the remembrance of being happy at one time, or yesterday; that remembrance is the pleasure and the pursuit of that remembrance in action. I hope you are following all this. So, is pleasure a matter of time? Is pleasure an action of thought? As fear, we said

yesterday, and we have said this often before, time and thought are the root of fear. Time and thought are the root of pleasure. We want to deny fear, but pursue pleasure. They are two sides of the same coin. You cannot be free from fear if you do not understand the nature of pleasure. When you look at that mountain, though it is a cloudy morning, when you look at these marvellous old trees, and the blue sky, it gives you a delight. It is a marvellous thing to look at nature and the mountains and the rivers and the animals; wild, not kept in the zoo. It gives you a sense of extraordinary width and beauty. You remember that, then that remembrance insists and pursues, demanding more of the same thing. So thought and time are the factors of fear, and pleasure. We are not denying or asserting or suppressing fear, but to observe it, to see what is implied in it, to be totally acquainted with it.

Then one can ask, what is love? You understand, this is very serious, all these questions, human questions which affect our daily life. Is love pleasure? Man has reduced it to that. Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Love of country, love of a person, love of a poem, love of a painting, love of the country; love of acquiring a great deal of knowledge. So what is love? Love of god; it's so easy to love god. We don't know what that is, but we have invented it, and so we love it. You understand? What we invent, we love. So what is love? Negation is the most positive action. To negate that which is false, totally negate that which is false is the most positive action. To negate, for instance, the whole concept of nationalism, or a saviour, or some external agency to reform us, to change us, to bring about a different society; to negate the outward agency of any kind is the most positive action. So to negate totally that which

is not love. That is, to negate jealousy, to negate totally every form of antagonism, to put aside competition; to deny the solitude, the sense of separate entity - and you are not a separate entity, you are related, you are the mankind.

So to deny that which is false is the truth. To deny all illusions is to live in reality. So can one deny, put aside, negate that which is not love. Attachment is not love; see the consequences of attachment; attachment to an idea; to a belief, to a conclusion, to a piece of earth, as my country; attachment to a person. What is involved in this attachment? Suppose I am attached to my wife. What are the consequences of attachment? Enquire, please, for yourself. I am attached to my wife, or the wife is attached to me. And the consequences are fear; the loss. If I am attached to a belief, the same thing, fear of losing that belief. If I am attached to some experience, I hold on to that and I battle, resist any form of enquiry by you to doubt it. I dare not doubt it, because I feel without it I am nothing. So, is it possible to have a relationship with a man, woman, or anything, anything, without any sense of attachment? With my wife, if I told her, "Darling, I am not attached to you," what would she say? She would throw something at me, probably. (Laughter) You laugh, but you have not applied, you don't face the facts; that attachment denies totally love. You will say, I understand it logically, intellectually, but I have not this feeling that I must be free from it; because that's one of the factors of conflict. Where there is conflict, there is not only division, there cannot be love. If I love the thing called god which man has invented, there is conflict, because I want his forgiveness, his prayer. You follow?

So love cannot exist where there is antagonism, competition, attachment, conflict, possession. Now can the mind, can a human being negate all that, and live with a man or a woman in society? You have heard this statement; either it is true or utterly meaningless. If it is meaningless, then it has no value. But if you have heard it and find it has value in the sense that it can be applied, why is it that human beings, knowing all this, don't apply? Why is it that human beings never change radically? Nothing outside will make you change. No gods, no gurus, no Masters, no saviours, no authority. There is a mutation in that conditioning, only when you yourself see the truth of it. That means you yourself have to think clearly, objectively, not personally. That means to have this extraordinary sense of the feeling of being whole. Not fragmented, means to be safe, free from all error. And when the mind is in that state, there is love. It's not whether you love your wife or don't love somebody else, love is love. Please see all this. It's not, can I love one person and not love another? It's like the perfume of a flower; when the perfume is there, it is not only for the one who is nearest to the flower, but the flower itself is a beauty of life, to be looked at, admired, smelled by anyone who wants to. This is not a romantic statement where you can kind of admire and smile and say, I wish I had it. Because without that perfume of love, life has no meaning. You may be a marvellous professor, great scientist, and so on; without that life has lost its vitality, its depth, its beauty.

And also we should talk about what is beauty. What is the quality of mind that has beauty? Is it the face, well covered up, all kinds of cosmetics, lovely hair, properly shaped eyes, and so on? Is

beauty in the painting of a great master; is there beauty in a lovely poem? What is beauty? Because if you have not that quality of that sense of depth and the clarity which beauty brings about, love has no meaning either, because they two go together. So one has to enquire very carefully, and if you are serious, deeply, what is beauty. Can beauty exist where the mind is in conflict? Where you have problems, one or many, can beauty exist? Or, beauty is there when you are not there. Have you ever looked at a great mountain, the majesty, the dignity, the immovability of that mountain when you look at it? For a moment, the majesty of it drives away all your problems - for a second. That is, at that moment, you, with all your problems, are not there. And you say, what a marvellous thing that is. There, the outward greatness drives away the pettiness of yourself. Then that feeling of immensity, magnitude, that great wordless state puts away the little problems of life. Like a child with a toy, the toy takes the child over; for a moment the child has forgotten; or is absorbed by the toy. And we are also absorbed by something; escape from ourselves. Which is to be absorbed. You are being absorbed now by the talk. So for the moment you are quiet and so on. So when you with your problems, with your anxieties, with your loneliness, with your attachments, are not there then beauty is. And where there is beauty, and love, life becomes an extraordinary movement.

I think we had better stop now. We'll discuss next Saturday the ending of sorrow, what death means, what is meditation, if there is at all something that is utterly beyond all words, beyond all time, and that which is sacred. We'll talk about it Saturday and Sunday. May we get up?

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 11TH MAY 1982

There are many questions that have been put; some rather extravagant and others, if I may point out, rather absurd. Like, why don't I grow a beard? Those we have set aside and taken some of the more serious questions. It's quite funny, isn't it, all this.

May I again remind you, if I may, you are putting these questions to yourself, and trying to find an answer, or to see the implications of the questions. As we also pointed out, it is important how you approach these questions; any question, any problem of life, whether we approach it personally or with some definite or unconscious motive, or with a desire only to find an answer, thereby we never understand the problem itself. As we said the other day, problem means something thrown at you, something that you have to meet, a challenge that you have to respond. But if one responds to it obliquely or in a certain direction, then one is not meeting that challenge completely. So it matters very much, if I may point out, we are not instructing you, we are not teaching you, just pointing out, how important it is how you approach a question, a problem. And one has to learn the approach, rather than the solution of the problem.

1st QUESTION: How do you feel about one million dollars going to educate a small, somewhat select group of children that do not appear to be from the suffering or destitute?

What do you think? This school, Oak Grove School, as far as I understand, has a scholarship fund for poorer people, for the so-called destitute, for children who are not from the well-to-do class.

I wonder why there is a general antagonism or feeling against a group of people who are elite? And why do we object to a school of this kind, which has really a scholarship; why do you object to it - not knowing all the intricacies of the school, problems of the school, and so on? And why don't you, if I may point out, object to the enormous sums of money being spent on war? Why don't you object to that? War, not any particular war, nuclear war, but the whole idea of killing people for one's country, isn't that much more important to object to than to this?

This is also important, we are replying to it. That is, this school, Oak Grove School, they are spending about a million dollars, if they can get it; I think they will get at least half of it; having a secondary school. And there is a scholarship fund for those who cannot possibly afford the full pay. If you feel this strongly, then what will you do about it? Burn up the place? Or, go into the question, why, in an affluent society as in America, as in this country, as in this part of the world, why there are people who are starving, who have very little, who are uneducated, who are submitting to all kinds of horrors? Why this country is spending millions and millions and millions on armament and so on. Why? Do we object merely verbally or do we take action about all this? And what can one do when a country, like all over the world, even the most primitive societies in the world are accumulating materials for war. Each country, like France, England, America, and other countries, are selling armaments to other countries, poorer countries, who are also spending millions on all kinds of horrible means of destruction of humanity. What do we feel about all this? And what can one do about all this?

It seems almost impossible to stop this destruction of man. So do we go to the root of all this or merely consider not to have a certain type of nuclear bombs and so on, superficially, Or, do we go into all these matters deeply? That is, what is the cause of all this? What is the cause of poverty, not only in this country, which is so affluent compared to the rest of the world? What do we do about it? When we go to the Asiatic world, India and so on, the population is increasing every year. In India, 15 or 13 million people are added every year. And, a very, very poor country like that is spending billions on armaments, buying Mirage from France, to oppose another country, a neighbour. We are all doing this. What shall we do? What is the cause of all this destitution, poverty, orphans; in the Asiatic world, people have starved, are starving. The speaker was part of it; not enough food, and so on, as a boy, as a child. So we all know what poverty is. Perhaps not you. I am glad you don't know it. And what is the root of all this?

Is it national pride? Is it some kind of peculiar honour, to fight for one's own country and kill millions of people in that for that honour? What is the cause of this destitution, the increasing poverty in the world? Is it that the nationalism has divided people and therefore one country is enormously well-to-do, and the other countries are not? Is it possible to have a global relationship, interrelationship, so that economically, socially, as politics, everything, it is a global problem, not American problem or Asiatic problem. Can we consider that to stop wars, which is part of destitution, part of this enormous destruction of another human being, who is like you. He may call himself a Turk or an Argentine or a British or Russian, but that human being is like you and me.

Going through all kinds of misery; hoping for security in nationalism, which is isolation, and in that isolation there is no security. So could we or some group of people be free of all nationalism, who are absolutely, totally against war, killing other human beings? I am not telling you to do it, please. There were in ancient societies a group of people who refused to kill under all circumstances; it was their religious deep conviction that to kill was an evil, and if you kill you'd pay for it next life; therefore don't kill - reward and punishment, maybe but the idea of killing something, because life is sacred. So if one feels that deeply, one puts aside all tribalism, and can governments in the world not accumulate armaments? It seems almost impossible. The world has gone insane. If you don't pay tax, you are sent to prison because you are an objector to all this. And if you buy a stamp you are sustaining war. If you pay for petrol, or gas as it's called in this country, part of it goes to war.

So, seeing all this, what is a human being to do? Not only in the school, that's a small affair. What is a human being, confronted with all these problems, what is he to do? Who is responsible for all this? Governments? Politicians? The group of terribly rich people who are controlling governments, big corporations? Who is responsible for all this horror? Please answer these questions. Isn't each one of us responsible? Because we dislike a foreigner; hate people who are not of the same colour as we are, and so on. Isn't each one of us responsible for all this? So, if we are responsible, it's our duty, our intense feeling that we bring about a new society; a new group of people. That's the function of education. At least we are trying in this school to bring about good human beings,

whether they are rich or poor, children are children. Good, integrated, honest human beings. They may fail, but it is good to attempt to do something of that kind. So it's our responsibility, it seems to us; that each one of us deeply understands this enormous problem for which each one of us is responsible.

You have heard the speaker saying all this. He has said it all over India, Europe and this country, in Australia and so on. You listen to all this, and apparently we don't seem to apply it. And that is really the most terrible thing to do. If you hear something that is true and not apply it, it acts as a poison. Do you understand? It's a very destructive thing to hear something true, natural, healthy, and not profoundly apply it. Then what you have heard and what you are brings about a contradiction and then there is conflict, perpetual conflict. Far better not to hear any of this, and not apply.

The speaker has a passport, an Indian passport, diplomatic passport. But that paper does not identify himself with the country. That paper is merely for the convenience of travelling.

2nd QUESTION: Why do we confuse function with role? For instance, we may teach or do some work, but why do we make personal these functions, claiming them as attributes of ourselves, thereby introducing will, position, power, and consequently tremendous harm?

The question is fairly clear. Why are we always so personal about almost everything? Please answer this question to yourself. Why is it that we cannot look at the world impersonally, dispassionately? Why do we through function, use that function for status? Please. Why can we not keep function as, say for instance, the speaker has something to say, but why does he - if he does,

which he doesn't - why does he through this function want a status, a position, power, all that business, why? Is it that power is worshipped by human beings; status is far more important than function; a prime minister far more important than the cook; a professor is far more important than a man who is learning something or other; master carpenter and so on? You follow? We don't apparently see that function has its own importance, but if you are using function for a status, your function becomes brittle, it has,lost its energy. You know, nowadays - it's an old problem - functions, as that of a teacher or a great scientist or great statesman, a teacher throughout the world is considered rather 'not quite, quite'. Whereas a scientist, a doctor, we all kind of look up to. But the teacher is far more important than any other profession, because a teacher is bringing about a new generation of people. He should be paid the highest; but we don't do that. For us in - in this peculiar society that we have created - the teacher is the least respected, least considered important. Haven't you noticed this, all this? The teacher can't have a Cadillac, or a Lincoln or a Rolls-Royce, but big businessmen can have it, and you respect the Cadillacs, Lincolns and Rolls-Royces; which shows status is far more important than function.

Now, we all know this. Why? Why do we do this? That is the question. The questioner wants to know, why we human beings use function as a means to achieve a status; why? Is it not one of the reasons that we worship success? That goddess of success. We are all trained; every television and so on says you must succeed, succeed, succeed. Success means achieving a certain status. Not function, the honourable state of function in something for itself,

but use the function to become something; which is, to be famous, to have a great, or whatever it is. Why do we do all this? You are doing it, sirs, we are all doing it; except perhaps a few. Why do we do this? Is it we all want power, domination over others; more comfort through money?

By the way, I don't know if you have noticed, the world is becoming more and more, if I may use that word, materialistic. They all want to be more comfortable, more clothes, more houses, more money, do the same thing over and over again, the more of it, and that is called culture. You follow all this, I wonder? So it is all becoming so terribly tragic. And why do we do all these things? Why do we want power? Because we see people in great power, what they are doing, influencing people, their name in the papers every morning; and we'd like to have our names in the paper every morning. Is it a form of deep frustrated urge to have a position, a status of respect, of looking up to authority? We all want that. So we use everything as a stepping stone to something else. You know, it is one of the most difficult things to be nothing. Because to be a successful person is the most respectable person. He is respected. But a human being who says, I don't want any of these things, I'll just live. I'll be nothing in this world. That requires a great deal of inward stability; a light to oneself; capacity to stand completely alone.

3rd QUESTION: Is it not political action necessary to bring about total change?

Lots of things are implied in this question, as in every question. What are politics, what does the word mean? The art of government, science of government; that is, to govern people;

because people are so dishonest, so wanting to do their own thing; each one wanting his own desires fulfilled, he wants to compete with others. You follow? All that. So people, ordinary human beings like all of us, are striving to express our own personal individual desires, which go against other people's desires, ambitions, and so on. So each one of us is in opposition to another. And so the art of government is to rule the people, because the people are corrupt, people left to themselves are dangerous animals, therefore they must be controlled, they must be ruled, there must be law, and so on. This is what is happening in the world. Please see it for yourself. More laws, more policemen; greater armies, greater materials of war. So what does government mean? What is the art of government?

You know the meaning of the word 'art'? Not the writing of poems, painting pictures, writing novels; art, the word, not the expression of that word. Art means to put everything in its right place; you understand? To put everything - every action, every thought, every human being has its own place. So, when we human beings have not this art in ourselves - you understand? No, sir, I don't know if you do, please don't agree. Art in this sense, to put my house, my house which is me, in order. Then somebody else has to put that house in order. We have created this society, and we leave it to politicians to alter the society. We have created the monster called society, and to control that society we have to have politicians. Politicians may be either good or supported by the very, very rich people, of a small group of rich people supporting; you know all the game that goes on in the world among politicians. The speaker knows a considerable lot of them. And this is going on

right throughout the world; that is, we want political leaders. This leader during this period is not good, but when this election is over, we'll have a new president - a new leader, I won't call them presidents, sorry - new leader; and he too or she too might fail, but we wait another election. You follow? We have done this throughout the world, waiting for new leaders. The present leader is no good, but we hope the next leader will be better, and so on and on and on. This has been the game in all political world. Our desires are that. That is, we are always wanting somebody else to lead us; to tell us what to do. And there is no leader, no saviour no guru, no book is going to help us. I think if one really deeply realizes this; no outside agency, no change of environment, changing of certain structure of society is not going to change the human condition. The human condition is what we are, and if we don't apply ourselves to bring about a radical mutation in ourselves, no leader, nobody in the world is going to do it. And we may search in vain for a new political leader, new statesman, new world leader; we're waiting, creating a world still most chaotic more than it is now. It is so terribly obvious to anybody who looks, thinks about all this, looks at all this. But apparently we are always wanting somebody to do something for us, psychologically, which is far more important. Because what the psychological state is, the outward state is.

So, having heard that, what are you going to do about it? Just listen? And say, very good; good idea. But it's terribly difficult for me to change. Because I have not the energy, the whatever is demanded, I haven't got it. So each one of us is so negligent, indifferent, accepting things as they are, and carrying on. So if we

realize the world, the society, the wars, the nuclear bomb, all the horrible threats of the destructive thing called war, and if we realize that we are responsible for this, each one of us; a burning responsibility, not a verbal idealistic responsibility, a burning responsibility, a responsibility that demands an intense action in ourselves, not over somebody. Then perhaps there will be a possibility of a new society; a new group of human beings might bring about a different world.

4th QUESTION: Won't we find the truth you speak of through loving service to humanity, through acts of love and compassion?

Oh, this is a lovely question! The do-gooders are always helping society, the poor, devoting their life to poverty and helping others to accept the poverty or to move out of that poverty. This is going on; recognized by religious people as a great act, making them into saints, you know all this, you read about it almost every day in the papers; the missionaries that go out. It's all so ridiculous!

Now, the questioner says, through acts of love, compassion, service, do we find that truth which is not yours or mine or doesn't belong to any religion? Now, do you love? Do you have compassion? Do you want to help or serve another? When you set out to serve another, to help another, it means you know much better than the other fellow does. I think there is a great deal of vanity in all this, in the name of service, in the name of love; don't you think so? A great deal of self-expression. I want to fulfil myself through various activities, maybe service, maybe that which is called love, or through what we call love or compassion. Isn't it natural and a healthy indication to help another? That's natural. Why do we make a dance and a song about it?

And compassion, what is it, what does that mean? The meaning of that word; passion for all; feeling deep passion for all. That means that feeling of great intensity not to kill another human being, not to kill a living thing. Then you will say, when you kill a cabbage, that's to kill something. So, where do you draw the line? To kill a human being? To kill a baby seal? To kill your enemy, who is aggressive, as you yourself have been aggressive last year?

So, can compassion exist, love exist when there is there is antagonism, when there is competition, when each one of us is seeking success? Go into all this, sirs.

So, in having self-knowing - let's put it this way - in knowing myself, which is knowing the content of my consciousness, which is myself, the content, the beliefs, the antagonisms, the agony, the loneliness, the suffering, the pain, desire to be secure, all that, and more is my consciousness. Without knowing that, understanding the whole conflicting, destructive combination which is my consciousness, how can I love? How can I have that thing called compassion? So to know, the understanding of oneself, not the improvement of the self, which is merely the improvement of my selfishness, which can be marvellous if you want that kind of thing; the understanding of myself, the understanding of my reactions, the way I think, why I do - you know, the whole movement of this. The Greeks, the ancient Greeks, and the ancient Hindus, talked about 'know thyself'. But very few people have really studied themselves. They have studied the animals: rats, guinea pigs, dogs, monkeys, vivisection, you know all that, what is happening. And through them they hope to understand themselves. They talk about behaviour, but they never study themselves. We are the greatest

experimenters, if we are, in ourselves.

And to know oneself is to understand, look in the mirror of our relationship. I can't know myself just by thinking about myself, whether I am this, whether I am that. But I can understand myself, it's revealed in my relationship to my wife, to my children, to my neighbour, to governments, to everything. I see myself as I am, not as I would like to be, but actually as I am. Then, there is a possibility of seeing what actually is, there is a possibility of changing that, of bringing about transformation in that. But we never study ourselves. We are always studying books, and the books tell us what we are, and trying to adjust ourselves to what others have told us. What others have told us is what we are, so why do we have to be told by others what we are? Do you understand all this? Because we want to be quite certain that what we study is accurate. So we turn to others. We make mistakes, we say, this is right, this is wrong, I did this, but there is this constant awareness of one's reaction in one's relationship. That requires attention, a great deal of sensitivity. And to be physically sensitive, not be drugged, not take alcohol, smoke; how can you be sensitive?

So, compassion, love can only exist when the self is not. As we said the other day, when you are not, that which is immense is.

Do you want to go on? I can go on, but can you?

5th QUESTION: Do levels of spiritual - I haven't seen this question, so I must read it - do levels of spirituality or consciousness exist? What part do psychic healing, astral projection, the ability to see auras, and the entities, etcetera, and so on play in all this? And can these interfere with relationship and our abilities to see clearly? Good god!

I don't know quite how to answer this. First of all, the first question in this is, do levels of spirituality or levels in consciousness exist? That is, is one more spiritual than the other? You understand? The more. That is, is one nearer truth than the other fellow? Now, what is the meaning of the word 'more'? 'The more' is a measurement, isn't it? I am this, I will be more rich tomorrow. Or I am violent now, but I will not be violent in another week's time. So the mind is always measuring; I am tall, you are short, you are fair, somebody is black, somebody is yellow, somebody is pink; measurement. That is measurement is comparison. And the word 'measure' also plays part in meditation. Measurement and meditation are related. Please, this is very important if you want to understand this. Why do human beings measure? Not for clothes, I'm not talking about that. Psychologically, inwardly, why do we want to measure ourselves with somebody? That is, the measurement of 'what is' towards 'what should be'. You follow this? I am not good today, but give me time, I will be good; which is, the allowing of a time interval is the measure. You follow this?

Are we together in this? When I have the concept of psychological time, that time implies measurement. You get this? So, the questioner says, is there in spirituality - whatever that word may mean, for the moment we are using the ordinary sense of that word; the accepted sense of that word - is there in spirituality a measurement? Where there is measurement, there is no spirituality. Right? A guru, a bishop and so on and so on and so on and so on, there is this concept, this idea that someone is nearer god, nearer truth - god, I don't mean god, nearer truth. And he has achieved

something, and I have to achieve that, and to achieve that I must have time and I must measure myself every day. Right? And this is obviously so utterly mundane, utterly physical; that is, I am a clerk in an office, and perhaps next year I'll be a superior clerk and ten years later I will be executive. It is the same movement carried over into the psychological area. And so there is the nearest disciple and the novitiate right there. There is a monastery in Italy, the speaker used to go and visit it, where the novitiate waited for nine years. You understand? After nine years he was allowed to go into the inner sanctuary. There is a perfect measurement. And that is called spiritual growth.

And the questioner asks also, are there levels in consciousness? That is, there is unconscious and the conscious. Right? This is how we have divided consciousness: the hidden and the obvious; the thing that is dark and the thing that is light. We have divided consciousness that way. And in that consciousness there are several divisions. Now, to the speaker, consciousness is whole. It cannot be divided. Please see why. If there is consciousness, which is to be fully awake, then there is nothing hidden. You understand? I wonder if - no please, don't agree to this so quickly! Go into it gradually. Freud and all those gentlemen, professionals, have divided it, our consciousness, into various categories. And we poor laymen, not knowing, we accept all this. But as the speaker, and many people, do not read all this, perhaps they have studied their own states; one can see very clearly, when one is conscious of something, either you are conscious fully or very, very partially, as most of us are. When you look at this marvellous country - the hills, the trees, the light and the shadows - when you are

completely aware of all this, there is no hidden shadows in your own mind. So if one is completely aware of oneself, there is no division between higher consciousness and lower consciousness. It is consciousness with all its content.

One can divide: belief in some sacred thing is higher than my sexual or sensory responses, but it's part of my consciousness; which I have divided for some pleasurable reasons or for some desire to achieve something, or it's a pattern which I have accepted as measurement, and I measure myself. This is better than this; this is nobler than this. But it is part of this consciousness. Now, can my unconscious, that is the deep - please listen to this - the deep undiscovered places of fear exist when I have gone into the whole movement of fear? You understand my question? I have examined fear, and the causes of fear, because the mind has realized that any form of fear, hidden, secret, personal or physical and so on, any form of fear is destructive. The mind has realized this, not verbally, but actually. So, it is concerned completely with the freedom of fear, freedom from total fear, not partial fear. So, it's willing, it is open to all the hidden movements of fear to reveal itself, through dreams, through acts, through various forms of - you know, when you are walking by yourself in a wood or on the road, suddenly you realize there is a movement of fear, unconscious, which you have not realized before; which means, your mind is open to the revelation of your own fears. That requires a great deal of enquiry into the nature of fear, which we did last few days ago. So the hidden dark fears that are in the deep recesses of one's consciousness, in the mind, can come out, expose naturally if one is insistent, urgent, that there must be freedom from total fear. You

are following all this? The very necessity of being free of fear brings about the total exposure of all fear.

That reply demands watchfulness; sensitivity to be alert to every kind of feeling, nuances of feeling, the subtleties of reactions.

So, as long as there is measurement, there must be division, both in consciousness and in so-called spirituality.

What part do psychic healing, astral projection, the ability to see, blah, blah, blah, play in all this and can these interfere with relationship and our abilities to see clearly?

How does one answer this question? What prevents a human being from seeing clearly? Seeing not optically, inwardly; seeing things as they are, very clearly, without any distortion. Outside agency, astral projections, imagination, prejudice, bias, conclusions which you hold on to, experiences which you think are important, aren't these obvious facts that prevent clarity of perception? Why don't we go into those rather than into astral projection?

You know that word, astral projection is - -I won't go into that, sorry.

Psychic healing. One can heal only when there is no self. You understand this? But self is so deceptive, so cunning, that it hides behind all kinds of manner. Suppose I am a devout religious person attached to some form of symbol or idea, a projection; and that projection is me, greater, nobler, is the highest form, I am still selfish. I am still me, only glorified. As long as there is any sense of the self, healing becomes rather tawdry. But when there is no self at all, there is a possibility of healing.

It's an hour and a quarter we have talked. Is that enough?

Audience: No.

K: One more question, that'll be enough, I think.

6th QUESTION: What is it in humanity that has always moved towards something called religion or god? Is it only a projection as a result of fear and suffering, a seeking for help, or is it something deeply real, necessary, intelligent?

As the questioner points out, historically and actually man has always sought something beyond himself. Man has always said, this is not enough; I have my food, clothes, shelter, I live in this world, I die, but there must be something more. I am sure every human being, at least who is alert, who is fairly intelligent, must have asked this question. Even the committed Communists must have asked, is this all? Is this suffering, pain, and nothing more? And as the questioner says, does fear make us invent something, an outside agency that will protect us, guard us.

So we want to go into this question very deeply.

When there is no fear whatsoever psychologically, whatsoever, what is the state of your mind - please enquire together - what is the state of mind that is totally, completely free from all fear? Will it have any desire to protect itself? Will it have any need or necessity to seek something to which it can pray, worship, or ask help? You understand? When you are perfectly healthy, physically, would you go near a doctor? Would you study all the diet books? See every morning the expert doing exercises on the television? Similarly, a very, tremendously healthy mind - healthy in the sense, having no fear, completely no fear, end to sorrow. The understanding of the whole movement of pleasure, you follow? Healthy, sane, rational mind. Will it need to go to any church? Go on, sir, answer for yourself. It's only the mind that is crippled,

conditioned, unhealthy, fearful, aching, lonely, deeply sorrowful, wants naturally some help. And so it projects gods, saviours, the whole religious circle. But that suffering, that loneliness, that fear, he has not been able to solve, he hasn't gone into it. And we have had saviours who have had leaders, we have had every kind of help in the world; all the evangelists, all the preachers, all the - you know what goes on. They have not freed man from this ache.

So, the question is really, can we be a light to ourselves, not depend psychologically on anyone; action that will not breed conflict, regret, sorrow, pain, inwardly? You understand? Can we understand ourselves so completely, or is that not possible? We have never tried. We have tried everything else, we have gone to the moon, invented most marvellous machines, extraordinary surgical instruments. The brain has got extraordinary capacity, but that capacity we have never applied to ourselves. Because we have always asked for someone else to help us; that's what you are doing here, now. The speaker is not helping you, he is not teaching you; we are saying, look at yourself.

We have got the capacity, the energy, sufficient intelligence to go into ourselves, look at ourselves, face ourselves; never escaping from ourselves. We have got all the energy to do that. Think what energy is needed to go to the moon; you understand, sir? Enormous co-operative energy, drive. But apparently when it comes to us, the mind becomes slack; we wither, and we hope somebody will give us water that will bring us again to health. Nobody is going to give it to you. That's one absolute fact, irrefutable fact. Because we have had leaders, teachers, we have had saviours, we have had every kind of outside agency, infinite information about ourselves from

others. And all that has not freed us from fear. And so, out of our laziness, out of our indifference, out of our callousness, we invent gods and all the rest of it.

And the misfortune is, because we don't know ourselves, we are destroying other human beings. We're destroying this marvellous earth.

Right, sir? May I get up now?

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 14TH MAY 1982

This is the last question and answer meeting. Again, there have been so many questions handed in we cannot answer all of them.

I really would like to ask a question of you, if I may. You have put so many questions for the speaker to answer, the speaker would like to ask you a question; and I hope you don't mind. Why is it, being so educated, living in an affluent society, with marvellous land, with forests, rivers, great mountains, why is it that you do not change? I think that's a very important question to put. Why is it that we are so indifferent - not to outward responses, but to something deep, abiding, something that is worthwhile? Why is it that we don't change?

This has been a question which the speaker has been concerned with wherever he goes. With large audiences, small discussions, interviews and so on, and at the end of the journey there are so very, very, very few who deeply bring about a radical transformation in themselves. They are very friendly, there are social workers, some are politicians, some are some of the well-known gurus. They all seem to follow the same old pattern; outwardly demanding certain political changes to stop a particular kind of war, to have a little more money and so on, but deeply in their relationship, in their enquiry, they go up to a certain point and there it ends. Why? I leave that question with you, and we'll answer these questions and I'll pick up that question again at the end of these several questions that have been put.

1st QUESTION: One sees that chaos in the world is rapidly

increasing. Billions are being spent on arms, social justice is being eroded, governments, both totalitarian and democratic are increasingly aggressive, and violent. Though one sees the necessity of much deeper fundamental human change, could the speaker comment on the issue of active political involvement?

Am I Democratic or Republican, is that it? Apart from joking, why, if one may ask, why do we have such great confidence in political leaders? This is the same issue in all the countries; in France, in England, here, in India, and so on. Why? We put such confidence in the economists, in the politicians, in the leaders. Why do we do this? And what do we mean by political action?

Please, we are enquiring together, you are not just listening to the speaker, waiting for his explanation and answer. We are thinking together over this problem which is really a very serious problem, which is affecting the whole of mankind. Some political group, Democratic, comes into power; Conservative or Labour, or Republican or Democrats and they seem to have such extraordinary power, position and authority, and we follow them. They tell us what to do and we accept them. Why is it that sense of trust in them and accepting their judgments. We are sent to war, according to some rulers, government officials, and thousands are being killed; because a majority has voted them into power, position and direction and we merely like sheep follow them. Generally they appeal to our lowest instincts, to our national pride, honour and all that business. And we are stimulated by all that and we are willing to kill others for this, for a piece of land, and so on. Why? Why do we trust them?

Please, you answer this question. And what do we mean by

political action which is different from all other actions? Why do we separate politics from our daily living? Why do we separate a political activity of the left, right, centre, or extreme left, extreme right? Why, if one may ask, why is political action so very different from our action of relationship, action with regard to fear in ourselves, and so on? Or is politics part of our life, not something separate. Then politics, as we explained the other day, according to the common usage, which is in the dictionary, is the art of government, science of government. Why do we give this art to the politician?

They apparently are a separate breed, different from us. This is really a question that involves, why do we depend on a politician, a guru, a priest, on anybody to govern us? Please answer this question. Why do specialists take charge of our lives? Is it that we have no so-called confidence in ourselves? We are not sure of ourselves? And we attribute this clarity to the politicians and to the others. Is it in ourselves that we are insufficient and somebody out there is going to make us sufficient?

So, are we to treat life as separate factors, political, religious, economic, and so on? Or, are we to treat life as a whole? Please, question this. The questioner asks, what political action is there that one can take? The questioner perhaps - one may be misjudging him, if one is please forgive us - is that action, political, different from religious action; from the action of an idealist; or does one treat life, the whole living, learning in colleges, universities, schools; relationship; fears, faith, anxiety, and political action - isn't that a whole way of living? Am I conveying this?

Is it that we are so fragmented in ourselves as religious action,

political action, family action, individual action, collective action - you follow? Or do we treat life as a total movement in which all these activities are included. But if we separate one from the other, we inevitably bring about contradiction. A religious life is incompatible, one would say with political life; a religious person will have no part with politics, because generally politics is such a crooked affair, controlled by big industrialists, by wanting a great deal of money for the party, and they're depending on rich people and so on and so on and so on. So how do we, each one of us, answer this question? There is increase of armaments; just now they are destroying each other, killing each other for god knows what. And both the democratic world and the totalitarian world are becoming, as the questioner says, more and more aggressive.

So how do you deal with this question? It's very easy to put questions; very easy to put a question and try to find an answer from another. But if we have to answer this question ourselves, taking what is actually going on in the world: the national, religious, economic divisions, wars, tremendous spending of money on armaments; what is your answer? How would you answer this question? If you are American, you say, our way is the best way; and so on and so on and so on. Or, would you consider the right answer, the true answer is, that we cannot separate these activities but treat life as a whole movement?

And what is a political action? Would you like to start a new party, social democratic party? Or, look for a new leader for the next election; condemn the present leader, and when the new leader comes into being next election, again there is doubt about him, you know the whole thing - when the honeymoon is over then

begins the whole problem. So, what is your answer? Please, sirs, go into it for yourselves; what is your answer when you have thought it out deeply? Do you want to ask if there is an activity, if there is action which is not divisible; an action that includes politics, religion, economics, everything, the whole bundle of life. And is that possible?

One sees corruption right through the world; black market, rich people getting tremendously more rich; the privileged classes, and so on. Where do you begin to bring about an action that will include all actions? Where do you begin? To go very far, one must begin very near. Right? So what is very near? Me. I am the nearest person, so I begin - not as a selfish activity, or self-centred movement - I am the nearest, or I am the centre from which I start; not out there. Can I live a life that is absolutely not broken up? Not a religious life separate from all other lives, activities, but a life that is political, religious - you follow? Can I live that way?

That implies, does it not, do I understand the whole separative activity completely, and in the comprehension of the separate activities which then become contradictory, conflicting, endless divisions - if I understand that very clearly, perceive it not in abstraction or as an ideal or intellectually, but as an actual thing; from that observation one will act which will be complete. Have I answered the question? If you are actually wanting to start a political action, a new party, new group, new leader of your own, then I am afraid you and I won't meet; we are back into the same old pattern. But we are saying, a life that is complete, sufficient psychologically, from that quality of mind and heart, then all action is included in that.

2nd QUESTION: You say that out of the negative comes the positive. How does one negate the 'I' without aggression, suppression or denial or without conflict? Who is that which does the negating? Can you go into this problem?

You are going to go into this problem; not the speaker.

What is positive action? And what is negative action? The positive action is, I must do that, I will do that, this is right, this is wrong, or what is considered positive following certain idealistic course which will eventually bring about a different world and so on; the positive action, positive thinking as the evangelists and others propagate, positive thinking. And what is negative thinking? To think of others badly? I don't know what negative thinking is, really. Thinking is in itself is negative, but it doesn't matter, we'll go into it.

So the questioner wants to know whether the self, the essence of selfishness, the self-centred activity, can be denied without suppression, without conflict, without any form of evasion. That is the question. We are not saying that you must negate the I; how can you negate the I? And who is it, as the questioner says, who negates or asserts? When you say 'I am', who is it that says 'I am' aggressively? And who is it that says, 'I am not'? Both the positive and the negative, who is it? Go on, sirs.

Is there a separate consciousness, a separate state of mind, a separate clarity in our consciousness? You follow all my questions? Is there some element of clarity in this messy consciousness, messy, conflicting, aggressive, fear, their fears, faith, beliefs, superstitions and all that. In that confusion which is our consciousness, is there a spot of clarity which then can say, I

will direct, I won't suppress, I will change this whole confusion. Do you understand my question? Is there? Please if one is terribly honest with oneself, doesn't want to deceive oneself or accept some comforting idea, or merely follow some tradition, then you will say there is a field in this messy consciousness that is clear, unconfused, and that will bring about clarity in the whole field of confusion. You understand my question? This is the old, very old story; that there is, according to the Hindus in the Asiatic world, a certain entity apart from all this - they call it atman, god, or what you like - who is witnessing all this and seeing all this, through various forms of assertions, conflicts and so on, will ultimately free the mind from the confusion. Right? And probably here to, in the Western world, there is this idea of permanent soul, whatever that may mean, who is gradually asserting himself and will ultimately go to heaven. Right? These are all very comforting utilitarian theories. But they have not so far cleared man's confusion, man's conflict, his agonies, his loneliness, his depression, and so on.

So, why not try - when you are all so practical in the West and the East is also trying to copy you by becoming very practical - why not see that this is so utterly impractical; the god within you or the soul within you, or the clarity within you which will wipe away this confusion so easily. If that is not practical, as it is not, apparently, because it has not succeeded; succeeded in the sense - please let's be clear in the usage of that word - succeeded, not to be something in this world, to have more money and so on, succeeded in bringing about complete comprehension, the ending of conflict and so on. As it has not, let's look at it differently. That means one must deny this, negate this. That's going against all your religious

tradition; the Bible, the soul; you understand what I am saying? Negating all that. Then if you do, then we can look at it differently, but if you have slight attachment to all that, conscious or unconscious, then you will not look for anything else.

So, first of all, what is the self, the 'I'? All the attributes, all the tendencies, the various forms of idiosyncrasies, various beliefs, the various hurts, the conflict in relationship, fear, loneliness, agony, seeking some illusive security, suffering, all that, the name, the form, is the 'you'. Right? Or do you doubt that? If you doubt it - one should - then when you doubt something it means you must examine it, not just doubt. If you doubt that there is god, doubt - I am not saying you should - if you doubt it, then you must enquire if there is such a thing. But merely to doubt, say, well - has no meaning. Scepticism has great value, but if you are merely sceptic all the time, what's the point, it's like being illusory, caught in an illusion, they are both the same. So where there is doubt there is also the movement of enquiry. So we are enquiring together. This 'I', this separatist activity, so-called individual, which is the essence of the 'I' - and the questioner wants to know how to negate that, the very whole activity of me, my possessions, my qualities, my aggression - you follow? The whole of that. How is one to negate it?

Now, the questioner asks that: how to negate it. Then he goes on to ask, who is it that negates? You follow? First he said, tell me how to negate it. Then he says, who is it that negates. You follow? I wonder if you understand this? So we are not negating it. We are trying to find out what it has done in the world first, this self-centred egotistic activity, what it has done in the world, and see the

reality of it, the actuality of it; and then enquire, who is it that is acting all the time from the centre. You understand my question? It is not that we are negating the self, but that the activity of the self in the world, what it has done in the world, what it has done in the family, in the group, in the community, in the nation, in the world, and so on; and seeing the reality of it, not the idea of what it has done in the world, but the actual happening, the actual activity of it, and from there - which is our criteria - from there enquire if that self which is creating such mischief in the world, can that self be looked at? You follow?

Then we will enquire, what is it that is looking at the self? It is the same question put differently. So, first, what has it done in the world? I don't have to answer that question; obviously, it has separated itself into nations, into communities, into various forms of social divisions; it has divided itself from the rest of the community, society, world, as the family, and from the family, the 'me', my aggression, my happiness, my pursuit, and so on so on so on. It has brought about division in the world, because it said, in that division as my particular belief, my particular religion, my particular faith, in that faith, in that belief, in that dogma I will be secure, I will be safe. Right? Are you following all this? So it has created vast division, incredible divisions; and so where there is division there must be conflict. So the I, which is the creator of this division, which is the essence of conflict - right - can that I come to an end? Not suppressing, not evading not avoiding, and so on so on; can that I which has done all this mischief, all these terrible things in the world - separate gods, it has brought about a million wars, thousands of wars. Is that a fact? For you, not for me. Is that

a fact? Or is it an exaggeration? Or is it some kind of concept, and you are adjusting yourself to that concept? That is, we think war is cruel, and therefore the I must be - you follow? First conceive an idea, and then adjust ourselves to that idea. We are saying, observe what is happening in the world without bias, without any partiality, and you see what the I, the so-called individual expansion, the individual aggression, the individual success, and so on so on, what it has done in the world.

If you are very clear on that point, then we say, now, seeing what cruelties, bestiality is brought about in the world, can this movement which is the 'me', can this movement ever stop or radically change? When you have put that question to yourself, then who is it that is to bring about a change? The questioner says, who is it that will end this self-centred activity. Right? That is what the questioner is saying. That is, we have to go much deeper into that, which is, is there a difference from the observer and the thing he observes. Please just listen to it; don't agree or disagree or say, oh, you are repeating the old stuff. I have heard this last year, or two years ago, or twenty years ago, you are repeating. Move out of that rut. We'll move out of that rut. It is not a rut, but you may call it a rut.

When you observe a tree, that thing, can you look at it without the word first? Or when you look at it, the instant response is, that's a tree, oak tree or whatever it is. Can you look at it without the word? - word being the symbol, the idea, the memory, which uses the word as the tree. You follow? Experiment for a minute, for a second or two to look at that thing which is around you now. And when you so look without the word, because we are caught in a

network of words. I don't know if one realizes it. The word, the symbol has taken the place of reality; when you say, my wife, you have the complete picture; or my husband or my son, my country, the flag; and when you use the word, Communist, it is - you follow - the whole intonation, the quality, what is behind that word. And when you say, I am an American, or I believe in god, I don't believe in god - you follow - this vast network of words in which the mind lives, the brain lives. I don't know if you have noticed all this. I hope it interests you. The questioner asks it, and the speaker says, if you are not interested, it is a nice day. Does one realize that? That one can never look at a thing, a living thing, or a dead thing or a thing that is moving - always with a word; to look at a river, at the flowing water, not call it the Mississippi or Thames or the Ganges, or the Nile - just look at the moving water. It has quite a different quality.

Now, so can you observe - is there an observation, not you observe, sorry! - is there an observation of the movement of the self which is anger, bitterness, hurt; just to look at all that without the word. Are you following all this? The word is the past; right? The word indicates the content of the past. My wife - I am taking an ordinary example - my wife; when you use 'my wife' see the content of that word, the enormous implications of various incidents, accidents, ideas, hurt, all that in the past. Right? And that word 'my wife' indicates the tremendous content of the past. But, can you look at the woman or the man without the past, to look at her? Go on, sirs, do it, don't listen to me, there's no point in listening to me if you are not applying, if you are not doing it.

So first of all we are asking, is there an observation of the whole

movement of the self, which we have described both outwardly and inwardly, can you look at that - no - is there an observation of that without the past? You get it? You understand what I am talking about? Look, I have lived 80 years or more; 87 years. A man who has lived 80, 87 years has collected lots of experience; lots of ideas, met lots of people. There are all these past memories throbbing away. And either he is an idiot to live in the past or memory - with this person being very, very, very, very selective - and not live in the past but watch things happening; to observe without the observer, which is the past. Have you got it? Am I making it clear? To observe; to observe one's reactions without naming it as jealousy, as anger; just to observe. When you so observe, what happens? Go into it, sir, I hope you are doing this, not just listening or getting bored with the damn stuff. If you are listening, we are asking a question, which is: when there is an observation without direction, without motive, which is the past, what happens? Now, to find out what happens, actually, you must enquire what takes place when you are directing it, when you are remembering it, your reactions, or giving direction to your reaction. That is, there is a separation between the observer and the observed. Then there is a division and hence a conflict: I must not do this, I must do that; this is right, this is wrong; I say this is right according to my motive, and so on so on so on. So when there is an observation that where there is division there must inevitably be conflict, outwardly and psychologically, that is absolute fact. When I call myself British or American, and I am willing - you follow, the whole thing you've right in front of you. You are willing to destroy thousands of people, spend enormous sums of money, to

do something which your national pride or some nonsense dictates.

So, can this conflict in the human mind, which is your mind, it is not my mind, the human mind, which is in constant travail, constant conflict - we are enquiring whether that conflict can end. It can end only completely when the observer is not, only observation is. Is the thinker different from thought? Look at it. Is the thinker - right - different from the thought which he has created? The thinker says, I am a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, I am a Democrat, totalitarian, whatever it is. the thinker says that. But the thinker has created the Democrat, the Republican, the left, far left, far right, far centre, and so on. The thinker has done that. And is the thinker different from his thoughts? Oh come on, sirs, this is so simple; obviously not. But we have divided it. Right?

So look at another question. Is the experiencer different from experience? Ah, this is - I am glad. Now you are caught! We all want experiences: going to the moon, experience of god, experience of a dozen kinds, of sex, experience of going to the Himalayas and climbing the Everest, you follow? Experiences. Now we are asking, is the experiencer different from his experience? The experiencer must recognize the experience. Right? Otherwise it is not an experience. You follow all this? Am I talking some strange language? I experience - what - a motor accident, I have an experience in an accident in a car, and that is recorded. Pleasant, unpleasant, and as hurt, and so on; the expense of it, and so on; that is recorded. Right? The experience of that thing is remembered, and that experience is a memory which is different from that which has happened last year. Right? So the observer is that experience of last year. Right? Oh, come on, sir. And that

experiencer either wants to avoid future incidents of that kind, or if he is prone to accidents, he'll invite them. We are asking, is the experiencer different from the experience? Of course not. I have invented god; and I am going to experience that marvellous state. Right? I have visions of, if I am a Christian, the Virgin Mary, if I was a Buddhist, I've an experience of various types of Buddhist consciousness, or if I'm a Hindu, I have - you follow? Being conditioned to a particular tradition, which is the past, I experience that. Oh, come on, sir, I have projected that and I experience that.

So the experiencer is the experience. And if there is no experience, what is the state of mind? Do you understand all these questions? We are all wanting experiences; and when one actually goes into it very, very deeply, experience, we hope, will bring about more knowledge, more clarity, more this and more that; but the experiencer is the experience, therefore the mind is no longer seeking any experience. Only such a mind is absolutely clear; it requires no challenge. That's a different thing.

So, is there pure observation of the movement of the self; because in that the self is not different from the observer, there is only observation, without the past accumulated memories interfering with observation. When the past memories and accumulated knowledge interfere, then there is wastage of energy. I don't know if you are following all this. Wastage of energy in conflict, in denying, in suppressing, in arguing, why should I, rationalizing the whole business, which is a form of conflict. Now, that's a wastage of energy. Whereas when there is observation without the past, all energy is brought into being, all energy comes in that observations, which dispels that which is observed.

It's up to you; I've said it ten different ways. So there is no conflict with the self, or denial of the self, or suppression of the self. It is the clarity of observation, which is the greatest form of intelligence.

What time is it? (Twelve-thirty) Good Lord, There are about nine questions, I've only answered two questions.

3rd QUESTION: How does one not become a victim while not becoming a predator?

That is, how does one stop exploiting without being exploited? Right? It's the same question, isn't it? I don't want to exploit you, but you are exploiting me. You actually are. You follow? It is the same, very interesting, this question.

How do I - no - the unconditioning of the mind doesn't become another form of conditioning. You have understood? There is a movement away from this trap, and not be caught in another trap. I am a Hindu, I say, it's absurd, and become a Catholic; or I am a Catholic and say, what silly stuff, and I join Hinduism or Buddhism, or become a Muslim. It is the same phenomena, you understand? So one has to enquire, what is freedom?

Does one realize one is caught in a trap? That is, the same repetitive movement, which the computer is doing, it is repeating much more rapidly, more quickly, more intelligently, more alive, quick, programmed; and we are also programmed to be a Catholic, to be a Protestant, to be a Hindu, to be a Buddhist, you follow, to be a Democrat, to be right, left, right; we are also programmed; don't let's fool ourselves. Therefore we are repeating, repeating, repeating; right? Come on, sirs, what are you all waiting for? And the questioner asks: is it possible to be free from conditioning - the

predator and the victim - and yet not fall into another form of conditioning? Am I being fair to the question? Of course. You agree?

Now: so I have to enquire - one has to enquire what is freedom? This movement from one corner to the other corner of the field - you understand - the field is my consciousness, this whole world is my field; and I move from one corner of this field, psychological field, to another corner, and I call that freedom; or I choose to move south instead of north, and I call that freedom. So I call choice freedom. I am a Democrat, I choose to become a Republican; but it is the same movement; we are silly enough not to see that. So is that freedom? You are following all this? Does choice bring about freedom? Or where there is choice there is no freedom. I may choose to move from Los Angeles to New York, and I can't do that in the totalitarian state, I have to have permission, special grants and so on; so I feel I am a free man. So at what level, at what depth, or superficial level, do you consider freedom lies? Here in this country you can say what you like, so far. But you cannot say what you like when there is a war. Right? Then we are all united to hate somebody, to kill somebody.

So what is freedom? Enquire, sir. The question is involved in that. What is freedom? To move from trap to trap to trap? To move from one kind of misery to another kind of misery? I am married, I am bored with my wife, I want a divorce and I go, because I like or love, or whatever word one uses, to another woman; but the same pattern is repeated; and I call that freedom. So is there freedom in this moving in the same area; that area may be wide, or very very narrow, but it is the same movement. That is not freedom. Right?

So what then is freedom? Freedom obviously means to totally be free from the whole content of consciousness. You understand? The problem of one corner is different from another corner, but it's in the same field; and we separate the problems, but it's one problem; you understand? I wonder if you see? All problems are interrelated, that's clear; my sexual problem, my problem of earning a livelihood, my problem of god, it's all one movement of this everlasting search for something or other; of becoming. So, freedom is the ending of completely becoming something.

4th QUESTION: What is humility and modesty?

That doesn't exist in this country! Nor in Europe or in India. So what is humility? And why have religions all over the world said you must be humble to inherit the land? Right? They have, certainly. You understand it? The humble shall inherit the earth. And the empire builders have inherited the earth. I wonder if you see this? No, you don't. It doesn't matter. What is humility? Can one ever know, or aware of oneself being humble? When you know, are aware, realize that you are humble, you are not. Right?

And, modesty; are we modest? Go on, sir. We were talking the other day to an India to an Indian, in India. He was looking at a magazine printed in this country; it was one of those magazines where you see half-naked ladies. And he said, my god, what has happened? Have they lost all modesty? And was horrified; because he has an idea of modesty is, that you must be absolutely up to here. You understand all this? So why do we want to be modest or humble? Please ask all these questions. When I try to be humble, that is, willing to learn, willing to be told, abnegating myself in front of authority, and hang my head down to the floor to receive

something which you are giving me, is that a form of vanity? It's like a man who is vain, as most of us are, and out of that vanity we try to be humble. Is that humility? A man who is full of aggression, violence, tries to be modest. You understand? It's absurd, it's lost its meaning. Whereas, a man who is aggressive realizes, sees what aggression has done in this world and all the consequences of that aggression, when he ends that aggression, a new thing can begin. The ending - please realize something - the ending of something is the beginning of the new. Right? If I end my vanity, if I have it - I am a big man, I am blah, blah - if I am that and I end it, there is something totally new taking place. But we want to be assured before I end that something will happen; guaranteed. Then what you are receiving is not guarantee, it is the same form, it's the same thing in another form.

Sir, I'd like to come back to our first question. You have heard all this, some many, many, many times, others perhaps for the first time. Why we human beings, who have lived on this marvellously lovely earth, destroying it, why we have become what we are, after so many millennia: vulgar, cruel, bestial, self-seeking, jealous, lonely - you follow - the whole thing. Why don't we change? Why don't we end what we are? Why? Is it we are lazy? Is it we are caught in a particular rut, pattern that we haven't the energy to change that pattern? We have plenty of energy when we want to do something. When we want to go to the moon we have incredible energy. When we want to be champion of the world as in the Olympics run, you have an incredible energy. We have enormous energy when there is an urge, when there is a demand; but apparently there is no urge, there is no demand; why? Is it our food

we eat, too much indulgence in sex, in drink, in this and that; too much demand to be entertained? So we are wasting all that extraordinary energy which is part of us in some futile things and therefore no energy to face these things and move, end. Is that it? Please, I can't tell you the cause of all this. There are many causes. But the explanation of the cause is not the ending of the causes.

So why is it, after so many, many years and thousands upon thousands of years we are what we are? So that's for you to answer.

May I get up now?

OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH MAY 1982

We'll continue, if we may, with what we were talking about last Sunday. Some of you probably were not here, so may I briefly restate what we were talking about. One would like to point out, if one may, that this is not an entertainment. Most people are used to being entertained, sustained by somebody else's words, actions and so on. This is not a lecture, as is commonly understood. Nor are we trying to direct or tell you what to do; this is not a propaganda. But we are thinking together, which is a rather difficult problem, because each one wants to think in his own particular way, from his own point of view, and so on. But here, during these last four talks, we were saying how important it is that we should think together. The capacity to think, not about something, but that comes a little later, but to think, which is to observe what is actually going on outside in the world, and also to be aware of all the difficulties, psychological travail, that one has, and to discover for oneself the relationship between the so-called individual and his activity psychologically and the world.

We were saying also, this outward society which has become so dangerous, so insecure, is the result of our own daily activities; perhaps the past generations have added to it, but we are responsible actually for all that is taking place in the world. And also we pointed out that our consciousness, that is, the consciousness of each so-called individual, what he thinks, what he believes, his feelings, his despairs, his loneliness, his fears, his pleasures, his enjoyments, his peculiar form of worship, and so on, those are the content of our consciousness. And this consciousness

is common, if one may use that word common, to all mankind. Wherever you go in this marvellous earth, which you are slowly destroying, wherever one goes - even if you go as a tourist - there is this problem for all human beings; they suffer, they go through great agonies; the fear of loneliness, not being able to stand alone; their form of worship, their beliefs, their gods, and so on, just like in the West. So, as we pointed out, when you go into this question very deeply, this consciousness, which each one of us thinks that it is ours, our special property, is the common property of mankind. So consciously, deeply, we are not individuals, though all religions, all society, all families, and so on, have maintained that we are separate individuals with our own peculiar tendencies, capacities, outward forms, name and so on. We are rest of mankind; therefore we are mankind. We are the world and the world is us. This is not a peculiar, exotic theory, something as an ideal, but an actual psychological fact; whether you like it or not, this is a fact. Because you do suffer, and the Asiatics also suffer; you have your many problems and so have they. You are a nationalist, and so are they; you want security, permanency, endurance, continuity, so do they.

So the illusion that we are, in our consciousness, separate individuals, is not a fact. And when one realizes that, not as an idea, not as an idealistic concept, something that we have to strive after, but rather that this is the ground on which all human beings throughout the world stand.

And also we were pointing out that in our relationship with each other, intimate or otherwise, man or woman, there is a great deal of strife, great deal of misunderstanding, contradiction, each one

psychologically going his own way, pursuing his own ambition or her fulfillment, and so on. Like two parallel lines never meeting, perhaps sexually. And also we were pointing out the nature of fear; the various forms of fear, and whether human beings who have carried this terrible burden of fear of millennia upon millennia, can ever be free of it completely. We went into it very deeply, step by step, and it is possible, not a theory, not a goal; but it is possible actually to be totally completely free of psychological fears.

And also we talked about the pursuit of pleasure. More and more in this world, outwardly, various forms of entertainment, both religious as well as the various facts of entertainment, football, and so on. And we are also pointing out how mechanical we are becoming; repeating the same thing over and over and over again, which is what the computer is doing; it may do it more rapidly, more efficiently, more widely, but our own minds, our own feelings, are repetitive.

So we are going to talk about this morning, if you will permit it, why is it that we human beings who have lived on this earth for over a million years or more, why we have become what we are, brutal, violent, contradictory, killing each other in the name of god, in the name of country, in the name of peace. There used to be a slogan, after the First World War, which said, "This War (like the next war) is to end all wars". And this repetitive process of killing each other has been going on, though we are highly educated, technologically we are extraordinarily efficient, but psychologically we are very, very primitive. And we were saying, why is it that we do not change? Why is it that there is no end to all this terrible individualistic, competitive drive, which is destroying

the world?

And we are going to talk about together the nature of what we consider love. This has been a question that has existed among the ancient Egyptians, the ancient Hindus, and recently the Christian world and the Islamic concept; they have all preached, talked about loving your neighbour, and so on. This has been asserted, religiously, in all the countries, but apparently we have never come to realize what it is. We talk a great deal about it, books are written, but we have created a god, or gods, and we love that god, or gods, we don't know exactly the nature of that beauty. So we ought to - though we went into it briefly the other day - we ought to go into this question very deeply. Is it mere sensory responses, sexual pleasure? Please, as we said, this is not a talk, this is not the speaker asserting any point of view, but we are together examining - please, I'll repeat over again - together we are enquiring into the nature of what one calls love.

So one must ask oneself whether it is mere sensory, sexual responses; which more and more in the Western world, and now which is creeping into the Eastern world, has been turned into pleasure. Is love pleasure? A form of entertainment? A thing which demands some kind of sensory fulfillment? Is it desire? We went into the question of what is desire very carefully; how desire arises and the demand of its fulfillment. When there is no fulfillment, there is frustration and all the neurotic activities of unfulfilled desire. We went into that. It would be unnecessary - if you have come for the first time, one hopes that you will not mind if we will not go into it again.

So is love desire? If it is, then all the complications, frustrations,

the demand for its fulfillment, with all the conflicts that arise - so is love conflict? Please, one must repeat this again, you are asking these questions, not the speaker. The speaker is merely pointing out, which you yourself are examining, not merely verbally, intellectually, as a thing passing by, but actually in daily life. Is love a movement which has continuity in pleasure and desire? You are asking the question. And why is it pleasure has become so extraordinarily important in the world? The whole entertainment industry, so-called sports, and, if you will forgive also, the religious entertainment, which is considered sacred; these are the various forms of pleasure. So one asks, is love a movement, an endless movement of pleasure? Is love attachment? Attachment to a belief, to a concept, to knowledge, to a person, or to a symbol. In attachment there is fear, with all the agony of being alone. So if one sees the consequences of attachment: one is attached to the country, to the flag, as everyone in the world is doing that, the separative, symbolic flag; the Asiatics have their own flags, to which they are terribly attached, as in this country, for which you are willing to kill each other, which is what is happening. And we say, that's a principle; a principle that a country which has become aggressive must be pushed back, and so we are willing to kill others. This has been the old repetition from the most ancient of days. And every religion, the most ancient ones and the recent ones of 2000 years, have always said love, do not kill. But our pleasure overcomes this edict.

So one must, if one is at all serious in our relationship to each other, man and woman, relationship with the rest of humanity, whether they're black, white or purple or whatever colour they be,

in that relationship, why is there so much conflict? Is it that in that relationship we seek security, safety? And this search for security in relationship, and naturally, fulfillment in that relationship, is that love? So, please, enquire; let us enquire together into this question very deeply. If all that is not love; the attachments, the desire to fulfil, the urge and the fear of being alone, lonely, all that; if all that is not love, like jealousy, hate, arrogance, pride, all that is not love, can it be ended? This is really quite a serious problem; because we never end anything, come to an end; but we want, where there is ending, a replacement. If I give up this, what will I have?

The question of ending a particular problem is really quite important: the ending. Because after all, as we are going to discuss a little later, the ending of life is called death. There you cannot argue, you cannot carry over anything, there is total ending of your memories, attachments, and so on. So one should enquire most seriously if there is an ending - not finding a substitution; not demanding a guarantee that if there is an ending of this, will there be that. So we ought to enquire very deeply, as we said, can all the things which are false, like pride, arrogance, attachment, and the desires, pleasures, and so on, which obviously are not love; can all that end? Because without love in life, the perfume, the passion, the depth of life is lost. Life becomes very, very superficial; very mundane, worldly; which is what most of the world is becoming more and more. Because we have never found out for ourselves what it is to love another. Love is not a remembrance of past events and past pleasures; love is not knowledge. But yet knowledge has played an extraordinary part in our life. Because there are all the

scientists and biologists and so on, saying that the ascent of man is only through knowledge. We so easily accept what the professionals say; we never enquire for ourselves. It's one of the calamities, I think - one may be wrong - that books have become so important; what other people have said and written; all the professionals, psychologists. We are talking of not the professionals in the technological world, but the psychological professionals, who have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about oneself, about other human beings; and that knowledge, will knowledge transform man? Transform totally, completely the nature of his consciousness, not partially, not here and there, little less fear, little more kindly, little more generous, less conflict; but will this knowledge that man has acquired through very many, many centuries about the psyche, about the various divisions in consciousness; will knowledge, that is, the accumulated information and accumulated experience, will that knowledge transform the whole content of man, content of his consciousness? Please, ask this question of yourself.

You have studied, you have enquired about yourself, or you have been told by other psychologists what you are, and you have accumulated knowledge about yourself; perhaps not too much, but a little. And has that knowledge - knowledge being always of the past - whether that knowledge has transformed man; or a totally different kind of energy, totally different kind of activity, or non-activity; will that bring about transformation in consciousness? Because this is again important to understand and go into.

There are those who say, man is conditioned; you cannot possibly transform that conditioning. A whole philosophy, a whole

school exists believing that, asserting it, writing all about it, they are very, very clever people. And if it cannot possibly be transformed, then we'll perpetually live in conflict; live in contradiction; continue in neuroticism of various kinds. So, is knowledge of one's wife going to transform the conflict that exists between man and woman?

So one has to ask, what place has knowledge? All that you have learned in school, college, university, your own personal experiences; the accumulated reservoir of memory we store in the brain, which is the past meeting the present may modify itself and continue in that modified form, in time as the future. So we are saying, asking, has that knowledge brought about deep change in human beings so that they will not kill, so that there is no fear whatsoever psychologically; so that human beings have this extraordinary capacity to love another? And has not knowledge become a barrier to love? Please, do enquire into all this. So can there be ending to all the things that prevent that perfume? And it cannot be brought about through conflict, through struggle, through the assertion of will; for after all, will is summation of desire, the essence of desire.

We're also ought to talk over together one of the most complex and apparently endless questions: suffering; suffering, not only separative, individualistic, personal suffering, but also the suffering of mankind. There have been so many wars, practically every year throughout the world for the last 5,000 years and more. War; that means, every year killing, killing, killing, how many millions have suffered, shed tears, felt the flame of loneliness; and yet we do not apparently use our intelligence to stop this cruelty, this bestiality of

violence, which we talked about too the other day. So there is suffering, both physically and non-physically. The understanding of suffering non-physically will help physical suffering.

So we must first enquire together into the nature of suffering; why human beings, psychologically, inwardly, go through agonies. This enquiry is not cynical or sadistic, but one must enquire whether suffering, psychologically, can end. Is that question self-motivated? Is that question irrelevant? Because we are inflicting, human beings are inflicting psychologically a great deal of suffering on others. We get hurt, deeply, which we talked about at the beginning of these talks - that's also suffering, and the consequences of being hurt psychologically; we went into it, the resistance, the isolation, fears, and so on. And in the Christian world suffering has been avoided in the worship of a symbol; but suffering still exists. In the Asiatic world they have all kinds of explanations for suffering, but yet they suffer. Apparently there is no end to suffering, the human sorrow, the human pain, the grief; that seems to have no end.

And we ought to enquire together - not verbally, intellectually, or romantically; find out whether there is an ending completely of sorrow. Because where there is sorrow there is no love; where there is sorrow there is no compassion; where there is sorrow there is no depth to intelligence. So one must go into this question: who is it that suffers? This is related to the question of death also. We'll go into that too, if there is time this morning. Who is it that goes through agony; tears, and utter loneliness and despair when you lose somebody whom you think you love? Who is it that suffers? What is the nature of that feeling or that state in consciousness?

You are understanding all this? We are meeting each other, aren't we? Or the speaker is talking to himself? These are your problems, not that of the speaker. So please listen, enquire, find out; not leave it to somebody else; because if you leave it to somebody else to solve this problem, then you depend on others and therefore you lose your own intrinsic capacity to solve all the human problems of which you are.

So we are asking, who is it that suffers? When you, shed tears, feel utterly lost, the shock of something you have held dear is gone or lost, who is it that has this feeling of great pain? Which means, who is the 'I' that says, I suffer? Who is this entity that feels this shock and the pain and the despair of loneliness? Please, this is an important question to ask, for when we are enquiring into the nature of dying - though on a lovely morning it may be morbid, but it's not - there, too, who is it that is dying? Who is the psyche, what is the nature of the psyche, the 'me', the 'I' that suffers? You know, we have clung to the idea the 'I' is something permanent; the 'I' has a continuity; the repetition: my house, my knowledge, my experience; my conditioning, my fear, my pleasure, which is secretive; so, who is this 'I'? The various psychologists have given various interpretations to it. If we could put aside all the psychologists, what they have said, and observe for ourselves - including what the speaker is saying - observe for ourselves very clearly without any direction, without any motive, actually what we are.

The ancient Greeks and the ancient Hindus have talked about knowing yourself, not according to some professional, but know yourself. What is that self, and what is it to know about it? You

understand? What is the self and to know about it, and what is the knowledge that is accumulated after knowing about it? Do you understand the question? Can I know myself through time? That is, I have learned, I have observed myself, watched all the reactions in my relationship with another, intimate or otherwise; I have accumulated a great deal of knowledge through that observation; and when I observe again other reactions, other idiosyncrasies and sensory responses, that previous knowledge interprets what is actually happening. Right? Are you following all this? So, you are actually not knowing yourself, you are perpetuating the knowledge which you have acquired through various examinations and observations which has become your knowledge and that knowledge is beginning again to interpret the present responses, the present happenings and incidents; so you are perpetuating the knowledge which you have acquired, modified and projecting into the future. This cycle is knowledge, action, learn from that action, which becomes further knowledge to keep the cycle going. I hope you are understanding. Isn't that so? We are not telling you anything that you have not observed yourself, if you have observed.

So, to know oneself really, deeply, previous remembrance, previous knowledge has no place. You have to observe each incident and each response as though for the first time. That is, to know, observe, enter into the field of this immense life which is specialized as the 'me'. Where there is the 'me', the self, there is no love. So it is very important to find out for oneself and not escape from this question. Because it's your life; it's your responsibility. If you merely avoid it and run away into various forms of

entertainment, you are bringing about great disaster in the world, for which you are utterly, totally responsible.

And where there is the ending of suffering, there is compassion. Suffering, the ending of it, is to have passion. There is a vast difference between lust and passion. Lust everybody knows. But the passion, not identified with some symbol, Christian or Asiatic symbols. We have not that passion. When the missionaries, evangelists, the preachers of God and all the rest of it, they are salesmen. To have passion; passion to go, understand the brutality, the violence, the fears, the agony, to resolve them so the mind is free from all the contamination of struggle. You must have great energy for that, to go into this. But if one is merely caught in fear, pleasure - pleasure is different from delight, watching something that is beautiful. But the remembrance of it and the desire to continue in that remembrance is pleasure.

And if we have time and if you are not tired this morning, we ought to consider together this immense, complex problem of death. As pleasure, fear, attachment, hurt, the conflict in relationship, that's our daily reality; and death is also a part of our life. It's not something that comes at the end of life, after old age, disease, accident, that's part of this whole business of living. And we never consider the importance of death; the quality, the depth of that word. Most people are afraid of it; and being afraid they have invented all kinds of theories which will give them comfort. In the Asiatic world, the origin of it perhaps born in India, reincarnation; that is, the 'me', dying, will have an opportunity next life to be more happy or more greedy, and so on. In the Christian world there is this whole concept of resurrection. You hear about it all day

wherever you go, in the Asiatic world and here. And which is important, what is after death, or before death? Please ask this question of yourself. Because most of us, being frightened of death, either rationalize it, say it is inevitable, like a tree grows, withers, dies, everything grows, becomes old, and ends, withers away. So we rationalize our existence if you are an intellectual; or if you had a very good time during life, popular, money, etcetera, then you'll say, I've had a jolly good life. Or, as most of us laymen, our life is shallow, insufficient, perhaps technologically we are good, money, position, status; or we are just feeble human beings, uncertain, no security psychologically, and so our life becomes rather dreary, meaningless; so shouldn't we consider first what is our life? Not what it is to die, we'll come to that.

What is our life? From the moment we are born till the moment we die, what actually goes on with our life? We know all about it, we don't have to repeat it. If you are grown up, an adult, you work in a factory, or a businessman, a lawyer, from morning till night, repeat, repeat, repeat. And if you are a housewife, you know all that business, one hasn't got to go into all the details of it. So our life is pretty shallow, whether it's a scientist, great philosophers; or generals or politicians, apart from their title and position they are just like other human beings; vain, frustrated psychologically, seeking - you know, all the rest of it. So, our daily life is a routine and an escape from that routine. Our daily life is work, work, work, without any leisure. And if there is leisure, which is called holidays, it's mere enjoyment. So our life is shoddy, tawdry - please excuse these words, they're just describing what it is - with occasional flare of great beauty and depth and happiness. The

ending of all that is to die. And man - man, woman - man throughout the world is more concerned about death than living; living without conflict; living with great energy; living in clarity; living without a shadow of conflict. And that is possible only if fear ends completely, psychologically. Then there is no need for gods.

So what is it that dies? The accumulation of the knowledge about oneself? The accumulation of your properties? The accumulation of all the things to which you are attached. So is it possible to live - please understand this - to live with death all the time? That's the ending, as you live, everything, day after day; you understand? That means you are, the mind is incarnating afresh each day. That is creation, that is a mind that is creative; not inventive. There is a vast difference between inventiveness and creation. All the technological world and technicians of that world are inventive, because they are using knowledge. And from knowledge to knowledge they move, but they are never free from the knowledge, so that there is a new beginning totally. So to live with death, not commit suicide, that's too silly, to live with death, to end my hurt, end it completely; end one's attachment, and so on; so that life and living, life and death are moving together all the time. Do it!

If one applies one's mind and energy to this enquiry and its activity, then there is a totally different kind of life. And we'll talk about it tomorrow, what place such a life has in this world and is that a religious life. And the place of a religious life in meditation and so on. May I get up, sirs?

OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH MAY 1982

I do wonder why you have all come; is it out of curiosity? Or, it's a lovely morning, it's an outing for you? Or, are we serious enough to face all our problems, which are mounting, and find out for ourselves if we can resolve them? And as it is not possible to have a discussion with so many people or have a dialogue, then we can have a conversation together; which is that you and the speaker are walking along a shady lane full of shadows and running waters, and are talking about their own problems, problems which confront all humanity; not only each one of us, but also what every human being in the world is going through. And as we were pointing out yesterday, we have assumed our consciousness as being something separate, personal, individual. But as one observes deeply, this consciousness, which is the common ground of all humanity, the common suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, and great uncertainty, and the everlasting search for security, is the problem of every human being in the world. It's not your particular problem, it's the problem which is the issue of all human beings, whether they be Christian, Muslim, Hindu or Buddhist.

So we are talking over together amicably, in a friendly spirit, the issues of our life. And as this is the last talk, we cannot go over all the things we have had a conversation about during the last five talks. But we can summarize the whole thing. Most of us are apt to take one special problem and try to resolve it. Or come here hoping that someone else will help you to overcome or resolve or transcend one's particular problem. But if one examines more acutely, critically, every problem is related to all problems. They

are interrelated; They cannot possibly be separated and, having separated them, try to resolve them individually or separatively. We talked about various things during the last five talks: fear, the nature of human beings who have been hurt all their life, psychologically, inwardly, and the consequences of that hurt. We went into that very, very carefully. And also we talked about relationship between human beings - man, woman, the neighbour, whether that neighbour be very, very, very far away. And in that relationship, however intimate, however personal, there is always conflict, there is always a certain sense of uneasiness, fear, domination, possessiveness, attachment. All these breed naturally struggle between two human beings. Conflict arises; and we went into that question, whether that conflict can possibly end, or must it everlastingly continue from generation to generation?

And also we talked about fear, which is a very, very, very complex problem; the contributory causes of that fear, conformity, comparison, imitation, trying to be something that you are not, and other factors, bring about fear. We went into that very deeply. And also we talked about the continuation and the demand for pleasure, whether it is the religious pleasure or ordinary pleasure of life; sexual, the form of achievement success, possession, money, prestige, status, and all that.

And yesterday morning we went into the question, what is love. We talked about yesterday morning why human beings have destroyed that one perfume, the absolute necessity in life, without which life has no meaning whatsoever. You may have lots of money, enjoy yourself on the sea, go to various churches, follow various gurus, accept various philosophies as the way of your life,

but without that quality and that perfume, that passion, which is different from lust, that comes about when there is love. We went into that sufficiently, extensively yesterday morning.

And also we talked about the ending of suffering; why human beings, so highly educated, in one direction so extraordinarily intelligent, in the technological world, why human beings who have lived on this marvellous earth millennia upon millennia, why they have not understood or ended suffering. Not only personal suffering but the suffering of mankind, where there is starvation, in Africa and in the East, India, where poverty is destructive, degrading, and other economic problems which separate mankind. And we said without nationalism, a global interrelationship alone will solve all our outward economic social problems. We live on this earth together; it's our earth, not the American earth, or the Russian earth, or the Hindu or the Buddhist or the Islamic world; it's our earth, but we have divided it as the American, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, European and Hindu and so on so on. Where there is division, racial, economic, religious divisions, there must be conflict; there must be wars; and these wars have been going on for millions of years. And our intelligence, which we give to the technological world, we have not applied that intelligence to solve this problem of suffering. And we have the capacity, we have the energy, but apparently we are caught in a mechanistic world. Our culture is becoming more and more mechanical; it's a mechanistic culture, which is not only where the machine becomes all-important, but also the culture, which is mechanistic, is to live a life of repetitiveness, to repeat over and over the same, with the same problem, with the same issues, with the same conflict.

And we also talked yesterday, and we shall go into it more deeply this morning, why human beings have become what they are, shallow, superficial, having learned a great deal of life, accumulated a great deal of knowledge, and that knowledge apparently has not solved our human, daily conflict. So knowledge may be one of the factors of sorrow, which we talked about yesterday morning.

And we shall go into some other subjects this morning; but first, please, this is not a lecture, as it is generally understood; lecture being, talking about a particular subject and being concerned with that subject to transmit it as clearly as possible to another. So this is not a lecture; but rather a conversation between you and the speaker in which both of us are observing, thinking about the same problem, looking at the same mountain, the same trees, the blue sky, and so we are together, the speaker means that, honestly together to observe these problems and to find out for ourselves, not according to some philosopher, not according to some priest, not according to authority of a guru and so on and so on; to discard all that completely and observe for ourselves why we human beings have become so deplorably unhealthy psychologically. So please, though the speaker may put certain things into words, but the words are not the actual; the explanation is not that which is explained. As we talked about the other day too, we are caught in a network of words. And words become extraordinarily important: the word 'American' has an extraordinary significance to the people who live in this part of the world. Or the word 'Communist', 'Socialist', 'Capitalist', and so on, Baptist and Catholic. So words are not the actuality; the symbol is not the actual. So please, if one

may point out most respectfully, what we are explaining, what we are going into is merely explanation, usage of certain words, but the words, the explanation are not the real.

We ought to talk over together what is culture. The ordinary meaning of that word is to cultivate, as you cultivate vegetables, a garden, a rose bed. Culture implies, not a repetitive, mechanical existence, but to be free from the known and act from that freedom; that's actually culture. That is, we live always in the known. Please, kindly follow all this if you are interested; it's a nice morning, and you may treat this gathering as an entertainment, which would be most unfortunate; as a kind of mental stimulation, a drug. But if you treat this as a form of stimulation, then you lose the reality of one's own life, of one's own shallowness, one's own emptiness, one's own fears, anxieties, and all the travail of life. So please, as the speaker puts it into words, examine that which he says for yourself. Because doubt, scepticism, is a great purifier. Most of us so easily accept things, specially in religious matters and so-called spiritual matters. There authority assumes it knows and you don't know. They act as interpreters. But it is necessary to discover what is truth, there must be doubt. And doubt in the Eastern world, in the Eastern religions, has been emphasized. In the Christian world doubt is an anathema; because if you doubt the whole structure of the church, whether it be local or from Rome or any other, if you doubt it then the whole thing collapses. So in the Western world doubt has been condemned; they have been burnt, those who doubted, called heresy, they have been tortured; as they are doing now to political prisoners in various parts of the world, it is the same phenomena. So, please don't accept a thing that the

speaker is saying but try to find out for yourself by carefully listening, if you are interested, if you don't treat this as an entertainment, then please listen and doubt and question and ask. Doubting that which you have created yourself, you are doubting your own ideas, your own conclusions, your own experiences, your beliefs, your faiths. You are doubting so that you find out for yourself what is truth.

And that is very important, because truth demands a free mind; a mind that is completely free. And there is no path to truth, so please, as we are going into this very complex problem, let us listen carefully, with certain quality of doubt. To doubt requires sensitivity. If you doubt everything, then it becomes rather stupid. But to doubt with a light hand, with a quick mind, with subtlety, then that doubt brings about clarity, energy. And we need energy to go into all these problems, to resolve them.

So we are asking, what is culture? Is it merely the mechanical repetition of the known? Which is, we live in the past, the past is our memory, the past is our knowledge through experience, and we live always in the past, in the known; and when we act from the known, it is repetitive. We must act in certain areas with knowledge; like a scientist, he has to have a great deal of knowledge; or a great surgeon must have experience, he must have operated upon many, accumulated knowledge, skill, and a sensitivity of hand; and there knowledge is necessary. And knowledge, which is all our remembrances, all the past incidents, the hurts, the fears, the longings, the despairs, the desperate loneliness; all that's part of our past knowledge. And when we are acting from the past, it must be repetitive. And therefore the mind

becomes mechanical. The computer is a repetitive machine, maybe quicker, faster than the human brain, but that machine is repetitive, as we human beings are. And so we are questioning any culture born from the past, from the known; obviously it's mechanical, repetitive. And so we are going to find out what is it that brings about a culture which is totally different from the mechanistic culture which we have accepted for thousands of years. Most of our minds - with some rare exceptions - are mediocre; forgive me if I use that word. One may think one is extraordinarily out of that class; but to think that you are out of that class is also a form of mediocrity. This is not an insult. We are examining together.

What is it to be mediocre? The word mediocre comes from Greek, Latin, 'climbing halfway up the mountain'. That's the real meaning of that word, mediocre; never climbing all the way up, but being satisfied to climb halfway or one-third of the way. That is the meaning of that word, mediocre. And our education, however wide, whatever knowledge one acquires through a particular subject, all these factors of education are limiting the mind. Have you noticed how, specially in this country, which is spreading this fact all over the rest of the world, how specialists, scientific specialists, the doctors, the surgeons, the philosophers, the psychologists and so on, they are ruling each one of us. They are the authority to tell you what to do. They are the experts: how to bring up a baby, how to have sexual relationship properly, how to make up your face; there are these authorities, and we all obey them. Our obedience has at certain times a revolt, but that revolt is merely a reaction and so it's not complete comprehension of the understanding that all specialized knowledge is limited, as all

knowledge is limited. And a culture born out of this limitation is no culture at all. There's no American culture; or European culture. They can go back to the Renaissance, to the past history, but deep culture of the mind can come about through freedom from the known. Can there be such freedom?

We are going to talk about it together because only from a religion a new culture can come into being. Religion is not the authoritarian, the accepted form of religion. The state religion, the religion of belief, of faith, of dogma, of rituals, of worship a symbol, that is not religion; obviously. So we are going to enquire into what is religion. Do you understand? Because we've enquired into fear; into the nature of that extraordinary thing called love; whether human beings can ever end their suffering, their misery, their anxiety. And also we should enquire together into what is religion?

Man worships; there are still those people in the East who worship a tree; who worship a mountain; they give in India to the Himalayas a special place, a special name. And they worshipped at one time the earth, the trees, the heavens, the sun - as the Egyptians did. But we consider all that illusion, nonsense. And as we are so terribly sophisticated, we worship a symbol, pray to that symbol, to that saviour or, as in India, another form of the same thing.

Worship has been part of human life from the ancient of days. You may not worship a tree; but you go to the church or to a temple or a mosque and there you pray, you worship. There is not much difference between the worship of a tree, which is alone in a marvellous field of green earth, and the symbol that thought has created in the church, in the temple, or in a mosque. There is not

much difference between the two because man suffers, he is in trouble, he doesn't know to whom to turn to, so he invents a comforting god; which is, thought invents a god, and then worships that which he has invented. These are facts, whether you like it or not. You invent the whole rituals of Christianity; as in India, there are complicated rituals. And it is the invention of thought. And then thought says, that is divine revelation. I do not know if you have not noticed. In Asia, which includes India and here, divine revelation plays an extraordinary part. But that divinity is brought about by thought. The interpreter of that divinity is the priest. He thinks and his thought has created various forms of rituals.

So we are asking, is religion all this? Is religion based upon books, the printed word. Where religion is based on a book, whether it is the Christian, Hindu, Muslim, or the Buddhist, then there is dogma; the authority of the book becomes all-important; there is bigotry, narrowness of mind. Both the Muslim world and the Christian world are based on books: the Koran and the Bible. In India, fortunately for them, they have got a hundred books, hundred gods - no, more than that, 300,000 gods. (Laughter) Don't please laugh. This is very serious. It sounds funny. And there they are tolerant, which means they put up with anything: false gods, true gods, any kind of illusion, any kind of assertions of any so-called religious man. Here in the West, as the Muslim world, the book plays an extraordinarily important part. And therefore those who believe in the book, deeply convinced by every word in that book, they become bigoted, dogmatic, assertive, aggressive, and if they are not semi-civilized, they'll kill. This is happening in the world. So is religion - the word religion, the etymological meaning

of that word, is unknown. It arises from certain Latin words, which we'll not go into, but it actually means, according to certain dictionaries, the capacity to gather all your energy to discover, to come upon that which is true. That is the root meaning of that word. So we are gathering our energy - all our energy, not a specialized energy; the energy of thought, the energy of emotions, a passionate energy to enquire into what is truth.

And to go into it deeply, we must enquire also into what is thought, which has invented all the religions in the world, all the rituals, all the dogmas, the beliefs, the faiths; it is the result of thought. There is nothing divine about anything. Thought can say what I have invented is divine. But thought is not sacred, is not holy. So it is important to go into this question of what is thought. We have gone into it previously but the more you look at it, the more you enquire into the very nature of thought, the more complicated, the more it demands a subtle mind, it demands a quickness of mind; not a mechanical mind, not a mind that accepts; not a mind that acquiesces; but a mind that is doubtful, questioning, demanding, has this great energy. And when you give this total energy, not an energy which is partial because you are interested in some form of entertainment, or in some form of relief, in some form of comfort; then it is all partial energy: whereas if you demand totally to understand the nature of the human mind, why we live the way we are living, destroying the earth, destroying ourselves, wars, misery; then you have to give all your energy. And where there is this total energy, complete passion to understand, to find out a way of living which is totally different from non-mechanistic, repetitive way.

So we have to go into this question deeply once again, what is thought? Why thought plays such an extraordinarily importance in our life, in our relationship. Is thought love? Please enquire with the speaker; really the speaker is putting your question, it is not his question. You are putting this question for yourself. Thought has created the marvellous cathedrals, magnificent structures in Europe and some of them here; and thought also has put all those things inside the cathedrals and the churches and the temples and the mosques. So one asks, is thought sacred? Because it has put all this in these buildings and then you worship it. I wonder if one sees the illusion of this, the ironic, actual deception; that thought has invented the symbol, the ritual, the host, and the different things in India and Asia, thought has been responsible for all this, some of it being copied from the ancient Egyptians, from India, and so on. And then thought, having created this marvellous structure in stone, then inside is all the symbols, the agony, and in the Asiatic world a different symbol; then thought says, you must worship that. So we are asking, is thought sacred in itself? Or, it is merely - please listen to it, you may not agree; do not agree but enquire - is thought a material process? If it is not sacred, then it is a material process. But thought has invented these, heaven and hell, the saviours of the world, according to different religions, their rituals, it is all the result of thought. And then thought turns around and says, you must worship it. So we must find out for ourselves, not according to any authority, in spiritual, religious matters. There is authority of the surgeon, that's a totally different matter. But to discover, to come upon that which is eternal, if there is such thing as eternity, your mind must be free in all spiritual matters, in all

psychic matters; that is, in the psychological realm, which is you, there must be total freedom to find out.

So we are going to enquire together the nature of thought. If you have never thought at all, you are in a state of amnesia, blankness, but that is a rare form of disease. But most human beings throughout the world, the Hindus, Buddhists and so on, communists, the common factor is thought. They all think, whether they are extremely poor, uneducated; or the highly sophisticated, accumulated professor; or the cunning politician; or the highest authority of the church, and so on; they all think. As each one of us does, in our daily life. And that thought dominates our life. So it is very, very important, if one may point out, to understand the whole movement of thought. It has created great poetry, great painting, great sculpture, literature; and thought is necessary to do business, to drive a car and so on. What is thought? What is its origin, the beginning of thought? You are asking the question, not the speaker. Please, apply your own minds, brain, to enquire into this question. Because thought dominates every action in our life. Thought is the determining factor in relationship. So what is that thing called thought, the thinking machinery and the origin of it?

Is not thought born out of memory? You remember where you live, the distance to be covered from here to where you are going, and that's knowledge, and that knowledge has been acquired through experience. So the beginning of thought is experience, knowledge, memory, stored up in the brain. Right? This is a fact, not exotic or absurd illusion. You remember something that happened yesterday, pleasurable or not, and that remembrance is stored in the brain, recorded in the brain; and from that record

thought comes into being. So thought, whatever it does, is not sacred. It's a material process. Some of the scientists even agree to what the speaker has been saying for many years. They have experimented on rats, pigeons, and guinea pigs, dogs; but they don't experiment upon themselves. We are also matter, and science is concerned with matter. And if thought is a material process and thought, whatever it does, whether in the religious field or in the business field or in preparing for wars through a gathering of armaments, is the result of thought. Thought has divided people into this type of religious person, this type of human being who lives in certain part of the world, and so on. It's thought that has divided human beings. And thought, because of its divisive nature, because thought is never complete, because born of knowledge, and knowledge is never total about anything, - therefore thought is always limited; and separated, because - I won't go into all that - it's separative. Where there is separative action, there must be conflict, between the communists and the socialists, and the capitalists; between the Arab and the Jew, between the Hindu and the Muslim, and so on. These are all the divisive processes of thought, and where there is division - that's a law - there must be conflict. So nothing that thought has put together, whether in a book, in the church, in the cathedrals, in the temples or in the mosques, is not sacred. No symbol is sacred. And that is not religion, it's merely a form of thoughtful, superficial reaction to that which is called sacred.

So we are going to find out, if we can this morning, giving our attention, our attention to enquire what is sacred, if there is anything sacred at all. The intellectuals throughout the world deny

all this. They are fed up with the religions, with their illusions, and all that. They discard; they are rather cynical about the whole affair, because religious organizations throughout the world have great property, enormous wealth, great power; all that is not spiritual, all that is not religious. So, as we said, the word religion, the etymological meaning is unknown, but also the dictionary takes it clear that to enquire into what is truth one must gather all energy, the capacity to be diligent, to act, not according to a certain pattern, to diligently observe your thoughts, your feelings, your antagonisms, your fears; and to go far beyond them; so that the mind is completely free.

Now we are asking, is there anything sacred in life? Not invented by thought, because man, from time immeasurable, he has always asked this question: Is there something beyond all this confusion, misery, darkness, illusions; beyond the institutions and reforms; is there something really true, something beyond time, something so immense that thought cannot come to it? Man has enquired into this. And only apparently very, very, very, very few people have been free to enter into that world. And the priest from ancient of times comes in between the seeker and that which he is hoping to find. He interprets, he becomes the man who knows, or thinks he knows. And is sidetracked, diverted; lost.

So if we want to enquire into that which is most holy, which is nameless, timeless, one must obviously belong to no group, no religion, have no belief, no faith, because belief and faith is accepting as true something which does not or may not exist. That is the nature of belief: taking for granted, accepting something to be true when your own enquiry, your own vitality, energy, has not

found out, you believe. Because in belief there is some form of security, comfort. But a man who is seeking merely psychological comfort, such a man will never come upon that which is beyond time. So there must be total freedom. Is that possible, to be free from all our conditioning, not biological conditioning, that's natural, but the psychological conditioning: the hates, the antagonisms, the pride, all the things that bring about confusion, which is the very nature of the self which is thought? And to find out, there must be attention; not concentration. The word meditation has been introduced into the Western world quite recently by some of those people who have accepted certain norms, certain patterns of meditation. There is the Zen meditation, the Tibetan form of meditation, which is different from the southern form of Buddhist meditation, there is the meditation of the Hindus, with their special gurus, who again have their own forms of meditation. Then there is the Christian form, which is contemplation. And the meaning of that word, meditation, implies, the meaning of that word is 'to ponder over, to think over'. And also, a meditative mind must be free of measurement. Please don't go to sleep, if you are interested. That is, the mind that's in meditation first of all - we'll go into that a little later, if we have time.

So all those people who have brought this word, - with their systems, methods and practices, are again put together by careful thought. Perhaps one guru or two - those Asiatic birds - have some kind of experience; immediately that's translated into some kind of a spiritual status, and they have their meditation. And they come here and you are gullible enough to swallow all that; pay for it; the

more you pay, the greater the meditation.

So we ought to enquire into what is meditation? To meditate; it's really important, because a mind that's merely mechanistic, as thought is, can never come upon that which is totally, supreme order, and therefore a complete freedom. Like the universe is in total order: it's only the human mind that is in disorder. And so one has to have an extraordinarily orderly mind, a mind that has understood disorder - we went into that the other day - and is free completely from disorder, which is contradiction, imitation, conformity, and all the rest of it. Such a mind is an attentive mind, completely attentive to whatever it does; to all its actions, in its relationship, and so on and so on. Attention is not concentration. Concentration is restricted, narrow, limited, whereas attention is limitless. And in that attention there is that quality of silence; not the silence invented by thought, not the silence that comes about after noise, not the silence of one thought waiting for another thought. There must be that silence which is not put together by desire, by will, by thought. And in that meditation there is no controller. And this is one of the factors in all the so-called meditative groups, and the systems they have invented: there is always effort, control, discipline. Discipline means to learn; not to conform, to learn so that your mind becomes more and more subtle, not based on knowledge, learning is a constant movement. So meditation is freedom from the known, which is the measure. And in that meditation, there is absolute silence. Then in that silence alone, that which is nameless is.

RISHI VALLEY 1ST TALK WITH STUDENTS

8TH DECEMBER 1982

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about? What would you like me to talk about? Jumping over the moon? No, you don't know what that means. Well, what would you like me to talk about? All right, if you have no suggestions I'll carry on, shall I?

Student: Sir, you may talk about anything.

K: Of course, that's the easiest, isn't it? If I was married, which I am not, and if I had children, which I haven't, what would I want my son or daughter to become, to be in life? Do you understand my question? Suppose I have a son or a daughter, I would like my son and daughter, perhaps one of you is my son and daughter, I would like first of all that they should be highly sensitive. You know what that word sensitive means - to have all your senses, your touch, your seeing, your hearing, highly developed. Because unless one becomes very, very sensitive when you touch, feel, see, your brain will not be greatly active. The senses are part of the brain. Is this too difficult? Could I go on like that?

Oh, I forgot something. The Foundation has appointed as the Secretary of the Executive committee, and the Director of Studies, Radhikaji, there she is sitting over there. She is going to be the executive secretary and Director of Studies. Probably some of you know her already. She has an MA in Sanskrit, Ma in Philosophy, and Phd. That's enough about her!

As I was saying, if I had a son and a daughter here, what would I want them to be, to become, to flower into?

S: A great man.

K: I don't know what you mean by a great man. A great man may be a swimmer, a man who runs one kilometre in two seconds, and so on. I don't know what you mean by 'great man'. Either he is a great scientist, a great archaeologist, or a great professor - I don't know what you mean by 'great'. Do you mean a great national hero?

S: Yes.

K: I thought so. (Laughter). A national hero is the last person to be great. You don't understand it, do you? So I would like a boy or a girl for whom I am responsible to be highly sensitive. I'll go into that presently. So that his brain - that's the only instrument we have, an instrument which is capable of extraordinary things, what it has done in the technological world, it is extraordinarily capable and to be sensitive, and to have a brain that is highly active, not suffocated, atrophied by so-called modern education. Sorry! Do you understand what I am saying? Am I boring you?

S: No, sir.

K: What does that mean? Yes? Why? And I would like that boy or girl to have an excellent body, a very healthy body, pliable, swift, strong, eating the right food, right exercise, clothed properly, with good taste. No response! All right. And to have a good mind, a good brain. You know we have an extraordinary body which has evolved through thousands upon thousands of years. It is an extraordinary instrument, if we don't abuse it, if we don't overeat, over exercise, over indulge, then it can last for a very, very long time, over a hundred years. And to have a good body is essential. Right? You agree to all this? Will you have a good body? Eat right food, exercise, walk so the your body becomes extraordinarily

alive, not just a lot of lumpy flesh. Is this all too much? Do you understand what I am talking about? All of you understand English? Yes? I don't speak Tamil, Telegu, Hindi or any other Indian language, but I know French - you know what French is? - I know Italian, I used to know Spanish. I am beginning to forget most of them. My mother tongue has become English. So I am afraid I have to speak in English so I hope you will understand it. And one must have a very good brain. So let's talk about that. Apart from the body, apart from having a good sensitive appreciation of nature - you know all the trees around you. Have you ever looked at any of the trees, have you? Go on, answer it. Have you looked at trees or have you pulled the branches off?

S: We did both. Sometimes we look at them and at the same time pull out some leaves.

K: I know. It is like pulling your hair out. The tree doesn't like it. But have you looked at it actually? Look at it one day after you leave here. Look at a tree. How extraordinarily beautiful it is, so symmetrical, the last highest leaf has extraordinary vitality. Look at it and don't do anything to harm the tree. Have you ever looked at the heavens, at the sky? Have you looked at it, not just casually look at it and go off and do something else, but actually take time to look at the sky, the clouds, the light in the clouds and the shape of the clouds and the moving clouds, how they cast shadows on the hills and how the shadows move? Have you watched all these?

S: Yes sir.

K: No. I am afraid you have not. Probably you are too busy pulling out somebody's hair, too busy talking, chattering, so you never have time to look at the extraordinary world we live in, the

beauty of this valley, the ancient hills and the dried river, the stream. Have you looked at all this, every day, as though you are looking at it for the first time? You can't look at it as though for the first time if you say, well, that's a stream, dead, you know. The moment you name it, it is not new. I wonder if you understand this?

So, I would have that child, that boy, that girl, highly sensitive, and that helps the brain to be also very alive, sensitive, active. You know modern education right throughout the world is making the brain dull because it has stuffed with a lot of knowledge, information, specialized career as an engineer, as a doctor, as a chemist or devoting time to research so that the brain becomes conditioned, shaped by the study you do. Right? Are you understanding some of this? Don't you discuss with me, can't you talk? Have you noticed how your brain is conditioned? You call yourself a Hindu. That is a conditioning. You call yourself a Muslim. That is conditioning. Or a Christian or a Communist or a Marxist. Do you understand? Our brain is programmed as a computer. I wonder if you understand all this? Aren't you programmed, haven't you been told from when you were little that you are a Hindu, that you have your own gods, that you have your own particular rituals? Haven't you been told all that? So by constant repetition of that: you are a Hindu, you are a Christian, you are a Muslim and so on, your brain gradually becomes conditioned, shaped, and all the rest of your life, you say I am a Muslim, I am a Hindu, I am a Christian, I am a Catholic, I am this or that. That's conditioning. Isn't it? Am I talking to a lot of dead people, not thinking people? Are you all cynical up there?

S: Whatever we do, aren't we in some way or the other being conditioned? In the way you mean, you look at a tree, you look at something without naming it, otherwise it seems we become conditioned. If we learn to look at it that way aren't we being conditioned?

K: Sir, suppose I want to be a good carpenter. None of you do that. Of course you all want to be lawyers, engineers. Right? But none of you want to be a good master carpenter. I watched one of them in California. He was really a most extraordinarily skilled person. Now, if I want to be a carpenter, I have to study the nature of the wood, I have to study the nature of the implements and the grain of this wood and so on. I have to familiarise myself with the various types of wood. And also the instruments I use I must handle them properly. Right? Now, that actually makes my brain somewhat conditioned in a particular direction as a carpenter. If I want to be an engineer, the same thing happens. Or a scientist or a philosopher or a religious maniac. So - please listen to this - does knowledge condition the brain?

S: Yes.

K: No, don't say, yes immediately. Think of it, talk it over. I go to school, pass examinations if I am lucky or if I am fairly brainy - not brainy - fairly good at memorizing. Then go to college, university and then a career. I have acquired knowledge about mathematics. That knowledge, is it conditioning my brain? Enquire into it. Let us talk about it. Don't keep silent.

S: Conditioning will mean your thought process is going in a particular direction.

K: Yes. So, if I specialize in one subject, does that condition my

brain? Apparently it does. A surgeon, a very good top surgeon, he has had ten years or fifteen years of medical study, gets a degree, practises till he becomes a top surgeon. And such a surgeon obviously being a specialist, his brain is conditioned. Right? Some of you are going to be engineers and some of you are going to be lawyers and so on. Your brain is already being conditioned by the idea that you will be an engineer, a doctor and so on. Is that right? Would you agree to that? Now, is knowledge, which is that, I have a great deal of knowledge as a surgeon, a great deal of experience, I have operated on the heart dozens and dozens of times, and my hands are skilful, I know the precise instrument to use and so on, so my brain is conditioned. So we are asking a further question which is, does knowledge condition the brain? Go on sir, answer it. That's what you are doing, you are acquiring knowledge in this school, getting a lot of information and you are memorizing it, it is stored up in the brain. In the very brain cells, you study, mathematics, whatever it is you study it is stored there as memory, that memory of a particular subject does condition the brain. You agree to that? Not 'agree', do you see the fact? S: Well my question now is, you just said, sometime back, look at anything without naming it, otherwise you become conditioned. Isn't that too a kind of gaining knowledge?

S: He said even when I look at something, as you are asking us to do, in that process also he says we are getting conditioned.

K: Now, when you look at a tree, do you name the tree?

S: I don't, because I don't know the name.

K: Right. You don't know the name. So you look at it. When you look at it without using the word 'tree' or a special kind of tree,

then you are looking at something very alive. Does that condition you? Obviously not. The moment you name it, the moment you recognize it as a particular species, then with that conditioning you are looking at the tree. You understand the difference? Go into it further. Can you look at your friend without the word, without the picture that you have built about the friend, without the image that you have carefully gathered - without the image, without the picture, without the word, can you look at your friend? The word, the picture, the image is the conditioning. You are following this? So, can you look at something, look at your friend, or look at the speaker, at me, without the image, without the picture you have built about him or the name, or the word, just look. Can you do that? Because if you name it, have an image about it, or the picture you have constructed or put together or put together through reputation, then that is your conditioning. But if you have no picture, then there is no conditioning. Clear? You follow it?

S: I can't do it. How do I decondition my mind?

S: I follow it, but how do you do it?

K: That's an excellent question, 'how do you do it?' Why do you ask that?

S: Because I am interested.

K: You want to achieve that, you want to have that kind of look.

S: Yes.

K: Yes. So you are asking, how. Now watch your brain, how it operates. When you ask the 'how' you want a system.

S: Yes.

K: That's your conditioning. You understand? The 'how' is your conditioning, but to see the fact, to see the truth, that conditioning

operates only when there is the naming, the picture, the image that you have built about her or him. That's your conditioning. Just be aware of that, don't say, how am I to get out of it. Just be aware of this fact. Do you understand? Aware. Are you aware of all the trees, of the hills, the shape of the hills, the rocks? Are you aware of all that? If you are not aware of all that, it is very, very difficult to be aware of your conditioning and to see how that conditioning acts. So one has to be aware of the whole environment around you.

S: How do you get along with him, with that person, if you don't have a name, or if you have no image about him?

K: If I have no image, picture, or idea about him, what is my relationship with him - is that it? Have you tried it? Then why do you ask that question? Do tell me please, I am not being impudent.

S: I cannot try it.

K: Why can't you? Look, how many years have you spent in a school or college or university? Years. Right? And to do this you do not even spend half an hour at it, investigating it. You don't spend even ten minutes to find out whether it is possible or not. So your brain is conditioned by your slackness, by your laziness. The moment you pay attention it becomes alive.

S: Our brain itself naturally seeks conditioning and can't help it.

K: Sir, our brain has evolved from the ape and so on, till man, which is about 40,000 years ago, and that's what the scientists say. It has passed through every kind of experience, every kind of incident. Right, sir? So it has gathered enormous information, experience and the brain itself is conditioned. Because it has in the very nature of growth become conditioned. Now, we are saying the conditioning is the word, the picture, the memory, the accumulated

information stored in the brain as memory. These are the factors that condition the brain, and more, there are other factors but there isn't time to go now into the various other factors like fear, greed, pain and so on. All these are the contributory causes of the conditioning. So we must ask the question: is it possible to uncondition the brain? You understand my question? There are many scholars, many professors and writers like the existentialists and so on - they say it cannot be unconditioned, that it can only be modified.

S: Logically speaking, those people who say it cannot be unconditioned are right.

K: Maybe, but I have to find out. Why should I accept it?

S: No, you yourself said so.

K: I said that sir. It has evolved from the ape till now, and there is a very great deal of ape in us. Now the fact is it is conditioned. Is it possible to free that conditioning? Otherwise evolution has no meaning. If I am violent from the moment, from the ape till now, I will be violent till the very end of all time. So is it possible to change the whole psychological structure of the brain? Is it possible for you to be completely free of fear? Because, that is one of the factors of conditioning.

S: It is awesome.

K: Of course it is awesome. Why do you call it awesome?

S: Sir, you want to decondition the brain. There is a whole lot of things to get rid of.

K: You young fellows are being rather restive. We ought to discuss this very carefully, step by step going into it. Do you want to do that? Not just with words, not just intellectually spin along,

but actually step by step going into it and as you take each step finish with it so that at the end there is total freedom from fear. Will you do that?

The next question is: our knowledge which we are acquiring through books, through conversations, through dialogues, through reading various books is making our brain full of knowledge without having an original experience. You understand what I am saying? I happened to know a very great writer, a literary man. He is dead now, he was a great friend of mine. One day he told me, because I knew him very well, we were great friends, on a walk in the hills, he said: `Look, I can speak about science, I can speak about painting, piano, music, I can talk about Vedanta, I can talk about Buddhism, because he had studied it, Tao and all that, I am full of knowledge, my brain has studied, acquired knowledge about so many things-encyclopedic knowledge. And I wonder if I will ever have an original experience'. Do you understand what I said? So your brains are now over-loaded and you will never have, unless you understand the nature of conditioning, never have something totally original. Then you are just a mediocre human being. You know what that word `mediocre' means? According to the dictionary, which is the common usage of the English language, if it is an English dictionary, it means going up the hill half way, never reaching the top but always going just a few steps up. That's what it means to be mediocre. And most of us are mediocre. We never go to the very end of anything. So look what is happening to you: you are being educated to be mediocre; to have a job, to get married, children and for the rest of your lives - for fifty, sixty years - work, work, work. Go to the office, to the

factory or tilling the land. You understand all this? Then you will say, how am I to earn more money, I must have food, shelter and clothing. Naturally.

S: Do you mean to say we must reach the top of the hill? Aren't we ambitious then?

K: No. To reach human excellence, that's the top of beyond the Everest-you understand? - that does not mean ambition. Ambition destroys love. You don't know all this. But to have a brain that is excellent, that means say exactly what you mean, not have double meaning, not to be cynical, not to be bitter, not to hate. Are you interested in all this? Or we are just having a talk on a weary morning when we ought to be out in the sun, with the green leaves and the beauty of the earth? Are you bored with this, are you? If you are bored, and perhaps you are, what would you like to do? Not just sit there and look at the speaker, that's no fun.

S: If I may go back, as you said knowledge leads to conditioning.

K: I said, does knowledge lead to conditioning? I asked a question. I don't say it. I want you to find out.

S: Knowledge does lead to conditioning, but knowledge is important in life. K: Of course.

S: Where do we draw the line?

K: Find out. Do you want me to draw the line and then you accept it? Look: I drive a car. To drive a car I must be taught. That means I must drive with a good driver beside me to tell me what to do, how to change gears, how to put on the brake, the accelerator and so on. I learn. Through learning about driving I become a good driver or a bad driver. That is, I have acquired knowledge to drive

a car; I have acquired knowledge to speak English or Hindi, whatever it is, I acquire knowledge to be a good carpenter - I prefer to be a carpenter than an engineer. You understand, I prefer that, not that I am a carpenter. So knowledge is necessary, otherwise you cannot live. So find out for yourselves where knowledge is necessary and where knowledge is not necessary. May I help you in this?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Don't say, yes, sir, and then relax and go to sleep. But find out where knowledge is essential, where it is necessary, where it is important, and also find out where it is not important at all. So, you have got this problem. Now what is a problem? Do you know the meaning of that word 'problem'? It is something thrown at you, that's what problem means. The actual meaning, the etymological meaning of that word means something thrown at you, something that you are challenged with.

S: But that's my problem sir, no one has thrown it at me.

K: Oh yes, I have thrown it at you.

S: No but...

K: I have said, sir, find out where knowledge is necessary and where knowledge is not necessary. Find out. And I added to that: may I help you to find out? Not direct you to find out. You understand the difference? By talking together, having a dialogue together, let's enquire into it. Will you accept that? So, knowledge is necessary, isn't it? Physical knowledge - how to ride a bicycle, how to drive a car, how to write, what to do if I am an engineer, carpenter. There it is necessary. That is the way the whole social structure is built now, that I must work to earn a livelihood. To

work I must have knowledge about whatever I do. Now where is it not necessary? Probably you have never asked this question. Now I am asking you where is it not necessary? Come on sirs. You have all studied, you are good, clever, come on sirs.

S: Do you have fear?

K: Do I have fear? You or me?

S: You.

K: I am glad it is a direct question at last. Do I have fear? What do you mean by fear? Passing examinations, a snake biting me, fear of something? Now, there is either physical fear, which is, I walk in the dark, I may be bitten by a snake. Therefore I have to be careful when I walk. And there is the other kind of fear, which is, I might not succeed in my career. Right? I want to be a good doctor, but I may not be capable of being a good doctor, and I am afraid of that. So when you asked me, are you frightened, have you fear, I say to you in humility that I have no inward fear of any kind. You understand what I am saying? I am not afraid of my reputation, you understand, what people say about me. I don't care. Right? What else? I am not afraid to die. What are you afraid of - your wife, or your husband, or your father and mother? As I have no father, no mother, nor a wife, I am not frightened of family. You understand?

Now, sirs, we have got ten minutes more so let's finish the subject you have raised. Are you interested in this? Tell me. It is important for you to find out. You may become an engineer but you have to find out, you have to learn, so learn about this also - where knowledge is necessary, important, essential, to go from here to Madras you must know the route you follow, you must have knowledge. Now where is knowledge an impediment? S:

Thought.

K: What do you mean by thought?

S: I am limited by knowledge.

K: Which means what?

S: I am always bounded in a certain area in which to live. And I am limited by what I know.

K: We agree to that. I am asking a different question sir. We agree that we must have knowledge to go from here to Delhi you need knowledge. You need knowledge to write a book, knowledge to drive a car. Right? To become a good chemist, good scientist you must have a great deal of knowledge.

Now we are asking a question where knowledge is not necessary. Is there any place where knowledge is an impediment?

S: Knowledge is not necessary when you want to be considerate to others. K: Are you saying where there is love, knowledge is not necessary? Have you understood what I am saying? Are you saying that where there is affection, care, love, compassion, knowledge is not necessary?

S: Yes.

K: Look, sir, I will indicate some things for you to pursue it or not, as you wish. Knowledge is not necessary in a relationship. And if I am married, I have a wife, I have built an image about her. Are you following this? And she has built an picture about me. Don't you know all this? You are not married but you have got a teacher, haven't you? An educator, you have a picture about him, haven't you? Right sir? Don't be shy.

S: Right, sir.

K: Good. You have a picture about him. So your picture you

have built since you have been here, about him. So your picture, your image about him is not the actual him. He may be different. He may have contributed to that picture. This requires much more investigation, I can't go into it now, but I am pointing out if I may, that in relationship knowledge is a detriment. Knowledge is what divides people, man, woman and all the rest of it. It is knowledge that is dividing the Hindu and the Muslim. Agreed? It is the knowledge that says, I am a Jew, you are an Arab, and because of this division, we kill each other.

Is that enough for this morning? Yes sir? Now before we go, will you sit very quietly for a few minutes. That is, if you want to. Sit very quietly, close your eyes and see what your thoughts are doing. Will you do that?

RISHI VALLEY 2ND TALK WITH STUDENTS 15TH DECEMBER 1982

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about?

Student: Could we continue with where we left off last time?

K: What was that?

S: Deterioration.

K: I think we went into that. Has your mind stopped deteriorating? We have talked about, if I remember rightly, that conflict is the very nature of degeneration of the mind, of the brain. Conflict is measurement. We have talked about it. Conflict is pretending to be one thing and doing something else. Have you stopped all that?

S: How am I going to stop that?

K: Seeing that your brain is deteriorating, if there is conflict, so you stop conflict. It is as simple as that. We went into what contributes to the deteriorating factor of the brain, and we said measurement, conflict, comparison. Right? And comparison implies time, trying to become better than what is. Right? And all these gradations and implications of conflict, after having listened to it, see the reason of it, the causation of deterioration, has your brain - or you have understood it and so your brain is now becoming much more sensitive, alive, active. Have you?

S: I can see certain things without necessarily going into the...

K: Quite right, you can see certain things. What are they?

S: I can see I am in conflict but I can't...

K: Now, have you found out what is the cause of conflict?

S: The...

K: Just words or actual fact?

S: It is a fact.

K: Then what do you do with the fact. It is like having pain. It is a fact. You just tolerate the pain? Do you or do you not do something about it?

S: Pain is something quite relievable...

K: Can I put the problem differently? What is freedom? You all have freedom, that's why you have come here. More than you should have. You understand what I am saying? You have freedom.

S: In the past two talks I am able to see that I have a certain type of freedom, I have freedom in a particular sense.

K: I will explain to you what I mean by freedom. Is freedom to do with what I like?

S: Provided you take the responsibility.

K: Now, do freedom and responsibility go together? So, freedom, responsibility and discipline. Right? Discipline imposed by another, by society, by study of a certain subject which demands its own discipline. Now what do we mean by discipline, the word? Are you getting bored with this? A little bit.

S: No

K: Are you representing the whole gang up there?

S: I don't represent the whole gang, I am speaking for myself, sir.

K: Why don't you let the others speak?

S: I think discipline is self-control.

K: Discipline, he says, is self-control. You know the meaning of that word?

S: You should have power over yourself and know how to act towards others. K: Now, just a minute. Before you say that, do you know the meaning of that word 'discipline', the meaning? What it means, the dictionary meaning. Do you know what it means?

S: The root is religion.

K: No, sorry. The root means, it comes from the word disciple. Disciple means one who learns. So the meaning of that word is to learn. Right? To learn. Now have you learnt about responsibility? Have you learnt what it means to be free? Have you?

S: I have.

K: You have. So find out first, let us talk about discipline. That is to learn, to learn about yourself, to learn about the environment around you, to learn Hindi, English, Sanskrit or learn yoga. Right? To learn. Do you learn to control yourself? That's what the boy said over there. He said discipline is to control yourself, right? What do you say?

S: (Inaudible)

K: I didn't say that. I said do you learn about yourself? Do you learn what control means, to learn what are the implications of controlling oneself?

S: Yes sir.

K: Don't be nervous, I am not going to throttle you.

S: When we try to control ourselves...

K: Have you understood what it means to control? What are you controlling? Anger?

S: A whole set of things.

K: Now get one set of things of the whole thing, like anger. Now, do you control anger?

S: I cannot control it but try not to show it.

K: You cannot control it but try not to show it. Why don't you show it? S: Because we may hurt others.

K: So in order not to hurt others, you don't show it, your anger. Is that it? Do you feel angry? We are learning about anger now. I am angry with you - I am not, but suppose I am angry with you and I won't show it, because it might hurt you, but I have the feeling. Haven't I? What do I do with that feeling?

S: Try to control it.

K: She said that old boy.

S: We keep it within ourselves.

K: That's what she said. You keep it in yourself. What happens when you keep it in yourself? You have a boil, you have a poison inside. What do you do? Keep it in yourself?

S: You get more angry, if you do that, if you keep it in yourself.

S: You might tell someone else but not the person you are angry with.

K: You are angry with someone else but not with the person you are angry with. (Laughter)

S: No, I said...

K: That's quite good too, isn't it?

S: If you tell someone else, not the person you are angry with, that you are angry with that person.

K: So, you tell somebody you are angry with somebody else. What's the point of that?

S: Just to comfort yourself.

K: This is getting rather childish, isn't it? (laughs). I am asking you: you learn a language, don't you, you learn mathematics, you

learn geography. What do you mean by learning?

S: It is a sort of programming.

K: Don't use that word. I used that yesterday. Skip that word.

S: I gain knowledge.

K: What do you mean by gaining knowledge?

S: You become intelligent.

K: You become intelligent by gaining knowledge?

S: You come to know something new.

K: You come to know something new in your life. Now, what is that new thing you have learnt? New language? What do you mean by learning?

S: Get information.

K: You are telling me something and I am asking you something else. I am asking you if I may, what do you mean by learning? The word.

S: To enquire.

K: You would consider learning enquiry? Quite right. Now how do I enquire?

S: Yes.

K: Quite right. Now how do you enquire? Listen first, old girl. What do you mean by enquiry?

S: By asking each other it leads to enquiry.

K: So you ask me and I ask you. Is that enquiry?

S: Acquire knowledge.

K: Acquire knowledge by enquiry.

S: We get information about what we don't know. You ask questions to gain knowledge and information.

K: About something you don't know. But I am not asking that

old boy. I am asking you if I may most politely, what do you mean by that word? Not enquire about the ants, or enquire about your grandmother, but I am asking you what that word means.

S: Like to know something which you don't know.

K: All right. I see you are not getting it.

S: Acquire someone else's knowledge.

S: To go into something.

K: That is right. Now, to enquire into why Madanapalle is so dirty. Right? That would be enquiry, wouldn't it? Do you enquire why you control? Do you enquire why you get angry? Why you are restless? Or say I am restless, tell me how to control myself? You understand the meaning now, I am asking. If you enquire, you begin to see the implications or the content, the significance of what it is to control. Right? Am I making this clear?

S: As I see, there is no learning when we control ourselves.

K: Have you asked who is the controller? I say I must control myself. But who is it says that I must control myself?

S: I am the person who is trying to control myself.

K: Who is yourself?

S: My mind.

K: Don't move to another series. Who is it who controls?

S: It is the brain.

K: No, you people haven't thought about it, don't play with words.

S: One part of our mind which thinks that whatever I am doing is not right tries to control.

K: Right. Which is that part of the mind, brain?

S: Conscience.

S: Our conscience is trying to control what we do.

K: What do you mean by the word conscience?

S: Part of our mind which is conscious of what we are doing while why we are doing deals with whether it is right or not.

K: How do you deal with this kind of topic? You are just repeating something. Now let us move from that. We said discipline. Right? Do you discipline yourself or all of you are in that big building, students, do you control yourselves there? Do you discipline yourselves to get up at exactly 6 o'clock in the morning, bathe, exercise, all the rest of it. Do you control, do you discipline yourselves or somebody tells you, you must get up at 6 o'clock. Sirs, answer that question? Come on, sirs, answer that question.

S: After some time, it becomes a matter of course.

K: Yes sir, it is a matter of course, but I am asking you are you disciplining yourself?

S: We discipline ourselves to a certain extent, and afterwards we try to discipline ourselves more and more to meet the situation.

K: I asked a question, sir, and you have not understood my question. Do you discipline yourself, learn about yourself? I explained the meaning of the word discipline. The word means to learn, not to control, to learn about yourself. Right? Right sir? That means to learn. Now do you learn why you should get up at 6 o'clock in the morning?

S: No.

K: No. So, somebody then disciplines you. He says you must get up at 6 o'clock in the morning and you think you are free human beings so you get angry, you resist. Right? Now, are you

learning about it, learning which brings about discipline, are you studying it?

S: Learning entails discipline, doesn't it?

K: That's what I am saying. You don't have to discipline yourself. If I am learning, that very learning is bringing about a discipline. Do you understand? Are you doing that?

S: Sir, before I answer your question, I want to clarify myself about what is learning itself.

K: What is learning? Go on. I teach you Sanskrit, right? Or I teach you Hindi or English. What does that mean?

S: You are giving me something which you know and I don't know.

K: So if you don't know and I know, then you listen to me, right? Do you listen to me? Not to me, to the teacher who is teaching you mathematics, do you listen? Or you casually listen but your attention is on that, so how can you listen if you are partly looking out of the window and partly listening to what is being said? You cannot learn, can you? That is where conflict arises. Doesn't it? The teacher tells you, please pay attention to what I am telling you, about mathematics, and you are looking out of the window watching that bird on the branch. So your attention is divided, isn't it? So you are not actually listening, right? So, when you learn to listen, what it means to listen. Will you learn about it? Now I will tell you what it is to listen. You listen to a story. Why?

S: Because it is interesting.

K: Because it is exciting, interesting, there is danger, there is amusement, there is thrill. All that excites you, and you listen. That means what? You only listen to something that is very exciting.

Right? And nothing that is not exciting.

S: Everything in its own way is interesting and exciting.

K: Yes, all right. That sounds very nice. But will you listen to something in your class. Will you listen in your class to something that you are not interested in, not exciting?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Have you ever tried listening? Are you listening to me now?

S: Yes sir.

K: You are not.

S: I am not.

K: Quite right sir. At last somebody is honest. But why aren't you? Is it not interesting, is it not exciting?

S: I am quite sure it is interesting. I don't know why I am not able to listen to you.

K: Quite right. Not to me, do you listen to anybody? To your father, to your mother, to your grandmother, to your teacher, do you listen?

S: Partially sir.

K: Partially. Like a partially cooked carrot. They don't listen partially. If you are listening partially, you are not listening at all. What do you say sirs?

S: We only do half of what our parents say and the other half we leave it alone. (Laughter)

K: All right. But if a very attentive parent watches you, you will have to do the whole thing, won't you? You can't dodge your parent who is watching you all the time. So you hope sometimes he won't be looking at you. You do something else. Don't you?

S: We seem to obey and not to listen.

K: I give up!

S: Sir, what exactly is stopping us from listening?

K: First of all, sir, do you ever listen to anybody? Just answer that question. Right? You don't. Why? Just ask that question, find out the answer. Why don't you listen to somebody completely. All of you. Why don't you listen?

S: Because our attention is divided.

K: Why is your attention divided? Are you ever attentive completely? About anything? Or you are always partially attentive, partially awake, and the rest of the day partially awake and partially asleep.

S: Sometimes...

K: Are you awake now?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Now what does that mean?

S: Partially awake.

K: What do you mean by partially awake, partially asleep?

S: I mean we only listen to half of what others say, the other half... K:...you don't listen. Why?

S: You don't receive it.

K: Why don't you receive it?

S: You cannot listen because you are in no mood to listen. You are half asleep.

K: You are in no mood to listen. You are half asleep. Why?

S: Because you have not had enough sleep. (Laughter)

K: That is a very good answer. Why haven't you had enough sleep?

S: You may have lots of worries.

K: You may have lots of worries?

S: Sometimes.

K: Do you sleep all night and feel rested next morning?

S: Yes.

K: Yes sir. Then can you listen when you are completely rested?

S: Yes sir.

K: Are you rested now. Now sit up here. At last I have a victim.
(Laughter) Are you completely awake now?

S: Yes.

K: So, will you listen to what I am saying? I am saying, discipline means to learn. Learn how to drive a car. Learn how to speak properly, how to walk properly, how to eat correctly, what you eat and so on. Right? That means you are learning how to walk properly. Does anybody teach you how to walk properly?

S: No.

K: Therefore how will you find out?

S: When you are a child.

K: No, answer my question. You don't know how to walk properly. Most people don't. How will you learn about it?

S: By looking at people.

K: That's right, by looking at people who know how to walk. Now when you look at people, will you give complete attention to it?

S: That is if you are interested in it.

K: I am asking you, old boy, to learn how to walk properly. It is nice, dignified. Now when you watch somebody walking properly, will you give your attention to that?

S: Yes sir.

K: Right. Will you give attention to eat correctly? Do it. Not say, yes sir, and not do it. Will you listen to your teacher who is teaching mathematics, completely? (No response) Because you are not interested in mathematics. Don't look at your teacher. Right. Are you listening to what I am saying now? Why?

S: I like it. It is interesting.

K: Which means what? Go into it.

S: It gives me more knowledge.

K: Go into it. Don't just stop there. You are interested, you want to learn, you like what I am saying and also what?

S: It is interesting.

K: Yes, you have said that.

S: It will help me a lot.

K: You are listening to me because, why?

S: Because you have more care for me.

K: Do you like me?

S: Yes.

K: When you like me, you listen.

S: Partially that way.

K: Partially that, partially you want to be helped, partially you want. So put it all together, will you listen to me? Now I am going to tell you what it means to learn. Most of us learn by accumulating a lot of knowledge. That's what you call learning. I learn mathematics. I learn geography. I learn how to walk. I learn how to speak properly. Which is I'm gathering a lot of information, stored up in the brain and then I use that to talk, to walk, to play and so on. This is one kind of learning. Is there another kind of learning?

S: Yes sir.

K: Don't answer yet.

S: There is.

K: What is it?

S: Learning through experience.

K: Which means what? Must you go through every kind of experience to learn?

S: No sir. We only go through the basic things, what is fundamental. Like you try to walk. Suppose I have not yet learned to walk. I fall once or twice, and suppose you have made a mistake in your step, you try to correct that. That is what is experience is.

K: All right, all right. Go on.

S: Suppose you are eating. You spill it on your dress.

K: So next time you don't. Most people learn through experience. The mathematics teacher, Mr Narayanan has learnt a great deal about mathematics. He is trying to tell you what he knows and you listen, put it in your brain and the brain says I have learnt mathematics up to a point. Which means what? You listen, you listen to his experience, to his knowledge, which becomes your knowledge. Right? And you call that learning. Agree to that? Then ask if there is another kind of learning which is not experience, not based on somebody else telling you. You understand what I am asking? Find out if there is another kind of learning.

S: By looking at things.

K: Looking at things. I have got two victims. You were here before, weren't you?

S: Yes.

K: I thought so. Now let us talk together. What did you say?

S: Sometimes I learn by looking at things.

K: Sometimes you learn by looking. Have you looked at a row of ants? Have you looked at it?

S: Sometimes I have.

K: No, don't say sometimes.

S: I have looked at the trees.

K: You have looked at trees. When you look at a tree, what are you looking at?

S: I look at it.

K: You look at it. You call that tamarind tree. Now look at it without the word. You understand what I am saying?

S: Yes.

K: Instead of saying that is a tamarind tree, and look and walk away. But if you don't use the words, will you look more closely?

S: Yes, so that I can know it.

K: No, you are going off to something else. I am asking you will you look at something without naming it? You have got a brother? No? You have got a sister? Will you look at her without calling her sister, having the image of a sister?

S: Yes.

K: Then do it.

S: I have done it.

K: You have done it. What happens there?

S: I seem to like her even more.

K: You seem to like her even more. Before, you did not like her?

S: No, I used to like her even before.

K: (Laughs) So, by not naming a thing, what happens? Don't

answer, look at it carefully. Look at the yellow flowers. Don't name them. Just look at them. Right?

S: Yes.

K: Then what happens?

S: We come to know about it.

K: No.

S: You don't exactly think.

K: Did you hear what I said? You don't have to make a face. Look at something, look at your father, sister, your mother, without the word - right? - without the image you have about the father, just look at him. Look at me without the word, the name, without all that you have heard about me. Look at me that way, can you?

S: Yes sir.

K: Look. Then what happens?

S: All of a sudden, I get the name in the mind.

K: It is a serious thing I am asking, extraordinarily serious. If you learn this, it will alter your whole looking at things, you understand? S: Yes.

S: I look at the same thing.

K: No, I am asking you to look at the new moon which is going to come up today probably. Look at it, a very, very thin slice. Isn't it? Look at it without using the word, the moon, the new moon. Just look at it.

S: Perhaps I will be able to appreciate the moon more if I just look at it without naming it.

K: Yes. You are able to appreciate it more. You are able to see it much more clearly. Now will you do that with your father, mother and sister, with your teacher?

S: I can.

K: You can. Have you done it?

S: No.

K: Will you do? That is learning. You understand? Learning to look at somebody without the word, without the picture you have about him.

S: It is not quite easy sir, because the moment you learn, you memorize, you recollect.

K: That's right. I am your teacher. I scold you. All right? I scold you. You know what that means? You know what scolding is?

S: You shout at me.

K: Yes, if you know, then you have a picture of me scolding you. Don't you? Each time we meet, you have that picture. Right? So look at me without that picture, without that memory. Then what happens when you look at your teacher who has scolded you, and you do not bring that picture forward as the man who has scolded you? See what happens between you and the teacher.

S: Relationship becomes better because you can understand better.

K: You look much more closely, you look much more, you see what he is actually.

S: Yes.

K: So will you learn that, do that, not just one day, do it always, do that all your life.

S: I see that. I try to do that. I can't.

K: Don't try. Just do it. You understand? Look, do you know how to ride a bicycle? First two or three days, somebody helps you, after that you do it yourself. Now this morning I tried to help you

to ride the bicycle. Right? Afterwards you have learnt. You don't say I will try and do it. S: As far as I am concerned, I can do it for just a moment, but after that the whole pattern of my old thinking comes up.

K: But isn't it important to learn how to look without the word? You may do it for a minute but it comes back. Isn't it important to learn something new? Then that something new is far more important than merely repeating the old thing. Then the important takes precedence over the old. Am I using big words?

S: Sir, friendship increases.

K: The friendship increases. Right. If you remember that I have scolded you and you forget it, we are greater friends. Isn't that so? Will you do it?

S: Our relationship is different.

K: That's right. If you do it, your teacher will also do it. You understand?

S: You must look at your teacher for many other purposes without the word. K: Why?

S: You try much more as to what he is saying, or what he wants.

K: That is right. Will you do it?

S: If I did it...

K: Not 'if'. You see the difference? You say, if I did it, I will try, I must do it, then you are not doing it. But if you say, yes, I see the importance of that, I am doing it. You see the difference?

S: Sir, in that case, if I look at him without the word...

K: You understand what it means 'without the word'?

S: Yes sir, you look at him as he was and not what he had done to you earlier and what you think he will do.

K: That's quite right. So, what happens then? Your relationship with the other is much more direct, isn't it? Will you learn that?

S: I am not very sure if I can do that. I will try. (Laughter)

S: But when you try not to, you are remembering it.

K: Of course, of course. So you go and try and do it. Not try, do it. S: Then you are looking and acting.

K: That's right. Looking and acting. That's right, looking is acting. Have we learnt something this morning? Have you? Will you do it?

S: Yes.

K: Good.

K: (To another student) Will you?

S: Yes.

K: Good. Don't say yes sir, and not do it. Then you become a hypocrite if you say I have understood it and not do it. Shall we sit quietly for a minute?

RISHI VALLEY 3RD TALK WITH STUDENTS 16TH DECEMBER 1982

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about?

Student: Could we continue from where we left off last time?

K: Where did we leave off?

S: The deconditioning of the brain.

K: Are you really interested in it or you just want to talk about it, just for the fun of it? All right sir, let us talk about it, shall we? You know what the brain is. Most of you must have in your biological study, you must have been told what the brain is. Apparently the brain is the most important part of the body; the heart and the liver are the most important organs of the body. You know what these three functions are. But the brain is an extraordinary instrument. It is now limited. It now only functions - we only use a very, very small part of the brain. We do not use all of the brain, and our brain has evolved from the ape till we are so-called well educated sophisticated human beings. Is that clear? Right?

S: Has the brain really evolved from the ape?

K: That is what the scientists say. You can accept that or you can accept what the Fundamentalists in the Christian world say, that man was created 4500 years ago by god. You can accept that or the scientific theory, or you can invent your own. But if you invent your own, you have to be very careful that it can stand logical investigation. Otherwise you can say my brain is the most important, you know, some kind of fancy, romantic thing we can make out of it. But from what the scientists, biologists and the

archaeologists have said, man has evolved as he is now standing on two feet about 40,000 years ago, and our brain has evolved for a much longer period. That is a fact. That is what the scientists say. I rather think they are right. For myself I think that man evolved from the ape. My grandfather was not quite the ape, probably his great-grandfather was. And this brain has evolved, grown, matured, has learned a great deal, has had immense experience, and that is again a fact.

And during all these forty centuries he has always been afraid, afraid of the physical world, living in the forests - the tigers and so on, physical danger, and also there were the psychological dangers, the inward dangers, of which there is fear, pleasure, pain, sorrow, anxiety, loneliness and so on. We are all educated. I don't quite know what it means. Here you are all being educated to become what? Greater monkeys? Glorified clerks, glorified bureaucrats? So you are being educated to become something, to earn a livelihood, to marry, to have a house, and to have a job, to maintain your family and so on. So you go to the office or to the factory or, if you are interested, in carpentry, for the rest of your life from 9 o'clock to 5 o'clock, go to the office day after day, month after month, year after year, till you die. That is your life. Right? Would you agree to that? You may have a weekend holiday or a month's holiday, but the next moment you get a job for the next fifty years or more, you will become a slave to your job. Right? That is what you are all going to do. Unfortunately. Right? Agree to that? Would you agree to this? So, like a computer - you know what a computer is. Do you know? A computer is an electronic machine which is programmed. You know what a programme is? A professor talks to it,

programmes it, as it is called, so that the computer knows what the professor knows. It is put on a tape or whatever they do, and it can repeat what the professor told the machine about mathematics.

That is what a computer is. And they are trying to build a computer which will be almost like the human brain. Already they have computers that can invent. You understand all this? The mother computer may be very good but the next generation computer is still better than the mother and so on and so on. They are working at it furiously to bring about a computer which has ultra mechanical intelligence. Right? You understand all this? Ultra mechanical intelligence which can think much more rapidly than human beings, calculate much faster than human beings, in a second what a human brain may take a couple of months and so on. So the computer is programmed. Is that clear? You are also programmed. You have been programmed for the last 5,000 years as a Hindu. You have been programmed as a Muslim within the last 1400 years. Mohammed was 600 A.D., therefore about 1400. And the Buddhist for the last 2500 years, he has been programmed to be a Buddhist. You understand? So you are all programmed. You are all functioning mechanically. Right? When you study engineering, which requires mathematics and so on, your study is programming you to become an engineer. Right? Do you see this? So your brain is programmed to think that you are a Hindu or an Arab or a Jew or a Catholic. So your brain is mechanical. The computer is then a far better instrument. But of course there is a great deal of difference between a machine and the brain. Now what makes the brain deteriorate? That is what your question is. Right? Are you interested in all this?

S: You have made a statement just before this that a computer is better than the brain.

K: I said they are trying to make a computer equal or better than the brain. They are trying to manufacture it. I did not say they did. The Japanese and the American IBM and other companies are pouring millions of dollars and so on to discover or to invent or to bring about a computer that has the quality of the brain. They may succeed or they may not succeed. Right? But the fact remains that our brain is programmed. When you say, I am a BA, you are programmed. When you say, I am in the Indian Administrative Service, you are being programmed.

Now, the question was, if I can repeat it rightly, what are the factors that bring about the deterioration of the brain? And can these factors be stopped so that the brain can continue till it is worn out by long age? What will keep the brain young, fresh? Right? Now let us first find out what are the factors that bring about deterioration of the brain. Right? What do you think of the factors?

S: Memory.

K: The gentleman says one of the factors that make the brain deteriorate is memory. Without memory what would you be? What would you do if you had no memory at all?

S: I would be a robot.

K: No, a robot is pretty intelligent. (Laughter)

S: You will repeat over and over again.

K: That's right. Now, go on. What will happen to you if you have no memory at all?

S: You destroy yourself.

K: No, what happens to you? You would be in a state of no

memory.

S: You won't know anything. You won't know what is happening.

K: You won't know what is happening. You won't feel anything. You will just be a blank wall. Probably you would eat - the body has its own function. Right? Its own intelligence. So you would carry on, but no thought, no feeling. You know, I saw in America, when I was there last year or this year, a Japanese factory. You know the Honda car. They were manufacturing a Honda car. All the workmen were in white aprons and white gloves and there was a computer and a robot. You know what a robot is? The computer was telling the robot what to do and the robot was building the Honda car. When the robot made a mistake, the computer stopped the robot, told him what to do, and how to bolt or screw the nut properly, and went after it, kept this going. And the workmen, Japanese workmen, with white gloves wandered around looking at the thing. Right? So our brain without memory would be like a vegetable, a non-active, unaware, blind body. So is that one of the factors of deterioration?

S: (Inaudible)

K: That's right sir. I said that. So is that one of the reasons why the brain deteriorates?

S: It is not that we don't have memory, our memory is deteriorating. Probably that is the cause of it.

K: Yes sir. All right. So is that one of the factors, one of the causes why the brain deteriorates?

S: I don't think so.

K: You don't think so. Quite right, neither do I. So find out what

are the other causes.

S: Due to memory, in our brain arise various contradictions, and I would say that the contradictions which arise in our brain are the causes for the deterioration of the brain.

K: Are you saying...

Narayan: He says contradictions that arise are partly due to memory. That's why the brain deteriorates.

K: Now, wait. What are contradictions? What do you call contradictions? Sir, don't go to sleep.

S: I am not sleeping.

K: I don't know, but you are keeping quiet. I don't know whether you are asleep or awake. So, if I may point out, this gentleman says one of the factors of deterioration of the brain is the contradiction. What do you mean by contradiction?

S: When you have two opposite thoughts.

K: When you have two opposing thoughts. Now, is that one of the causes of deterioration, contradiction? Contradiction means also, say one thing and do something else, think one thing and act quite the opposite of what you think. Right? What does that indicate? I say one thing and do quite the opposite. I think one thing and act totally differently from what I think. S: That means you don't have the strength to follow up your thought.

K: No, no. I am not asking strength. See what happens when there is contradiction in you. What happens?

S: You are thrown off balance.

K: No. Don't use these words. Just look at it carefully. What happens? Look at yourself. When you say one thing and do another, do something totally different.

S: I can't trust myself.

K: You can't trust yourself. Quite right. And those grown up people there. There is a boy who says you cannot trust yourself. What does that mean?

S: You become a hypocrite.

K: That's right. You become a hypocrite. You cannot trust yourself. What next?

S: You don't think, you just act.

K: You don't think but you act. I want you to move around. Go on.

S: You become like a computer. You are not thinking what you are doing. K: The computer thinks old boy.

S: It is programmed.

K: So are you. When you say I am a BA, or MA, you are being programmed. When you say I am a Hindu, I am a Muslim, I am a Christian, these statements indicate that you have been programmed. So what? Go on. You haven't touched the root of it. Please go on. Look. I say, I must love, and I hate. Right? I must be generous but I am not generous. What does that indicate - not indicate - what is the result of that? As that boy pointed out, I am a hypocrite.

S: Conflict.

K: That's right. At last. It took a long time. Now one of the causes, perhaps the major causes of the deterioration of the brain is conflict. Would you agree to all that? Yes sir?

S: Yes sir. I agree that it is perhaps one of the causes.

K: I said one. I said it may be the major. I am very careful in my usage of words. I said either one, or the major cause of

deterioration is conflict. Right? Are you in conflict? Are you in conflict, any of you? S: Almost all the time you think of doing something but you do something else.

K: Yes. She is going to tell me.

S: I am always thinking something and doing something else.

K: Yes, but what is the result.

S: I get very upset when I do that.

K: You are in conflict, aren't you?

S: Yes.

K: Now we are asking, is that one of the factors of deterioration? Like an engine, internal combustion machine, when it is well-oiled, smoothly running, it can go on indefinitely, but when there is a friction then it begins to wear itself out. Agree? So where there is conflict there is great friction in the brain and so one of the reasons for the deterioration of the brain is conflict, friction, strain. Right? Agree to this? Are you all under strain, friction, conflict? Of course, you are.

S: Yes.

K: No, no.

S: Yes.

K: You are in conflict at your age? You are enjoying yourself, you are not in conflict, old boy! Only those so-called educated big people don't enjoy, don't look at the sky, they are not curious, they don't look at a trail of ants going on the road.

S: At that moment you are not.

K: At the moment you are not, but I am saying, are you in conflict?

S: Sometimes.

K: Sometimes, when? When are you in conflict?

S: When I am angry.

K: When you are angry. Go on. Good.

S: When I want to slap someone.

K: When you want to slap someone. (Laughter) You come over here. Come on. So, when you get angry, when you want to slap someone, when you can't pass your examinations.

S: Yes.

K: When the teacher scolds you. I hope he doesn't. Does he scold you? S: No.

K: No. I am delighted. So when somebody scolds you, when you get angry, when you want to slap somebody, go on, what are the reasons which bring about conflict, struggle?

S: When you want revenge.

K: When you want revenge. Go on. You only think along that line, think along another line.

S: If you are not able to think logically and reason out, you will be in conflict.

K: He says if you don't think logically, you are in conflict. Even if you think logically, you may be in conflict. I may think very logically, I must not be greedy, I must not be angry, but I am angry. So there is conflict even though I think logically. Right?

S: What brings you in conflict?

K: I am asking what brings about conflict. You are asking. Right. They said just now contradiction; that is, saying one thing, doing another. Clear? That brings conflict, one of the causes. So, as I said, a machine well-oiled, perfectly balanced, good material, well-oiled, looked after, that machine can go on for years and years

and years. And the human brain is also a machine. So when it is in conflict, it is like putting sand into a machine, then it can't run properly. You understand? Right? So if you are in conflict, one of the reasons of deterioration of the brain is conflict. Right sir? Are you?

S: Am I in conflict?

K: Yes. So your brain is deteriorating.

S: Yes.

K: I am glad you acknowledge that. You may get an MA, BA, or BA, MA, I don't know why, but there it is. And what is the point of it when you are in conflict and your brain is deteriorating. What are you doing?

S: Destroying ourselves.

K: Why do you want to destroy yourselves?

S: I don't want to.

K: Then why don't you stop being in conflict?

S: How do I stop it?

K: I understand. You have asked a question: how do I put an end to conflict? When you ask how, what does that mean? Look. Think it out carefully. You think out carefully, when he says how, what does that word mean?

S: I want a method.

K: Sir, I am not asking, just listen to me first. When you use the word 'how', what does that word mean?

S: You want a method.

K: Stop there. What do you mean by a method?

S: A solution.

K: No, method.

S: The way to do it.

K: Now, the way to do it, follow it up, what does it mean? Go on. Think clearly.

S: We want help.

K: Help. From who?

S: From his brain.

K: When you say how, it means a system. How am I to climb the mountain? Right? Then if you say, how am I to climb Everest, first you must have a certain kind of shoes and so on and so on. That means you want a system, a method, a plan according to which you act. Right sirs?

S: Right.

K: Now, what does that do?

S: (Inaudible)

K: No, listen to what I am saying. What does a system do to our brain? S: You try again and again.

K: Which is ugly. Isn't it? When you repeat over and over again, the brain is mechanical.

S: If you try one system, you get into another system.

K: That's it. You haven't understood what I am saying. Please listen first. When I follow a system, a method, and I repeat it over and over again, am I not? Which means what? That I am becoming more and more mechanical.

S: You are deteriorating again.

K: That's right. When the brain becomes more and more mechanical, it is again deteriorating. So, conflict, a mechanical way of living, saying, I am a Hindu, I am a Hindu, I am a Hindu or I am an Arab, Jew - you follow?-any repetitive verbal statement or

repetitive action is another factor of deterioration in the brain.

Right?

S: What does that mean?

K: No. Do you understand that? Proceed.

S: It is inevitable.

K: It is inevitable if you are mechanical, if there is conflict in your life. Right?

S: Does that mean there is another solution?

K: Not another solution. Stop being mechanical, then you are out of it. Then find out if you can live without conflict. If you do, then you are out of it. Your brain is not deteriorating. You understand this? Now what will you do to find out if you can live without conflict?

S: I can stop being in conflict whenever I can.

K: No. Find out what are the causes of conflict. You understand? Suppose I have got tummy ache because I eat the wrong food. So if I stop eating the wrong food, then I have no tummy ache. Right?

S: Yes.

K: So I have to find out what are the causes of conflict and if I can remove the causes, conflict ends. And we say and one of the causes of the conflict is contradiction: saying one thing and doing another; believing in god and killing people: believing that you must be a great saint and being very worldly. So where there is contradiction, opposition, contrary statements, contrary ways of living, there must be conflict, which means there must be conflict where there is division. You understand this? So find out if your life is free of division. You understand what I am saying? When a

man says he is an Arab and the other man says he is a Jew or a Muslim or a Hindu, Buddhist, there is conflict between them. When I say I am a nationalist, I am opposed to the nationalists of other countries. So don't be a nationalist. You understand this? Or the nonsense about the flags is nonsense. Agree?

S: Yes.

K: Will you live that way?

S: I hope so.

K: Not 'hope so'. You have to do it. If you want your brain to be extraordinarily alive, fresh, you have to do that. Right sirs? Will you do it after your examination, not before your examination! Will you end your conflicts? Otherwise your brain deteriorates.

S: Will competition bring about deterioration?

K: Yes sir. No, the constant repetition, to repeat over and over again I am a Jew, I am an Arab, I am a Hindu, this and that, just like a gramophone record playing the same tune over and over again, that is wearing out the brain.

S: Competitions. I feel nervous before an examination just because I may come last.

K: That's right. So, unfortunately examinations apparently are necessary. Either you have examinations at the end of your school career - right?-and so no examination until you leave - which would be marvellous. I am in the eighth class, the teacher looks up sees that I am studying properly. If he knows that I am studying properly, why should I have examinations? You follow? So I may have to have examinations when I leave school but a long way ahead. That's another matter. Have you understood this? That is, where there is conflict of any kind, the brain deteriorates.

S: Sir, the whole world is full of conflict.

K: You don't have to make a mountain out of it.

S: I mean, everywhere there is conflict.

K: I know. Everywhere you see it, I agree. Your father, your mother are in conflict. The society is in conflict. The government is in conflict. The priest is in conflict. He wants more money and all the rest of it. So practically every human being is in conflict.

Right? So find out if you can live without conflict. That requires a great deal of intelligence. S: I get very scared when I see this conflict.

K: Yes. When she sees the conflict, she says she is scared. If you are scared, that's another form of conflict, isn't it?

S: Yes.

K: So, one of the factors now we have found is conflict. Now what is the second factor?

S: When you do something without thinking.

K: When you do something without thinking, is that another factor of deterioration? That's what you are all doing. Agree?

S: Yes.

K: You don't think, you go on doing something. You don't think why you should become an engineer, why you should become a clerk, why you should join the navy or the army, or this or that. You don't think, you say, well, I like it, I'll go and do it.

S: If I don't do it, what can I do?

K: If you don't do it, what can you do? That's a good question. Why don't those chaps over there put any of these questions? If you don't do a thing, what can you do?

S: If you don't do anything, you can't live.

K: There you are, that's your answer.

S: Somehow they are trying to live.

K: Anyhow you are trying to live. Therefore, you live in conflict.

S: If you want to climb the Everest, you must wear heavy boots. If you don't wear heavy boots and try to climb, you will die.

K: Of course, so I am asking old girl: what is another factor of deterioration of the brain. We said conflict. What is the other factor? S: (Inaudible)

K: Yes. Look sir, are you sure society is deteriorating?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Do you know it, or logically, verbally have studied it?

S: No, I can see it.

K: Go on. I am glad you are all waking up. Tell me about the other factor of deterioration.

S: It is the condition of the brain. As the brain is programmed, that's why it is deteriorating.

K: Have you all understood that? As my brain is programmed to be a Muslim, to be a Hindu, to become a BA or to be a doctor and so on, the very programming is another factor of deterioration. Would you agree to that? See, that means you are completely deteriorating, because you are all programmed. You are half living? Aren't you?

S: The brain depends on experience and we are being programmed since we are born, so what do we do?

K: I am being programmed from the moment I am born: my grandmother, my mother, my father, my people around me say, you must, you must not. You are this, you are that. Right? You are

being programmed.

S: From the origin of mankind.

K: Yes sir. I said that, old boy. I said at the beginning.

S: If you want to decondition, can you negate the whole past?

K: All right. I have got your question. Are you saying: I have been programmed for 40,000 years and as long as I am living in the world of programmes, the brain must deteriorate? Now, can't you get out of it? It's too serious a question to go into because it requires a great deal of enquiry, questioning, asking, pushing.

S: Is there another form of deconditioning?

K: Yes, I understand. You are unconditioned from one form and fall into another form.

S: Deteriorating.

K: Of course, that is what we said.

S: Sir, then how did the mind evolve? Why is it only now the mind is beginning to destroy itself?

K: Probably sir, the moment it has accumulated knowledge through experience, that very beginning is the deteriorating factor. I won't discuss this because it is much too complicated.

S: If you are programmed, are you just like a computer?

K: Nearly. I said nearly.

K: Is that enough for now?

S: I think we should go on.

K: Who should go on? I should go on or you should go on? You see, that's what you are all used to: somebody else tells you what to do.

S: I didn't say you. I said we.

K: Then why don't you go on? (Laughter)

S: How can a computer be programmed?

K: I told you.

S: How can a carpenter be programmed?

K: Carpenter? (Laughter). Have you worked on a piece of wood? Have you done anything with your hands? What have you done?

S: Some pottery we have done.

K: You have done pottery. What else?

S: We have communicated.

K: Yes. What else have you done with your hands? Carpentry and what else? S: Painting.

K: Good. Tell me more.

S: Writing. Leather work.

K: Have you done any gardening?

S: Yes sir.

K: Dug in the earth?

S: Yes sir, gardening.

K: Have you milked a cow?

S: No sir.

K: Have any of you milked a cow?

S: Yes.

K: For how long?

S: Have you sir?

K: Have I milked a cow? Yes. (Laughter) I milked a cow in California for about six months every morning and evening. There were others who were doing it too but I was doing it till I got what they call cow fever which made all my face swell. So I stopped. I did gardening, painted walls, helped to build a house.

S: When you milked a cow, did you do it when you wanted milk?

S: When you milked the cow, were you afraid of the cow fever.

K: No. I got it. After I got it, I stopped milking the cow. I don't know what you are talking about.

S: He is saying, did you milk the cow for drinking the milk yourself or for others?

K: No, we all drank the milk. And I also played tennis. I played golf. Do you know what golf is? I was very good at it.

S: How does the human brain get programmed?

K: When you repeat you are a Muslim, you are programmed.

S: What makes you repeat it?

K: What makes you. Because your mother has told you, your father has told you, your grandmother told you that you are a Muslim.

S: So you have to repeat it.

K: Yes, that's all.

S: Educating is like programming, isn't it sir?

K: Yes sir, you are being educated to be glorified monkeys.

S: Then why do they educate us?

K: Ask them. Ask him, and he will inevitably say to earn money. And that is what everybody is doing.

So I think it is time to stop, it's half past ten. That fellow wants me to go on, but he won't go on. That's enough, or are you escaping from your classes? We can sit here and have some fun. Is that what you want to do? That's enough. Let's sit quietly for a minute. Sit properly. Close your eyes. Let's sit very quietly. Watch yourself, what are you thinking about, will you?

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 11TH JULY 1982

There are two entertainments going on near here - the tennis and the circus! This is not an entertainment, either politically or religiously, or any kind of stimulation. And so we have to together consider what is happening in the world and our relationship to it and our action in that relationship. So please bear in mind during all these talks, if one may over and over again point out, this is not an entertainment of any kind.

And also one would like to point out we are together going to examine, investigate, criticize, be sceptical, question, never accepting anything the speaker says, but what he says must be examined, questioned, investigated, so that he doesn't become an authority of any kind. To merely quote him is pointless, or to allow yourself to become a follower of the speaker, which again would be utterly meaningless. So please, if I may point out most seriously, the person is not important. The person, K, is not at all important. What is important is that we together, the speaker means together, investigate, examine, be very critical, exercising your own capacity to observe, to doubt, to question, so that we understand the same thing together, not that you are understanding the speaker but we are together understanding what has happened to man - not according to the speaker, not according to what he says, not accepting his perception, his values, his investigation, but rather together, you and the speaker exercising our capacity to think clearly, to observe clearly, not according to the speaker but to observe what is happening in the world, and our relationship to the world and to understand not merely ideologically or verbally what

has happened to man after these twenty five thousand years, or fifty thousand years, or a million years. What has happened to us? This is really a very important question to ask.

We have evolved through a million years. If you do not accept a million years, at least twenty five thousand years, we have evolved, grown through time, accumulating a lot of experience, knowledge, and what has happened to us as human beings? What has happened to man after all these centuries upon centuries? Please together we are investigating, you are not looking at the picture I am drawing. Because that is the only problem in the world now: either we are going to destroy ourselves through hatred, through antagonism, through brutality, nationalism and so on, or question, not only the political world, the religious world, the world of entertainment, the world of philosophy, the world of morality and discover for ourselves why we are what we are. We have become violent, brutal, savage, fighting each other in the name of peace, in the name of our country, in the name of honour, hating each other, there is the economic war, the religious war, the actual physical war. We are producing armaments, the industrial countries - as one heard the other day one country is producing so much that they are exporting 80 per cent of their armaments and 20 per cent keeping for their own defence. The investigator asked, "What happens to the 80 per cent?" They said, "We don't care as long as it goes out." So that the so-called enemy buys your armaments which you have produced, and then kills you, which you have produced. This is actually happening. That is man.

So one asks oneself why we have become like this, perpetual conflict, both inward and outward, politically, religiously,

economically and in our relationships with each other, the people who hate and do all kinds of mischievous things, the religious leader talking everlastingly about peace. And there is no peace on earth, there is no justice on earth, but only war, killing each other by word, by a phrase, by an idea, conflict between ideologies. I am sure we know all this. The East and the West, the Totalitarians and the so-called Democratic, but when you observe dispassionately, without any bias, the national patriotic spirit dividing people, killing each other. This is what man after millenia upon millenia has become. That is, through evolution he has become what he is now, through various cultures, through great technology, marvellous architecture, great paintings, music but inwardly he is more or less the same as he has been for millenia. That is a fact. It is not a statement by the speaker which you have to accept. It is an obvious daily observable, dispassionate fact. If time has brought us to this level, to this condition, and we proceed to depend on time, evolution, we will continue the same pattern of hate, of wars, of destroying each others, hatred, wanting to be violent, terror and all the rest of it. This has been going on historically, psychologically, for the last ten thousand, or fifty thousand years, this tribalism. So we must first observe this, then discover for ourselves, see the fact that evolution, which is time, has brought us to this state - right? Time has brought us to this state. And if we proceed along the same way as we are doing now, that is accepting evolution, we will continue the same pattern. We must be clear on this subject.

Tradition, which is the past, tradition of war, tradition of nationalism, the tradition of isolation, isolated communities, which are all forms of tribalism, savagery, including that tribalism, and

this is our tradition. Each country must look after itself at the expense of other countries. Patriotism is extolled, praised, called a new spirit, and there is internationalism, which is absurd if you look at it. How can isolated countries have any relationship internationally? They are isolated. They look at the world from their isolated point of view. These are all everyday actual facts.

So one asks, and I hope you are asking this yourself, if we go along this pattern, this tradition, modern or ancient, we will perpetuate wars, nationalism, isolation. If that is very clear that we will inevitably follow the same pattern if we accept that we are going to bring about a psychological transformation through time - you understand all this? We shall go into what we mean by time - if we accept the psychological change, the self-centred activity which can be transformed through time, it is a fallacy, it is an illusion. Don't accept what the speaker is saying. That is, he is saying we have accepted this tradition of tribalism, isolation, nationally, economically and religiously, and if we pursue that same direction, the same path, we shall be as we are now in spite of time. You understand this? Is this clear between us?

So what shall we do? That is the real problem. There is no other problem, economic, war, all the horrors that are going on in the world, this is the central problem. The central problem, which is man has become like this through evolution, through time, broken, violent, terror, always ready to kill another at the drop of a hat, hating others, antagonism, which is perpetual conflict in himself and in the world. We have lived like that, religiously, economically, politically, psychologically, inwardly. We have lived like this for fifty thousand years. Nobody enquires into that,

why we live like this, why we are willing to kill another in the name of god, in the name of ideologies, in the name of patriotism and so on and so on. We are no better than we were fifty thousand years ago, only we are more civilized, we have better bathrooms, better means of killing others, better literature, music. Those are all peripheral activities, forms of entertainment, but inwardly in our depths, in our hearts, in our minds, we remain what we have been through evolution, through time and we have not fundamentally changed. That is a fact, isn't it? We have peripheral advantages, better communication, better hygiene, better doctors and so on, medicine. That is the peripheral activity. But at the centre, deep down in ourselves we are actually what we are, have been, after these long centuries of evolution. Is this clear? You are not accepting what the speaker says?

First see the tragedy of it all: we are highly intellectual, or tremendously emotional, romantic, worshipping images, which the tribes do, only we worship in a more pleasant place, better architecture, but it is the same spirit. And outwardly this is the state. Inwardly in our consciousness, in our way of thinking, which is isolating, each one of us thinks that he is separate from another. Outwardly we have produced a world that is isolating itself, each group, each community, each religion, each country. And in this isolation they are seeking security. Which is what is happening - the Britisher says we must be secure in our isolation, and other countries are doing exactly the same thing. That is, they feel in isolating themselves by a name - British, German, French, American, Russia - enclosing themselves with a certain frontier, which is the isolating process, they feel they are secure. Of course.

And inwardly we are doing exactly the same thing. Each one of us feels he is isolated, he is separate, divided from all others. He has encouraged this isolating process through religion - religions have said you are separate, you are a separate soul, that soul must be saved. In our education we are educated to be separate, to be isolated, seek your own success. And our own conditioning is along the lines of me, my centre, myself, my isolation and through that isolation I hope to find relationship. So there is this isolating process outwardly and inwardly which is bringing tremendous conflict. Please don't agree with me for god's sake. Look at each one of us - we have our own problems, our own desire to fulfil, to become, to be something, to be a great artist, to be a great painter, to be a great writer, to become something, which is me becoming in isolation - right? And you are doing exactly the same thing, to become something, in isolation, through your ambition, through your greed, through your drive of desire. And another is following exactly the same pattern.

So please look at it: we want to be secure outwardly and inwardly through isolation - right? That is a fact, an irrefutable fact. You mightn't like it but it is so. Each one is seeking his own salvation, his own happiness, his own isolating process of self-centred activity. So one questions whether there is any kind of radical change in isolation? You understand my question? Or we are looking at the whole thing, at this whole process, outward and inward, from a peripheral point of view - you understand? Are we looking at this vast movement of life, which includes all this, from only a superficial ideological, intellectual point of view, which is all peripheral, looking at the whole of life at the edges of it - you

understand? You understand what the speaker has said? Am I looking, observing, criticizing from a very, very superficial - from the extreme edge of the psychological field and saying, "What shall I do about it?" - you understand? Please we must be clear on this. Am I in my investigation, examination without any bias, objectively, dispassionately, am I looking at all this, this isolating process, from extreme borders, the peripheral dimension, from there I am looking? And when I look that way I say, "What am I to do?" You understand? It is like looking at a player, tennis or golf, or an actor, and from there looking at life, from the stage. Are we doing that? Or do we enquire into much more deeper issues? Which is: is my consciousness - we will go into that - is my consciousness, my thinking, is it separate, my thinking, is it separate, isolated, is my consciousness only mine and not yours? You understand my question? Are you following all this?

We have accepted thought as individualistic. We have accepted through tradition, through education, through religious dogma, religious assertions, that our consciousness, our thinking, is our own. It is not yours. You have yours and I have mine. Is that so? Is that an actual irrevocable fact? Or it is an illusion? I am not saying one way or the other. We are examining, we are criticizing, we are sceptical, doubting, whether this is a fact, therefore we must always live in conflict. Or this isolating process of thought, with its consciousness, is mine and not yours? Or this whole way of thinking is illusory, is deceptive, is not a fact? This is not an intellectual entertainment. Please one must repeat this over and over again. Or you are not accepting what the speaker is saying. Then it becomes too silly altogether, to quote him, to say, "I am his

follower. I have read his books" and all the rest of it, and just repeat, repeat, repeat. But if you see this fact that outwardly this isolating process is going on, economically, politically and religiously. And inwardly we think our thinking is individual, mine, my thinking separate from your thinking, my philosophy is different from your philosophy, what I have understood is different from what you have understood. My cravings, my longings, my desire, my relationship, my god, everything is mine. So we are asking is this a fact? Are we really, fundamentally isolated? British, French, German, Swiss, Italians, Americans - we are far away from Burma, Japan and India, so I won't mention those. It is the same pattern repeated all over the world. The tiniest hamlet in the world, the smallest group - they say "It is ours, mine. I am separate from you. My god is separate from your god".

So let us enquire into this. That is: we are enquiring, questioning, criticizing this tradition. You are not following the speaker. Don't at the end of it say, "Do we understand you?" You have to understand the problem, the issue yourself. There is no authority to help you to that. So please put away altogether this idea of following somebody, worshipping somebody, following somebody, but look at it. It is your life.

So this isolating process inwardly and outwardly has brought about great conflict. That is a fact. In our relationships, intimate or otherwise, outwardly we are in perpetual conflict. After a million years, or twenty five thousand years, there is something wrong in this. You understand? There is something radically amiss. So we are asking: is this an illusion or a reality? We are approaching it. We are not saying it is. We are approaching the central issue -

right? Now how do you approach an issue? Crumbs it is hot!

How do you, if I may ask, you are asking yourself, I am putting it into words, how do you approach a problem, an issue, something that has to be resolved? How do you approach it? Because we are approaching the problem, the central issue. Which is: I have to repeat it again: is it a fact that we must always live in isolation, outwardly and inwardly? And this isolation though apparently it gives security will inevitably destroy, which is happening. And inwardly, psychologically we are isolating ourselves. We think our thinking is separate from your thinking. This is the issue. And the speaker is asking how you approach it, how you come to it? You understand? Please understand the word 'approach'. Approach means coming very near, coming into contact. How do you approach this issue? If you approach with a motive - this is important - then that motive directs your investigation. Right, do you see? If I say "I want to find out if this is a fact or an illusion, but I like to believe it is a fact." That is my motive. I have found comfort in that isolation and I approach the problem anchored to a prejudice, to a concept and my investigation then is directed by my concept, by my desire, by my fear and so on and so on. So I must be very clear in my mind how I approach this thing. Please take time, we have got six talks, if you can stand it. How do I look at this thing? How do I hear this whole movement, with all its complicated problems which are growing more and more? How do you look at it? How do you come to it? What is your approach? How close do you get to it? Or is it just an idea? You understand? It is just an idea that I must examine. Or I must examine, investigate, doubt every examination, every question, every

conclusion, so that I come to it as though I was really deeply wanting to find a solution. You understand? I want to find out why human beings through so-called million years of education and so on have come to this point: to live perpetually in conflict. Is it isolation that is producing this, inwardly and outwardly? Or life then is inevitable, that is to live in conflict? You understand the question?

Now how do you come to it? You, not me. How do you look at it? How do you listen to the movement of it? The movement of war, the brutality, the appalling things that are happening in the world, technologically? Do you read it and brush it off? The wars, the insults, the Pacific, the South Atlantic, and the Eastern Mediterranean, just pass it off? Or do you say, "What has happened to man to become like this?" Right? So either you examine from the peripheral activity, or you enquire into the very consciousness of man. That is what we are going to do. Is my consciousness, my thinking, separate from yours? Consciousness being my belief, my faith, my experience, my ambition, my god, the philosophy which I have learnt from another, or that I have learnt about myself, my greed, my envy, my hatred, my psychological wounds, my pleasures, my sorrow, my pain, my utter loneliness, all that is my consciousness - right? Please be quite sure of this. That is my consciousness. Consciousness is its content, like a pot is useless, it has no meaning unless you put something into it. So my consciousness is all that: the battle, the conflict, the pleasure, the hurts, the wounds, wanting to hurt others, my arrogance, my sense of haughtiness, the wounds I have received all my life and from there I want to hurt others, and I hate others, that is all my

consciousness. Right? Be quite sure of this, not because I tell you. I am only, the speaker is only voicing that which is so.

So this has been my tradition, through school, college, university, through my studies, through my longing, through my loneliness and so on, that is my consciousness. I go abroad to the Far East, or to the Near East, or the Far West, or near West, and I see human beings are exactly the same - right? They suffer, they are anxious, they are in conflict, miserable, unhappy, lonely, poverty - you understand? - their gods, their beliefs, their rituals, exactly, more or less, the same - right? So my consciousness is common to all mankind at the centre. At the periphery you are taller, fairer, I am darker, I am brown, I am a carpenter, you are a scientist, you are the Pope or you are the great man and so on and so on. All that, but inwardly it is the same content. Right? Is this so? Question it, enquire, put your guts into it, find out. Don't you suffer? Aren't you in conflict, lonely, seeking, longing for some comfort, somebody to look after you, to say you are doing marvellously, go on? In the East every human being is doing the same, they are crying over their son's death and you are crying here. So is my consciousness separate from that of yours? Peripherally, outside you are different, you are far more educated than I am, much cleverer, you have a good business sense and so on and so on and so on. But move away from that, you and that man in the Far East, Near East, or anywhere, you have the same problems. You want the solution of the peripheral problems - you understand? How to earn more money, how to have a better house - peripheral. And that has become far more important than the enquiry at the centre. And therefore you insist on being an

individual. You get this? Insist that you are an individual because you are always thinking at the peripheral, at the outside, never going into the depth of the thing.

So if my consciousness with all its content is similar to yours - right? - whether you live in Switzerland or in America, or in India, or wherever you are, as a human being your consciousness has the same movement of conflict, of misery, so are you an individual? Are you separate from me? Or at the depths we are similar? The waters of a great river has ripples, on the top and we are concerned about the ripples, building a bank, this and that, controlling, but at the depths we are all the same water. Is that so, or not? You have to enquire, go into it, put yourself...

Evolution, which is the process of time, has been concerned at the peripheral level, at the outside level - better doctors, better health, keeping young, you follow? And inwardly the pot is boiling. It is not your pot or my pot. Right? Is this a fact, or just an idea? An intellectual concept which you accept? Please see the deep significance of this. If you and I, living in India, living in America, or Russia, our consciousness is the same as yours - right? - then where is there isolation? At the peripheral level yes because you are taller, shorter. So if that is so, that you are essentially, deeply, humanity, not Mr. Smith by himself, or Mr. Cragnolini by himself.

So if my consciousness is the common ground on which all human beings stand, then I am the entire humanity. That is logical, that is a fact. My thinking, which I have considered separate, mine, my thinking is common to all mankind. Thinking. You must be clear on this too. We said consciousness is similar. The variety, the

outward appearances are different, the peripheral activity is different, but at the core we are all alike. Therefore I am humanity, not as an idea, an actual fact because I have worked at it, discovered it, it is mine - not mine, I have found it. You have to find it yourself, not accept what some other silly man says. The speaker may be totally wrong, trying to hypnotize you into something which is non-fact. You have to go into it, and find out. Then if I see that I am humanity then that means that I am the world and the world is me. Therefore I don't belong to any group, to any guru, to any religion, to no nationality. I have no religion, religion in the orthodox sense of that word. Are you like that? The moment you say, "My consciousness is the rest of mankind", you have dropped away the entire tradition of the past. Right?

So then, if you are the world and the world is you, and you are the whole of humanity in consciousness, not in your capacity as a carpenter, technician, or a musician or a surgeon, then what is your responsibility to the rest of mankind? You understand? I am mankind, I am the world, but what is my responsibility to the world? I don't say I am mankind, my consciousness is like yours, and just remain there. You follow? I wonder if you understand? May I go on? We have talked for an hour. May I go on? You are going on with yourself not with the speaker. How am I, seeing the truth of all this, not as an idea, a conclusion, as an ideological Utopian concept but as an actual fact, as factual as we are sitting in this hot tent, then what am I to do? What is my action, not in relationship to the world because I am the world? I don't know if you understand all this? What is my activity which will not be related to the peripheral activity - you understand? I must go on

being a carpenter, I must go on being a surgeon, or a professor. I have to do it as long as I live in this terrible world. But inwardly, psychologically, which is far more important because the psyche always overcomes the outer - right? - when the Communists started out with their evolution they said no soldiers, equality - we were all excited at the time. And now look what is happening. I don't have to go into all that, you know it. So what is my activity, not in relationship to the world? Please understand this deeply. Activity in myself, in myself is the rest of mankind. I am asking what is the activity of my consciousness? You understand? Not in relationship with you, we will come to that a little later. What is my relationship to politics, to war - we will come to that later. But what is my activity when I understand I am the world, my consciousness with its content is like the rest of mankind - right? So where do I begin? You understand my question? Where do I begin? Out there? Or in there? In there I mean psychologically, not some kind of illusory inward, actually inward. So I enquire what am I to do? Is my thinking mine? Right? Or is thinking common? You understand? Thinking, not thinking about something: thinking about god, thinking about my achievement, the very act of thinking, is that individual, yours and mine? Separate? Oh, no, please go into it carefully.

Apparently thinking is common to all mankind - right? They think. They may find a lot of excuses for thinking but now tradition says it is individual thinking. Again is that so? Is your thinking separate from my thinking? You may want a better car. I may want a better shirt. But thinking is the same - right? Right? You are doubtful. Don't accept what I am saying. Is thinking separate from

my thinking? Or thinking is common? Then if it is common, what is thinking? Thought - our tradition says your thinking is separate from my thinking. Nobody has enquired into the question of thinking - right? So we are now saying thinking is common to all mankind because thinking is born out of knowledge, experience, memory - right? This happens to the most humble village man, and to the greatest philosopher - right? So thinking is common to all mankind. It is not my thinking, and your thinking separate. So thinking and consciousness are the same, because all the content of my consciousness is the product of my thinking. I think I am separate so the content of my consciousness is the conflict, the loneliness, the despair, the anxiety, suffering, I must resolve it.

So we have discovered for yourself, I am not telling you, that consciousness with its content is the movement of thought. Right? Of course, it is logical. So I see all this, where shall I begin? At the periphery or at the centre? We have been educated to work along the peripheral lines, and we see if you work along the peripheral lines there is no radical change at all. So I have to begin at the very centre, looking at the very centre and see its activity - right? Are we clear on this? Not how am I to get a job - I can't tell you I am afraid. How to stop the war - that is impossible. They are all idiots. How to solve the economic problem - it is possible only when there are no nationalities, no economic divisions. All these peripheral problems can be solved when there is a global outlook, not nationalistic outlook, which is isolated, conditioned outlook. It is only when we see we are all humanity, we are all one, life is one, life is sacred, not my life and your life.

So seeing all that, where shall I begin? I won't begin there, at

the peripheral level. So I am beginning to enquire: is my thinking fragmentary? You understand? Is my activity fragmentary? - inwardly. I may say outwardly I am the world but inwardly is my activity fragmentary, broken up? Is that so? So I begin there. You understand? Is it possible to find out a way of living which is whole, not fragmented? I don't say there is, or there is not. I want to find out, enquire, question, doubt, never accept any conclusion I may come to even.

So what is it that breaks up life, life, the movement of living? You understand? What is it that breaks it up as mine, yours and all the rest of it? Please enquire, what is it? Don't reduce it to one word, it is very complex. Why do I live a broken up life, so divisive - you understand - so fragmented, so separate, broken up, why, what makes my life that way? We have got plenty of days to think it over. Study it, not accepting, looking, exercising your brain to find out.

[Interruption]

Sirs, we were asking what makes our life so broken up inwardly? What is the root of it, what is the cause of it? If you find the cause then it is simple to dispel it - you understand? if I find the cause of my disease then it can be cured, or may not be cured. So I must find the cause. When I find the cause the effect can be changed, therefore the cause itself disappears. You understand? We give importance to the cause because we see the effects of the cause - right? But if I understand the cause, why my life is so broken up, so contradictory, so hypocritical, saying one thing and so on and so on, why, what is the root of it? So I discover that all my life is based on thinking. My gods are the product of my

thinking, the rituals - everything is based on thought - right? You are clear on this? Then is thought the cause of this, this constant struggle between the broken parts: I want, I don't want, I must, I must not, I must become something and there is fear in it, and so on? You understand? Please see the importance of this. If thought is the cause of this conflict, if that is the cause, contradiction, living one way, actual living, and thinking something else. If thought is responsible for this then what is life, living, in which thought doesn't divide? You have understood this? Are we together in this? I see that thought has created nationalism, obviously. Thought has created god - go slowly, you may not agree with this. Thought has created all the rituals, the symbols of religion, the robes, the non-robes, the wanting to put on a robe of a different colour, it is all the product of thinking. So is there a causeless way of living? You understand my question? A living that has no cause because the moment you have a cause it is broken up. You understand this? This requires a great deal of enquiry. The cause is now thought, thought has broken up the world geographically, nationally, religiously, thought has broken up me separate from you, my soul and your soul. My salvation is through there and your salvation is through there. The activity of thought has produced this - right? Thought is knowledge, experience, which is the past movement. So there is nothing sacred in thought. And all the things it creates are not sacred. You understand what this means? We have worshipped the things which thought has created as sacred, in the East, in the West, in the North and in the South. That is a deception of thought. Thought creates it and then worships it. So there it is, right away there is the breaking up, the divisive process begun.

So that divisive process in religion is brought about by thought and thought itself may be divisive, may be itself broken up because knowledge is never complete. Knowledge always goes with ignorance. So is there a way of living, please enquire, I am not telling you to do it, find out, put your mind, your heart to find out, is there a way of living which has no cause? Love has no cause - right? Love is not thought. But love that has hatred is thought.

I think we had better stop and continue on Tuesday. The day after tomorrow? May I get up? Will you get up too? It is finished.

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 13TH JULY 1982

If I may we will continue where we left off the day before yesterday.

I think it is important to realize not merely verbally or intellectually that our tradition is to follow, either political leaders, religious leaders or psychological specialists. We want to be told what to do, and we naturally follow. Following somebody, it doesn't matter who it is, is totally detrimental to freedom, obviously. Perhaps most of us do not want to be free, not merely outwardly but inwardly, to be completely free. And so there is a great tendency to follow people, to follow what somebody says, including the speaker. So if one really wants to investigate into this whole problem of the world outside of us and the world inside, one must, it seems to us, totally deny every form of authority, inwardly and not to follow anybody. One must repeat that over and over again if you don't mind because our tendency is to repeat what another says, try to say, "We understand you but it is so difficult. We have listened to you for so many years and we have not changed" and all that kind of thing - which implies that you are really, if I may most respectfully point out, not investigating, exploring, examining critically what we are, what we have become, why the world is in such a terrible mess. And being confused in an uncertain world and a dangerous world, we want leaders, political, religious, new kind of philosophy, but all those have betrayed us. And as we said the day before yesterday, it is important to relate what we are to the world, and the world to us, and to understand this interrelationship between the world and ourselves, and that

investigation, the real relationship and the realization between the world and ourselves inwardly, doesn't depend on anybody. There is no guru, nor all the popes in the world will help us. We have to investigate, go into this problem of why there is this division, this conflict in all of us.

And as we said the day before yesterday, we have divided, broken up life. There is the political area, business area, the religious area, and the ideological, Utopian concepts, and our own relationship with each other, it is all broken up, it is all fragmented. And the politicians never see this fragmentation, they have their own ideas, their own concepts of what government should be and so on, totally disregarding the whole psychological area of man. People think politics will solve all our problems - better government, better environment, better leadership and so on.

So we have broken up our lives and most of us are unaware of this. So we said the day before yesterday, every form of isolation, nationally, economically, religiously, in that isolation there is no security. You can see that very, very clearly throughout the world. They are building up our armaments and so on - we went into all that the day before yesterday.

And then we said: where is one to begin? Seeing all this most obvious activity that is going on in the world, dangerous, destructive, degenerating, vulgar, coarse, where should one begin with all this? And what kind of action is necessary, not at the peripheral level, but at the psychological level because man has always tried to alter the periphery, the outward things - better system, better government, better this and so on, but as we pointed out the day before yesterday man has lived for thirty thousand, or a

million years, and we are more or less the same as we were at the beginning of time. If we go along in that direction we shall never bring about a different world. And seeing all this where shall one begin? That is where, more or less, we left off the day before yesterday.

Do we realize, or are we aware, know, recognize, that each one of us has different departments, broken up - the business world, the world of teaching, the world, if you are a professor, scientist, businessman, politician, or a rather disillusioned religious man, are we aware in our life how fragmented we are? And we said what is the cause of this, what is the origin that makes our life so fragmented, so broken up? Please, as we said the day before yesterday, this is not a lecture that is giving you some information about something, but rather that together we are looking at this problem, together - not I look at it and the speaker tells you, or you tell the speaker; together we are observing this phenomena. So please, if one may point out, don't merely listen to the speaker but observe the thing yourself so that it is yours, not the speaker's.

We said: what is the origin of all this division? - in ourselves and in the world? In ourselves being our relationship with each other, with the world, and the colossal, almost destructive separatism in the world. We said is it thought? Is thought the origin of this division, of this fragmentation in our life? We are asking, so we are, both of us, criticizing, questioning, examining, not the speaker pointing out, then it becomes another circus. But whereas if both of us realize how necessary it is to see what exactly is happening outside of us and inside of us, and look at it very objectively, dispassionately, not say, "I like this, I don't like that." -

without any bias, one realizes that our life, the whole process of living, which is a very complex affair, has become more and more fragmented. Now we are asking: what is the beginning of it? Who has brought about this fragmentation? Please ask yourself, don't rely on the speaker. We are asking: is it thought? Or is it natural in life to be fragmented? Because that is the way we have lived: I am an idealist, you are not. I believe in this, I don't believe in that - right? So is thought the origin of this division? Where there is division there must be conflict - right? The Arab and the Jew, and the Russian and German, and so on and so on. And also there is division in us - I am, I should be. I am what I am but I will become.

So there is this constant division. And that may be the way of life: live in a constant conflict, constant destruction, having destroyed, build, and that which you have built destroy - as the animals live in conflict, so we live in conflict. And you may say that is the natural way of life, it has been like that for a million years or thirty thousand years, it is so. Or you question: is that the way of life? And when you begin to question, not accept the tradition of this fragmentation then you begin to ask: how did this come about? Is it thought, because that is the only thing we have? We have lived on thought, all our activities are based on thought, all the armaments, the wars, the brutality, the vulgarity, the hatred, all that is based on thought. A marvellous technology and so on. And when one asks: is thought the origin of this terrible way of living, one must enquire what is the nature of thought? Is thought itself divisive? Is thought itself, in itself, a fragmentary process? Thought, which has done so extraordinarily well in the technological world, in beautiful architecture, the extraordinary

things thought has done outwardly; and inwardly there is only one instrument we have, which is thought, and if thought is the instrument, the process that brings about this division, this fragmentation, this conflict in us, is that so? We are examining it together, you are not, please don't accept whatever the speaker says, he may be totally wrong. If you accept you will make him into an authority, which is an abomination to the speaker. Whereas together let's look at it, amicably, hesitantly, with a sense of co-operation.

You know it is one of the most difficult things to co-operate. We co-operate round a person, or round an idea, or we co-operate when we hate somebody, like hating another country everybody joins in, if there is a war they all co-operate to destroy somebody else. We are talking about co-operation in a totally different sense: not round a person, not round some authority, an idea, a concept, but the feeling of wanting to co-operate, the feeling, not co-operate about something, or for something. Here we are co-operating together in that sense of investigating, looking at this question, which is: is thought in itself a process that divides the whole world outside of us, and the world inside of us? Is this clear? If this is clear, and if thought is the origin of it, the cause of it, then we must investigate: what do we mean by cause? Cause for action is a ground, is a motive, is a reason - cause. I act because I have some prejudice, some idea, some concept which is the ground, which is the cause, the reason, the motive for my action. Where there is a cause the effect can be changed - right? But in changing the effect, the very changing becomes the cause. I wonder if you follow all this?

We are investigating together the meaning of that word, because it is very important. Cause means doing something with a motive. Cause implies a process of time which produces the effect. Cause implies the whole movement of the past, which may alter the future - right? This is not an intellectual game we are playing. We are understanding the nature of cause. When I am afraid, which is the cause, I do all kinds of silly things. And I try to alter the silly things I do, not discover the cause of my fear. But when I do discover the cause is it possible to dissolve the cause without the effect, without a future effect? You understand? I wonder if it is clear?

Is this clear? Shall we go on with it? So it is important, it seems to me, to understand the cause. I have cancer - I haven't got it - I have cancer and the cause of that is practically unknown yet. The moment they discover the cause cancer will end, but the ending of cancer has its other problems, other diseases. You understand? So is there a possibility of dissolving the cause without a future effect? You understand? I have done something wrong, of which I am ashamed. I discover why I did that thing which is not correct, and I am concerned with altering that which is not correct because I have not discovered the cause of it. But when I do discover the cause of it and dissolve that cause, there is no effect, which, if I do not dissolve it, the effect can become the cause of another problem. You understand now? Right sir?

So we are asking: is thought the cause of this division? Is thought in itself divisive? And therefore whatever it does must be divisive, separative? So let's go into the question of what is thought, what is thinking, what is the origin of this thinking

process? - the origin, the beginning of it. Are you interested in all this? Because you see sirs we live in a very dangerous world, this dangerous world man has made. There is terror, uncertainty, there is tremendous sorrow in the world. And that has been going for thousands of years. Any observant, dispassionate, mind says, "Is there an end to all this?" - not my end, not my ending of my suffering but the ending of suffering of man. And we went into it the day before yesterday, that our consciousness is similar to all the consciousness of the world, of human beings, so we are totally humanity. We went into that carefully, it is no good going back again. We are the entire humanity because our consciousness is not my consciousness, the consciousness that has evolved through time, evolution, and it has come to this present condition. And is there a possibility of totally understanding this whole consciousness and transforming it? That is why it is important to understand the nature of thought because thought is the instrument of all our actions. Thought has put all the content of our consciousness, our beliefs, our ideas, our hopes, our aspirations, fears, anxieties, loneliness, depression - you know, sorrow, it is all the result of thought, because love is totally another matter. Thought is not love, nor the remembrance of past things which give pleasure and that is called love. So we will go into that at another time.

So realizing what the world is and what we have become, it is not a vain question, not a selfish question, to ask: is thought responsible for all this? Do you understand what we are enquiring? Because the whole world is emphasizing thinking, the whole world is acquiring more and more knowledge. Psychologically and

outwardly knowledge has become all-important. And what is knowledge? Scientific knowledge, business knowledge, the knowledge of music, composition? And there are those scholars and scientists who say through knowledge alone man ascends, grows, becomes. Please see in our own lives how important knowledge is, because we have to live in the world, to do certain jobs, and to do a good job in any direction you must have knowledge. And knowledge can never be complete about anything. It is so obvious. Knowledge means accumulation of experience, of tradition, gathering all kinds of information which has been stored up, learning about it, and having a degree and functioning. So knowledge has become extraordinarily important. And we never question: can knowledge be complete at any time about anything? Obviously not. Therefore knowledge must always go hand in hand with ignorance - right? Please see the importance of this. There is no complete knowledge about myself. There can't be because to understand oneself is a tremendous movement all the time. It isn't I have understood, gathered information, and accumulated from that information a great deal of knowledge and hold that knowledge. Then when I say, "I know myself", which is a false statement because I can never know myself completely because there is always the shadow of ignorance. The more I delve into myself, the more I discover. But knowledge is accepted as the chief instrument of our life, but knowledge is never complete. Therefore our thought can never be complete because knowledge comes through experience, and you store up that experience as knowledge, which then is held in the brain as memory, and that memory acts, which is thinking. This is normal, reasonable, rational. There is nothing to

dispute about it, you can't prove it. They are trying to prove it to build a computer that is exactly like a human mind, human brain. Probably they will succeed because the computer, which is mechanical intelligence, is based on how it is programmed, and we have been programmed, never completely.

So thought born of knowledge, born of experience, stored in the brain as memory, the remembrance of things past, that is thought. And so thought in itself is fragmentary, it is not my thinking and your thinking are separate, there is only thinking. I may think about the tent and look at it with different eyes, its proportion and so on, you may think of it differently, but thinking is common to both of us. Whether you are very, very poor, highly educated, or totally ignorant, thinking is going on. So thought is the origin, the beginning of this division in our life. You are German, I am French, you are British, I am Russian - that is, we have geographically divided the world by thought. That is, thought tries to seek security in isolation, in fragmentation - right? Have you got this? Thought seeks security in isolation because it is fragmented it is the process of its own division - right? Is this clear to all of us? I am not explaining. Please don't accept the explanation. The reality is not the explanation. You may paint a most beautiful mountain with all the shadows, and the depth of light, and the beauty of light, but that picture is not the actual mountain. So please this is your own understanding, your own observation from which you are learning. You are not learning from the speaker. You are learning through observation of what is going on. So you can throw away the speaker, the speaker is not important - I must emphasize this - but what you see, what you understand, and from that

understanding to discover that thought is the origin of all this.

So the cause is knowledge, which is incomplete. You understand? Now we asked the other day: is there a way of living without cause? You understand? Please this requires a lot of investigation, not acceptance or denial. Everything we do is based on a cause. Every action, every emotion, every ideation has a cause in thought. And can that cause be altered without trying to change the effect? You understand? This is very important to understand. I am exploring with you. This is something new for me too, for the speaker, I have just heard it the other day when he spoke - the causation. I want to find out, like you, we are trying to find out together, co-operating together, man has lived always with a cause. I hate somebody because he has hurt me and I try to alter the effects of hate - right? But I never enquire what is the cause of my hate? The cause of my hate is that he has done something wrong to me. That is the cause. Now can I alter the cause, which is that he has done something wrong to me, totally forgetting him, he is the effect. You understand? I wonder if you are following all this? Not be concerned with him at all, but the hurt, which is the cause of my hatred, my anger, antagonism, wanting to hit him back. And the cause is the image I have about myself. And that image has been hurt, and that image is me - right? Surely. I have an image about myself, that I am a great man, or whatever you like, or some kind of silly person, illusion and so on. I have got an image very carefully put together by thought about myself. The myself is the image - right? I am not different from the image. Thought has separated me from the image because it can only think in terms of division, so it says "I am different from the image" but the fact is

the image is me. That image has been hurt by someone. And the cause of that hatred is the hurt which is part of that image. So I am not concerned about another who has hurt me, I want to find the cause of it, which is my image about myself and the cause says, "Can that end?" - not be concerned with the person who has hurt me. I wonder if you follow all this? It is simple enough.

So the causation is the image. Now can that image end? Please ask this question of yourself. You certainly have an image about yourself - beautiful, clever, depressed, I belong to this group, it will help me - you have an image about yourself. And that image has been put together by thought. And the cause of that hurt is the image. Now if I say to myself I must end the image in order not to be hurt, then that becomes a cause, not to be hurt. So I begin to see how not to be hurt, keeping the image - you understand? So the cause remains and the hurt will remain. But whereas when there is the observation of the fact that the image is hurt and the realization, the truth that the image is hurt, then the dissolution of that image has no cause. It doesn't say, "I must get over my hurt" - you understand? There is no ground, no motive, no reason, to dissolve the image, but the mere fact of observing the truth that as long as there is an image it will be hurt. Is this clear? We will approach it as we go along in ten different ways.

So we are asking, co-operating together to find out a way of life where there is no cause. Please sirs this is a tremendous question, don't just throw it out. I have lived so far - all of us have lived so far responding to the causes, treating the symptoms and never going to the root, which is the cause. We have accepted causation. That is our tradition, that is our conditioning. And there are those

extraordinarily clever, erudite people who say you can never change a conditioning. You can modify it, you can alter it, but the conditioning of man will always remain. That means he will always suffer, he will always be in a state of anxiety, fear and so on. But we are trying to observe and ask: this conditioning in which we live has been brought about by various causes, the main cause is the desire to be secure, secure outwardly and secure very, very deeply inwardly, to have no doubt, no uncertainty, to be completely secure. That is how our mind works. Because inwardly there is uncertainty - please follow this - insecurity because I can't depend on anybody, I have discovered that, even in my most intimate relationships I can't depend. And my desire from childhood is my condition which says, "Be secure, for god's sake." - either in ideas, in knowledge, in property, or no property, which is another form of security, go off into the mountains, or into the monastery, that is another form of security, be attached to Jesus, or Krishna, or somebody. So we are inwardly insecure, the cause of it we are going into. The cause of insecurity and the demand to be secure. You understand that we all want security, popularity, to be known.

Now, why is it that we are insecure? Begin inwardly first please. You understand? The outward things are controlled, shaped by inward action. Our psychological demands control the outward circumstances - right? We have created the society, the society in which we live. We are responsible for it, not the present generation, a thousand generations of human beings have produced this, those generations are a part of it. So we have produced this. And we say one must be secure. Why? Because inwardly we are

uncertain, confused - right? If I am very clear why should I demand security? So we are going to find out the cause of this urge, this longing for security, what is the cause of it? I feel secure in putting on a certain robe. I belong to a certain group, I feel safe, I feel safe when I say I am British, or Swiss. Inwardly too, when I say I am a great man, or I have a job which satisfies me and so on and so on. So what is the cause of this uncertainty? This deep sense of insecurity? We all want security - right? So what is the cause of it? Go on sirs. What is the cause of my insecurity? My feeling of loneliness, of my feeling totally dissatisfied with everything, discontent like a flame that is burning in me about the things which man has done, which I don't want to do but I don't know how not to do. You understand? I am burning, I am anxious, depressed. I want to change the world but I don't know how. I want to stop wars. And politicians won't listen. The speaker has tried it.

So why is the brain, which can only function in complete security fully, knowing it can only function in that way yet it is constantly living in uncertainty, insecurity, what is the cause of it? Don't look at me. Please look at yourselves and find out.

What do we mean by security? Secure from what? Secure from danger - right? Secure from any form of interference - right? Secure to pursue my own way, to be safe in my desire for fulfilment, inwardly. Outwardly I need to be secure, otherwise you and I wouldn't be here, you must have food, clothes and shelter, that is natural. But that which is natural is being denied by the division of nationalities. Any intelligent man sees this, that there can only be security for mankind if there is a global relationship, and interrelationship economically, socially, a global relationship,

not an isolated security.

So we are seeking - please follow this - we are seeking security for ourselves; which is, ourselves is the rest of mankind - right? Because my consciousness is like yours, you suffer, I suffer, we go through terrible times together. All human beings psychologically are on the same ground. It is this terrible illusion that we are all separate entities. So is there security in isolation? Go carefully. Who has brought about this isolation? Having brought about this isolation it protects itself and that protection is called security. And we see more and more observable, this tribal seclusion, isolation is destroying the world. Right? America against Russia, Russia against Afghanistan - all the horrors that are going on. You have your guru and I have my guru - I haven't got one but you have your guru, your priest, your authority. So if one realizes, sees the truth - please, just listen to this for a moment, give your attention to this - if you really see in your investigation that in isolation there is no security. Now thought has brought about this isolation, of course. Now how do you see the truth of the fact that isolation is most destructive? Who sees it? Does thought see it? You understand my question? You have heard this statement that any form of isolation, any form, is destructive, will inevitably bring about total insecurity. You hear that statement, which is, first you hear through the sensory ear, then you hear those words which have significance inwardly - right? And you say, "Yes, I hear it. I see that." Now what do you mean by seeing that? You understand? Seeing the statement by saying "I understand it". "I understand what it means." - right? Do you understand the idea, the words, or the actual fact? Not understand, see the fact. Which is it? Please look

at it. The word, which is spoken in English, we speak in English therefore there is the understanding of the word, the conclusion of the whole statement - are you observing the abstraction of that fact as an idea, or without abstraction observing the fact? I observe the fact that I have pain, physical pain. There is no abstraction about it. I don't say I am perfectly well when there is agony. When there is real pain there is no abstraction. But our brain is traditionally conditioned to make abstractions. That is, I hear the statement, I make an abstract of it, the idea of it, the concept of it, the conclusion that by jove, this is so. And I hold on to that conclusion which is totally different from the fact. Now what is it that you are doing? What is it that we are together doing? Observing the fact only without abstraction, without the idea. When you so observe, that is, observing without the desire to transcend it, the desire - please follow - the fact that as long as I have an image about myself it is going to be hurt. I am that image - right? I am that image. But the condition of my brain says, "I am different from the image." So I see the fact that there is this division - right? I say why is there this division? There is this division because thought has separated the fact from me. The me is the fact. The me is the enemy. Right? The me, with the image, gets hurt.

As long as I live in isolation there must be uncertainty. From that uncertainty comes the desire to be secure. The cause is thought has made me insecure - not made me - thought has brought about this sense of division - I am British, you are French, my guru, your guru - my guru is different from yours, my god is different, I will be saved only through that way, and so on and so on and so on. It is all the product of thought. And thought has brought about this

isolation, and where there is isolation there is total insecurity. And being insecure, the urge to be secure. Now to see this whole thing, to observe the whole thing, as you would observe a beautiful mountain without any reaction, just watch. When you so observe the very cause disappears, doesn't it? Because it is so. It is so, a fact that thought has brought this isolation. Having brought it about there is confusion, conflict, isolation and therefore in that isolation there can be no security, therefore I seek some. You follow?

If one remains with that fact completely then the causation doesn't create an effect. Got it? We are wanting to change the effect but not see the cause and let the cause disappear.

From this one begins to enquire: what is intelligence? Because this is intelligence, you understand? To see the false and discard the false is intelligence - right? Is that clear? I see and there is perception that nationalism is destructive. To perceive that is intelligence. I perceive this whole religious structure which man has built, with all the rituals, dresses, thought has built it, and to see the fact that it is not religion is intelligence. To see the fact that thought has created isolation outwardly, and also inwardly. And the cause of this is thought which is fragmented in itself. And to see that is obviously intelligence.

Now proceed that way, go in more and more deeply and you will see that we live in a world that is so utterly impractical, utterly unintelligent. To see that, not just verbally to say it is unintelligent. So to discover, not to be told, what is false, what is illusory, to see it, not to act upon it, just to see it, that very perception of the false denies the false. I don't have to fight against it. You understand?

So I see step by step the way intelligence is acting. It is not my

intelligence, it is not yours, it is intelligence.

Right Sirs. May I get up now?

SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH JULY 1982

May we continue with what we have been talking about for the last three or four meetings? One thinks it should be made clear that this is not a sermon, nor a lecture as is commonly understood. We are not giving you, if we may point out, any information or any ideological new set of beliefs and tracts and exotic religion and philosophy. Nor is the person who is speaking important.

We were pointing out the other day that we are together co-operating in the investigation of what has happened to human beings after twenty five thousand years or thirty thousand years or millenia upon millenia. We have become coarse, brutal, violent, cynical, a tremendous sense of antagonism, hatred, having enemies and the present structure of religions, the organized, orthodox, dogmatic religions, have no place at all.

And also we point out how dangerous it is to follow somebody psychologically. We pointed out that human beings in a confused world with their wars and self-destruction, we want someone to lead us, to help us out of this chaos, and we have relied on political and religious and other forms of leaders, and they have not actually deeply helped to bring about a new society, new ways of living and so on. So it behoves us, if you are at all aware of what is happening, we have to be a light to ourselves. Which doesn't mean doing exactly what we would like to do, but rather consider our relationship with the whole of humanity and realize that we are the entire humanity, each one. We have been talking about that quite a bit.

And one thinks this morning we should go together into the

question: what is it that we human beings are trying to become? What is it each one of us, if one may ask, is trying to do, achieve, and gain an end? If we enquire into ourselves, even very superficially, what is it we all want? Whether we are well placed, poor, or intellectually highly cultivated, each one of us apparently is becoming something, wants to become something. It is natural I think to become something in this world - natural. That is, if we do not know a certain language we spend a great deal of time learning it. That is becoming learned in a particular language. Or if one is not skilful academically, then you strive, study to achieve a certain position academically because it gives you a job and so on. It is also quite natural if one is a poor carpenter to study the nature of the wood, the instruments and so on and become a good master carpenter, or a scientist and so on. That is fairly obvious. If I am a worker in a factory I want to become the foreman in that factory, and so on.

And we are asking: is it natural - and we are using the word natural in the sense that is it inevitable, is it in the nature of human beings psychologically to become something? That is, the becoming something, whatever it be, involves time, naturally. I am this but I will be that. That requires a series of days, weeks or months or years, and during that period one strives to become that. That is, I am violent, one is violent, one will attempt to become free of violence, and so on. And after achieving freedom from violence what is there more to achieve? That is the eternal demand of human beings to achieve, to become something, psychologically, inwardly. If one examines, each one of us, deeply, what is it we are trying to become? More enlightened? To achieve

heaven? To achieve in the Buddhist sense Nirvana? Or in the Hindu sense Moksha? What is it each one of us wants to achieve? One thinks this is an important question to ask. Is there anything to achieve? We are predisposed to the concept of becoming something inwardly. That is, we have carried over the same mentality of becoming something in skill, in technological knowledge, in achieving certain status, we have carried that same mentality to the psychological field. I wonder if you are aware of all this?

If one is aware of this, what is it we are trying to become? What is it deeply we are trying to achieve? And each achievement is separate from all other achievements. It is isolated achievements. I am poor inwardly and I want to be rich inwardly. The richness consists in achieving knowledge, in overcoming conflict. So I am always struggling to become what I project, what thought projects, that which is not. And one is trying to become that which is not - right? And this achievement is based on the principle of reward and punishment. The reward is to achieve, to come to a point where one can say "I have got this". And punishment is in not achieving what is projected, which is pain, in which there is a sense of lack of fulfilment, pain and depression, and all the consequences of so-called failure. In this process we are caught.

Please, we are together co-operating in the investigation, examination of this question. The speaker is not stating something which is not actual. We are examining. Please don't accept what the speaker says. That is the first principle. One must have a sense of questioning, doubt, enquiry, scepticism so that we can both of us together investigate why human beings have become what they are,

living in eternal conflict, endless wars, terrorism and all the rest of it. Outwardly we have made perhaps what may be called progress, from the horse-drawn carriage, to the jet. That is called progress and we apply the same attitude, the same way of thinking that I am this, I will be that. It has taken many centuries to move, evolve from a bullock cart to the present transportation. And man has said, "I am this but I will take centuries to become that." All this implies time. Right? Time as evolution. And what is time? It is important to understand the nature of time, not only by the sunrise and the sunset, the evening, the night and the morning, time by the clock, and also we have psychological time, "I am this, I must be that". And we also say society is this, with all the terrible things that are going on, the hatreds, the violence and all that, and it will take time to change the condition of man - right? Again we are caught in that movement of time.

So we are talking about time together, I am not telling you, please bear in mind that we are putting into words what you are obviously, if you are interested, if you are serious, we are considering together the nature of time, because we live by time. Hope is time, the future which promises something or other is time. The remembrance of the past is time. And one will require knowledge in order to act properly. So the accumulation of knowledge is in the field of time, and as knowledge is never complete it goes with ignorance. So this whole process, outwardly and inwardly, we have accepted as a movement in evolution, in becoming something - right?

Now as we said the other day, intelligence has no cause, as love has no cause. And we said time also is the cause and the movement

of the effect. That is also time. But time may be a second or many years. The cause and the effect. The movement of the cause to bring about effect is time. Right? So where there is a cause there is time - right? Please this is important because we are going to go into the question of whether certain conditioning of man - do those conditions require time at all to be free of them - you understand? We are asking: the human brain is conditioned, mechanical, repetitive, it is conditioned that way and that condition has been brought about through evolution, which is time and whether time, if we proceed along that way, living in this constant time there is no radical change. It is a continuity of what has been, the process of that will go on. But we are asking together - the speaker is not asking, you are asking, if one may point out - can this condition of man, which is the result of time, which has a cause and the effect is what we are, and if we continue in the same pattern, modified, it will be the same line. What has continuity is a process of time.

So can the condition of man be transformed without time? You understand the question? I am conditioned, as born in a certain culture, with certain religious dogmas, superstitions, realities, and a way of life that has conditioned the brain. And there are those who assert that conditionings can never be changed, they can be modified, they can be somewhat, like living in a prison make the prison rather nice. And we are questioning together whether that condition can be transformed, end, without time. Right? We are going into it, we are not asserting a thing. We are together investigating if you are aware of all this, and exercising your brain, not your romantic feelings and activities, but your capacity to think. We are not telling you what to think but how to think, which

is quite different.

As we said too, where there is a cause, that very cause brings about its own end. The cause of anger, violence and so on, there is a cause for it. When there is the discovery of that cause the effect can be radically changed. Right? I am lonely, which is a terrible fear and anxiety and ache and the effect of that is isolation, more and more isolation. The cause of loneliness, if one can discover it, that the very ending of the cause is the ending of loneliness - right? Because I have discovered the cause. I have discovered that I have tuberculosis and it can be cured, they have modern medicines that can cure it. So one must discover the cause of this sense of separateness which brings about such deep isolation which is called loneliness. Right? Please go into this.

What is it to be lonely? In that feeling of loneliness, which is deep isolation from all outward and inward relationship, what is the cause of that, this sense of being utterly, without any relation to anything. You all know this perhaps. You may be married, you may have children, you may have lots of friends, position and all the rest of it but there is this deep element, see it in man, that is so desperately alone. Please, what is the cause of it? The explanation by the speaker is not the fact. Explanations are never the fact. Descriptions are never the real. The word is not the thing. So please do not be carried away by the word, by the description or by the explanation. It is like looking at the movement of the river in a picture, in a painting, which is entirely different from the actual beauty of a river that is in full flow. So we are asking the cause of it.

How does one look at this question? How does one enquire into

this question? Do you exercise thought to enquire? Please understand this. Is thought the instrument of enquiry into such a problem? Thought being, as we went into it the other day, limited because it is the outcome of knowledge which is limited, and knowledge can never be complete about anything. So thought is always limited. Now do you, do we enquire into this question by the exercise of thought? If you exercise thought, obviously thought being limited in itself, fragmented in itself, can only discover the fragmentary causes, not the actual cause. You follow? Right? So if one does not exercise thought, then what is there as an other instrument? We are used to this one single instrument. That is our conditioning. That is our education. And that is the only instrument we have. And we discover that instrument cannot delve into something much more profound - right? Be sure, be absolutely clear on this point.

Man through fear, uncertainty, confusion, isolation, thought has created an idea called god, invented it. God certainly has not created us. If he had we would be extraordinary human beings. We are not. The cause of this invention is one's fear, one's hope. That is the cause of this effect. So if one is enquiring into something that demands not the instrument of thought, then what is the instrument? You understand? The question is clear, is it not? You are putting this question, not the speaker only. Therefore it is your question. And you have to answer it. Thought is not the instrument.

Then we are asking: is the other instrument, if it exists, is it the invention of thought, which may be unconscious? You are following? I know thought cannot examine the whole universe, the extraordinary order of the universe. And thought cannot examine it

because thought itself is limited. So when I say thought is limited and cannot possibly examine that which is limitless, then I am asking: is there a way of observation which is not the instrument of thought? Can I observe, observe this problem of deep loneliness, this sense of total isolation with all its consequences? Where there is isolation there must be conflict. Where there is isolation there must be various forms of antagonism, hatred, inevitably leading to war. So what is the instrument, which is not thought, which is not unconsciously invented by thought, and you say, "Yes, that is it"? So one must be very clear that it is not the activity of remembrance, which is thought. Are we meeting each other?

So we have to go into the question of observation. That may be the instrument. We are not saying that is the instrument, because then it becomes dogmatic and perhaps you will accept it, then it has no meaning. But to enquire, which is only possible when one sees for oneself that thought is limited, utterly. And that thought is not your thought or my thought, thought under all circumstances always is limited. Then only you can put the other question: is there another instrument which is not put together by thought? Only when you have seen the reality, the truth that thought is limited, then you can go to something else. But if you are confused then you will be playing a game? Is this clear? If you are clear on this point then what is observation? Is there an observation without the word, without association, which is remembrance, which is the chain of incidences, remembrance and activity, the chain of it, is there an observation without the past? Is that possible? You understand? Is it possible to observe the whole world as it is, not from any bias, not from the point of view of an American, British,

Russian, an idealist, a terrorist, which are all a bias. Whether it is historical bias, or bias brought about through reason, it is still a bias. Can one observe this world, this society around us and therefore myself, which is my loneliness? Is there an observation without the past? The past being the word, the past being the accumulated memory of experience, which is knowledge. Is that possible? To look as though you are looking at the world around us, the society, for the first time, afresh. Surely it is possible, isn't it? To look at the speaker, I am taking that as an example, without all the reputation, all that nonsense. To look, not at the figure, not at the form, but at what he is saying, which means you have to listen, to listen not only with the sensual ear but the inward ear, to see whether it is false or true. So this listening requires attention, not translate what you hear to please yourself or to accommodate it to the past memories, but to listen without any single movement of thought. To listen.

When you listen to sound, like music, it is a sound. Can you listen to that sound without naming who wrote it, who composed it? Just to listen. There is great beauty in that listening, without any form of association. That means you are listening to it for the first time. Or when you go to Greece and see the Parthenon for the first time, it has an extraordinary significance, you want to kneel to it, the beauty, the colour against the sky, the whole immensity of the Grecian civilization. So in the same way can we look at this problem without the word, without the association, without any form of relationship? Can I look at myself, which is lonely, not that there is loneliness and I feel it, all loneliness is me? I have brought about this loneliness by self-centred activity, by pursuing my own

desires, ambitions, greed and all the rest of it.

So the outward activity of isolation and the inward activity of separateness has brought about this. That is the cause. Can I observe the cause - not I - is there an observation of the cause without wanting to transform it, change it? You understand? Just to observe it, as you would observe the flow of that river. You cannot change the depth of that water, the purity of that water, the swiftness of that water. So can you observe the cause? - the cause being the whole way of our life. If you can so observe it, that very observation which is the ending of the cause and therefore the effect which is loneliness is gone. This is not just words. Work at it, look at it.

So from that we should begin to enquire together into the question of fear, because that is one of our major problems in life. Fear of the future, fear of the past, fear of the present. Fear of public opinion, fear what somebody will say, fear of being exposed, that which you have done in the past, fear of death, fear of not fulfilling, fear of not being loved, and fear of loving. We all know the various forms of fear. Fear that I might lose my wife or the girl-friend, what she will say about me. Expand all this. Fear of having no pleasure, physically or psychologically. Fear of being lonely, fear of getting hurt, getting hurt you want to hurt another, and we carry this hurt all through life. And the consequence of that hurt is building a wall round oneself not to be hurt any more, resisting any form of relationship, therefore out of that bitterness, anxiety, loneliness, depression, agony. And there is the fear of not becoming. So it is like a vast tree with many branches, with many, many leaves full of chattering leaves. And we are concerned with

one form of fear or another. One may be concerned only with the fear of death and nothing else. Or one may be involved with thought about the fear of tomorrow. Tomorrow is not just the day after, twenty four hours, the whole movement of tomorrow, which is endless. And the fear of having no significance in life, life has no meaning. It has no meaning as it is, which is perpetual striving after something, conflict, misery, unhappiness and all that.

So fear has multiple forms. It is not your fear or my fear, it is fear. You may translate it in one way, express it in a different way, and I or another may describe it differently, but basically it is fear. Right? And naturally most human beings, at least sane, rational, healthy human beings say we must end fear, not merely cut the branches of fear or tear the pieces, tear the leaves on the branches but rather what is the cause of fear? If one can discover the cause then it can, as we went into it, where there is a cause there is an ending to the effect - right? Please that is a principle, that is a law. Cancer, with all its different varieties, the cause of it they have not discovered yet, though they have spent billions on it, they will discover it one day and the effect is ended - right? Please see the significance of this. Where there is a cause with its effect, the cause can come to an end - right?

So we are now concerned with what is the cause of fear, not your fear of mine, the cause, which is so common to all mankind, which is the ground on which all human beings struggle? So please this is not your fear or mine, but fear of mankind. What is the cause? This is important to discover for oneself because man has carried, lived with fear for millenia upon millenia, he hasn't solved it. He has escaped from it, he has disciplined it, or he has

rationalized it, or justified it, but it is there, whether it is in the conscious mind or in the deeper levels of the mind. So one must enquire together what is the cause of it? If you discover it, right, if you say, "This is the cause" then hold it. You understand? Like a precious jewel, hold it, look at it. Don't say "I must go away". You have got a marvellous diamond in your hand, a jewel that has its brilliancy. So what is the cause?

We were asking the other day: what is intelligence? We were saying intelligence is not the product of thought, it is not put together by thought. Please, this is very serious. To understand this you will have to go into it, not just see the implications of it. Thought is neither yours nor mine, it is thought. Whether you live as a hermit, or as a saint, or as an explorer, or as a scientist, there is thinking, it may be limited or less limited. So thought is never personal. Then thought cannot through struggle, through study, through accumulated knowledge, thought can never have the capacity of that extraordinary thing called intelligence. And we said intelligence has no cause; like love has no cause. If love has a cause then it is not intelligence, obviously. One sees that very quickly. But one doesn't see that where there is cause there is no intelligence.

So we are enquiring intelligently, which is that intelligence which has not a cause, that intelligence is observing - please go carefully into this - into the nature of fear, the root of it. You understand? When intelligence has no cause that intelligence which is observing - no, I won't tell you, you go on, I will come to it presently. What is the cause of fear? Is it thought? Is it time? Please go slowly into it, enquire. Is it desire, desire being the

freedom from fear? So are we looking at the cause with intelligence, which has no cause, you follow? Or we are trying to make an effort to look, therefore the effort has a cause? Because you want to be free from it, you want to live more happily and all the rest of it. So can you observe desire, time, thought? They are not separate, they are interrelated, therefore they are one - right?

So is that the cause? Fear of death, I am not dead but I will be dead. This interval between the living and the ending. I am not, I will be. The 'will be' may be uncertain. So time is involved in this. I have done something wrong, one is afraid of being exposed of that which is wrong, one is afraid of it, which is time. Desire is more complicated. I do not know if we have time to go into it.

Is it desire, time, thought, as one unitary movement that is causing fear? Causing. Effort has a cause, fear has a cause. Intelligence has no cause, love has no cause - right? Psychologically everything has a cause. I do this because. So that is the cause, desire, thought, time - time being a movement, tomorrow psychologically, therefore it is limited. So these may be the factors. We can enlarge it, go into details of the nature of desire, what is desire, perhaps next time we will go into it.

This apparently is the one cause, though they look separate they are all the same movement, within the same area, within the same field. So that is the cause. Please I am not telling you. You, yourself, are using your capacity to observe without any bias, without any sense of wanting to suppress fear, or to escape from fear, rationalize fear, just observe it. Do you see the inward movement of fear, the cause of it? Now when you discover the cause of it, what do you do with it? Now just please go into it a

little carefully. You have discovered the cause, discovered for yourself, found it, then what is your action, or non-action? We are accustomed, it is our habit, our condition, to do something. I have discovered the cause, I must do something about it, rub it out, forget it, analyse it, tear it to pieces, I must act. Which is, again that action has a cause, which is thought saying this is unbearable, I must get rid of it, go beyond it, transmute it, whatever it is. So one has to be aware of that condition of action, wanting to do something about it. Now who is it that is doing something about it? You understand my question? Surely desire, time, thought, is you. Right? You are not separate from fear, you are fear. You might like to say, "I can get rid of it", separate yourself from the fact but you are that. Right? Like you are, if you are violent, perpetually seeking fear, caught in some illusion, you are the enemy of mankind. That is a fact. If you are nationalistic, bound to a certain religion, a certain dogma, you are the enemy of the whole of mankind.

So you are that desire, time and thought. You are that. You are not separate from that. So what happens when there is the realization, the truth of it, not just the verbal description of it, verbal explanation of it, but the fact that you are that? And that fear is the root, has its root in this. So you are the whole of that. Don't say, "Am I not also sometimes free of time, I look at the world afresh, waking up one morning after a deep dreamless night, wake up in the morning and say what a beautiful lovely feeling to be fresh." Those mornings are very rare. We can't live on those mornings, which is to live on dead memories. But this is a fact. This is the cause. The cause is me - right? The cause is time,

thought, desire and so on, which is the whole composition of my consciousness. The content of that consciousness is the common content of humanity. So our enquiry into the nature of fear is not a selfish activity. Please bear this in mind. It is not a selfish activity that I want to be free of fear. I am concerned - we are concerned with the human fear of which you are part.

So when we look at the nature of fear we are considering the whole of human fear. But if you are looking at it as though it was your personal fear then you have to examine why you think it is your personal fear. Then you will find out when you so think that it is limited. And if you like to live that way naturally you will live that way. Nobody is going to force you. That is what humanity has done, living in separate compartments and fighting each other, destroying each other.

So this observation has led you to this. Your examination, which is very careful investigation, exploration into the nature of fear. Now can the brain, which is accustomed to escape, which is conditioned to rationalize, which is moulded to avoid and escape to some other form of entertainment, can that brain break the pattern and look without any movement of its past conditioning? This requires your application. Then when you so look, that is, when you give complete and total attention to the cause - you understand? - which we don't, we want to escape - when there is complete focussing of your attention on the cause, what happens? That very light of attention dispels the cause, and so there is a total ending of fear.

Don't ask: "But occasionally fear comes up again, can this ending of fear be perpetual?" - you follow how our mind works?

That state which I realized when you pointed out I had captured it for a second, can that second continue? - which is desire, which is time, which is thought. You are back again in the circle. You see our brains are so used to continuity. I have had happiness, it must go on for the rest of my life.

So to look without any movement of thought. That is, to give complete, total energy to observe the jewel that you have caught, which is the cause. Where there is a cause there is an end to the effect, and to the cause itself, naturally.

We will continue if we may on Tuesday, if you are interested. And if one may point out you must see the whole of it, not just that you have told me about fear, that is not good enough. But you have to see life as a total movement, not a fragmentary movement which you are pursuing. Right?

SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1982

What are you waiting for? I think we should go on with our investigation together. We should talk about first, what it is to listen, what is it to learn, and what is it to observe?

Most of us hardly listen. We listen with our sensory ears and it doesn't penetrate much deeper than that generally. To listen without translating what one hears into our own language, without interpreting what is being said, whether by one's friend or relative, or listening to a bird, or to the flow of water, that listening doesn't go very much deeper. You hear a statement by somebody who is telling you something, or the speaker is investigating for you, together we are investigating, whether our hearing is superficial, or the very act of listening opens up the whole problem. So it is important how one listens, not only to what is being said now but to listen, the art of listening, so that one has a great deal of sensitivity in listening. You can reject what is absurd, superficial, that is fairly obvious. But in listening is it possible to see what is false immediately and what is true, not with a lot of explanations, descriptions, analysis, but in the very act of listening perceive?

And listening is perhaps really the greatest thing to do. If one tells you, "I love you", how do you listen to it? Do you actually listen? Or wonder why he says that? What does he want? What is his aim? What is the idea, *arriere-pensee*, behind the words? So we are not listening actually to the feeling of that person who says, "I have great affection for you". Then if one does so listen there is immediate communication with each other. I wonder - one wonders if it has happened to you that way, to listen so completely

so that the whole heaven is open to you.

And also we should consider what is learning? Is there anything to learn, except technological learning, learning a language, learning how to fly or write a letter, learning the fairly necessary things in life? That is necessary. How to read a book, how to drive a car, how to be a very good carpenter. You learn, accumulate and then you use that knowledge to act skilfully. That is what most of us do when we use the word 'learning' - accumulating a lot of information and knowledge stored in the brain, which the brain directs and then acts. That is generally what is understood by what we mean by learning, external learning about the atmosphere, about various things, the peripheral learning. Now is there any other form of learning? Is there a learning which is psychologically accumulated by various incidents, experiences and stored up psychologically, which then in our relationship, in our daily life, will that knowledge help or bring about clarity? You understand my question?

Most of us, as you are doing now perhaps, and I hope you are not, you are listening and learning in the ordinary sense of that word what is being said, accumulating it, and then saying, "Yes, I have understood it." First the listening, then observing the fact or the falseness of what is being said and clinging to something that you feel to be real, and holding on to that, and from there act, accumulating more and more and more. Again the same phenomenon as one does outwardly when learning a language and so on. This is the whole process of learning.

We are asking a question, you and I, is there a different way of observing without accumulating? Because the moment one

accumulates and acts, it becomes mechanical. Our brain has become mechanical but when the brain is free of the mechanical process of thought, of reactions, then it has immense capacity, infinite capacity. Look what human beings have done in the technological world, in the world of computers, in the world of warfare, in the world of communication and so on. Within the last perhaps a hundred years tremendous advancement, technologically. So the brain is capable of extraordinary things. The scientists are saying so. Perhaps then you will accept it. That is not being said sarcastically.

Now when we learn as is commonly understood, the learning, accumulating knowledge, that very accumulation process becomes automatic, mechanical. So we are asking a question together whether this mechanical process will ever free the mind, the brain, so that it is in an immense, unlimited state. You understand my question? I hope the question is somewhat clear. Our brain is not yours or mine. That is obvious. Because how can your so-called personal brain evolve? It is the evolution of time - evolution means time - through millenia upon millenia, and this process of evolution has conditioned the brain to certain rewards and punishments, to certain reactions, and so it has made itself limited. And in this limitation it is accumulating knowledge and functioning from that knowledge therefore it makes itself more and more mechanical. It is so obvious, isn't it? It is not something exotic or irrational but when one observes oneself rather deeply and very in the sense aware of what is happening outside and inward, one can see the brain, how it has been conditioned, and that very knowledge which has accumulated is becoming its own instrument of limitation -

right? I hope you are meeting this? Are we aware of this? Are we aware that our brains are first of all limited, conditioned - nationalism and so on - conditioned, and we are acting from that conditioning, learning from that conditioning, therefore increasing the conditioning more and more and more - right? Are we aware of this? Know it, perceive it? Not accept that our brains are limited and repeat that they are limited. Whereas if one is aware of this conditioning then one can ask a different question altogether.

Which is: is there any form of psychological learning at all? You understand my question? Are we together in this? Or are we just...?

What is there to learn about oneself - learn in the ordinary sense of that word? What is there when I observe myself, the conditioning, the responses of that conditioning, the reactions to various pressures, influences, strains and seeing this constant pressure externally and inwardly, the strain of it, which becomes more and more, introducing a great factor of conflict - right? And is it possible to be aware of this, to observe this as it is, and find out for oneself whether it is possible to go beyond it? Not to learn what is beyond, because then it is just a quid pro quo - right? This is very important, please, because we are going into something presently which requires your real enquiry.

So we are saying: learning must be there obviously. Learning about the external world totally, as much as one can learn, because learning is never complete about the external world, there is always something being added or taken away. But can one learn, or observe oneself never recording what is observed? Otherwise the recording becomes the knowledge and you are back again. You have understood this? Please we are talking over together. It is not

I, the speaker is laying down any dogma, any belief, any statement, we are enquiring together. Humanity has accumulated a tremendous lot of information, knowledge, which is necessary, externally, with all its pitfalls, with all its dangers, with all its limitations. And is there anything to learn about oneself? Or there is only the act of observation, not learning? We must differentiate between the two: observation and accumulation as learning.

To observe the condition, to observe the reactions, the reactions with their responses as reward, punishment, good and back, the more. Just to observe. And that observation implies holding that which is observed without any movement of thought. Are we together in this or not? One observes that one is afraid, there is fear, conscious or unconscious deep down. The immediate response is to go beyond it, to be free of it, to suppress it, to escape from it. That is our conditioning - right? Now to observe, to be aware of fear and not rationalize it, not give an explanation, not try to discover the cause of it, just to observe it - right? Are you doing it as we are talking?

You observe that you are greedy, envious - envy is not only at the social level but much deeper. Envy implies the more. The more is measurement, the more, the better and so on. It is a form of measurement. Now can you observe envy which has a cause in measurement, in comparison, in imitation, in conformity, in pursuing an ideal, which are all measurements, which are all comparison? Now to observe envy without any accumulated responses to it, are you doing it? Please don't make it difficult. It is really simple. I am envious because I see that you have brains, I see that you are capable, I see you have got extraordinary capacity

which I haven't got. And I compare myself with you. That very comparison is the cause of envy - right? - the more. Now to be aware of this process and not move away from my envy, from the envy which is a reaction of my state - right? Can you so hold it as a vessel holds the water, hold it? Are we communicating?

Perhaps some of us are not used to this kind of enquiry. Some of us perhaps come out of curiosity here, or to see that chap, what he is talking about, what he is against or for, and all the things that go on in one's mind, the chattering mind. If one can for an hour give one's attention, it may be sporadic, but give your attention to understand a very complex problem. And the complex problem is: what we have learnt and accumulated all the time is making the brain mechanical. So knowledge is becoming mechanical, making the mind mechanical. I learn how to be a carpenter, I am apprenticed to a Master carpenter and I learn. I have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about the instruments of carpentry, the wood and so on and from there I act, I become a carpenter. That becomes more and more mechanical. If I am a specialist in a certain direction, it is the same thing.

So we are asking a very serious question, which is: is knowledge making us, psychological knowledge, not the outward knowledge, is the psychological knowledge making us more and more mechanical, therefore more and more limiting the capacity of the brain? The brain has an extraordinary capacity, infinite capacity but we have reduced it to a very small affair - right? So can one observe this fact: that psychologically we have been told what we are by the specialists and according to them we try to understand ourselves, according to them we conform, but we never investigate

apart from the psychologists. That means enquiring, not knowing, moving. Right? Is this clear?

So there is a hearing, a different action of learning through observation. That learning is not accumulation. The water is flowing, it is never accumulating, it is moving, moving. And when there is the total process of listening, never accumulating from any experience, never recording that which has happened, and this can only take place when you are observing very, very closely, so that the brain which has become more and more conditioned, more and more mechanical, limited, can break down this limitation.

If that is clear then we can begin to enquire into something that is absolutely necessary: what is beauty? What is the relationship of beauty to love, to compassion, to intelligence? Right? Please ask this question, put this question to yourself and find out. We are talking over together, I am not telling you. You are not following the speaker at all. He is totally anonymous. He happens to be sitting on a platform for convenience but there is no authority in this. It is not, "I know and I tell you all about it." On the contrary, we are together co-operating into the investigation into something that is absolutely necessary, the whole of life itself. We have talked about fear and other things during the last times that we met and now we are talking, we are asking: what is this immense sense of beauty?

Our whole civilization, whether in the East or in the West, has been the investigation of the external, making the external as pleasant, as agreeable, as comfortable and so on. Making the external beautiful - beautiful house, beautiful furniture, a lovely garden, beautiful clothes, a marvellous painting, a really quite

extraordinary poem, the great cathedrals, the temples and so on. A beautiful woman, a man and so on - external. Making the external as perfect as possible, as accurate as possible. If you live in this part of the country you can see the mechanical things are extraordinarily lasting, you don't have to call the plumber in every other day. Here they endure.

So our history, which is the story of mankind, and that mankind is you, it is the history, the story of yourself. And we have made the external as so-called beautiful as possible. If you see an aeroplane, it is really extraordinarily beautiful, or a diamond, or a marvellous bridge, expanding over vast waters.

So is that beauty? Partly. When you see a mountain against a blue sky, the shadows, the valleys, the rivers, that is an astonishing sight. So one asks: what is beauty? Is there a beauty without having inner beauty? You understand? We will go into the word beauty presently. You may have a beautiful face, beautiful body, proportion, good eyes and all the rest of it. And the external beauty of a person is nice, attractive, pleasant, and is that beauty, without understanding the depth and the meaning of beauty? - You are following? Are we together in this? Yes? Somebody agree with me please. I am not talking to myself.

So what is beauty? Is it only in the external world? And can there be beauty in the external world without understanding the beauty of life in oneself? Right? So we are enquiring together. Please I must emphasize together, co-operating together to find out what is beauty, not according to the magazines, not what the artistic authorities say what is beauty, but to understand for ourselves the nature of beauty. Because without that love cannot

be. Has beauty a cause? As love has no cause, as intelligence has no cause, which we went into previously, has beauty a cause? So we are going to enquire if there is a cause to beauty, you understand? A cause. When you see something extraordinarily great, marvellous, majestic, what is your response to it? You observe it, if you are at all aware of something external what is taking place, you say, "How extraordinary, how beautiful that is, let's go and have tea", then such a response is very, very superficial.

Now what takes place when you see something majestic, like these mountains around one? What takes place in you, in each of us? For that single second, or perhaps for some longer period, for that moment the immensity of that pushes away all our problems, all our conflicts, all our unhappiness, for that single instant in the majesty of that great mountain you cease to be, for a second - right? There the outer greatness has driven away the pettiness of oneself? Please observe it, this is so. You stand in front of a great picture, painting, or hear great music, for a moment everything has gone except the sound, and the sound has immense movement, it covers the earth. And at that moment you, as all my associations, is not. When the self is not there is beauty - right? Please see the truth of this, not because the speaker says so. See the actual happening of an incident where you can say, "My god, what an extraordinary thing this is." That is, when your thought and all the implications of thought, and all the things that thought has put together have completely gone for a second. It is not there because something externally has impressed you so enormously you forget yourself. Right?

Now is it possible not to have this enormity in front of you which pushes away the self, the problems and so on, is it possible without any external greatness or beauty or impression to look at life with this sense of not from a centre? You have understood my question? Is it possible for me to look at this life, which is really quite extraordinary, much greater than all the music, and all the temples and all the mountains and poems, this life which is so extraordinary, with all its complexities, with its pain, sorrows, anxieties and so on, to look at it without any response to it, without any reaction to all this? That means can you look at this with absolute quietness? Right? When you look at the mountain you are quiet for a second because that vastness made you be quiet, forced you. Now without any force, without any compulsion, without any pressure externally, have that silent observation not only of yourself, of all the things that are going on, but to have that capacity to observe totally silently. Is not love, which has no cause, one may put it into words, "I love you", but behind those words is a sense of vastness, a sense of extraordinary depth to it. And that depth and that quality cannot possibly exist when there is this tremendous activity of "I should", "I should not" and all the rest of it. Is it possible to look at life that way?

Now we are going to look at a problem which most of have: the problem of dying. It is not the question of old people like myself, it is the problem of everyone whether they are poor, rich, powerful and so on. Together we are going to look at it. Look at it. Not asking for explanations, we will do that presently, later, but to look at this question which has troubled mankind from the time immemorial, death, the dying. Not what happens after the death,

not enquire what is more important, which is before death, the whole long period of years before dying, but just to observe the thing called ending. Right? Ending.

Death is the ending. Now what does it mean to end? This is really important, do go into it. To end something; let us take for example attachment. Most of us are attached to a house, to a belief, to a faith, to some ideal, to some pattern of existence, or to a person, attached, which means clinging to that, holding to a person and so on. The consequences of that attachment are fear, anxiety, the pleasure of holding the person or the idea, and fighting for that idea, which is another form of pleasure, following somebody, saying he is my guru, etc. etc. and holding on to him. Or in attachment there is fear, anxiety, some pleasure and the desire to continue in that attachment, never ending it. We all know this. It is so common for most human beings. Now what does it mean to end attachment? Because we see the consequences of it. And also we see the cause of it. I am attached to you as an audience because I derive from that a great sense of satisfaction, a great sense of fulfilment - I don't but suppose I do - a sense of achievement, fame and so on, all that nonsense. We are not talking about detachment. Detachment is the opposite of attachment. When I pursue detachment I am really pursuing attachment. Are you clear on this point? Please see the truth of this. I am attached and it brings me great pain, and out of that pain I say, "For god's sake, if I could be detached from all this." Which is, the response of pain, which has projected an idea of detachment, and I am pursuing detachment. Clear? So we are not talking about detachment. We are only talking about the fact of attachment. Detachment is just an idea,

away from attachment.

So we are talking about ending, without the cultivation of detachment - right? Is this clear? So is it possible to end altogether attachment? Which means being aware of all the implications of attachment - right? And end it. The ending is not a process of time - right? Most of us say, "I am attached, yes, I will gradually move away from it. It will take time because I can't let go because there are various reasons and all the rest of it." So it is partly lack of clear observation, partly laziness and the habit of being attached. When one is aware of the whole movement of attachment it is so obvious. When one is deeply aware of this fact of attachment, to a community, to a commune, to a group, you know, the whole of it, to end it because you see the truth of attachment. And the perception of truth is not of time. Right? I wonder if you see this?

Is this clear somewhat? That perceiving that which is false, which is illusory, and that which is true, doesn't take time, doesn't say, "I must think it over, I must analyse it, I must talk to my friends about it, I must cultivate a sense, a silence to observe." So perception, seeing the truth, is not of time. You understand, that's a discovery, because for most of us our tradition says take time, practise. Practise detachment, you may not be free of it today, work at it, which are all so absurd. It is another form of pain, struggle, anxiety.

So to see the fact, the truth is instantaneous if you are aware of the whole thing. But most of us are partially asleep, because we have been drugged by tradition, by what other people have said. If you can put aside all that and look, and see the whole implication of attachment, and end it. The ending is not that there is a future.

Do you understand this? I may end attachment because I have pain in that attachment therefore I want to end it, which has a cause - right? Please understand this. That which has a cause can end. Love has no cause, therefore it is limitless.

So we are asking: as death is the ending, both physiologically and all the things that one has psychologically accumulated. That is the ending. But thought says, "That isn't good enough. What is the future? I have accumulated so much knowledge. I have been virtuous, struggled, what is the reward for all that?" So our mind, our brain is accustomed to reward and punishment. The reward is the future comfort, future security, a continuity of that which has been. And if there is nothing after death life has no meaning. I will go on, struggle, I have done that all my life, it is part of life. But if we understand the nature of conflict and end it.

So what is it that continues? You understand? What is it that has given us the sense of continuity? Physiologically one has continued from the moment you are born until you die, there is a continuity. It is measurable by age, by time, physically. Apart from that, what is continuity? The things that I have accumulated, the furniture, the knowledge, the experience, the vast suffering? Is there a sense of no measurement? Continuity means measurement. Are you following this? Anything that continues can be measured, not by measurement, a tape, but the psychological comparison that I have been this and I am going to be that, that is a form of continuity - right? - which is measurement. Can I look at continuity without measurement? Or is it possible for the brain not to measure? Measurement was born out of Greece - right? Out of ancient Greece measurement was put together. And the western world and

the eastern world has followed this pattern, without measurement there is no technology - right?

So our conditioning is to measure - the better, the more. Now is there an observation without measurement? This is rather a complex question, you can't just agree or disagree because all our life is based on measurement. You are tall, I am short, you are clever, I am not, you are beautiful, I am not. You are a great success, I am a failure. So always in the realm of comparison - right? - which is measurement. What does it mean to live without measurement? You are asking this question. I hope you are. To have no measure, which means no comparison. Is love measurement? You understand? Please go into this. I love you, tomorrow I won't love you.

To live a life, if it is at all possible, one has to go into it, find out, to live a life without a cause, which is time, to live a life without measurement. To live a life without the burden which is accumulated in that word 'the better', 'the more', is it at all possible? Or life must always continue in measurement, in cause, therefore always within the limitation of time and knowledge.

Right sirs, that is enough.

SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND JULY 1982

This is the last talk. There will be a question and answer meeting on Sunday.

We have talked about many things together during this Gathering. Together we observed and examined many other factors and problems of our life. We also should this morning explore together whether it is possible to live in this world, which is becoming more and more corrupt, more and more immoral, wars, uncertainty, dangerous, whether in this world we can live at peace, whether the conflict that is going on outwardly, whether that conflict is destroying us also, or whether we have contributed to that chaos in the world.

And we ought to talk over together what does it mean to live at peace? It requires a great deal of enquiry, a great deal of not merely superficial verbal explanation but one has to look at one's life in relationship to the world and find out for ourselves whether we can live utterly inwardly peacefully. One cannot live at peace with oneself if one is in constant conflict. We went into that question: what is the cause of conflict? And we pointed out in our examination together: wherever there is a cause that cause can come to an end. And we have made life into a series of causes. And when there is the ending of cause, is there peace? And we also enquired together into the nature of fear, what is the cause of fear. And we went briefly into the problem of suffering. Mankind throughout the world has suffered a great deal and still goes on suffering. In their desire to be free from suffering they have accepted all kinds of illusions. They have been trapped in various

beliefs, dogmas, rituals and concepts, and yet fear remains as one of the major factors of our life. We went into that too.

And we also went into the question: what is a human being, living in this world, what can he do which will both affect his life and the life around him? And if his action is based on an ideal, a conclusion, an ideological concept, any action born from these various causes of action, then there must inevitably be conflict. We went into that quite deliberately, deeply.

And we should also go this morning into the question of suffering, whether suffering can end in mankind, in us. And the question of religion: what is religion? And also to understand, explore into the nature of meditation and whether there is something sacred at all? These are the problems we are going to talk over together this morning.

Man has suffered, and is still suffering, for various causes: the cause of war, the cause of division, nationally, economically, socially. And also he has suffered in isolation. He is isolated both in his activity and in his way of life. He is concerned with himself, though he may be related to others intimately, or not, he is concerned with himself and he is living a solitary lonely life, desiring various, not only physical objects but psychological projections to be achieved in his isolation.

And we talked about human consciousness. That is, our life which is based, which is the result of our accumulated experiences, incidents, beliefs, anxieties, loneliness and so on, which makes up the whole content of our consciousness. Our consciousness is not individual because our consciousness is the rest of mankind. All human beings suffer, even the most uneducated, ignorant, living in

a small village or town, he also suffers, which is the common lot of mankind. When one observes this non-verbally, not as an idea but actually then one sees one's consciousness is not a particular consciousness. It is the consciousness of all mankind, therefore your consciousness, with all its content is the consciousness of all humanity, therefore you are actually, when you observe, you are the rest of mankind. You are not actually an individual. That is our conditioning, our tradition, our education and our religious beliefs, that we are separate souls, that our brains are separate, which is totally absurd if you examine it. Our brains are the result of great evolution, time. It is not a particular individual consciousness. There is no individual thought. Thought again is the common ground of all mankind. So there is no individual thought, or individual isolated existence. We went into this very carefully.

And also in talking about consciousness and all its content thought has put together the content of our consciousness - our gods, our rituals, our behaviour, all the things that thought has invented, both outwardly and inwardly And we went into the question: what is thinking? What is the nature of thought? Because all of us live, most of us, on the activity of thought. And part of thought is our sorrow. And whether thought can ever end sorrow? You understand our question? I suffer. Suppose I suffer, an ordinary man living in some country, surrounded by lots of idiocy and so on. I suffer. My son is dead. Or the person whom I think I love has gone. In this detachment, in this isolation, because I have lost something which I have held dear, I have been attached to that person, or to that idea, and that idea is shattered by reason, logic, sane observation. And also my son has been dead, disappeared

entirely from this earth. And I suffer. And together, please, as we said, we are enquiring together. The speaker is not at all important, he is totally, completely anonymous, he has no authority. But together we are going to enquire into the nature of suffering.

Suddenly I find myself isolated completely. I have depended on my son, or on my wife, or girl-friend and so on. And one day I have lost him or her. And sorrow, pain, grief, is my lot, as the lot of all human beings living on the earth. And what am I to do? Bear the suffering, which most of us do, in isolation? Or escape from that suffering through some form of drug? - whether that drug be a concept, a future projected formula that "I will meet him when I die"? All those forms are an escape from reality. The reality is that I suffer. I am not escaping from that suffering nor seeking comfort. I hope we are together in this. Because when one seeks comfort when there is sorrow, it is an escape from actuality, from that actual state of suffering. There are various forms of comfort - belief, rationalization, enquiring deeply into oneself. All those forms of observation are another form of escape. So can I, with my tears, with my longing for my son, wife, or girl-friend, or the lost beliefs and ideals, can I remain, can the mind or the brain remain with that suffering? What we mean by remaining is not to escape in any form from the actual, the actual pain, the real grief which brings about tears. Life then becomes utterly meaningless because I have been so dependent, attached, and that which I have been attached to is gone. And I suddenly realize how utterly lonely I am. (Noise of aeroplane)

This is a serious subject not to be interrupted by noise. We should really have these meetings far away from all civilization,

where one can talk over things together seriously without any interruption. And as that is not possible we have to listen to the noise, listen to the thunder of an aeroplane, of a jet, without any resistance, and as you would listen to the speaker and to yourself without any resistance. But for most of us resistance is a part of our life. We resist anything new. We resist any change. We resist any new thought, though thought can never have a new concept, thought can project something and call it new and we resist it. If we understand the nature of resistance then we will know when not to resist. When we know what it is to co-operate, not round a person or an idea, or some authority, or for some profitable reason. To co-operate not for a particular reason, or with a motive, but the quality of co-operation, to work together, the feeling of wanting to work together, not for something, nor because of something. When there is that spirit, that clarity of co-operation, then one will know for oneself when not to co-operate, as one will know when not to resist. So one hopes in our conversation together, in our enquiry, we are not resisting each other.

So I have lost, as all human beings have lost, something that I held very closely, dearly, and I find myself totally isolated. So what is the relationship between love, isolation and grief, sorrow? What is the relationship of suffering to love? I love my son. And if love brings sorrow, is that love? Is sorrow part of love? As jealousy, as fear, anxiety, is that the nature of love? Or love has nothing whatsoever to do, has no relationship whatsoever with sorrow. Please we are enquiring together. We are examining so that we find the actual reality of love and suffering. The speaker is not stating something which you have to accept, or deny. We are

examining together, therefore it is neither yours nor mine, it is examination. Like a scientist examining the cause of a cancer, if he is a rather shoddy scientist then his personal interest is involved in that examination, which distorts that examination. Whereas we are now, ordinary human beings, with all our daily problems, and one of them is sorrow, asking whether sorrow can ever end? Or it is the lot of man? Is there the ending of this thing? And in the ending is the brain seeking a further result? I hope you are all following all this carefully. I may end sorrow, which requires a great deal of understanding of one's own consciousness, the consciousness of mankind. To go into that very deeply, which means whether thought, which is the central factor, the contributory element in putting together the whole structure of consciousness, what is the relationship of thought to sorrow?

Therefore one has to ask what is the relationship of desire, which for most of us is the actuality, what is the relationship of desire to love? And where there is desire, this urge to fulfil, the energy of that desire, will it end sorrow? Or the understanding of all causation, the investigation of all causation - you are following? - our life is based on causation: I do this because in doing this I will get a reward: if I do this I will be punished. So our life is essentially based on various causes, and where there is a cause there must be an end, so we cling to causation. I wonder if you are following all this? You understand? Causation, the motive, the result, the reward, the punishment, that is our life. And so our life is a process of cause and effect. From that effect becomes the cause, and so it is a perpetual chain. And thought realizes this, if you are at all aware of all this.

And what is life without a cause? Can one live without a cause? Suffering has a cause, which is my desire to be attached, my desire to possess, in that possession I feel safe, in holding on to a belief there is certain security, so there is always this process of cause and effect. So the cause of suffering is my movement of self-centred isolation. This is obvious. Two wars are going on at present - in Lebanon, Iraq and Iran. They are all human beings, they have isolated themselves as the Israelis, the Iranians and the Iraqis, they have isolated themselves. In that isolation they thought there was security. That isolation has brought about tremendous wars throughout the world, in the past and in the present, and probably in the future. So wherever there is isolation there must be grief, there must be conflict. This is a law. This is so. And our whole life is a process of isolation, so there is conflict, there is grief, there is sorrow.

So then one asks: is it possible to live in this world without a cause and without isolation - right? And therefore one asks: has love a cause? Please ask yourself, the speaker is only verbalizing what you are asking, what you want, what your enquiry is. Has love a cause? Has intelligence, the capacity to observe very clearly without any distortion, without any bias, without the previous knowledge which guides? To observe so closely, it has no cause. So love has no cause. And can one live in this world, which is appalling, so utterly destructive, can one live in this world with that intelligence which has no cause, and that love which has no cause? Which means can one live in this world with complete compassion? Compassion can only be when thought doesn't belong to any group, any association, any isolation. You understand all

this?

Then we can proceed to find out together what is religion? What is religion? Why human beings are trapped in organized religions, as the Christians, the Buddhists, the Hindus, the Muslims and so on and so on? The small little sects and the large expanding sects, they all call themselves religious. In their religion they have a thousand divisions. I believe there are in India something like three hundred thousand gods. And you can have your choice. And here too you have got a great many divisions, perhaps not so many. But in having many it is rather pleasant, you don't belong to any. But if you have one or two principal divisions it then becomes rather difficult.

So we are enquiring together into what is religion? Why man, throughout the ages, accepting that life is pain, life is sorrow, life is constant travail, has projected something called god - thought has invented it. I wonder how many of us see that fact, that thought is responsible for the gods, for the rituals, for the dogmas, for the various divisions of religions, thought is at the core of it. And whatever thought has put together can never be sacred. Right?

Then if one sees the truth, not the verbal explanation, but the actual, when one sees the truth that whatever thought has created is mechanical, thought being in itself divisive, limited, though the brain, which is now conditioned by thought, that brain has extraordinary capacity, infinite capacity, not your brain but the brain of mankind. So in enquiring into religion, we can discard entirely, completely, all the things that thought has put together, which then thought says you must worship, which is just a form of a game, a form of illusion. The word 'illusion' means, the root of it,

is to play. So our religions are a matter of amusement, entertainment, sensation. If one has put aside all that, that means the brain is clear, therefore not afraid what happens in the future, or in the past.

Please follow all this a little more closely if you will, together. The brain as it is now, our brain, is limited, conditioned by vast experience of millenia. Our brains are the result of accumulated knowledge, from books, from the prophets, from all the psychologists of the past, present and future. Our brain is shaped, conditioned, therefore limited. And that brain can never, as it is now, uncover the limitless, the enquiry into the whole universe. The scientists are exploring the universe, through telescopes, through various forms of satellites and so on. It is all the activity of thought. Thought is enquiring into the universe. You understand? And thought can never, whatever it does, understand the deep fulness and the beauty of the universe. Our brain is limited, mechanical and is it possible to free the brain from all its conditioning? You understand? Then one can discover - not one - then there is a possibility to find out that which is timeless, that which has no limitation, that which is not the result of measurement?

So we are asking: a religious man, not one who belongs to various religions, but the religious man who doesn't belong to any community, to any group, no nation, he doesn't have any belief, for all these are factors of conditioning, then one can ask: can one be totally free, is there a freedom from the content of our consciousness? I am putting the thing differently.

Our consciousness is put together by thought. Which is, I

believe in god, I don't believe in god, I have faith, I have no faith, I belong to a particular country, I am patriotic, I suffer, I have pain, I have anxiety, I have loneliness. All that is put together by thought as consciousness, which is me. Right? It is so obvious. Can that content end? You understand? Can that content, which is so confused, which is so messy, disorderly, contradictory, can that consciousness with its content totally disappear? That is we have talked about it as fear, the ending of fear. We have talked about various contents of that consciousness, is that possible? You understand?

Now this is meditation, not all the silly things that are going on, with their systems, with their practices, with their desire to achieve something or other. Because the more they practise the more they go step by step, by step, every day the brain becomes more and more mechanical, more and more dull, more and more repetitive. You will do what you please. But if you really want to understand the nature of meditation, what is involved in it, there must be freedom: never to follow somebody, never to accept authority inwardly. Freedom demands tremendous intelligence. There is no cause for freedom. I suffer therefore I must be free - then that which you are seeking is another form of imprisonment. But when one begins to enquire into freedom, it is not going from one corner of the world to another corner, travelling, nor is freedom choice. Our choice is to move from one corner of the field to another corner but remain in the same field, and this movement is called choice.

So one has to enquire together into the nature of freedom. I want to be free because I have pain. There is a motive. I want to be

free from all attachment because attachment implies pain, jealousy, anxiety, the fear of being alone. So freedom has no cause.

Then we can begin to examine: what is meditation? The very word implies, the root of it, not only to ponder over, think over, but deeply the freedom from all measurement. Do you understand? Measurement. That is, achieving something which requires time. Right? Every form of measurement - the better, the more, the becoming, the achieving, which ordinary meditations promise, but in meditation there is the freedom from measurement. Follow this carefully. Please this is very serious if you are interested in it. To observe without measurement, which means no comparison. "I have been, I am, I shall be", which is measurement, which is time. Man has asked whether time has a stop. Meditation is the enquiry into time, whether it has a stop. That is, time has put together the 'me', the self, the self with all its knowledge, whether that self, which is the result of evolution, which is time, which is thought, whether that has an end, a stop? Which means, the freedom from all becoming, from all measurement, whether you sit cross-legged, breathe in different ways, become neurotic about your food, accept some kind of fad, and practise some kind of system, all that is a continuity of time, the brain demanding more experience, the more.

So meditation is the ending of the self, the 'me', which is love. How can I love you if I am most concerned with myself? If I am ambitious, greedy, envious, wanting to fulfil, achieve, how can there be love? So to see the truth of it, not take time over it, not analyse it, go into step by step, explanation after explanation, but to see instantly that as long as the brain is caught in time and thought, which is limited, what ever it does will create more conflict. See it

instantly, the truth of it, which is to have an insight into it, the whole movement of it. Then, as we said at the beginning of the conversation, the brain has that peace of quietness, silence, naturally. There is no perpetuity of thought all the time chattering, chattering. Living in this world, is that possible? One has to go to the office from nine until five - god knows why! Of course I know why, we all know why - responsibility, money, position, you know, the whole business, nine to five. And there are those who don't want to go to the office, form a commune and work together on their own land, or whatever it is, that is also another occupation, from nine to five. One has to live in this world, one has to have money, shelter, clothes, that is normal, natural. And can one live with that quality of love, with that quality of intelligence and freedom - they are all one, they are not three separate activities, time, thought, intelligence, love - you understand? As we know it now. But when there is freedom of this limitation, love without a cause, freedom without a cause, and intelligence without cause, with that state of quality, can one live in this world? Go to the office, go to a factory, cook, wash dishes, go for a solitary walk even for ten minutes, is that possible living in this terrible world? You have to answer that question, not me. You will answer it only when you have realized that thought is the central issue, that thought is always, under all circumstances, is fragmentary, because knowledge is fragmentary, there can never be complete knowledge. Then meditation is the total denial - denial I am using in the right sense of the word - denial of the self, the 'me'.

Then one asks: is there anything sacred beyond all this? You understand? Because that is what man has enquired. He says this

world, in which we live, is perpetual conflict and pain. There may be slight joys and pleasures but there is always this, there is always death, there is always pain, both physically and psychologically, and he says, "Is there something beyond all this?" Because one sees all this is so meaningless, empty, and one asks: is there something beyond, something that transcends all this? So not being able to transcend this he invents the gods, the principles, you follow? So is one aware of this, not to be caught in that trap of the priest, of the specialist - right?

Then in this freedom, love and intelligence, the brain is naturally not chattery, not pursuing one thought after another, is quiet. You know silence has its own sound. The silence that thought creates is noisy. The silence of a brain that is free has its own peculiar sound. Out of that sound is creativeness. You won't understand this unless you have done all this. It is just like words. In that silence with its sound there may be something which is limitless, timeless. That may be the eternal love. Do you understand?

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 25TH JULY 1982

The talks are over. This is a meeting where many questions have been put, written down. And I don't think it's possible to answer all the questions that have been sent in. It would probably take ten days or so to answer each one of them, or perhaps more. So I've chosen some of the questions out of them.

When we put a question to somebody, or to ourselves, what is the intention behind the question? Is it merely to find an answer, and the answer from somebody else, or do we put the question to ourselves and what is the response to the question which we have put to ourselves? As there have been written down questions handed over, apparently you're expecting actually answers from the speaker. I'm afraid that will not be possible. We are going together to explore the question. We're going together not seek an answer, but rather what the question itself means. And so in the very investigation of that question we find the answer - we find the answer is in the question, not away from the question. Right?

The question is an explosion, it's a challenge. And to meet a challenge, whether it is scientific, medical or our own personal lives, one must approach it correctly. The approach, if we can go into it first, matters a great deal. How do we approach any problem? A problem, the meaning of that word is something thrown at you - that's the root meaning of that word, something pushed forward. And how do we meet it? What is our motive in looking at it, the question. What is our cause in inquiring into the question? Is it to find a comfortable answer, a satisfying answer, or

to investigate the question so deeply? And to enquire deeply one cannot have a motive, a question when you are looking at it, exploring it, opens its whole depth and significance. So could we, this morning and the next two mornings, in investigating the question, one must be clear whether we approach it with a motive, or observe the question very carefully, so that the question itself begins to unfold.

For most of us we want to narrow down everything to a certain narrow point of view. For most of us any problem which is related to all other problems - there is no single problem by itself - but we would like to reduce this problem to a narrow, limited, enquiry. But in enquiring you must let it flow, let it run, let it move. So that's what we can, I hope, together, go into these questions. The speaker is not answering the questions, but rather together co-operating in the enquiry of the question. Right?

1st QUESTION: Can one slow down the ageing process of the mind? Or is the deterioration of the mind inevitable?

That is a question that all of us are asking as we grow older. Everybody wants to slow down the process of ageing, not only physically but also mentally, intellectually, emotionally, and keep the capacity of heightened sensitivity. Right? We all want that, especially as one grows older. One can be old at the age of ten. Or one can be old at the age of ninety. So we must enquire what do we mean by growing old.

The world outside of us is always pressing down upon us. The world is becoming more and more dangerous, more and more violent, and if we do not respond to it correctly, we'll also be violent, we'll also be destructive and degenerating. So there is the

problem, there is the question: can the brain keep young? It doesn't matter how old it is, can that brain be active, efficient, clear, and have the energy of youth, to make decisions, and maintain a certain standard of quality? That is the problem, that is the question.

Right? Is this possible? We would all like to have a very clear, precise, decisive brain, unconfused, uncluttered, always fresh, moving, not bogged down by problems. That's what we all would like, whether we are very young or very old.

And what makes the brain old? Please, we are enquiring together, you're not just listening to the speaker. What makes the brain, which is, as we explained during the talks, not our brain, it is not a personal brain, that it's rather childish and rather immature to think our brain is mine and yours, because the brain has evolved through time, accumulated a great deal of knowledge, has been through a great many experiences, pain, sorrow, anxiety, all kinds of travail. It's not my brain or your brain, it's the brain of humanity that has manifested itself in each of us. I think we have talked about it very carefully so we don't have to go into it now.

So what makes the brain, which is manifest in each of us, old, worn down? Please, we're asking each other this question. Please think it out, not just wait for me to explain it. Any organism, any machinery, wears down through friction - friction, either artificially created, brought about, or the natural friction. Whether it is artificial or natural, it is friction. Everything wears down through friction, friction being strain, disease, ill health, wrong behaviour and so on. It is inevitable that the brain should and must break down, deteriorate. And the questioner asks whether it is possible to keep it afresh. In investigating this question, what is the cause of

this deterioration? Is it conflict, perpetual conflict? Our life is not only conflict but adjustment. We are exploring together, you're not accepting what the speaker is saying. We are together looking at this problem. This question has been asked from the ancient of times, and apparently very few have found the answer, the cause. Perhaps we can try to find the correct observation into this matter.

Is it conflict? Conflict in our relationship, conflict in becoming - I am this, I will be that. 'What is' and 'what should be', 'what is', and transform 'what is' into the ideal. 'What is', that is, what I am, what is at the present moment, what is actually happening inwardly, and that happening is translated according to the past, or according to an ideological concept. So there is always this contradictory existence. This very contradiction is the cause, one of the causes of conflict. Right?

Please, let's understand it very carefully. 'What is', that which is actually happening, and we have the ideal, the opposite, and we strive to achieve the opposite, so there is always conflict. Is this very clear then we can enquire if this conflict is necessary. We might say all life so far has been a series of infinite conflicts, it can never end - that's part of life. If you accept that, then inevitably the machinery, which is the brain, will wear down. But if you don't accept that, that conflict is necessary, then we can ask, as we're asking now: is conflict necessary, in relationship, in learning, in acquiring knowledge, conflict? Now, which means, does duality exist at all, the opposite? Right? Are we meeting each other? We're asking each other, does the opposite exist, which is the contrary, which is something totally opposed to 'what is'.

That is - you're following all this, we're enquiring - are you

interested in all this? I hope the speaker is not making you interested in it. This is a natural interest of every human being, wherever he be in the world, he wants to find out.

And we're asking, is there a psychological opposite? There is the opposite, man-woman, darkness and light, pain and no pain - there is the opposite, naturally, but we're asking, is the conflict, does it exist in the psychological opposite? Is that clear? So is there an opposite to 'what is'? I am violent, and is there an opposite to violence? And many philosophers and many teachers and many idealists have said it, the opposite is the concept of non-violence. Right? Then we have the problem right away, the concept and the fact. So there is a division of time. Right? Time being, 'what is' and what is violence, that to be transformed through a series of investigations, to arrive at the opposite, which is non-violence, which is the end of violence. Right? Now where there is opposite, there must be conflict, good and bad. Right? We're talking psychologically, first. So there is violence probably in all human beings, inherited from the animal and so on. And cultivated, carefully, through nationalism, separatism, the idea that each one of us is utterly separate from everybody else, psychologically. Right? Religions throughout the world have maintained that you are a separate soul. We've talked about that during the last six Talks.

So we are asking: is there psychologically an opposite to 'what is'? Right? I am violent. Why does the thought create the opposite? The fact is I am violent, the fact is I am anxious, the fact is I am greedy, envious, lonely, those are facts. The opposite is a non-fact. Right? Do we accept that? What matters is not there should be

freedom from violence, what matters is to understand the nature of violence, and see if violence can end, not create the opposite. The moment we create, thought creates the opposite, conflict begins. Is this clear? Can we go on from there?

So one is violent. Can we look at that quality, that reaction, and find out whether it is possible to end violence, not create a state of mind which says, "I'm free from violence", ending violence? You understand? Not the continuation of violence as non-violence. Right? That is, the opposite is inevitably born from its own opposite. Right? So is it possible to observe violence and end it? What is violence? Anger, the desire to hurt another, violence is competition, comparison, imitation - all that is generally considered violence. An ambitious man is naturally violent. We have described what is violence. And without creating the opposite, can this state of violence end? Right? Because we see the opposite must create conflict. Right? But if I say to myself, I must end violence in order to achieve another state, that, again, is escaping from 'what is'. Clear?

So can that end, and not let it continue in another form, at another level? Right? So let's find out together whether violence with all its extraordinary complexity can end. That is, can we observe the reaction which the word has awakened - right? - the word - for most of us the word is extraordinarily important, so can we look at this reaction called violence without the word? Right? It's really quite a complex issue this. Can I look at my wife, if I have one, or girl friend, without the word, without the word which creates the image, the word which is the symbol, and discover that thought is the movement of verbalization? Right? Are you doing

all this together, are we? Or am I, are you merely listening to the speaker?

You know, we are caught in a network of words. We are German, French, Italian, whatever it is. Those are just words, but behind that word is a great deal of culture, certain traditions and so on, and so on.

So can one observe this fact of violence without the word? That's the first question. Then is the word creating the feeling? Right? When I say 'my wife', the word creates the feeling. So can we look at the reaction without the word? Right? See what the implications of that is. That is, the word is the remembrance or the association of the past incidents which I have called violent. So when I use the word, I have related the present response to the past, and therefore the past is judging. Right? This requires a lot of exercise of the brain, exercise to observe very, very, very closely when you're looking at this fact of violence. So is there a freedom from the word, so that you look? Right? When you free the brain, when there is freedom from the word, what remains? You understand? Only the reaction, what you have named as violent. I wonder if you follow all this. Are we meeting each other - or am I talking to myself?

In observation to be free of time. Right? I'll explain it more. Time being the past - right? - modifying the present, and continuing. Right? The past accumulation of memories, experience, knowledge, meeting the present, modified or not modified, and continuing, which is the future. Now to look at violence without the idea of time. Have you got it?

Now, just a minute. To look at one's wife or friend or whatever

it is, afresh, to look at something afresh, time cannot be, cannot come into being. Right? If I look at my wife with all the past memories and incidents and so on, and so on, this accumulation which is the result of time, is observing the wife. Right? So can I look at the person whom I call my wife without the word and without time? You understand? Try it, do it, sir as you are sitting there. You see it requires very, very close observation to do all this. It requires a brain that is active, not just say, yes, a brain that is alert and sensitive to this question. To observe without time and the word, time being all the accumulated knowledge about her and about him. Then you are observing the person or that reaction afresh. Right? Are we doing it?

And the question is: is it possible for the brain not to deteriorate? And we said, conflict is one of the factors of deterioration, strain, pressure, the urge to achieve, the urge to become something, psychologically, all these are factors of conflict. Now we have observed the whole movement of violence, which is one of the major factors of conflict, factors in which conflict is involved. Right? Now can this conflict, psychologically, inwardly, end? Please ask yourself, go into it. Let's go into it again carefully, because one can see any machinery which is in perpetual movement, however well oiled but constantly moving, must wear down. And one of the factors is that thought, thought is perpetually active. Right? Now can thought, which is chattering all the time, creating pictures, all that - can thought come to an end in observing itself in action? You understand? Oh Lord! Which is, can thought quieten down, because thought is constantly active, therefore the brain is constantly being, chattering, arguing, discussing - you

follow? Can that brain with its movement of thought, quieten down? Right? And they have said, it is possible if you do certain things, meditate, sit quietly, go for a walk by yourself, all that. Right? But all that has a motive, a cause, because you think by quietening down the brain will become not so old. Right? So where there is a motive, the end is merely a continuation in another form. I wonder if you understand all this.

So, sir, you're not used to this kind of thinking, you're not used to investigation, free investigation. So, we're asking whether the brain, which has become mechanical, which is constantly active, can that activity slow down? Can that activity stop? What is the motive behind that desire, that question: can it stop? Is it that you want to have a brain that is very young, therefore there is a motive behind it. That very motive is going to destroy your investigation. Right? So can one be free of all motives in looking at this fact? Right? If there is freedom from motive, however subtle, however hidden, then can conflict end? Now this is the question - can conflict end? Who's going to answer it? The speaker? Or you have investigated it, explored into it, and it's burst open, and you have to answer it yourself. Right? Can you look at it and find out? Suppose if the speaker said, says, "Yes, it can end", then where are you? It's not important. What is important is to find out for oneself. So the question is answered.

2nd QUESTION: How can one face an incurable disease with all the physical pain and agony that's involved?

There are different kinds of pain, physical and psychological. Now the psychological pain, the agony, the acute suffering, is that what one is concerned with? Or the physical pain, a certain

incurable disease, like cancer, how do we meet this? There are various drugs and so on to alleviate physical pain. And one can put up with it. I'm sure most of us have experienced in spite of the drugs, put up with certain forms of pain. When it becomes acute, then you do something, some kind of medicine, medical treatment.

So let us first look at the psychological pain, which may be psychosomatic. And what is pain inwardly? You answer please. What is psychological grief, pain, pain that's caused by many factors, like one wants to fulfil, become, achieve, and there is the pain of all that. Right? There is the pain of being hurt, being wounded by another. And most of us are hurt from childhood, and we carry that hurt all our lives. That hurt brings about a resistance - right? - resistance in my relationship, because I don't want to be hurt any more. So I build a wall around myself, isolate myself, and that creates more fear. So I live with this hurt and fear and resistance all my life. That's one of the hurts that most human beings have. Is it possible not to have the pain of hurt, which is, not to be hurt at all, psychologically? Right? What is it that is hurt? Look at it, please, go into it yourself. When I say, "I am hurt by what you have told me, what you have said", what is it that's hurt? The 'me'. What is that? What is the 'me' which is hurt? The thought which has created the image, the image being myself. Right? Myself is not without the image.

I may have many images. So is it possible to live a daily life without the image which is me? Go into it, sir. You understand? The image is getting hurt, the image is causing pain, the image is created by thought through various incidents, accidents, and so on. That image, with all its complexity, it isn't just an image, is hurt.

The image is I have a conclusion, I've come to a conclusion, and I hold onto that conclusion. And any disturbance of that conclusion is pain. I believe, if I do, in God. And you come along and say, "Don't be absurd." Then that very verbal assertion has hurt, because I'm beginning to question. Or I may not question but I'm hurt, because you say something very serious.

So as long as we have an image, as long as the process of thought, which is constantly creating the image and giving life to that image, there must be pain. Right? This is a fact. Then one asks, can that pain end, which means, can one live in this life without any image? Sir, this is not an intellectual conundrum, a puzzle - this is our life. "I am British", or Indian, or whatever it is. And it is very important to hold to that image. Any slur on that image I get violent, and pain follows and so on. Can one live a life without any image whatsoever? Right? You think it out.

Now there is this psychological pain. If one understands the nature of this pain, inwardly, therefore there is no image and therefore there is no pain as we, psychologically, know it. Right? From there let's move to the physical pain, not from the physical to the psychological, but from the psychological to the physical. Right? We always are concerned with the physical pains, never enquiring into the psychological structure of pain, inwardly. Right? We begin with the psychological, the psychosomatic state of mind and brain, and then enquire into the physical pain.

We live such rotten lives, smoke, drink and all the rest of it, we're all the time corrupting the natural process of life. Right? Pollution, polluting the air, waters, eating dead animals - right? Carcasses. And indulging ourselves in various forms of sensation

and taste becomes all-important. So physically we yield to all the things that seem so abnormal. Right? And that may be, and perhaps it is one of the causes of physical pain, disease and illness. We're not going into the question, now what is disease and what is illness - we'll do that another time. Or you've have an accident, in a car. Your arm or your leg is broken and so on. Can one look at all this pain, physical pain, if it isn't too acute, to observe it, and remain with it for a while, as long as one can? You understand my question? Do we accept physical pain, or we are always trying to get rid of pain? If it is acute, naturally, we want to be free of pain. But can we observe pain, not being identified with pain? You understand my question? Suppose I have a bad headache, migraine, can I observe it, not identify myself with it? You understand my question? Or say, "My God, I've got such awful headache, I must do something about it." Or, if it isn't too terrible, can one be free of all identification with that pain? Right? Enquire into it, find out.

Sirs, in all this, what is important is to approach life with intelligence. Now what is intelligence? This is a problem, isn't it - here is a problem - first problem was whether the brain can be kept fresh, young, active, clear. Second question is, can one bear pain, and so on. Now, in observing these two questions, the central fact comes out, which is intelligence. To approach life, which is pain, pleasure, anxiety, sorrow, and all the complexities of this life which man has made for himself, both outwardly and inwardly: the wars, the terrors, the terrorists, kidnapping, the brutality, the vulgarity, the coarseness, the whole of that - which is part of our life, can one approach all this with real intelligence?

So let's enquire, what is intelligence? Right? If you are not tired.

Intelligence, the meaning of that word, is to accumulate information and use it, collect a lot of information and use it so-called intelligently, not according to your pleasure or pain, according to your bias, you have collected lot a of experience, knowledge, and employed that knowledge actively in life, intelligently. Right? That intelligence is not personal, because you have accumulated a lot of information. You may identify yourself with that information, saying, 'My information' but it is information. So can you see that intelligence is not personal, it is not the clever activity of thought? Right?

When we enter into the world of technology there is a vast accumulation of experience, knowledge. A technician may use that tremendous accumulation and identify himself with that accumulation, with that knowledge, and says, "I have done it." Right? Or he uses that information, knowledge, to produce something. Like a scientist who has gathered a great deal of knowledge from previous scientists, and uses it and enquires further and is adding to that knowledge. But the moment he identifies himself with that knowledge as 'me', the great person who has - then that activity is not intelligent. Right? Right? And intelligence is not the activity of thought. This is difficult to understand. We are enquiring, not accepting my definition. You're not accepting my description and the explanation of what is intelligence. We are seeing together what is intelligence, not my conclusion or your conclusion. Right?

Now what is intelligence? Thought is based on accumulated knowledge. Right? Therefore that knowledge will always be limited, there is no complete knowledge about anything. We must

be clear on this point. Right? About the universe, about science, about physics, there is no complete, total knowledge, they are always adding, adding. Right? So knowledge goes hand in hand with ignorance. Right? Of course. I know you won't like that, but that's a fact. Right? So knowledge, being limited, thought must be limited. Right? That's so - it is limited. And whatever thought does, cleverly, being limited, is not complete intelligence. Right? You're following this? So it is not the activity of thought bringing about clever perceptions, clever arguments, clever doctrinaire theories - that's not intelligence - right? So what is intelligence? We have negated what it is not. Right? Right, sir? We have said this is not it, this is not it, this is not it. Then what is? If you discard all this, what it is not, which is also to see the false as the false - right? To see the truth in the false. Right? Which is another form of discarding. So if you discard all this, which includes time - right? - because accumulation of knowledge is time - right? - then what remains is intelligence. Right?

Now just a minute. I see something: I see I am vain, proud, arrogant, that is perceivable. Now to take time to dissolve it, if one wants to, that is, I will take time not to be arrogant - is that an intelligent action, because I have allowed there time? I am vain, I play it for a while, I like it, I know it is absurd but I like it, I carry on. And I hope some day it will end. Which is, I perceive, I am aware that I am vain, and I don't act immediately. The immediate action is intelligence. Get it? You understand? Is this clear? When I allow time to dissolve, or put away my vanity, then the action is not intelligent. But to perceive and act immediately is intelligence. Right? Which is, not to allow time to come between the perception

and action.

So we can go into this fact of what is intelligence? Right? Look at another factor in this - what is love? We all use that word very freely. What do we mean by that word? You can only find out the depth of that word, the depth of that feeling, the clarity, the intensity of it, only when you discover what it is not - right? Right? It is not jealousy - right? Would you agree to that? I love you. Do I? I love you - I mean it. When I say, "I love you", I mean it. I love you. Has that love any motive? That is, the motive being I love you because I sit on a platform and talk to you, I feel very satisfied, very - you know, all the glamour of it, I am fulfilling that and so on, all that absurd stuff. So when I say, "I love you" if there is a motive, it is not. Right? If there is jealousy, which is, I'm attached to you, I cling to you, it gives me a sense of power, position, a sense of the avoidance of loneliness, and when I say, "I love you" it means I'm attached to you. Is that love? Go on, sir, investigate it. Is attachment love? Obviously not.

So I have discovered jealousy is not, attachment is not. I perceive attachment, I am attached, I won't take time to free myself from attachment, I see the consequences of attachment and end it immediately. That is intelligence.

So what are the factors which love is not? We said jealousy, attachment and isolation - my ambition, my fulfillment, you follow? The whole movement of self-centred activity is not love - right? Sir, don't look so dazed. These are facts. So by negation one discovers what it is, not occasionally or rarely. And if one has gone into this deeply there is that quality, that perfume, that intensity, the beauty of it, and with it comes compassion. I cannot be

compassionate if I am attached to any form of conceit. If I love my god and say I'm compassionate, it is not compassion.

So love, compassion, intelligence, go together. So can we approach with this intelligence this problem: psychological pain and physical pain? Not to get neurotic about it, not to be constantly occupied with one's own pain, creating all kinds of psychological problems - right? So at the end of this conversation is there this quality of intelligence, is there this quality of intelligence which is love, which is compassion? Or merely clever argumentation, dialectical enquiry, opinion against opinion, idea against idea, which is conflict? One ideological group against another ideological group. The Communist ideology and the Totalitarian ideology, and so-called democratic ideology - these two are in battle now. So after this conversation together is there this perfume, this quality of intelligence and compassion that is active?

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 26TH JULY 1982

It is not possible to have a discussion with a large group like this. So it's a dialogue, a conversation with two people. And we will, if you do not mind, treat it as such. Two friends are talking over together about their problems. They are real friends, not convenient friends, but friends who have known each other for some time, and they are walking, perhaps, in a wood, sitting on a bench, and talking over their intimate problems, as friends do. So this is not only a conversation between two people, you and the speaker, and it's a dialogue, a friendly conversation, each one trying to penetrate into the problem as deeply as possible, and trying to find an answer to all their innumerable struggles, pain, anxieties and so on.

So that's what we are going to do this morning, two people talking over together and not asserting anything, neither one nor the other, two people who are concerned, deeply, with life, with all its complexities, with all its subtleties, its varieties, the craziness that goes on, in themselves and outwardly. So we are together, like two people who have known each other for some time, friendly, going to have conversation together.

1st QUESTION: My son died three years ago and so did my husband. I find it extremely hard to let go of the memory of their utter desperation. There must be a way, perhaps you may know it. I have come a long distance and found help listening to your talks - could you speak about death and detachment, please.

First of all, let us talk over together, what does it mean to be attached and what is the difference between attachment and

dependence. What is attachment? Why is one attached to a country, to a person, to some experience they've had, to some ideology, to some definite conclusion? Why do people do this throughout the world, depending upon their circumstances, upon their environment, social, moral and so on? This is the pattern man has repeated over and over again. I've had an experience, something that stirs me deeply, brings a colour to my life, gives a meaning, and that experience, which has gone, dead, and I hold on to the memory of it. Why do we do this, my friend asks me, and I'm talking over with my friend - why human beings, wherever they live, cling to this in some form or another, to their land, their property, their wealth, their wives, their husbands and so on. Why? Please, we're talking over together, my friend and I - you are the audience who's listening. Why do we cling, be attached? The word attachment comes from *attaccare*, Italian, which means to put your grips into something and hold.

Is it because in ourselves we are insufficient, inwardly? Is it because there is loneliness, there is a sense of to possess something, whether it's a piece of furniture or a house or a person, to possess something, to say, "It's mine" gives a great deal of pleasure. Is it that we human beings, you and I, have nothing deeper, more vital, and therefore we hold onto something very, very superficial, something that may pass away? We know it unconsciously, something is passing away - but we hold on. We may hold onto an illusion. The word 'illusion' means to play - the root meaning of that word is to play. And we play with illusions, which is very, very satisfactory.

Or we invent a subtle form of ourselves at a different level. So

we create all these things and hold on. Why? Is it that one is afraid to be nothing, to have nothing to hold onto? Is it because in possessing, holding, clinging to something, it gives us a great sense of security, a sense of well-being, because life is very uncertain, dangerous, incredibly brutal? You see the world is becoming more and more like a concentration camp.

So why are we attached, each one of us, to something? And when we look at the different forms of attachment, see the consequences of it, that is, fear, anxiety, pain, to see it, and not allow time to end it. That is, I'm attached to my wife; and I see both intellectually and deeply, that this attachment has many consequences, painful, desperate. And I see it all logically, I see it intellectually, rationally, and I can't let it go because I am afraid to be alone, lonely. And I see all this, because my friend and I are fairly intelligent, we are both looking at it. And we say, time will allow me to be free of this attachment, gradually I'll understand, gradually I'll let it go. That attitude of graduality is stupidity, because either I see the whole thing and end it immediately, or I'm foolish, because I like to cling to something, to a memory that is dead, gone. Right?

So intelligence is to see the whole movement of attachment, the whole process of it, both the inward and outward, and the very perception of it is to end it. That is intelligence, not to postpone, not to allow time to dull the mind, the brain, because if one postpones, neglects, accepts, you are living in a pattern that is already over, that is in the memory of the past - memory - it is dead. And so the brain is living with something that is finished, with something that is past. And living in the past always dulls the

quality, the vitality of the brain. Right?

So we have examined, you and I, sitting on that bench in the forest, and now let's examine what is detachment. Is detachment the opposite of attachment? If one pursues detachment, and makes that another form of attachment, you are exactly the same thing as before. I hope this is clear. That is, if detachment from my attachment is its opposite, then there is conflict. Right? There is conflict between attachment and "I should be detached". And then my whole attention or my energy is trying to be detached, and yet I know I'm attached. So there is conflict going on. So we have to find out what is the relationship, if there is any, between attachment and detachment. Or there is no relationship whatsoever. When there is an ending of attachment, there is no need to use the word 'detachment'. There is the ending of it. But for most of us, our brain is conditioned to this process of the opposite.

And one has to question if there is an opposite at all. At the physical level there are the opposites, tall, short, wide, broad, ugly, beautiful and so on. But psychologically, inwardly, is there an opposite at all, or only what is? And we invent the opposite in order to leave or get rid of, get rid of what is. Right? I hope you and I sitting on that bench, are talking about this, and we understand each other. There is no authority between two friends. There is no assertion between two friends who have gone into this matter. So it is a mutual, cooperative understanding. It is not, one is telling the other, they are both are travelling together, along the same path with the same intensity, with the same depth.

So if that is clear between us two, that there is no relationship between attachment and detachment, there is only the ending of

attachment and nothing else. Now is love attachment? I love my friend, I am attached to every evening to sit on the bench with him, talk over my problems. And I miss, when we don't meet with him, every day on the bench, and sit down. So we are asking each other, is love attachment, to possess somebody, to hold onto someone, whether it is the idea of god, whether it is the idea of liberation, freedom, whether it is the idea, concept, that in possession love grows? So we are questioning, what is the relationship between attachment and love? My friend who is married and has had several marriages, and he's rather wounded by all that. He's rather unhappy. And he thinks that he still loves his present wife. And he says to me, in our conversation, "I can't lose her, I must hold on, because my life is empty without her." You know all this, don't you? "I can't let her go. She wants to do something totally different from me, and it may lead her away from me. So I plead to her, I suppress my desire, my wanting something else, but I'll accept her and follow her. But inwardly there is conflict all the time, between her and me." Right? You know all this, don't you? It's not a new story is it?

So I have reduced the whole immensity of love, which is extraordinary, which I don't understand, to something so trivial. That is, I'm attached, possessive, I don't want to lose. If I lose I'm unhappy. And this I call love. So is it love. Please, don't agree. Don't say it's not. If it is not, that is the end. But most of us, my friend, is afraid to look at it, look at the complexity of it. My friend wants to move away from the subject, because if he really sees that attachment is not love, then can he go to his wife and say, "I love you, but I'm not attached to you." What would happen? She might

throw a brick at me. Walk away, because her whole life is to be attached, to the furniture, to ideas, to children, to the husband - you follow?

So then what is my relationship, who have seen that love is not attachment, is not jealousy, not ambition, competition. Then to me that's a reality, not just a verbal structure. And what is my relationship to her who is quite different? Go on, sir, it's your problem, not mine.

She will not accept what to me is truth. And see, sir, see what is involved in this. How painful it all is. It's nothing superficial. It touches the very core of one's being. And what shall I do? Have patience? Patience, to be patient, doesn't require time. Patience is not time. Whereas impatience has the quality of time in it. Think it over. Right? When I realize my wife is different from me, everything which I think is totally wrong, and I have to live in the same house and so on, do I have patience, knowing, for myself that patience is not a process of time? Do I realize that, that process, patience, which is putting up, allowing, time to resolve? I can't do anything but perhaps some other day, another week, another year, we'll settle everything. So I tolerate the situation. And this tolerance loves. Go on, sir, think it out. To put up with something knowing it is wrong, wrong in quotes, and say, "Well, time will gradually eliminate it", which is, I'm really impatient to find a result. Right? So I put up with it. So what shall I do? Go on, sir, - divorce? Run away? Leave her my house, my goods etc. and say goodbye, and disappear altogether?

Or I'm asking, can my love, intense, can that bring about a change in her? Please, you're asking these questions. Can I, who

have understood this whole phenomena with all its depth, will that quality of love, compassion, intelligence, bring about a change in her? That is, if she's at all sensitive, if she's at all observant, listening to what I'm saying, wants to understand each other, then there is a possibility of her changing. If she puts a ball, as most people do, then what am I to do? Go on, sir. Don't look at me, look at your selves. You see, one of our peculiarities is that we want a definite answer, we want something settled, because then I'm free, then I can do what I want. So as there is no definite answer to this question, it depends on the quality of your attention, your intelligence, your love.

And the question my friend asks: my son and husband are dead. I'm attached to their memory. I'm getting more and more desperate, more and more depressed. I'm living in the past, and the present is always coloured by the past, so what am I to do?

And the question my friend asks, let's talk over the problem of death. You and the speaker sitting on that bench, with birds singing all round them, with a thousand shadows and the river running down, swiftly, making sweet sound, and he raises this question. He says, I'm quite young, any moment an accident can happen, and there may be death, not only of my son and my wife, but also my own death. He says, "Let's talk about it."

We've spent half an hour with half a question. You don't mind? Let's talk about death. From the ancient of times, historically, culturally, from all the paintings and statuary, man has always asked, "What happens after death?" One has gathered a lot of experience, struggled to be moral, aesthetic, collected a lot of knowledge, gone into the depths of oneself. If death is the end,

then what's the point of all this, what's the point of all this struggle, pain, experience, knowledge, wealth? And death is always waiting at the end of it. I may belong to one sect, accept certain costume because I belong to that sect, which is again an isolating process. And death is the common factor for all of us: for the guru, for the Pope, or the innumerable popes in the world. So that's a fact, we all want to understand the significance, the depth of that extraordinary event, which is extraordinary. And what is the relationship between death and living? Please, I hope you're following all this - I'm asking my friend, I hope you're following what I am saying. He says, go ahead, I follow verbally, I understand this.

Various civilizations throughout the world have tried to overcome death. They've said, life after is more important than now. So they prepared for death. And at present now, there are people who say, we must help our patients, our friends, to die happily. We never ask, what is important, before death, or the many years before death or after death, which is important, which is essential? I'm asking my friend. Naturally he says, "Before dying, the long years one has lived, maybe ten, fifteen, thirty, fifty, ninety - those long years before the ending. That is the period of living. That is far more significant than the ending of it." Why is it we are always asking, he and I, why don't we ask this question, not what is after, or help me to die happily. But what is my life that I have lived for eighty years? It has been one constant battle, with occasional lapse where there has been no pain, no struggle, something occasionally rarely happens. But the rest of my life has been struggle, struggle. And I've called that 'living'. Right? That's what we are all doing, not only my friend and I, but all human

beings are that, struggling to have work, being unemployed, wanting more wealth, being oppressed, the tyranny of totalitarian states, and so on. It has been a vast jungle. That's been my life. And I cling to that, to the struggle, to the pain, to the anxiety, to the loneliness - that's all I have. Right? That has become all important.

So I'm asking, we're asking each other, what is it that dies? Now this becomes a rather complex question. My friend and I have time, it's Sunday morning and no work, so we can sit down and go into it. Is it the individual that dies? Please, enquire as a friend, who is it that dies? Apart from the biological ending of an organism, which has been ill-treated, it has had several diseases, illnesses, that inevitably comes to an end. You may find a new drug that may help man to live 150 years, but always at the end of 150 years, that extraordinary thing is there, waiting. Is my consciousness the whole of it, with all its content, is it mine? That is, my consciousness is its content, the content is my belief, my dogmas, my superstitions, my attachment to my country, patriotism, fear, pain, pleasure, sorrow and so on, is the content of my consciousness, and yours. So both of us, sitting on that bench, recognise this fact, that the content makes up consciousness, without the content consciousness as we know it doesn't exist. Right? So my friend and we see the logic of it, the rationality of it, and so on. We agree to that.

Then, is this consciousness which I have clung to as mine, and my friend also clings to it, calling ourselves individuals, is that consciousness unlike other consciousness? Right? Please be clear on this point. That is, if you're lucky to travel, observe, talk over with other people, you'll find that they are similar to yours. They

suffer, they are lonely, they have a thousand gods and you may have one god, they believe, they don't believe, and so on. All most similar to yours, though on the periphery, there may be varieties, on the outskirts of our consciousness. You may be tall, you may be short, you may be very clever, may be scholarly, you've read a great deal, you're capable, you've a certain technique, efficiency, it's all on the periphery, on the outside. But inwardly, we are similar. Right? This is a fact. Therefore our conditioning which says we are individual, separate souls, is not a fact. This is where my friend begins to squirm, because he doesn't like the idea that he is not an individual. He can't face the fact, because all his conditioning has been that. So I say to my friend, look at it, old chap, don't run away from it, don't resist it, look at it. Use your brains, not your sentiment, not your desire - just look at it, is that a fact or not? And he accepts it, vaguely.

So if our consciousness is similar to all mankind, then I am mankind. You understand? Please understand this, the depth and the beauty of this. If I am the mankind, the entire mankind, then what is it that dies? You understand? Either I can contribute, or I move away from that entire consciousness, which is me, I cleanse the whole of my being from that - right? - that I am not individual, that I am the whole of humanity.

Then is there emptying of the consciousness, which is my belief, my anxiety, my pain, my blah, blah - all that? Is there ending to all that? If I end it, what importance is it? You follow? What importance is it or what value to humanity is it? I am the humanity, I am asking this question. What value, what significance has this when, after a great deal of intelligence, love, I observe this

and in that observation there is the total ending of those contents? Has it any value? Value in the sense of moving humanity from its present condition. Right? You understand? Surely it has, has it not? One drop of clarity in a bucket of dirt, confusion, mess, that one drop begins to act.

And the questioner, my friend says, I'm beginning to understand the nature of death. I see that the things I'm attached to, if I hold onto them, death has a grip on me. If I let them go, each day as they arise, I am living with death. You understand? Death is the ending, so I'm ending while living everything that I will lose when I die. Right? So, the question my friend asks, can I let go every day my accumulation, end it, so that I am living with death and therefore a freshness, not living in the past, in memories? Right?

So from this arises a very complex question, what is immortality? One question, we're still going on, sorry! What is immortality? That is, beyond mortality, beyond death. As we said the other day, where there is a cause, there is an end. There is an end to the effect and the cause remains and creates another effect. It's a constant change. Right? And we are asking: is there a life without any causation? Please, you understand? I'm asking my friend, do you understand what I'm saying? We live with causes - you know, I don't have to go into that. All our life is based on many, many causes. I love you because you give me something. I love you because you comfort me. I love you because I'm sexually fulfilling, and so on. That is a cause, and the effect is the word I use is 'love' which it is not, and any motive I have is a causation. So I'm asking my friend, is it possible to live without any cause, not belong to any cause in the sense, organized cause or in myself,

to have no cause? Knowing if there is a causation there is an ending, which is time.

Now we're going to find out together, if there is a life, daily living, in our daily relations, in our daily activity, not some theoretical activity, actual - can one live without a cause? Look into it, my friend, don't look to me but look at it, look at the question first. Knowing when I say, I love you because in return you give me something, in that relationship of causation there is always ending of that relationship. So we're asking each other, is there a life without cause? See the beauty of it, sir, first, see the depth, see the vitality of that question, not the mere words. We said, love has no cause - obviously. If I love you because you give me something, it's a merchandise, a thing of the market. So can I love you, can there be love, without wanting, nothing physically, nothing psychologically, inwardly, nothing in any form? So that is love, which has no cause, therefore it is infinite. You understand? Like intelligence, it has no cause, it is endless, timeless, so is compassion.

Now if there is that quality in our life, the whole activity changes completely. That's enough of that question. I hope my friend who put this question has understood.

2nd QUESTION: How do you pose a fundamental question? Is holding, observing a question, a thought, is it a thought process?

I'll read that question. How do you pose a fundamental question? That's what the questioner asks. And looking at it, observing it, holding it as a jewel in your hand, will that lead to a fundamental understanding of this problem, of this question? Or is the understanding, the looking, a thought process? Right? Is the

question clear?

Sir, I have a problem, the problem is my death. What is the fundamental question I can put about death? Fundamental, deep question that is reality, not just superficial reaction. "My wife is dead, I'm unhappy, please answer how to get over my unhappiness" - that's a very superficial question. "Tell me how to be detached". That's very simple. But to put a fundamental question, which we rarely do. And does the fundamental question come out, happen, when there is an observation, listening to the question without any bias, without any direction? Or can thought find, discover the fundamental question? You understand? My friend, I said, follow what I'm saying. He says, "Go on."

Have we ever observed without the word? Look at it, sirs, go into it. Because the word has become all important to us, the capitalists, the dictatorship, the German, the French, the word. And do we observe, do he and I observe that our brain is caught in a network of words? Right? Are we aware of this? The word being time, thought, memory. Right? The word is the symbol, the word is the effect of a cause, and we live with words, which is, the movement of thought, expressing itself in symbols, words, but it is movement of a thought which lives with words. Right? Look.

So the question is, can thought with its words and time, can it put a fundamental question? You understand? Thought being limited, broken up, and can such thought ask a fundamental question? Or, the questioner wants to know, my friend wants to know: fundamental question is not related to thought. Then my friend asks, how does this fundamental question arise? You're following? Please look, exercise your brain, your energy, to find

this out, not go off to sleep or all that.

Does the fundamental question arise through pure observation? That is, to observe, to observe means not only with the optical eye, but observing is also listening, not only with the sensory ear but the inward ear, to listen, and to look, not translate what you look at into your own terminology, into your own words. If you translate it to suit you or look at it for your convenience, your observation then is limited. Therefore can you observe your wife, the tree, that extraordinary movement of water, those mountains - observe without the word, and listen without the word, and observe without any direction, that is, without any motive? Can you do that? That is, are you listening, I'm asking my friend, are you listening to what I'm saying? Or you can't sustain a state of attention for some time?

So can you listen without the accompaniment of thought? Which is, verbalizing, making an abstraction of what you hear, what you see into an idea and pursue the idea. You understand? Can you observe so totally, completely? And if you so observe, what is the need for a fundamental question? What is the need of a question at all? Look, sir it's like understanding envy. Let's take envy. Look at envy, which most of us are, envious. I'm sure you'd all like to sit on the platform. And you know, the quality of envy, wanting more and more and more power, position, reputation, well-known. Now envy: to look at the reaction called envy, without the word. When you say, 'I'm envious' you are merely associating the present reaction to past memories of envy. Right? Past memory. Therefore you are not looking, observing that movement of envy in the present. Can you observe envy without any movement of the past, which is thought? And when you do so observe, it's a totally

new reaction and therefore it is something new which we have to observe. And when you observe the fundamental question may be, is there an end to it? Of course. Yes? Where there is a cause for your observation, there is an end to your observation. When you observe without a cause - you understand?

Shall we do one more?

3rd QUESTION: I have lived in a forest, close to nature. There is no violence there, but the outer world is the real jungle. How am I to live in it without becoming part of its competition, brutality, violence and cruelty?

First, how easy it is to live by yourself in a world. I tell my friend, I have done it, without any boast or anything, it is natural. I've done it, it's very easy, because you're not related to anybody, you look at the trees, the rivers, the plant, they invite you to look at them. The more you look at a tree, the more beautiful it becomes. The shadow, the leaves fluttering in the wind. It doesn't demand anything of you. You are enjoying yourself, listening to the birds, to the sound of water, to the lovely clear morning. And one is tempted to live like that for ever. But you can't. Even there, if you live in a forest, you're related to somebody or something. You're related to the man who brings you milk. So there is always, even though one is a hermit, always living in certain kind of relationship with another. And if you are a neurotic saint, then it becomes very easy. Most saints are neurotic. And then, they bring you food, clothes and all the rest of it.

So when one enters the world, the trouble begins. The world which human beings have created, not only the past generation upon generation, which has created this society, but also all of us

have contributed to it. When you buy a stamp, when you post a letter, you are contributing to war. When you take the train, you are contributing to war. So you might say, I won't take a train, I won't post a letter, I won't telephone, I won't pay taxes, and so on. Taxes are rather different, the Government will be after you, if you have money. So what will you do? Withdraw completely, not write a letter, not travel? You understand, Sir, the question has been put to the speaker, often. You say you are against war, peace and so on, but you're contributing to it by travelling all over the world.

So where shall I stop? You understand? Not write a letter, not travel, not do all the things that are contributory, that give, help war? Or do you ask a much more fundamental question, which is, why does war exist at all? Why has man, who is so-called civilized, so-called educated, why does he support killing another, another human being. So what is the fundamental question there? Is it nationality, is it this whole idea of isolation, national isolation, individual isolation, communal isolation. When I put on a monk's robe or a different kind of robe, I am isolating myself. So is isolation the cause of war? Obviously. When I say I'm British, you're French, you're this, you're that, I'm isolating myself; I've a long tradition as a British or in India. If I am an Indian, I have a much more ancient tradition, which is isolating. So any form of isolation must contribute to war, which is war being not only killing each other but the conflict with each other. Right?

Now seeing all that, which requires intelligence, not just a vague Utopian idea, seeing that, the very perception of this fact that where there is isolation of any kind, belonging to one group against another group, one sect against another, one uniform of

purple, yellow, isolating. These actually contribute to isolation and therefore inevitable conflict. To perceive that, to see the truth of it, requires intelligence, not say I agree with it. And do nothing about it. But when I see the truth of it, that very perception is the action of intelligence. Right? So with that intelligence, I enter the world. Which is, that intelligence which has no cause, that love that has no cause, compassion obviously cannot have a cause, with that beauty, with that clarity, with that energy, I meet, I meet the world which is brutal. I act from that love. Or rather, that love that has no cause, acts. I may be a beggar, or very good technician, but the quality of that can never enter the world of ambition, brutality, violence.

Now, my friend says, "I understand. I understand very clearly what you say, I have grasped intellectually what you have said, superficially." Now, how am I to capture it, how am I to hold it, as I hold breath, as I breathe, hold something, so enormous? What is the method, what is the system that will help me? Of course, obviously, when you follow a system, you are gone, finished. Because you want to achieve that state of real love, and you want to achieve because you're unhappy, therefore you have a motive, therefore it's not intelligence, therefore it's not love.

So when you have this perfume, then you can go through the world that perfume never losing its beauty.

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 27TH JULY 1982

This is the last Question and Answer Meeting. A lot of questions have been asked, written down, and it's impossible to answer all of them. If we were to answer all of them, probably we'd be sitting to the end of next month. And I'm sure you wouldn't like that.

I wonder why we ask questions. Why is it that we cannot find the answers in ourselves? Why do we depend on others, whether it be a psychologist, a person who is called a guru, a teacher, or on the speaker? Why? Is it that all of us are so accustomed to be guided, we seek help from others, we want guidelines, we want to be told what to do, we want to be helped? The world as it is now growing more and more confused, more and more horrible, and we want somebody to tell us or help us to understand ourselves and the world.

And we're asking, is there any help at all from another. Then you might ask, why do we sit here and listen to you. If there is no help from another, why do we gather at all? As far as one understands, we gather, not to be helped in the ordinary sense of that word, nor depend or look to the speaker. We gather together, not in any spirit of authority, or seeking some kind of solution to our problems, but rather meeting together to converse, to go into matters that are essential in our lives. It's a conversation between two people, between two friends.

And in that conversation, each one is beginning to see clearly his own problems, each one is observing during this conversation, this investigation together, one is beginning to see clearly for

oneself, what we are, what has happened to us, what are the causes that have brought us to this present condition. And in investigating together we find, not only the answer, which is not very important, but the unravelling of this whole life, the opening up, if one may use that word, into the very complex problem of humanity. If we look at it very carefully, it begins to flower, it begins to expand, it begins to explode. Whatever then is perceived, understood and lived, that brings about one's own intelligence. But to depend on others, which has become, not only the fashion but also that has been the state of man for many centuries, the priest, the soothsayer, the clairvoyant, the guru, the psychologist, you follow - the whole world which says, we'll help you.

Those who help us are like ourselves: confused, rather unhappy, they are like you and me. And when we do not depend on anybody, literally inwardly not depend on a soul, that means, to be a light to oneself. One may make a mistake, we often do, do the things that are not correct, regrets. And if we do not carry over day after day, those regrets, those incidents that have not been correct, precise, those activities that have brought about confusion, if we see them clearly, and end them immediately, then you need to ask help of nobody. Right? Do we do this? Or just carry on: I'm confused, I'm unhappy, I've followed this and I've followed that, listened to that person or to that individual, and at the end of it all I'm still lost, I'm still confused, unhappy. If we once see the truth that following anybody is most destructive because it denies freedom. And if there is no freedom there is no love.

So in answering these questions, we are together going into these matters, not that the speaker is helping you, the speaker is not

guiding you - for God's sake, everyone must realize this, not verbally or casually but very, very seriously, psychologically not to depend on anybody. We do depend outwardly, the surgeon, the doctor and so on, in the technological world, one must naturally follow somebody. But even there, if you are merely copying, imitating, conforming, then you become another machine. Whereas if we could really put away from our hearts and minds the reality of the truth that there is no help from outside.

Don't be unhappy about it. One sees one's own conditioning then, one's own trivial, very narrow desire for help. One of the factors which we'll go into is, the world outside and the world within, are they two different states, or like a tide that goes in and out, the world is out there and we are here, there is an interrelationship between the two, there is constantly flowing back and forth, there is not this clear, definite division between the outer and the inner, it's a movement. That is, the outer, we have created the outer, the misery, the wars, the destruction, the brutality, the hatreds and antagonisms, we have created it, that is the society in which we live. And that society begins to shape us, tell us what to do. We are caught in this, so there is no division but it's an interrelationship. Right? Is this very clear, that there is no division, that is, like a tide, with tremendous rapidity, that flows in and goes out.

From that question arises, these questions, it's not put here, a very fundamental question. This movement from the outer to the inner, and the inner to the outer, inner being psychological movement, which effects the outer, and the outer effects the psychological state, as long as this movement exists, we'll be

caught in this cycle of misery. Right? The cycle of confusion, because the outside is pushing us, a great deal of pressure upon us, and we respond to it. You're following? So we're asking a very serious question, which is, can this movement of the inner to the outer, and the outer to the psychological state end? Or must this everlastingly go on? You understand my question? Please, think, look at it. Consider it as two friends talking over together.

Then what is the state of mind, the brain that is not caught in this movement? Is that at all possible? Is it at all possible not to respond hatred by hatred, which is what's happening inwardly? Can you see, having created confusion, seeking clarity, and that clarity is partial, and then caught again by the outer world and so on. Back and forth. This is clear. This is what we are doing, this is what is actually taking place in all of us, responding to the outer, which we have created, and then the outer is challenging us, and we respond to it. Right? See this tremendous mechanical process of our life.

And is there a cessation of this movement, is there a freedom at all from this movement? Then if there is, what is the quality of the brain which is not caught in this repetitive reaction? You're following? We have to find out. It's no good the speaker telling you what it is, we have to work, find out, work at it. Then if one understands this process, this way of living, and if you enquire very, very deeply, then there is a freedom in which there is this quality of affection, love and so on. As long as this reaction goes on between the outer and the inner, there cannot be love. Right? Go into it. If I depend on you, as my guru, and you naturally depend on me, because you can't be a guru without me, so you tell me and I respond to you, which is out, you follow? - the same phenomena

going on. How can there be this sense of great love which is intelligence, when I depend on you, and you depend on me? You understand?

So if that is clear, what is the state of the brain that is no longer demanding experience? The reaction to the outer, and the outer challenge to oneself is a constant movement in time and experience. Right? And we depend on experience, to awaken us - experience is a challenge. Right? And can the brain be free of all experience and therefore all challenge, so that it is all the time awake? You understand? So that it is totally a light to itself, without any challenge. Right? Is this clear? You have to work, you have to go into it yourself, if you're interested.

That is, is there a quality of the brain which is not a slave to time, slave to the process of evolution, which is time, the gradual approach? And can the brain be so extraordinarily alive, not caught in various forms of memories, so that it is wholly awake? This is a very serious question which you have to think over, go into.

1st QUESTION: In the seeing and listening of which you speak..

You see, of which I speak, it is not 'we' speak. Therefore the speaker is becoming gradually the authority, which is an abomination, because you have leaders of every kind, political, religious, psychological and so on, and we are where we are at the end of all this millenia. So please, it's not what the speaker is saying, the speaker is only putting into words our problems. He is the mirror into which you yourself are observing, he, you are the mirror, and he's merely putting into words clearly, that's all. If he is the mirror, destroy it. Break it to pieces, because the mind must be

free so it begins to live anew, afresh, and not always, depend, depend, like a child. We're all grown-up people.

2nd QUESTION: Is the seeing and listening - I'm cutting out, 'of which you speak' - the same seeing and listening we all know? Or does it imply the awakening of a new perception? And how can we be sure that thought has not crept in more subtly?

Now let's look at it, not K. says it therefore you must listen to it. Let's look at it. Do we ever listen? Or listen very partially? When do we listen completely to anything? Have you asked, do I ever listen completely to, say for instance, Beethoven? Absorb what he's saying, the beauty of it, the vitality of it, the enormity of that music, the strength of it. Or our reactions to that music come immediately? You understand? I listen to Beethoven's Leonara and he is telling me about the prison, I used to know the story, I won't go into it. And I'm emotionally disturbed, and I enjoy this emotion, feel I'm really appreciating that music. Whereas if there is no response emotionally, I am actually absorbing all that he wants to tell me. Right?

So do we ever listen that way, not only to music, to my wife, to your friend, do we ever listen so completely, to catch the intonation, to feel the subtlety of what she wants to tell? Or you say, "Well, the old girl I know, she's been telling me this for 20 years." You understand? To listen so as to catch the subtlety of the voice, the intonation, the feeling behind the word, which means you must actually give attention to what is happening.

When you give such attention - please will you go with me a little bit? - when you give such attention, there is no recording. Right? You see, it's only when we are not completely attending that

there is recording, recording an insult, or her encouragement, or all the rest of it. The brain is recording - this is an important question, I'll go into it, it's rather fun. The brain is recording, that's its function, to survive. Right? The language, the skill, the understanding of the environment, seeking security, it has to record. If you want to drive a car, you have to learn, which is recording. And when one's friend or wife says this or that, it's being recorded. And the record is the image, is the noise. And that recording, which is the noise of the tape, prevents my understanding or listening to the person. I don't know whether you follow all this. So one asks - it is necessary to record to live outwardly - is it necessary to record anything psychologically? You understand my question? She says some word that hurts me. Need that word be recorded and the feeling behind that word? If it is, there is a division, there is conflict and all the rest of the ugliness follows. You understand this question - it requires a very clear perception of what is actually going on. I listen to my wife or girl-friend or whatever it is, or to a friend, I listen and find out if that listening is so clear, precise and wholly attentive, and in that attention is there a recording? You understand?

So what do we mean by attention? Are we working together or am I just talking? You don't catch onto this quickly. Attention means, doesn't it, to give, to focus all your energy without limitation. Right? Whereas concentration is the limitation of energy on a certain point. Clear? I concentrate on a book, which is to focus my attention on a certain phrase, on a page, and not let other thoughts pour in. There is a resistance in concentration. Right? Whereas when you give complete attention, there is no

resistance. Right? Where there is resistance there is a barrier. So when another person insults or flatters - much more difficult to be flattered - to listen to both with such attention there is no building up, piling up of resentment or acceptance. Right?

Are we doing this now, otherwise it's no fun. So the questioner asks: is it possible to listen so clearly without the interference of thought? Which is, thought being the past memories about one's friend, wife and so on, to listen without that past with its thoughts so that there is no recording whatever, psychologically to whatever ugly things one says about each other. Right?

Now, the questioner asks: is there in that attention a new perception? I'm putting it for the questioner. I attend to what you're saying, without any interpretation, without any reaction, without any resistance. I listen to what you're saying. Such a listening is obviously something totally new, something that's not limited. So there is a perception which is not the activity of thought, but it is perception of total observation, attention, and let the thing that is observed fly, move.

We are always telling stories about what should be done. Right? That's our lot, we never listen to the story, the story being the history of mankind. All the history books in the world are the story of mankind. Mankind is me, it is telling me, the books, about myself. That's the story of myself. Now can I listen to the story without your help? You understand? Without your saying, read it this way, look at it carefully, guide me. Then I become your slave. Whereas I am reading this whole history of mankind, that mankind is me, I am mankind. So can I look at that story, listen to it without a single motive, without a single saying, this is correct, this is

wrong, this is right, which is, I'm not listening to the story but I'm telling what the story should be? Right? So when you are so attentive, listen, then there is a totally new perception.

3rd QUESTION: You speak about bringing about a new generation - I speak about it! It is necessary to bring about a new generation, not 'you speak about it'. It is said, that it is necessary to bring about a new generation, will this happen by individuals transforming themselves, which seems almost impossible, or can the change of only a few affect the total human consciousness. Right? You've understood the question?

If the questioner, in our conversation one of you bring up this point, a new generation is necessary, obviously, depending on education and so on. And it seems almost impossible to rely on every human being changing, to bring about a new society, new culture, new this. And as that seems almost impossible, will the transformation of a few people, that's you and I, few people - not the elite - I don't know why you are afraid of using that word 'elite' - the few are the elite, always - will those few affect the whole consciousness of mankind? Right?

I believe the scientists, the biologists and so on, are investigating the problem of one group of animals, if there is a change in one, in that group of one rat, or one wolf, it affects the whole group consciousness. Right? They are experimenting with that. We were talking about it the other day to certain scientists. That is, a group of certain species, like the wolf, like various other animal groups, if in that group one has certain experience, it affects the whole of the others. I don't know if you have not watched the Japanese monkeys. One monkey by chance washed a potato or

whatever it was he was going to eat, and it affected then the whole, other groups are doing the same. It's very important to understand this. If you as a human being who are the representative of the whole of humanity - right? - because your consciousness is the consciousness of every human being with their struggles, pain and anxiety, loneliness, unhappiness, suffering. That's your consciousness, it's not yours, it's the human consciousness. That is, you as a human being are the representative of all humanity,, which is marvellous truth.

Now, if you are really transformed, naturally you'll affect the whole of human consciousness. All the great killers of the world, so-called warriors - like - I don't have to explain all this. The war leaders, who tried to conquer the world, from Genghis Khan to present day, they have affected the consciousness of man. Right? Obviously. You and I have not fought a war, but war has been in the consciousness of mankind, killing, killing, not only the whales and the baby seals, but killing each other. That is part of our consciousness. Now if you see that killing is an abomination, I mean it's something unholy, and you then take part in killing. Don't say, do I not kill a cauliflower when I eat? - we're not talking about cauliflower or tomatoes - we are talking about human beings killing each other. If when you as a human being who are the entire humanity, you change radically, change, not new hair, but change at depth, then naturally you affect the mankind.

So from that question arises, are you, as a human being, going to do it, or just carry on, day after day, day after day, the same old pattern being repeated? And say, will the wars ever end? You know, that's our problem, the wars will end if you end war. So a

group of people, and I hope there is a group of people, with all one's heart, that there are such people in the world. And if they are transformed it affects the whole of the human consciousness.

4th QUESTION: I have been following a spiritual leader and it has helped me. But after listening to you I felt what you say is right and I have left the poor old guru I was following. (He doesn't say that.) (Laughter) Sorry!. (Laughter) But after listening to you I felt what you say is right and I have left the guru I was following. Now I feel lost without guidance. What do you say?

You know in the Western world faith has become very important. Right? In the Western religious structure, faith, belief have been the central factor of religion. Right? And scepticism, doubt, has been an anathema, a curse. If I doubted in Christianity, belonging to a particular sect, it would collapse. Right? Whereas in the Eastern world, doubt, question, has been one of the requirements of a disciple who is seeking truth, of any man who is seeking truth. That doubt, question, enquire, has been stressed.

Now most of us are rather gullible. Right? I set myself up, putting on a certain robe, and I say, I'll teach you, I'll help you, and you flock around me. You don't question me, you don't say, what right have you to say this, who are you to tell me? You follow? There is no enquiry, questioning, challenging. We're all so gullible. And you hear somebody come along and say, "Look, don't follow, look at yourself, learn about yourself, it's all there." You don't have to go to India or to Jamaica, or wherever it is - perhaps Barbados might be nicer, it's warmer! You go there and there is all this circus going on. And you fall into that trap. And then after spending years, you say, "My God, this may be wrong," somebody tells you

it's not right and you're caught. You understand? You never begin by questioning, by doubting, doubting the authority of another. And for years you have followed what he has said, or she has said. And then you come and tell me, "Look, that's all wrong." It's all there, if you look, if you know how to read that book, which is yourself, you don't have to leave your town, go far away - it's there, it's in your heart and mind. And you say, "I can't read. Tell me how to read." Then you're had. Right?

So from the beginning, from the very beginning, psychologically, in matters of the spirit, there is no authority. And one is lost - right? - confused. Now when you're lost, look at your loss, what you have, you understand? - look at it. Don't go away saying, "I am confused, help me." But be confused, enquire into confusion. Why you are confused, because you are confused you accepted somebody outside you, who is trying to guide you. Right? But if you don't rely on anybody, then you're looking at that extraordinary rich device of oneself. Right?

So one begins to ask, what is confusion? Is confusion - please just listen - the opposite of clarity? Right? Is clarity is the opposite of confusion, then the opposite, which you call clarity, is also confused - any confusion, right? There is clarity. But we don't know how to end confusion because we don't look at it, we run away from it, we don't investigate, see why. I'm attached, I'm dependent, I'm that, I'm this, therefore that is bringing about confusion. Right?

5th QUESTION: Is there something sacred in life? Is it possible for all of us to come to that? Is this God?

First of all, we don't know what is sacred. Right? We don't

know, actually. We worship something called sacred, in a church, in a mosque, in a temple, we worship something, a symbol, calling that symbol sacred. We pray for it, we genuflect for it and so on.

What is sacred? Is thought, which has put together all this, the symbols which we worship, the figure which we worship, the various categories of saints and so on, which thought has invented. Right? The rituals, the dogmas, the beliefs, the faith. Now, to enquire if there is anything sacred, one has to enquire is thought itself which creates all this, sacred? Right? Is thought sacred? Answer it. The thought that has created wars, divided people into races, groups - right? - thought which has created this division, hoping for security, thought which has brought about the enormous destruction in the world, thought which is creating the bomb, the thought which divides you from your wife, from your friend, the thought that says, 'I am important' not you.' I must get on.' All those are the activities of thought. Right?

Are all those activities sacred? Obvious, I mean it's so obvious they are not. Right? And thought has created god. You won't accept this. Thought has given to that idea of god all kinds of attributes, omniscient, omnipresent, all-loving father, you know, all that business. If god existed, which must be without cause, then if he created us, right? - you've answered that question, he must be most extraordinary entity, to create us, to make us miserable.

So there nothing that thought has created is sacred. Right? If that is clear, it is so logical, so absolute, then, is there in our life, in living, anything sacred? Not to achieve or come near that which is sacred. Right? This is important to understand. To achieve or perceive or come near that which is sacred implies the sacred is

there and I have to come to it, I have to achieve, through good behaviour, through this and through that, through sacrifice - you know, all the rest of it. You see what tricks thought plays? It has projected something out there and says that is sacred and I'll work for it. Right? So what is important is not if there is something sacred, but to see the tremendous subtlety of thought, how thought is always projecting something better, better, more noble, more and more - a form of achievement. That is, in this world I am a general manager, ultimately I become the executive. Right? This is the same mentality carried over.

So can thought realize its own limitation? Not say to thought that you are limited, which would be another thought saying - to realize the very activity of thought is limited. Then is there something sacred which is not put together by thought. You understand? Till we understand very deeply the nature of thought, which has its place - right? - I must use thought to use my English, I must use thought to go from here to over there. So to realize thought is a broken up fragment, and that fragment may conceive the eternal, that which is nameless - that is just a concept, projected by thought itself. Whereas if you go into it, very carefully, attentively, to see that thought has its place but has no other place. That is, there is no recording of psychological accumulation, the recording of accumulation, which is the me.

So, one has to enquire into this very deeply and find out for yourself. If the speaker tells you that there is something sacred, it becomes so silly. But if you yourself, as a human being, who are the rest of mankind, if you go into it, seriously, then there is that which is what is.

6th QUESTION: What preparation can I give my children for today's world, what should be the meaning and focus of education?

Sir, what are we all being educated for? Answer it - you're all very educated people, you've probably gone to colleges, universities, gathered a lot of information, knowledge, about various subjects, and you probably have specialized in a particular subject, and if as an engineer, psychologist, and so on, you earn a good living, a good bit of money. And for the rest of your life, there you are: married, children, with all the problems of children, and the wife and so on. That is what is happening in the world. Right? Those who are educated and those who are not educated. Go to India or Far East, not to Japan, there they are very well educated, go to India, and other eastern countries, there's overpopulation, every year in India, 15 to 30 million people are added, which is the population of Holland. And poverty, the degradation of poverty. And they are not educated. Most of them will never know how to read a book. Right?

So modern education as it is now is making the human mind, brain, more and more mechanical. Right? So this is a very serious question. Is knowledge making the human brain more and more mechanical? You understand my question? I specialize in engineering. From college to university I've learnt a great deal about mathematics and so on, and I become an engineer, how to build bridges, or construction of various kinds. That's my life till I die, or retire and die. Right? Is that education? That's necessary, apparently. And psychologically, inwardly, I don't know, I'm not educated. Right? I am what I've been for a million years, slightly transformed. Right? But I am brutal, violent, cruel, wanting to hurt

others, and so on.

So what do we mean by education? Answer it, sir. Is it merely to live in a world of technology, science, knowledge - you follow? And that is creating such havoc in the world. And we totally neglect the other, because the other is much more difficult, requires a great deal of enquiry, exercising your brain so that you're looking at life totally differently.

So, from all this which we can't go into in great detail, from all this, education is to bring about a good human being. Right? Good in the old sense of that word - that word is not fashionable. Good. That is, a human being who is highly intelligent in the sense we've used that word, who has the capacity to understand the technological world and live there and also the other, to feel, to have great affection, love, compassion, not belong to any sect, any group, any country. You understand?

There are no such schools in the world. Perhaps one or two exist where we are concerned, but it is very difficult to bring about such quality of mind, because the parents don't want it, the outward conditions are so appalling, so frightening, and so on. So can you, you as a human being, educate yourself, so that you have this enormous depth of love and all the rest?

The last question.

7th QUESTION: What is the future of mankind?'

It's a very good question. What is the future of you? What is you who are mankind, what is your future? As we now are living, which has been the continuity of the past - right? - continuity of wars, hatreds, divisions, the ugliness that is going on, the brutality, everything, if humanity continues that way, and it is you, continue

that way, there is very little chance of survival. Right? Obviously. If every country in the world is preparing for war - right - they are - the unenlightened countries are buying armaments from the enlightened countries, those who are highly civilized like Britain, France, America and so on, they are supplying armaments right and left, to everybody, because in industry it is becoming necessary to supply arms. Right? So their economy depends on it. So the continuity of war, destruction, is guaranteed. And what is the future of all of us? Not only of us, of the coming generation, your children? It's really a very frightening world. You may talk about all the rest of the things we've talked about, gurus and followers and all that silly stuff, but this is a tremendous problem. If we go on as we are going on, we are bound to end up in a catastrophe of some kind or other.

And if you accept that, it's all right. If that's what you want, it's perfectly all right. But if you say, that's totally wrong, it's totally unholy to kill another, for whatever cause, for whatever reason, for your honour, for whatever reason, to kill another is the denial of the most holy. (Dog barks) That dog agrees! (Laughter)

So what is one to do? It is really a very serious question. What are you going to do? Because whatever we do is going to supply, help armaments. And the politicians know all this. And the politicians' function is to keep isolation going, my country first. They have no global relationship, they have no idea of that. Right? That we can only exist on this earth when we treat the earth as ours, all of ours, not British, French, German and all the rest of it.

Now, you perhaps and we realize this. Then will it affect the whole consciousness of mankind if I really, if you and I really,

deeply do not belong to any group, to any nation, to any sect? Will that affect the whole of the world? Of course, if all of us in this hall, in this tent, really felt this, naturally it would affect the whole of consciousness, even of the politicians. Right?

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 22ND JANUARY 1983

If one may, I would like to point out that this is not a lecture. A lecture generally means to instruct on a particular subject with a view to inform, instruct and teach. So this is not a lecture, but we are going to talk over things together, not that the speaker is going to only talk, but together you and the speaker search out the various issues of our daily lives and to see if there is any solution for them. We are concerned not with philosophy, which is generally understood to mean theories, speculation and a form of intellectual entertainment but rather you and the speaker, slowly, with certain scepticism, doubt, questioning, demanding that we two talk over, converse, have a dialogue over our whole existence. We are not instructing or informing on any particular subject but together, and we mean together, share together, into the many problems of our life. So please it is your responsibility as well as that of the speaker to think together, not you think separately, and the speaker think separately, but each of us discover, find out for ourselves if we are meeting each other, not merely at the intellectual level or emotional, romantic, ideational level, but rather you and the speaker meet in a relationship that is enquiring, not accepting but questioning.

And to question, enquire, one must be free of prejudice, otherwise your enquiry has no value at all. Or if you are committed to a particular form of thought, particular adjustment to an ideal, then we cannot possibly think together. Thinking together requires a great deal of attention, because most of us are already committed

to some ideals, conclusions, opinions, and so we never meet. As the speaker has no belief, has no ideals, has no authority whatsoever, he can investigate easily, freely; happily, but if you also were free to enquire, to look into the vast complex of our society, of our governments, not the government of this particular country but governments throughout the world. To not merely have information about them all but why human beings who have lived on this earth for perhaps forty, fifty thousand years of perhaps more, have become what they are, dull, violent, superstitious and following some idiotic nonsensical tradition.

We must be capable to deeply understand the nature of ourselves because we are the society, we have created this society in which we live, and to bring about order in that society, not by legislation, not by governmental laws or a new form of governors and Chief Ministers and so on, but as long as our own house is not in order - our house, the house in which we live, not the physical house, but the house of our struggle, conflict, misery, confusion, sorrow. That is our house and if we don't bring about order in that, mere demand for outward order has very little meaning.

So please we are thinking together. You are not merely listening to the speaker taking a few ideas from him or few slogans, or few concepts and then agreeing or disagreeing. But what we are concerned about deeply is why human beings are what they are, why they have become like this, and the future is what they are now. If they don't change now the future will be exactly what it is now, perhaps with certain modifications, variations, but human beings if they don't radically, fundamentally bring about in their own attitudes, in their own lives, which is to put order, then

attending to all these talks, seeing old familiar faces has very little meaning. If that is very clear that we are together meeting at a certain level with the same intensity, at the same time, then communication become very simple. Because obviously the speaker is here to say something, to explore something with you. But if you hold on to your commitments, to your beliefs, to your gurus, and all that business, we can never meet each other.

So please, this is a talk or a conversation between two people, between you and the speaker - a conversation, a dialogue of two friends who are concerned, not only with their own private life, but concerned with the world, concerned with what is happening in the world: the global disorder, the threat of wars, poverty, the violence and the destruction, that is going on right throughout the world. So we are responsible for all that. And it is no good going off into some corner to meditate about god knows what. So please if you will kindly bear in mind all the time that we are together deeply concerned, serious, not flippant, to find a solution to all the problems.

What is a problem? Why have we throughout our life, from the beginning, when we see the light till we die, why do we have problems - social problems, economic problems, mechanical problems, computer problems and our own problems in our daily life, in our relationship, why do we have problems at all? Is it necessary to have problems? The word problem - its root meaning is something that is thrown at you. The meaning of that word 'problem' means something thrown at you, a challenge. That is the meaning of that word. And we are asking why we have problems at all? Is it possible to live without a single problem? If you have

problems, obviously those problems act as friction, and wears out the brain, and one gets old and so on.

So human beings throughout the world have many, many problems. They live with problems. Their whole life is a movement of problems. And now we are asking: is it possible not to have problems? We are going to investigate the question, not say yes, it is possible to live without problems, or not. That is not the point. The point is why do we have it, what is a problem, why is the brain always trying to solve problems. There are mechanical problems, computer problems, mathematical problems, problems of design, problems in architecture, physics, in all the technological field, there are many, many problems there. That is inevitable. If you are treading the road of technology, it must have its many problems. And why do we in our life, in our relationship, in our own way of living, in our family, the people one loves, why do we have problems? Whether you should follow a certain guru or not, you know the whole structure of problems of our life.

We see in the technological world problems must exist. When you are building a computer, it demands not only the resolution of the problems there, and in the technological world problems will always exist. And is our brain educated, trained to solve problems? You are following all this, I hope. We live in a mechanical world. We are business people, we are doctors, surgeons, physicists, biologists trained computer experts. And our brain - please follow all this if you are interested - is trained, educated, conditioned to solve problems. So we extend that same attitude to our daily life. You understand what I am saying? Are we meeting each other?

Suppose one is a computer expert. He has several problems

there, and mechanically he has to solve those problems, which means his brain is trained, conditioned, educated to solve problems. Right? And we extend that same movement of solution of problems to the psychological field. So in the psychological field, that is in our relationship, in our fears, anxiety, all the rest of it, we have got the same mentality, the same condition that these have to be solved. Right? These are problems that have to be solved, which means we look at life, at our daily living from the point of view of a problem. Are we meeting each other? Are we, or am I talking to myself? What we are trying to point out is if you are trained or educated to solve problems, by solving one problem, you are increasing many other problems. This is what is happening throughout, in all the governments. They try to solve one problem, in the solution of that one problem, they increase or add more problems. So we live with problems. And we are saying something totally different, which is to observe life not with a mind that is trained to solve problems, but to understand the nature why the brain is conditioned, trained, educated to solve problems, and with that same movement we meet life.

So we are going to look at the various issues of our life, not with a brain that is trained to solve problems, but to observe the issues, not demanding an answer, not demanding a solution. Is it clear? Please, this is very serious because to live a life without a single problem is the most extraordinary life. It has immense capacity. It had tremendous energy. It is always renewing itself. But if you are always caught in the field of problems and the resolution of those problems, then you never move out of those problems. Is this clear?

So we are going to find out whether it is possible to look at any issue, and not call it a problem, except a mechanical problem. Look at any issue of our daily life and not label it as a problem, but look at it, observe it, be aware of the whole nature of that issue, the content of that issue. But if you approach it as a problem and therefore try to find an answer to it, you will increase the problem. Say for example, it is important to have an unoccupied mind. It is only a brain that is unoccupied that can perceive something new, that is free, has tremendous vitality. It is necessary to have a very quiet mind because it is only a quiet mind, unoccupied mind, a brain that can see things clearly, that can actually think totally differently. Now you hear that, that it is necessary to have a quiet, still mind, a brain whatever you like to call it for the moment. Then you ask how am I to get it. Then you make a problem of it: I need a quiet mind; my mind is occupied, restless, chattering all the time, and then you say how am I to stop it? The desire to stop it brings about problems. How am I to do it, is a problem. Have you understood? But if you approach the question, is it that one must have an unoccupied mind, then you will begin to see for yourself the nature of occupation, why it is occupied, why it is constantly dwelling on a particular thing. When you observe it, when you are aware of it, it is telling you its story. You understand this?

We are going to go into all this. But first we must be very clear that you and the speaker are treating life not as a problem but as a tremendous movement. And if your brain is trained to solve problems, then you will treat this movement as a problem to be solved. And is it possible to look at life with all its questions, with all its issues which is tremendously complex, to look at it not as a

problem, but to observe it: to observe it clearly, without bias, without coming to some conclusion which will then dictate your observation. So to observe this vast movement of life, not only your own particular life, the life of humanity, the life of the earth, the life of the whole world, to look at it, to observe it, to move with it. But if you treat it as a problem, then you will create more problems. Right? Is this clear?

Now let's proceed. What is our first issue in life. I am not using the word problem, as I said problem means something thrown at you, that is the root meaning of that word etymologically. Now what is the first movement in our life - the life of man, life of not only your little life, some business life, or you are a doctor, or a surgeon or some kind of leader. We are not talking about that petty little life which we will come to presently, but the life that is around us, the vast immense complex movement of existence. What is it that strikes you first? What is it that has meaning, that has depth, that has a sense of vitality behind it? What would you say if each one of you was asked that question, what would be your first observation, your first response, your first immediate enquiry? Perhaps you never ask this question and so you are not willing to answer it for yourself, but if you look at this vast extraordinary movement of life, of which one is a part, what is the thing that you meet first? Would it be relationship, would it be your own particular concern about yourself, would it be your own fear, your own anxiety, your own particular narrow, limited enquiry, your own search for god? You understand? What would be your first natural contact, natural demand?

We look at this vast movement of life from a narrow little

window, that window being your own little self - your own worries, your own anxieties, your own sexual demands? So enquire with me please, don't go to sleep. Or you are looking at this vast movement from no particular point of view, from no window, from no commitment, or are you so caught in a system, in a tradition, in knowledge as a professor, as a philosopher, or a writer, or a surgeon, or are you looking at it as a specialist? Or do you look at it as a human being, the human being who has to many questions, sorrows, pains, anxieties? How do you look at all this? When you put such a question amongst so many people, naturally each one has a different response. But as we are all human beings who are the rest of mankind - we are the rest of mankind, we are not Indian. We may have a certain background, certain tradition, certain long history. That is only a matter of labels. But primarily you are a human being, not a Christian, not a doctor, not a Buddhist, not a Hindu. You are primarily a human being related to all other human beings. Therefore you are the rest of humanity. Your body may be different from another body, the organism, the physical organism may be different from other physical organisms. You are obviously different from the speaker physically. But the body never says I am. You understand what I am saying.

The body never says, I am something special: my progress, my success, I must seek god, the body never says all that. But thought says all that. You are different physically from another and the physical organism is the most extraordinary organism which we despoil. And the body is never conscious that it is separate from somebody else. It is thought that says, I am different. You understand? It is important to see how thought divides. So that is

the first thing, don't you notice, when you look at this vast movement of life, how man has divided himself from another, separated himself from another calling himself an American, a Jew, a Russian, an Arab, a Hindu and all the rest of it. Don't you observe this extraordinary broken up human entity. Are you aware of all that? Isn't that the first thing you see how the world is divided geographically, nationally, racially, religiously. And this division is causing immense conflict. This division is causing wars - the Hindu against the Muslim, the Russian against Afghanistan and so on and so on and so on. Isn't that the first thing you see in this world - how man has created this division? This division must exist because thought has created this division.

Sir, if you are at all alert, aware, one sees what thought, man, human being has done to himself and what he has done to others. That is the first thing one observes - the destruction of this division, the breeding of wars through nationalism. One of the causes of war is nationalism, the economic division, and one never treats this vast movement of life as one unit. That is what one meets the first thing, when you look at the world - man fighting man. And we have lived that way for thousands of years, killing each other, in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of country, in the name of a flag and we are still doing this, after thousands of years. So one asks what is wrong with man? Why is he doing this? He is extraordinarily clever in the technological world. He has invented the most extraordinary instruments, most delicate. We cannot imagine the things that they are doing. But we are still carrying on most stupidly our own lives. So that is the first thing that you notice. And one asks what is the cause of it? I hope

you are asking that too, not just listening.

What is the cause of all this - this division, these wars, the structure of hierarchical authority in every country, in the religious world, in the political world, in the scientific world. It is all based on hierarchical principles - authority - the authority of knowledge, authority of the experience and so on. Now what is the cause of all this? Who is responsible? Please enquire, go into it with the speaker. Because where there is a cause, there is an end to that cause. If one has a pain, the cause being cancer or what you will then that pain can be ended or you are killed. So wherever there is a cause, there is an end to that. That is a law, that is a principle. So we are asking: what is the cause of all this - this vast misery, unhappiness, the tremendous uncertainty? This uncertainty that is breeding tribal gods, what is the root of all this? Are you waiting for the speaker to tell you or you yourself are discovering it? If the speaker tells you, then you make an abstraction of it as an idea. Then the idea and putting that idea into action becomes a problem. But if you and I together, could discover the cause of all this, not the particular misery of this country. It is overpopulation, misrule and corruption and ugliness and so on, that is going on here, it is happening all over the world. They are preparing for monstrous wars; adding great misery to humanity. What is the root of all this?

May we go into it together? Not I explain, you accept, but together, slowly, carefully, find out for ourselves what is the root of all this? What is the cause of all this? If we don't find it now, the future will be exactly the same, what you are now - wars, division, sorrow, pain, anxiety, uncertainty - you understand? So together let us find out. Please bear in mind, the speaker is not instructing. He

has no authority to instruct you. You are not his students. He is not your teacher. There is no reward and no punishment. But together let us enquire. Which means you must be equally eager, equally intense, equally interested to find out, not just attend a talk like this and go off, go back to your own life, narrow, bitter, anxious, sorrowful life.

So what is the cause of this division? And this division breeds wars, rows, quarrels, perpetual conflict, conflict between man and woman, sexually, ambitious. What is the root of all this? How do you, if I may ask, if one may ask, how do you approach a question like that? Approach - the question is, what is the root of this, what is the cause of all this? That is the question. How do you approach that question? How do you come near to it? Approach means to come near, to come into contact. This is a question put to you and are you looking at it as a problem to be resolved, or you come very close to it? If you do, then you are then open to the question, but if you keep away from the question, you are not open, you are not alive to the question. You understand? Right sirs? So are we together approaching this question with no direction, with no motive, because if you have a motive, then that motive dictates the answer, it distorts the perception. Suppose this is my question. I am putting this question to myself, 'What is the root of all this?' I have no answer. I don't know, but I am going to find out.

But to find out, I must be free, absolutely free from any kind of direction. Right? Because if I have a direction, a motive, hoping for some kind of reward, then that motive, that reward is going to dictate my investigation. Right? So one must be free to observe this question. What is the root of all this? Is it thought, is it inevitable

that we human beings on this beautiful earth which you are very sedulously destroying, is it for every human being living on this earth, that it is inevitable that he must live in conflict, he must live with anxiety, fear? If you accept that as inevitable, then there is no investigation. You have come to a conclusion and there you have shut the door. Conclusion means the ending of investigation. The very word conclusion is to close, to end. So if you come to any conclusion, then you cannot possibly answer. So one must be aware of how you approach this question. We are asking: is it thought? What is thought? Is thought yours, is thought individual? Is your thinking separate from somebody else's thinking? Every person thinks, the most stupid, ignorant, downtrodden man in a village, he thinks, so does the great scientist. So thinking is common to all of us. It is not your thinking separate from my thinking. Thinking is, you may express it differently, another may express it differently, but thinking is the movement of all mankind. So it is not individual thinking. Right? Do we see that? It is rather difficult to accept it or see it because we are so conditioned, we are so educated, trained to think that my thinking is separate from yours. My opinion is different from yours, but opinion is opinion, it is not your opinion or my opinion.

So is thinking the root of all this misery, this destruction, this decline, this corruption, this decay? If it is, then can that movement of thought which has created such havoc in the world - it has created the most extraordinary technological world, great instruments of war, those extraordinary submarines and so on. And also it has created all the religions in the world. It has built extraordinary cathedrals, mosques, temples and all the things that

are in the temples, in the mosques, in the churches. Thought has done that, invented all the rituals, invented the saviour in the Christian world, invented liberation or moksha or whatever you like to call it, in this country. And also it has invented god. The more you are uncertain, the more dangerous the world becomes, thought must find a security, a sense of safety, certainty, and so it creates god - your god and my god. My god is better than your god. My guru is better than yours, he gives me initiations, puts garlands on me and all that silly nonsense that goes on. Thought has been responsible for all this. Right sirs? And if that is the cause, please listen carefully, if thought is the cause of all this, our misery, our superstitions, our immense insecurity, uncertainty and also thought has created the most extraordinary things - communications, surgery, medicines and so on. Thought has done all this.

If that is the cause, is there an end to it. You understand my question. Is there an end to thought? That is, if thought is responsible for all this technological world and the human world of misery, unhappiness, anxiety, if thought is the cause of all this, it must have an end. Right? That is, if one has a certain disease brought about by various incidents, that disease has a cause, and that cause having been discovered, it can be treated and ended, the pain or the disease. Similarly, if thought is responsible for all this - not the technological, that will go on, but our daily confusion, misery, uncertainty, sorrow, and all these superstitions that thought has created around us - if thought is the cause, it has an end. If you say, tell me how to end thought, then you make a problem of it. Because your brain is trained, educated to solve problems. As an expert in computers is trained to solve problems there, that same

movement is extended into the psychological world. So if thought is the cause of this, the question is, not how to end it, but to understand the whole movement of thought. I am not treated as my thinking, separate from your thinking. Thinking - you understand. If you treat your thinking as yours, and somebody else treats it as his thinking, then the issues are totally different. That leads to all kinds of illusion, superstitions that have no reality. But thinking is the ground upon which all human beings - the black, the white, the pink, the Muslim, the Hindu, the villager, the uneducated, all of them stand. Then we move away from the idea that it is my thinking. Then you are concerned with global thinking. You understand? Not the Indian way of thinking. You are concerned really with the world, with all humanity of which you are. You are not an individual. Individual means unique, undivided. You are not unique, you are totally divided, fragmented in yourself. And you are the result of all the past generations. Your brain is not yours. It has evolved through thousands and thousands of years. But your religion, your scriptures, your everyday life, says you are separate from everybody else. And you are trained to accept it. You have never gone into it, you have never questioned it, doubted it, fearless scepticism, which must investigate, but you accept, and in that acceptance lies your problems. But if you look at it all as a vast movement of life of which you are a part, this movement that is limitless, that has no beginning and no end, then you begin to enquire into the nature of thought.

What is the origin of thought? Why thought divides in its very nature, the very movement of thinking in itself, is it divisive, fragmentary, limited? Unless you ask all the questions, but if you

say merely, since thought is perhaps the cause, please tell me how to end the cause; then you are back into your old field of problems. And if you try to solve this problem, you have other problems. I think, I know thought is creating problems. Tell me how to stop them, how to stop thinking. And there are lots of people who will tell how to stop thinking, and then those people vary from each other - meditate, don't meditate, breathe this way, you know all that nonsense that goes on. So we multiply problems after problems. But if you look at this movement of thought, and with this thought man has lived for thousands upon thousands of years. So one has to ask not how to end thought, that is a stupid question, but what is the nature of it? Why has thought become so important? Because thought implies knowledge. What place has knowledge in life? You follow?

We must stop now, we will continue tomorrow evening. But please when you leave here, investigate for yourself. Don't allow me to stimulate you to think, which is what is happening now. Then the speaker becomes a drug. Then you depend on him, then you make him into a guru, and then out of making him into your guru, you have other problems connected with it. But if when you leave here, look at it, find out. That means an active brain, a brain that is active, thinking, discussing, going, not just stuck in a narrow little groove of tradition or some system. And one of the calamities that is taking place in the world is, that we are all getting old, not merely old in the body, but old mentally. Decay begins there inside, first, because we become mechanical. We never have the energy, vitality, passion, to find out. You have all been told what to do, you have all been instructed. And please don't. This is not a

place of instruction or are you being told what to do. Here we are serious to find a different way of living, and you can only find that out when you understand the nature of thought, then the way of living in which thought is not important at all.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 23RD JANUARY 1983

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday evening. We said, didn't we, the present condition of national divisions, racial divisions, linguistic divisions, religious divisions - national divisions as Muslim and the Hindu, the Jew and the Arab, the American and the European, the Russian and so on, the Chinese. And this tribal division which is called national, glorified tribalism called nationalism - it has brought about a great many wars. Where there is division, we said, there must be conflict, not only division between man and woman in their relationship, but also division, racial, religious and linguistic divisions. And we went into the question: why does this constant conflict between man and man exist. What is the root of it? What is the cause of all this chaos, anarchy, almost anarchy, bad governments, arming each group, each nation preparing for wars, thinking one religion is superior to the other, one guru more important than the other and so on. We are seeing this division throughout the world and also historically it has existed for many, many centuries. What is the cause of it? Who is responsible for it? And we said thought has divided man against man: thought has also created most extraordinary architecture, painting, poetry and the whole world of technology, medicine, surgery, communications, computers, robots and so on. Thought has brought about good health, good medicine, various forms of human comfort.

But thought also, as we said yesterday, has created this vast division between man and man, man against man and we ask: what

is the cause of all this? Who is responsible for all this? And we said, where there is a cause, there is an end; like when you have a certain disease the cause can be found of that disease, the disease can be cured. So wherever there is a cause, there is an end to that cause. That is obviously a fact. And if thought has created this confusion, this uncertainty, this perpetual danger - war, if thought is responsible for that, then what is to happen if thought is not used.

And also we said yesterday, this is not a lecture to instruct, to inform on a particular subject. We are together investigating, exploring, asking, to find out why man, of course woman included, why man throughout the world lives and perpetuates conflict, not only within himself but outwardly - in society, in religion, in economy and so on. If thought is responsible which is fairly obvious, that thought is responsible for the mess, for the division, for all the misery of human beings. If one recognizes that fact, not a theory about some philosophical outlook or philosophical statement, but if one realizes the actual fact of it, that thought however clever, however crafty, however erudite, thought is responsible. And if it is responsible then what is man to do?

That is where we left off yesterday. We said also that thought has created marvellous cathedrals, temples and mosques and all the things that are in the temples, mosques and churches are the invention of thought. Thought has created god. Because thought seeks to find security, finding uncertainty, insecurity, conflict in this world, then thought invents an entity, a principle, an ideal which may give security, comfort, but that comfort, that security is the invention of thought. I think it is fairly obvious if you think

about it very deeply, if you observe your own thinking, that thought however subtle, however stupid, cunning, crafty, has created this division and this conflict. Then we can ask a question: why does this conflict exist, why have we lived with conflict from immemorial times between the good and the bad, the 'what is' and 'what should be', the actual and the ideal. There is this division.

So let us enquire why, not only conflict, why there is division as the good and the bad, evil and that which is beautiful, holy. Please as we said yesterday, we are thinking together, not agreeing, not accepting, but having observed the state of the world, having observed your own society in which you live, your own governments, your own economic condition, and the various gurus with their assumptions, when you have observed all this objectively rationally, sanely, why does man live in conflict? What is conflict? Please bear in mind, if I may remind you, over and over again I shall, that we are having a dialogue together. You and the speaker are having a conversation together, you are not just sitting there, listening to some ideals, listening to some concepts, to some words, but you are sharing. You can only share, partake if you are actually concerned.

But if we merely treat what is being said as a series of ideas, conclusions, suppositions, then our dialogue ends. Therefore there is no communication between you and the speaker. But if you are concerned as every human being is concerned, at all awake to all the things that are happening in the world - the tyranny, the search for power, accepting power, living with power. All power is evil, ugly - whether the power over the wife, or the wife over the husband or the governments throughout the world. Where there is

power, the power goes with all the ugly things.

So we are asking why man lives in conflict? What is conflict? Not only between two people man, woman, but also one community against another community, one group against another group and so on. What is the nature of conflict? Please we are thinking together. So do not go to sleep because we are talking about very serious things, which is not a philosophy, but investigating our daily life: the life that we lead day after day - year after year till we die. So please have the goodness, the responsibility of sharing this concern together. We are asking what is conflict? Why do human beings live with conflict? I do not know if some of you have seen those caves in the south of France where twenty five, thirty thousand years ago, there is a picture of a man fighting evil in the form of a bull and so on. For thousands of years we have lived with conflict. To meditate becomes a conflict. So everything that we do or don't do has become a conflict.

Does conflict exist where there is comparison? Comparison means measurement: one compares oneself with another, one may be bright, intelligent, a man in a position, power and so on. Where there is comparison there must be fear, there must be conflict. So can one live without comparison at all? We think by comparing ourselves with somebody, we are progressing. You want to be like your guru or beat your guru, go beyond him. You want to achieve enlightenment, position, you want a following, you want to be respected and so on and so on. So where there is a becoming psychologically, there must be conflict. Right? Are we together thinking about this? Whether it is possible to live a life, a modern life, without any comparison and therefore without any conflict?

Don't say it is not practical. So we are questioning the psychological becoming. You understand? A child becomes an adult, then grows into manhood. To learn a language we need time, to acquire any skill, we need time. And we are asking, please find out for yourself, we are asking, is becoming psychologically one of the reasons of conflict? I want 'what is' to be changed into 'what should be'. I am not good but I will be good. I am greedy, envious, but perhaps one day I will be free of all this.

The desire to become, which is measurement, which is comparison, is that one of the causes of conflict? And is there another reason which is, there is duality. This is not philosophy. We are examining something to understand the nature of conflict and to find out for ourselves if it is possible to be totally, completely free of conflict. Conflict wears out the brain, makes the mind old. A man that has lived without conflict is an extraordinary human being. There is tremendous energy which is dissipated in conflict. So it is important, if one may point out, the necessity of understanding conflict. We see measurement, comparison brings about conflict.

And also we have stated that there is duality, or some of your philosophers have stated that, posited that there is duality and that one of the reasons of this conflict is because of this duality. There is duality - night and morning, light and shade, tall and short, bright and dull, morning sun rising, and sun setting. Physically there is duality. You are a woman and another is a man. But we are asking, please think together with the speaker, not accepting what he says, think together, because then we can co-operate together. Then we can do things together. It is important that we do think

together, which means you must put aside your opinions, your conclusions, your experiences, but if you stick to your opinions, conclusions, experiences and another also sticks to his, then there is no co-operation, there is no thinking together. There is division, there is conflict. So please I beg of you, think together, let us think together. Because it is very serious. Is there psychological duality at all? Or is there only 'what is'? I am violent, that's the only state violence, not non-violence. The non-violence is just an idea. It is not a fact. So where there is violence and non-violence, there must be conflict. And in this country you have talked endlessly about non-violence, but probably you are also very violent people. So the fact and the non-fact: the fact is human beings throughout the world are violent. That is a fact. Violence means not only physical but also imitation, conformity, obedience, acceptance.

There are various other forms of violence. That is 'what is', the other is not. But if you are conditioned to the other, that is to pursue while you are violent, non-violence, that is, to pursue away from the fact, then you must have conflict. But whereas is one dealt with 'what is', that is, I am violent, I am not seeking non-violence, which is nonsense, because while I am seeking non-violence I am being violent, I am sowing seeds of violence. Right? Don't go to sleep please. So there is only one fact and that is I am violent. So in the understanding of the nature and the structure of violence there may be the ending of violence, but the ending of violence is not a problem as we went into yesterday. Our minds are trained, educated to solve problems - mathematical problems, economic problems, political problems and so on. We are trained, educated. Our brains are conditioned to deal mechanically with problems.

And we make of life, as we said yesterday, a series of endless problems psychologically and so on.

We went into that yesterday, we are not going to go into it any more because there is lots more to be talked about. So there is only fact, not the opposite. If this is very clear - that the ideal, the principle, that which you call the noble are all illusions. What is fact is we are violent, ignoble, corrupt, uncertain and so on. Those are facts and we have to deal with fact. Facts if you face them, they do not create problems, it is like that. So I discover that I am violent. And I have no opposite to it, I reject totally the opposite. It has no meaning. So I have only this fact. Now how do I deal with fact? How do I approach the fact? How do I look at the fact? What is my motive in looking at the fact, what is the direction in which I want the fact to move. I must be aware of the nature and the structure of the fact. To be aware without choice of the fact. Are you doing this as we are talking? Or you are just happily listening to lot of words and picking up here and there some words that will be convenient and suitable, and not listening totally to your own enquiry.

How does one deal with fact? That is, how do I observe the fact that I am violent? That violence is shown when I am angry, when I am jealous, when I am trying to compare myself with another. If I am doing all that, then it is impossible to face facts. A good mind faces facts. If you are in business, you face facts and deal with the fact, change the fact, you don't pretend that you will do something else away from the fact. Then you are not a good business man. But here we are so ineffectual, we don't change, because we don't deal with facts. Psychologically, inwardly we avoid them. We

escape from them or when we do discover them we suppress them. And so there is no resolution of any of them.

From that we can go to something else, which is important. What is a good mind? Have you ever asked? Is a mind good when it is full of knowledge? And what is knowledge? Go on sir, enquire with the speaker. We are all very proud of having knowledge, scholastic knowledge through experience, knowledge through incidents, accidents. Accumulated memory is knowledge. Right? Accumulated experience, and experience can never be complete. So is a good mind, a mind full of knowledge? Is a good mind, a free comprehensive, global mind? Or is a good mind parochial, narrow, nationalistic, traditional? You understand all this? That is not a good mind, obviously. A good mind is a free mind. It is not a contemporary mind. A good mind is not of a time, a good mind is not concerned with time, with environment. It can deal with environment, it can deal with time. But in itself, it is totally free. And such a mind has no fear. The speaker is telling this because our minds have been so educated, so trained that we have nothing original. There is no depth, knowledge is always superficial.

So we are concerned with the understanding of the human being, his mind, his action, his behaviour, his responses which are limited because his senses are limited. And to understand the depth, the nature of conflict and whether it is possible to be completely, wholly free, one must have a good mind, not just a verbal accumulation of words. Which does not mean a clever mind, a crafty mind which most of us have. We have very crafty minds but not good minds. We are very cunning, crafty, subtle, cunning, you know, deceptive, dishonest, but that is not a good mind. So is

it possible for us, living in this modern world, with all the activities, the pressures, the influences and newspapers and constant repetition - our minds are being programmed like a computer - you are a Hindu, that is, you have been programmed for the last three thousand years, and so you repeat. Such a repetition indicates not a good mind - strong, healthy, active, decisive, full of passionate alertness. Such a mind is necessary. It is only then it is possible to bring about a psychological revolution and so a new society, a new culture.

And in listening to the speaker, as I hope you are listening, perhaps you are not, it does not matter, but those who are listening, the art of listening is to listen, to see the truth of it and act. For us, we see something to be true, we understand it, not only logically, reasonably, we understand things very clearly but we don't act. There is an interval between perception and action. Right? Between the perception and action all other incidents take place, therefore you will never act. Right? If you see that violence in you is a fact and not try to become non-violent, which is non-fact, but if you perceive the nature of violence, the complexity of violence - and you can see the complexity of violence, if you listen to violence, that is listen to your own violence, it will reveal the nature of itself not descriptively, you can know it yourself. But if you perceive your violence and act, then there is the end of violence, completely. Whereas perception and interval and action is conflict.

As we said yesterday, a chattering mind, is an unhealthy mind. A chattering mind perpetually talks, talks, talks, thinks - not only about business problems, mathematical problems and so on, but

problems of one's relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your children, with your neighbour, perpetually occupied and such occupation will inevitably wear down, weigh down the capacity of the brain. One knows this, it is obvious. So is it possible not to chatter? And when we realize that it is chattering and ask the question, is it possible to stop it, then we make a problem of it. And our brains are trained to solve problems. So we think we solve by saying, I must not chatter, and try to control. And then the problem arises: who is the controller? Is the controller different from the controlled? So problems arise and you are ready to solve them. That is what is happening politically the world over. There are innumerable problems. And their brains, like ours, like yours, are trained to solve problems. In solving one problem, they have multiplied or increased other problems. And this is called government and all over the world this is going on.

So to see something, a fact, that I am violent and to let the story of violence reveal itself, it will if your mind is quiet. But don't make a problem of it - how is the brain to be quiet? Then you might just as well take a drug, or what you call meditation, which is an escape from life and we have the other problems in meditation which all become so utterly stupid, meaningless. So is it possible to look, to observe, to find without any choice, to look at your greed, envy, ambition, your arrogance? Have you noticed how many people are arrogant? Not the politician, that is understood, they want power, possession, prestige. Where there is power there is envy. Absolute power is absolute evil, as has been said. Now are you arrogant? You understand? The man who is trying to become something psychologically is arrogant. I am ignorant, not

ignorance of books, I don't mean that. That is still ignorance. You may read the Gita, the Upanishads, or the Bible, or the Koran, repeat them endlessly but you are an ignorant human being. Ignorance means not understanding the depth of yourself, not what you are. And a person is arrogant when he tries to become something which he is not. Are you following all this?

We all want to achieve a state of happiness perpetual, unending happiness. And that can only come about through enlightenment - whatever that may mean. And so a disciple with some strange gods and all the rest of it, he is trying to become enlightened. The becoming is the movement of arrogance. Yes sir, look at it. It denies totally the sense of humility. When you are facing facts then you have to be totally humble, not cultivate humility. Only the vain cultivate humility. Right sirs? When they are vain, arrogant, they may cultivate humility but their humility is still arrogance. Go into all this sirs.

So when one discovers for oneself that one is arrogant - arrogance may be that you are a great scientist, won a Nobel prize, or well-known, or you are a writer who wants to be known, because the more books that are sold, more money. So we are all treading the same path of becoming and therefore being utterly dishonest, pretending what we are not. Whereas a good mind faces the fact, the fact that I am violent, arrogant. Nobody has to tell me that I am arrogant, it is so obvious. The way you talk, the way you behave, if one is at all awake one sees the nature of arrogance. To see it, to comprehend it and to hold it, not try to escape from it, it is so. So when there is perception of that which is, that is arrogance, that very perception demands immediate action. That is intelligence. If

I see something dangerous and I don't act, I am just stupid.

Whereas arrogance, violence is tremendous danger for a healthy, sane, rational, passionate mind. And if there is the perception of that, that very perception demands immediate action. That is the ending of it. Perception doesn't demand analysis. I don't know if you have gone into all that. Perception of something actual, understanding it, looking at it, ending it, from there you can reason. That very reasoning will be logical. But if you begin with logic, reason, find out the cause, then you will take time and the cause will multiply. It is so obvious all this. Right sirs?

So to come to the point: is it possible to live a life without a single problem? We are not talking of mathematical problems and so on, but problems of relationship. To have no problem in relationship, is that possible? Please enquire with the speaker. You have problems, haven't you, with your wife, with your father, with your mother, with your children, why? Because we are concerned with daily living. If the daily living is not in order, you can meditate till you are blue in the face, that meditation has no meaning, it is merely an escape; you might just as well take a drug and enjoy yourself. But if you do not put your house in order, which is your relationship, if that house is not in order, then your society will not be in order. You must begin near to go far. The near is your relationship. Why have we problems there? Please enquire with me. Don't let me explain, talk endlessly. Let us together, please I request you most earnestly, investigate why you have problems with your wife, with your husband, with your children, with your neighbour, with your government, with your community and all the rest of it. Which is, what is relationship?

Life is a movement in relationship, living. There is no escape from that. You may become a hermit, take vows, put on strange garbs and all the rest of it, thinking yourself extraordinary, exceptional, but you are related. And to understand relationship is the most important thing in life, not god, not all the scriptures, but to understand the depth, the meaning, the beauty, the quality of relationship.

Are you getting tired by listening to the speaker? Are we drowned by a lot of words? Are you being drowned by a lot of words, or do you catch instantly the depth, the beauty, the quality of relationship without more explanation, more analysis, but see the extraordinary importance of relationship? But as you don't see the beauty of relationship, where there is no relationship there is disorder. So let us look at it together. You know I was listening to something serious, perhaps not relevant - you know most of us have homes, have houses, flats, and we own them and possess them. It is our home. We never realize that we are also guests in that house. Right? You understand the meaning of that: to be a guest in a house, in your own house. Do you understand what it means? Must I explain? That means one must be a teacher as well as a disciple. There is no teacher outside of you. You are the teacher and also you are the disciple who is learning from the teacher, not from the teacher as a guru, that is all silly, but you are learning and teaching. You are the owner of your house and also you are the guest of your house. That means you look after the house, you care for the house, you care for whoever is in the house because you are a guest. Oh, come on sirs, you don't see it.

So let us go back. The speaker has travelled all over the world

for the last sixty years, different countries, different houses, wherever he is he is a guest. That means he is always adjusting himself, like a river full of water, a great volume of water behind it, and every boulder, every rock it round it. Do you understand? The guest is like that. Let us go back.

Relationship is one of the most important things in life. Right, it is so obvious. And we have made it such a confusion and such misery. And having created conflict, we say it has become a problem and we are able to solve it because our minds are trained as in business, as in science, mathematics. We have problems there. So we are trained that way. So there are problems in our family and we are going to solve that. By solving them we will have more problems because your mind is trained to solve problems, and never free to look at the beauty or the depth of what relationship is. So let us go into it, if we may. What is relationship? The very word implies being in contact, not physical contact, not sexual contact, that you all know, but to be in contact, mentally, emotionally, psychologically, you know, to be in contact with another, so that there is no division in that contact. You understand? That is relationship. But we have not got that contact. You are ambitious and your wife also is ambitious. You want this and she wants something else. She may be right and you may be wrong. She wants to live in a marvellous house, and you say, please for god's sake. She wants to be popular and you don't care. You are a scholar, a professor in your own little groove and she is also. So you never are in contact with each other except sexually. This is a fact. Why? And you call that relationship, your image about her or her image about you. You are not kind, you are brutal,

you are this, you are that, you know.

So where does love come into all this? Do you understand my question? When one says to one's wife, I love you, what does it mean? If you ever say it. I don't know whether you say it at all. I doubt it. But if you do say it, what does it mean to love another? Relationship means to love another. What does that word mean? We use that word in advertisements. You see it. I love Coca-Cola or I love this or I love that. I love god, I love my guru. What does that love mean? Is it based on reward and punishment? Look at it sirs, because we are always caught between the two - reward and punishment. I follow the guru because he is going to promise heaven, give me comfort. I don't lose because he is going to punish.

So we are caught in this. Is relationship a reward and punishment process? Is love a movement of that? Think about it. Or we never meet - the wife and husband, except physically, never psychologically meet, and because we never meet there is conflict. Right? That is, to meet your wife or your husband, your children, your neighbour at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity, that is love. You understand this? You understand this sir, not physically, I don't mean that. To meet somebody, you must meet him, if he is also willing, at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity. Then that is relationship, but if you are ambitious, you follow the path, becoming noble, ignoble and all the rest of it and she also follows another path, naturally - you may be married, you may have children and all the rest of it - but you never meet. And that breeds a sense of desperate loneliness. Don't you know all this? When I have no relationship with anyone - with

my wife, with my boss, with my foreman, when I have no relationship at all with anybody, because I am self-centred, my actions are self-centred, my wife is also self-centred, so that self-centredness, the lack of relationship brings about great loneliness. And discovering that loneliness, then we make out of that loneliness a problem - what am I to do when I am lonely. And your brain is ready to solve the problem. But you never rest with that loneliness, you never enquire the cause of it.

So where there is love, there is no loneliness. Unless you love your wife, if you are the most extraordinary husband or whatever it is, where there is love in your heart, then there is no problem. Because you have not got it, you have a thousand problems. Having stated that, don't make it into a problem. Look at the fact. The fact is that we are not sensitive, that we don't have the depth of beauty - not a picture, not a painting, I don't mean that - the depth of beauty. And the fact is that we don't love. To look at it, to remain with it, to see 'that is so', not invade it, not try to rationalize it. It is so that I don't love my wife. You know what that means to say that to yourself. You should cry. I want to cry for you all.

So sir, it is like two parallel lines never meeting and therefore increasing conflict day after day till you die. And to see the fact that there is no love in your heart, to have the mind in your heart, the mind, not the heart in your mind. You see the difference? Because we are so clever. We think love can be achieved, cultivated. Love is not something to cultivate. Either there is or there is not. If there is not, look at it, hold it, realize what you are without love in your heart. One just then becomes a machine - insensitive, vulgar, coarse, only concerned with sex and pleasure.

Sir, please, I am not harassing you, I am not scolding you. I am just pointing out what has happened to you. Your knowledge, your books have destroyed you because love is not bought in the books. It does not lie with knowledge. Knowledge and love don't go together. When you say, I know my wife, that is your knowledge which is your image about her. That knowledge is put together by thought, and thought is not love.

So having stated all this, do you have love in your heart? Or is it something romantic, nonsensical, impractical, valueless - it does not give you any money. That is so. So having heard all this, is there a comprehension of the depth of that word so that your mind is in the heart? And then you have right relationship. When you have right relationship, which means love, you can never go wrong. You can do what you like. Right sirs.

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 29TH JANUARY 1983

It is a rather noisy place, isn't it? We have to talk over together not only this evening but tomorrow. Tomorrow will be the last talk. We have to cover a great deal during these two talks and as we are going to deal with a difficult subject, we must together perceive for ourselves what is truth and what is false; not to be told what is false or what is true, what is ignorance and what is knowledge, but to find out for ourselves a quiet corner in ourselves, living in this dreadful city, living in small spaces, dirty, working all day long, commuting, going great distances in crowded trains and buses. We must find for ourselves a quiet corner, not in a house or in a garden or an empty lane, but deep within ourselves, because from there act, live and find out for ourselves what is beauty, what is time, the nature and the movement of fear, the pursuit of pleasure and the ending of sorrow. We must have such a corner, not in the mind but in the heart, the mind in the heart because then where there is affection and love, intellect, understanding, then there comes out of that clarity and from that, there is action. But for most of us, we live such strenuous conflicting lives, so much pressure around us, such terrible things are going on in the world, if we don't find for ourselves some inward space, a space not created by thought - which we will go into when we talk about meditation and so on - but to find this space, uncontaminated, clear, in which there is a light which is not lit by another; a light to ourselves so that we are totally free.

We are not free human beings. We think we are free. We think,

because we can choose, because we can do what we want, we think we are free but freedom is something entirely different from the desire to do our own thing. So we must together this evening and tomorrow find for ourselves without guidance, without help, without any outside agency telling us what to do, how to behave, what is right action, but to find in ourselves a space, that has no ending and no beginning.

And if one may point out again and I hope you will not mind, that this is not a lecture, a lecture being telling or explaining a certain subject, for you to be instructed, to learn. Lecture generally means that. But this is not a lecture. Here, we are having a conversation together like two friends perhaps walking in a quiet lane, full of trees and beauty of flowers, the singing of many birds, sitting down on a bench unfrequented, solitary and having a dialogue, because we are concerned, both you and the speaker are concerned with our daily life, not with something beyond, romantic and fantastic because if we don't make our own lives clear, unruffled, non-chaotic, whatever one may do it will have no meaning. So we must begin very near to go far. The near is what we are. So please if one may point out, it is your responsibility to think together, not to accept because one must have a great deal of scepticism, a scepticism that is not trammelled by fear, a scepticism, a doubt, so that one begins to question not only what the speaker is saying but also what you think, what you believe, your faith, your conclusions, your religion. One must have tremendous questioning, doubt, enquiry, not accept, because throughout the world, religion has played an extraordinary part in narrowing down the mind, in narrowing down one's investigation

through doubt, through questioning, through deep exploration. So please we are together going to look at many things which confront our daily life. We are not going to talk about any philosophy, any dogma, or encourage any faith, but a mind that is questioning, doubting, demanding to find out for oneself what is true, what is illusory, what is fantastic and what is false.

First of all we are going to enquire together what is beauty? You may say, what has that to do with our daily life? Our daily life is rather ugly, self-centred, concerned about oneself; our daily life is a labour, conflict, pain, anxiety, and that sense of desperate loneliness; that is our daily life. And to understand that, one must not only have a great sense of perception, seeing actually what is going on.

So one of the factors of our life is time. We are going to find out together what is time, what a great part time plays in our life; and whether time which is the process of division, time which is a beginning and an ending, time which is becoming, whether that time, apart from chronological time, apart from the time of sun rising, sun setting, the beauty of the full moon and the slip of the new moon - whether time has a part in, or excludes, beauty. This is important to understand for us because we have lost all sense of an aesthetic way of living. We have lost the sense of natural beauty, not the beauty of a face only, or the good taste of clothes and so on but the quality of beauty. Beauty cannot exist without life. Beauty is not of time. Creation is not of time. We will go into that as we go along. So you must first, if you will kindly allow the speaker to go on, time is a great factor in our life. There is time by the watch, the chronological time and the time to learn a language, a skill, a time

to achieve in this world, rise from a clerk to the executive person and so on. There is time in that direction. Is there time psychologically, that is, inwardly? Please enquire with me. Don't accept what the speaker is saying. Is there time which means a progress from here to there? Ideologically in the sense of becoming more noble, more free of greed, anger, violence; is there in this fear of the psyche. You understand the word psyche. This is what you are. That is, time is evolution. Right? From the seed to a tree, from the baby to manhood, the growth, the becoming, all that implies time, time as evolution.

Now we are going to question together whether there is psychological evolution at all? You understand what I am saying? Please one must exercise one's brain, think together, not just let the words flow but to think clearly, not stimulated by the speaker, but to question, to find out the implication of time. This is important because time and thought are the root of fear. Fear cannot end or fade away or be dissipated if you don't understand the nature of time and the nature of thought, which are the roots of all fear. So we are examining together the nature of time. There is physical time, the new moon becoming the full moon, the seed growing into a great gigantic tree. Time is necessary to learn a language, a skill; time is necessary to accumulate knowledge. There time is absolutely necessary. You may learn a language within a week or six months. To go from here to your house takes time; from one point to another. All physical movement, physical activity, learning requires time. The psychic, that is, the bundle of all your thinking, of all your feelings, of all your conclusions, beliefs, gods, hope, fears, all that is a bundle, that is your consciousness, that is what

you are. Is that clear? That is what your consciousness is. Your consciousness is made up of all these things - your gods, your knowledge, your faith, your hope, your fears, your pleasures, your conclusions, your loneliness, and the great fear of sorrow, pain. All that is your consciousness. We are asking whether that consciousness has evolution at all? Evolutions means becoming what you are more and more and more. You have understood this? That is, I am greedy, envious, violent. Can greed evolve into non-greed, or anger, loneliness become gradually something else? Are we making things clear? Or have we all gone to sleep after a hard day?

Please, this is rather a difficult subject, because all our tradition, all our religious training, our belief, our faith and all the so-called sacred literature tell you that you will become something if you make an effort, if you strive after, if you meditate from this to that, from what you are to what you should be, that is evolution. Now, the speaker is denying all that. Do you understand? The speaker is saying, greed can never become better greed. There is only the ending of something, not becoming something. Most of you probably believe in reincarnation. I don't know why - it is fairly obvious why, why you believe in it, that is from this life to next life, where you have better opportunities, where you will be a little bit nobler, where you have a little more comfort, more enlightenment; that is from what you are, to become what you should be. That is called evolution. The speaker is questioning that. He says there is no such thing as psychological evolution. You have to understand the nature of that statement, what is implied. That enlightenment, deep perception of that which is true, that is

which is beyond time is not through progress, through a continuity. So there is no movement as evolution of the psychic, which means there is no becoming. I don't become noble, I don't achieve enlightenment if I practise, if I strive, if I deny this or control and so on, which is gradation in achievement. So one has to understand the nature of time. Time, as we said, essentially means to divide, break; time implies a beginning and an ending.

So we are going to talk over together the nature of fear; whether fear can end now or it must end gradually. You understand the point? We are used to the idea that gradually we will be free of fear, which is, I am afraid but give me time I will be over it. Please don't look at me, it's not worth it. Just think together. So we are going to find out for ourselves whether fear can disappear through time or the very time itself is the root of fear? Is that clear? So what is the root of fear? Please enquire together. What is the root of fear, what is the cause of it? What is fear? You all know what fear is - fear of not becoming, not achieving, fear of the dark, fear of authority, fear of your wife or husband, fear has many, many aspects. We are not concerned with the many facets of fear, or wipe away one or two fears. It is like cutting the branches of a tree, but if you want to destroy the tree you must uproot the tree, go to the very root of it. So we are together and please look at your own fear. You may put on saintly robes, take vows and all that kind of stuff, but there is fear in you.

So look at that fear. What is that fear? Fear of an accident, fear of disease and of course there is the ultimate fear which is of death or the fear of living. And most of you who put on these strange robes and garlands are frightened of living. It makes no difference.

What the speaker is saying will make no difference to those who are dressed in this fancy dress, will it? They go on because they have got this idea that fear can be surrendered to an idea and they will be free of it. Fear is much too deep to surrender it or to dispel it or to control it or to suppress it. One must enquire into the root of it. What is the root of fear? Is it not time, is it not remembrance, is it not an experience which you have had which was painful and the fear of it recurring again, fear of disease; these are all the symptoms. We are not dealing with symptoms. We are concerned whether it is possible to uproot totally all fear.

If that is clear that we are concerned not with a particular fear, not your own special neurotic fear but the nature, the structure, the cause of fear, because where there is a cause, there is an end. So we are going together to find out the cause. We are saying one of the causes of fear is time, that is, the future, the fear of what might happen; fear of the past which is time, which is a remembrance, which is thought. So we are asking, is time and thought - are they the root of fear, are they the cause of fear? I am afraid of what might happen. That is the future. Or I am afraid of something that has happened in the past that might happen again, that is, the past invading the present, modifying itself and going on. Right? So time is one of the factors of fear. It is so obvious isn't it? Now we are asking whether thought is also a factor of fear, and if there is a difference between time and thought. Can you bear all this? Can you go on with this or are you getting tired already?

We are saying that thought and time are the root of fear. We explained somewhat; you can work it out for yourself the nature of time. Time is division as yesterday, today and tomorrow. Time of

something that has happened which was painful a week ago and might happen again. The remembrance of the past projecting into the future and we are afraid of that which might happen. Now is thought one of the causes or the cause of fear? So what is thought? What is thinking? The most ignorant, who does not know how to read or write, who lives in a small village, poverty ridden, unhappy, he thinks too, as you think, as the scientist thinks. So thinking is shared by all. So it is not your thinking. It is not individual thinking. I know it is difficult to accept this. Go into it. You think at the moment, I hope. And we are asking: is thought one of the factors of fear? And so we are investigating what is thinking. Thinking is shared by all humanity whether the most educated, sophisticated, rich, powerful and all the rest of it, or by the most simple ignorant half-starving person. It is common to all, therefore it is not your thinking. You may express your thinking differently and I may express it in different words, but the fact is that we both think and thinking is not yours or mine. It is thinking.

So what is thinking? Why has it become so extraordinarily important in your life? Please understand this. Give your mind to this. Because love and thinking cannot go together. Compassion is not the product of thought. Love cannot exist in the shadow of thought. Love is not remembrance. So we must understand, please give your heart and mind to the understanding of this, that thinking is common to all of us. It is not individual thinking. You may express it differently and another express it differently, most scholastically, most capable but another may not. But thinking is shared by all.

So what is thinking? When that question is put to you, you

begin to think, don't you, or do you listen to the question? If you listen to the question, which is, your mind is not interfering with your conclusions, with your ideas and so on. If you are listening with all your attention, which means with all your senses totally awakened, then you will see for yourself what is the origin of thinking. The origin of thinking is experience. Experience gives knowledge, whether it is scientific knowledge or the knowledge about your wife or husband. Experience, knowledge, stored in the brain as memory and response of memory is thinking. Right? This is very simple. It is a fact. You cannot think if there is no memory, if there is no knowledge, if there is no experience. So thinking is a process of time. Right? Because knowledge is a process of time, and knowledge being never complete about anything, including your wife or your husband or about your guru, knowledge can never be complete, therefore thought can never be complete, it must always be fragmented. Is that clear?

So fear is the child of thought. Right? I am afraid because I have done something not right, that I might be condemned for it. That is, to think about it. You understand this is simple enough. So thought and time are the factors of fear.

Now, is thought different from time, or thought is time? Thought is a movement, isn't it? It is a material process. Whatever thought has done is material. Your gods are created by thought; your rituals are created by thought; all the things that go on in the name of religion are created by thought: the gods, the gurus, everything is created by thought. And thought being limited, fragmented, because knowledge is limited, and all action then becomes limited. And where there is limitation, there must be fear.

So we are asking, do thought and time work together or are they different? Or there is only thought which, divides as time, as progress, as evolution, as becoming? Sirs, as we said, please explore all this, search out. Don't let your brains become dull by knowledge, by doing all the rubbish we do. Life is both intellect, emotion, senses. But if you let thought dominate them all, as we do, then our life becomes fragmented, shallow, empty.

We ought to talk over together what is love: would you say that you love somebody, love without attachment, love without jealousy? If there is attachment, there is no love. If there is any kind of antagonism, hate, love cannot exist. Where there is fear, love cannot exist. Where there is ambition, love cannot exist; where there is power of any kind, the other cannot be. If you have power over your wife or if you possess your husband, if you are ambitious, then love is not. So we are asking, do you love, because without love, suffering will go on.

So we ought also to enquire - perhaps not enquire - search out, seek out whether there is a possibility of ending sorrow because all these are linked together. Sorrow is not different from fear. Sorrow is not different from thought. Sorrow is not different from hate, the wounds, the psychological wounds that we receive. They are all related to each other. It is one issue, not separate issues. It is something that you have to approach wholly, not partially. But if you approach it intellectually, ideally or idealistically, romantically, then you don't see the wholeness of life. So we are asking, we are searching out if there is a possibility of ending sorrow.

Fear, pleasure, and sorrow have existed from time beyond

thought. Man has always had these three factors in life - fear, the pursuit of pleasure and sorrow. And apparently man has not gone beyond that. They have tried every method, every system that you can think of: they have tried to suppress it, they have tried to escape from it, they have tried to invent a god and surrender all this to that invention, but that has not worked either. So we must find out whether sorrow can end. And to understand the nature of sorrow, the cause of sorrow, is the cause different from fear, is the cause different from pleasure, pleasure of achievement, pleasure of possession, pleasure of having great power, pleasure of talent, pleasure of wealth. I do not know if you have not noticed, this country is becoming more and more materialistic. Money matters an awful lot to all of you and yet you go and worship not god, money. If you are pursuing the path of material happiness, you are going to end up in such chaos. And the world is doing that. There is threat of war - the atom bomb. That is the end of materialism. But you don't understand all this.

So let us find out whether sorrow and fear can ever end? And the pursuit of pleasure is infinite, is endless, not only sexual pleasure, the pleasure of becoming something, the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of being attached to somebody, whether that attachment is to a person, to an idea or to a conclusion. And while you are pursuing that pleasure, there is always the shadow of fear with it. And where there is fear, there is sorrow. So please don't take one thing as though it is something separate - fear is separate. But they are all together, they are all interrelated and one must deal with them all wholly, not separately. If that is clear and we are not dealing with sorrow separately, as though it was

something different from fear. So we are looking, searching out the nature of sorrow and the ending of sorrow because where there is sorrow there is no love. Sorrow expresses itself in so many ways: the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of seeing this vast country - poverty, corruption, utter disregard for another human being, carelessness. When you watch all this day after day that is also sorrow. The utter neglect of all the politicians right all over the world, they only want power, position and where there is power, there is evil. And sorrow is the loss of some one you love, whatever that love may mean. Sorrow of losing, sorrow of ending something you have cherished, something that you have held on to; the sorrow of doubt, the sorrow of seeing one's own life such an empty shell, meaningless existence. You may have money, sex, children, be very fashionable, rich but it is an empty life. There is no depth in it. Seeing that, perceiving the nature of it, is also sorrow. The sorrow of a man who has everything and nothing. The sorrow of ignorance. So can sorrow end? It is not your sorrow, it is also mine and another's. Don't deal with sorrow as your particular precious stuff; it is shared by all humanity. But when you deal with it as your particular sorrow, your private quiet sorrow, it is the sorrow of all human beings, whether you are a man or a woman, rich or poor, sophisticated or at the height of your excellence.

So please do not deal with all these factors like fear, pleasure, sorrow, love and so on as something separate from each other. All that is yours, your secret pleasure, your secret sorrow. You must approach this whole thing wholly, not fragmentarily, if you approach it fragmentarily you will never solve it. You see this country is separating itself from all other countries. America is

separating from all other countries. England, Russia and each country is trying to solve its own problems - poverty, lack of food, ignorance - not of books, that is fairly cheap, but ignorance of oneself. So either the politicians awake one day and see there must be a global relationship, not national relationship, global human relationship. One wants to cry when such appalling things are going on. So please look at greed, pain, sorrow, as a movement of life, as a whole movement of life, not something different from life. This is our daily life. And to find out whether there is an end to all this - to misery, to conflict, pain, sorrow and fear - one must be able to perceive them, one must be able to be aware of them. So we must understand what is perception, how to look at all this? Is the observer who looks at all this - the poverty, the loneliness, the anxiety, the uncertainty, the suffering - is all that different from the observer or all that is the observer? I will explain this.

We have separated the 'me' who is the observer, as different from that which he is observing. I say I am suffering, and I say to myself that suffering must end, and to end it I must suppress it, I must escape from it, I must follow a certain system. So I am different from fear, from pleasure, from pain, sorrow. Are you different from all that? Or you may think that there is something in you which is totally different from all that. If you think that, that is part of your thought, and therefore there is nothing sacred there. So, please, is the observer different from the observed? Don't make it absurd. You see a tree and when you say, am I different from the tree, you are I hope. But when you are angry, envious, brutal, violent, are you not all that? The meditator is the meditation. Yes, sir, think about it. So the observer is the observed. See the

importance of this. Before we have divided the observer from the observed. That means there is a division between that and the other. So there was conflict. You could then control it, suppress it, fight it, but if you are that, if you are sorrow, if you are fear, if you are pleasure, you are this whole conglomeration of all this. And to realize that fact is a tremendous reality. Therefore, there is no division and therefore there is no conflict. Then the observer is the observed. Then a totally different action takes place, a totally different chemical action takes place.

It is not an intellectual achievement, but to see the truth of it, not the intellectual concept of the truth but to see the fact that you are not different from your qualities. You are not different from your anger, jealousy, hatred, but you are all that. You know what happens when you realize that, not verbally but inwardly? Find out. You are waiting for me to tell you? I won't! You see how your mind works. You are waiting for me to tell you. You don't want to find out. If I tell you then you will say, yes, right or wrong, but you will go on, But when you find out for yourself the actual truth of it, that the observer is the observed, the watcher is the watched. When you watch the moon, the full moon of yesterday rising out of that smog, that moon is not you, unless you are loony. But you are the whole bundle of your consciousness, the content of your consciousness is what you are and the content of that consciousness is put together by thought. Now to find out, not the ending of thought but to find out how to observe the content. When you observe without the division, then a totally different action takes place. Where there is love, there is no observer, there is no you and the one that you love; there is only that quality of love.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH JANUARY 1983

This is the last talk. We have talked about a great many things which concern our daily life. We ought to talk over together the significance of death, not that it is a morbid subject. Also we should have a dialogue about what is religion and meditation. But before we go into all that, I wonder if one is aware of what is happening to our minds, to our brains; if one is aware of the extraordinary capacity of the brain in the technological world, the extraordinary things that the brain, which is the seat of thought, has brought about; extraordinary things are happening in the technological world of which most of us are unaware. And technologically we have progressed, advanced so rapidly, and psychologically - that is what we are, our behaviour, our attitudes, our actions - we are more or less unevolved. We are still aggressive, brutal, cruel, thoughtless - for thousands and thousands of years. And apparently man is still behaving more or less as he behaved 40,000 years ago. And if one had that same energy, that same intensity as one uses in the technological world, if we could go very, very deeply into ourselves and go beyond ourselves, the brain has infinite capacity there too. But very few have taken that journey, very few have gone into this question whether the mind, the brain, can ever be free, totally free and therefore enquire very, very deeply, search out what lies beyond, if there is anything beyond thought. And we are going to talk over that presently.

Some of you perhaps have heard of genetic engineering. That is, man has not progressed, evolved to the same extent as the

technological effort. So the genetic experts say that they assume a factor, a creative element handed down from the father to the offspring, certain tendencies, qualities. This is what is called partly the beginning of genetic engineering. They are saying since man, you, have not changed fundamentally for thousands of years, perhaps, and they assume that man can be changed through genetic interference. We are putting it very, very briefly. It is a very complex question which we are not going to discuss. But we must understand what is going on. That as human beings have not deeply changed their characteristics, their way of life, their violence, they are hoping through certain chemicals and so on to change the genes, the factors of that create certain characteristics from the father to the son.

And also we should consider what is happening in the computer world. We cannot neglect all this - the genetic engineering and what is happening in the computer world. They are trying, perhaps successfully or not, to create a mechanical intelligence, ultimate intelligence through the computer which will then think much more rapidly, more accurately and inform the robots what they should do. This is happening already. And they are trying, we have talked to others about this matter, they are trying to bring about a machine, a computer which has ultimate intelligence. You understand all this?

So there is on the one side genetic engineering, on the other the computer taking, acting, as human beings, inventing generation after generation of the computer, improving, and so on. I won't go into all that. So what is going to happen to the human mind? What is going to happen to us when the computer can do almost

everything that we do? It can meditate, it can invent gods, much better gods than yours, it can inform, educate your children far better than the present teacher, educators, and it will create a great deal of leisure to man. One has seen in Japan on a television, a computer instructing a robot how to build a car and the robot did some mistake, the whole machinery stopped and the computer told him what went wrong, and the computer did the right thing, and the whole thing started. You are understanding the nature of all this, the significance of all this? That is, what is going to happen to our minds when the computer and the genetic engineering are rapidly advancing, what is going to happen to us?

We would have more leisure, the computer plus the robot will do a great many things that we are doing now in factories, in offices and so on. Then man will have more leisure. And how will he use that leisure? You understand? Please go into this with me for a while. If the computer can outthink you, remember far more than you do, calculate with such astonishing speed and gives you leisure, either you pursue the path of pleasure which is entertainment - cinemas, religious entertainments, you know all the industry of entertainment, including gurus - and either entertainment or psychological search, seek out inwardly and find out for oneself a tremendous area that is beyond all thought. These are the only two possibilities left for us: entertainment or delve into the whole structure of the psyche and acting. Now we are asking what is our human mind, our brain. We are going to find out for ourselves.

So please, as we have said over and over again, we are thinking together, you are not merely listening to the speaker, accepting

some words, ideas, or we are communicating with each other, thinking together and finding out.

So we first begin by asking what is the significance of death. It is not an old man's question. It is the question of all humanity whether we are very young or very old. What is the meaning, the significance, of the extraordinary thing called death? Yesterday evening, we talked about several things including what is love, compassion. What is the relationship of life which is not only the whole human existence, what is its relationship to love, to death and to the whole search of man for thousands of years to find something that is beyond all thought? We have to understand the meaning of death because we are all going to die, thank the Lord. Right? We are all going to die. That is an absolute certainty. And we are so afraid of it or we rationalize it. You say, yes, I accept it. I accept death as I accept pain; as I accept sorrow, as I accept loneliness, I also accept death. Which is to submit, to suffer death, to allow the whole of existence of a human being to come to an end, either through disease, through old age or through some incident. We have never found out what it means to die while we are living, not commit suicide but to understand the depth of it. I hope we are together looking at it. We are looking at it as an incident of life, as a fact of life, as violence is a fact of life, as hatred is a fact of life. And we must if we are at all reasonable, sane, we must look at this question of death in a similar manner, not accept it, not just say it is inevitable or try to find out what lies beyond death, but to observe the nature of dying.

What does death mean to most of us? Please we are asking this question not rhetorically but to find out. Surely it means the ending

both organically, biologically and to all the things that we have held dear, to all the wounds, pains, sacrifice, resistance, loneliness, despair all that coming to an end. Which means either there is a continuity of the self, the 'me' or the ending of the 'me'. You are following all this. We said death is an ending.

You can believe in reincarnation, as most of you perhaps do. If you do, you have to ask the question, what is it that continues. Is there a continuity or is there constant change - breaking, ending, beginning? You are following all this? So if you believe as most people perhaps in India believe, that you are going to be reborn and what is it that is going to be reborn? Surely not the physical body, but if you believe in that, it is a continuity of what you are now, continuity of your beliefs, your activities, your greed and so on and so on. That is the bundle which is the consciousness, which is the self. That self which is essentially consciousness is put together by thought, your greed, your envy, your religious belief, superstitions, your anger and so on, all those are the activities of thought. You are the result of a continuous movement of thought. And if you believe in reincarnation and all that, you must find out if it is an illusion or a reality. If you are your name, your form, your ideas, your conclusions, your experiences, are they the factor of continuity as the 'me' in the next life?

Now what is that 'me'? Go on, sirs, please search out with the speaker. This is a very important question. Each one of us, we think, is a separate entity, so-called individuals. And what is that individuality? The name, the form, what you remember, your attitudes, your loneliness, your pain, your anxiety, your chaos, your sorrow and uncertainty. You may have a bank account or not; you

may live in a nice house or a small little room or a nice flat, but you are all that. You are the bank account. Are you following all this? When you are attached to a bank account, you are that bank account; when you are attached to a house, you are the house; when you are attached to your body, you are that. You may have lovely furniture, perhaps thirteenth, fourteenth century and it is marvellous furniture, and if you are attached to that you are that furniture. So you are all that, which is what? Go on sirs, think it out please. When you are attached to a chair, to a person, to an idea, to an ideal, to a personal experience, what are the implications of that attachment?

Why are you attached, because death says you cannot be attached. That is the end of it. You may believe in the future but death says, you have ended, your attachment is over, your bank account is over, your guru and all your following is over. Right? So what is it that continues, that is reborn? Memories, ideas? Which is what? Something dead? Or there is no continuity at all? Think, search out, please. Continuity means that which is goes on modifying itself. You are becoming something, and achieving it and wanting more. Continuity implies security, certainty. Are you certain about anything? Is there security in your ideas? So we want continuity. We hope to have continuity because in continuity we think there is security. One has been married for ten years, fifteen years or five years, or fifty years, there is certain continuity - legal responsibility but in that continuity there is conflict, misery, unhappiness and all the rest of that, in that relationship. So there is no continuity at all. There is constant change if you are aware of it. Either that can be superficial or a total mutation - not

transformation but mutation, change, that which has existed completely undergoes a change.

One must find out for oneself, what is the fact, what is the truth of this matter? One cannot be convinced by argument, by so-called evidence and so on. One cannot be convinced about anything. One has to search out, seek and find what is true and what is illusion. We have lived with this illusion that we are separate entities. Whereas if you examine very closely, our consciousness which is you, is shared by all humanity. They suffer as you suffer; they are uncertain, as you; they are lonely, miserable, confused, anxious, as you are. So your consciousness is not yours. It is the consciousness of all humanity. So you are the entire humanity. It is not mere logical conclusion or observation, that is a fact. And we have been trained, educated both religiously, educationally that we are separate individuals. So we are frightened that individuality should come to an end. You are following all this? But if one sees the reality, the truth that you are the rest of mankind, and then what is death? You understand? Instead of being frightened I may die and I hope to live next life, and I who wish to have continuity and hoping that continuing will modify, change gradually till it reaches god knows what, such a thought, such concept as an individual when one approaches the question of death, there is immense fear of ending.

Have you ever enquired what is the nature of ending, not ending to begin something, ending? That is, you are attached, that is a common fact; attached to your children, attached to your husband, and wife, attached to something or other. And death comes along and wipes away that attachment. You can't carry your money to

heaven. You may like to have it till the last moment but you cannot take it with you, and death says, 'No'. So can we living, understand the nature of attachment with all its fear, jealousy, anxiety, possessive feeling, while living, be free of attachment? You are following all this? Are you following what we are talking about? While you are alive, to end something voluntarily, easily without any pressure, without any reward or punishment, to end. In that there is great beauty. Then one understands the nature of freedom.

In the ending, there is no beginning, something new. There is an ending. And when there is an ending, there is that feeling of total freedom of all the burden that humanity has carried for centuries. One knows that you listen to all this, smile, nod your head and agree but you will go on being attached. That is the easiest way, the most comforting and the most painful, anxious, but you will go on. And you call that practical. Whereas if you understand the nature of ending, ending your ambition in a very, very, competitive world, understand the ending of your arrogance, your pride, your status. So when this so-called organism ends, the content of consciousness of humanity goes on, unless you bring about a radical change in that consciousness, a mutation so that you are no longer in that stream of selfishness; you are no longer caught, encaged, put in prison of attachment, uncertainty and so on. There is a totally different way of living.

And also we should talk about religion. Again it is a very complex question. And together we are going to find out what is a religious mind, a mind that is religious, not the mind that does puja, you know all the ceremonials and all the beliefs and all that. That is not religion, that is all the inventions of thought. God is

your invention because you find life so dull, boring. It is such a pain, so you invent god who is all perfect, all loving, you know all that stuff. And you worship that. You worship that which you have put together by thought. So thought is deceiving you. I wonder if you understand all this. But you will go on, because you love to live in illusion. So we must find out what is a religious mind because a religious mind brings about a new world, a new civilization, a new culture, a new outburst of energy. So one must find out for oneself, not be told, not be directed, not to be explained like a lot of children what is a religious mind? Obviously all the religions in the world are the result of a great deal of intrigue, property, a great deal of wealth, all put together by thought. There is no denying that, however erudite you are, however sceptical you are or however religious you are - religious in the ordinary sense of that word. If you are willing to examine, as you must, if you are at all concerned with what is happening in the world and what is happening around you, you must enquire what is religion, not accept it, not believe it, not having faith, because such activities are related to one's own desires, comforts, thought.

So what is a religious mind? You can only find out if you deny totally all the present religious structure, religious beliefs and ideas because it is only a free mind that can find out what is the quality of a religious mind. First of all, one can see very clearly freedom is essential; not freedom from something, a prisoner wanting freedom which means away from a prison. First he is caught in a prison, then he wants freedom to leave that prison. That is only a reaction. Right? That reaction is not freedom. Freedom implies the total ending of all illusions, of all belief, of all your accumulated wants,

desires. That freedom is something totally different from the desire to be free. A religious mind is a sane, healthy factual mind, faces facts, not ideas. The speaker can go on explaining what is a religious mind. Perhaps you will accept the definitions or deny the definitions but merely arguing, analyzing, questioning may help, but it may not necessarily bring about a religious mind.

We have become too clever. So one has to have a great humility, a sense of not knowing. And also a religious mind acts, because it is compassionate. And that action is born of intelligence. Intelligence, compassion, love all go together.

What is meditation. Don't suddenly sit up properly. That has no meaning. You may sit cross-legged, breathe properly, practise various systems, that is not meditation. We are going to enquire, search out for ourselves what is meditation? The word meditation means, the word, according to a good dictionary, to ponder over, to think over, to look closely, to come in touch with, not something sublime, invented by thought, but come close and touch your daily life. That is the ordinary dictionary meaning of that word meditation. And also meditation implies measurement. The meaning of that word is to measure, also to think over, to ponder over, to consider and to measure. That is the meaning of that word. So we begin by asking why do we measure? What do we mean by measurement? Are we talking together, or are you going to sleep? Are we both meeting each other or is the speaker instructing you? If you are thinking he is instructing you, then you are totally wrong. He is not instructing you, he is not telling you what to do. But together find out what is meditation. We must ask, why is there in our mind and heart this constant measurement? Measurement

means comparison. To compare myself with you, who are beautiful, clear, certain, the whole feeling of your being is totally different from me. And I compare myself with you, wanting to be like you, wanting to be like your guru, like your highest - whatever the example is.

Why do we compare at all in life? And we say, we compare in order to make progress. In the technological world you have to compare. There must be measurement. Measurement was invented by the ancient Greeks - to measure. And with us, we are always comparing: you are beautiful, I am not; I want to be as beautiful, as powerful as you are. Right? We want to be enlightened as you are. So there is always this competition of comparison between us. We are never free of that movement; but if we are free, then what are we? You understand my question? If you don't compare, as you must compare between two materials, two clothes, or two cars, there you must naturally compare, but in human relationship why do we compare? And is it possible to be free of comparison, the ending of comparison? If you don't, then you throw away a great burden that has no reality. Because then you are what you are. From there you can begin. But if you are always comparing, becoming somebody else, then you are fundamentally unhappy, anxious, frightened, and all the rest of it.

So please ask the question of yourself whether you can live without comparison, without any form of measurement, which is quite difficult, because we are trained, educated, convinced that we are this, but we will become that. The 'becoming that' is a form of measurement. To live without a single movement of measurement, that is part of meditation. And most people who meditate now

follow various systems. Each one has his own guru and he has laid down certain systems of meditation and you practise, repeat certain words over and over and over again, and you call that meditation. When you repeat over and over again, what is happening to your brain? You become more and more dull, you become a machine, and you think that is meditation. And you will go on doing it in spite of what the speaker is saying.

So in enquiring what is meditation, there can be no system, no effort. Effort means conflict. Right sir? Can you be free of systems, practice, realizing the fact that your brain, your senses become dull? And perhaps that is what has happened to this country, the tragedy of it. You are copying all the technology of the West. You have your own aeroplanes, your own guns, your own shells, your own computers, all from the West. And the West is making you more and more materialistic. We are not talking, we are not condemning the West. They have their own problems, as you have. So can you be free of systems? It is so logical, so sensible, so sane that when you practise over and over again, sitting straight - you know all that silly stuff - you are becoming gradually mechanical, gradually dull, like those people who belong to certain communities, form little groups. You can't talk to them reasonably. They believe, they practise, and they are killing themselves. So can the mind, the brain realize what it means to follow somebody; to obey what somebody else tells you what to do, because he has got a different dress, calls himself a guru, all those things have destroyed the beauty of a religious mind.

And meditation is none of these things, yoga included. Standing on your head and doing all those things, none of them are

meditation, obviously. Then what is meditation? We want experience. You are craving for some strange experience, so-called spiritual experiences. We have enough of experiences in this world, of pain, anxiety, sorrow, and we say we must have something more, greater experience. Experience has nothing whatsoever to do with meditation. To experience there must be an experiencer, and if there is an experiencer, that experiencer is the continuity of past memories which is the self. Meditation is the understanding of the whole structure of the 'me', the self, the ego, and whether it is possible to be totally free of the self, not seek some super-self. The super-self is still the self.

So meditation is something which is not a cultivated, determined activity. There must be freedom and where there is freedom there is space. I wonder if we understand what space is. Have we space, apart from the physical world? Have we, living in Bombay, space? Hardly. We live in a little flat or a little room and our minds gradually accept that little space. We are talking of space which has no walls. You know when you look at the sea, when the smog has gone and you see the far horizon, the vast distance, and when you look up at the stars and see their extraordinary brightness and vast space, and the space that you have in your mind, how small it is, how narrow it is. That space in your heart and mind is so controlled, shaped, put together, so there is hardly any space in you. To understand that which is sacred, there must be vast space in you, not out there in the sea. You understand? Space is not separation. Space is not division. When you divide there is space between you and your wife, between you as India and another country. But that is not space. The space

demanded inwardly can only exist when there is no conflict whatsoever. Then when there is that vast limitless space of the mind, then only in that space there is energy, not the energy and friction of thought because that energy is born out of freedom.

When there is that space and silence and that immeasurable energy, then there is that which is utterly nameless, measureless, timeless, then there is that which is sacred. But to find that, one must have great love, great compassion which must begin at home. You must love your wife, your children, your husband. Love cannot exist with attachment. Then if it is attachment, then you have all the problems of life.

So, sirs and ladies, it is your life. Either you bring about a great radical psychological revolution in yourself, or the chemists, the experts of the genetic world are going to make you do something. Then you will become merely machines. Then life will have very little meaning. But there is great significance, great meaning, if you are aware what love is, compassion and intelligence, and out of that comes great silence and vast space. All that cannot exist if there is any shadow of selfishness. And this is meditation, not the repetition of words, not the discipline of will but the discipline of order which comes when there is no conflict. Right sirs?

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH PUPUL JAYAKAR 24TH JUNE 1983

PJ: Krishnaji, there is a strange phenomenon happening in the world today where the East reaches out to the West to find sustenance, and the West reaches out to the East for - in inverted commas - wisdom to fill some vacuum which exists. Would you say there in an Indian mind which may have the same directions, or contain the same elements of sorrow, greed, anger, etc., but where the ground from which these spring is different?

K: Are you asking, whether the Eastern thought, Eastern culture, Eastern way of life, is different from the West?

PJ: Well obviously the Indian way of life is different to the West.

K: It is.

PJ: Because the conditionings of the two are different. But they in a sense complement each other.

K: In what way?

PJ: In the sense that the East, or India more specifically, lacks perhaps that precision of carrying an abstraction to concrete action.

K: Are you saying they live more in abstractions?

PJ: Yes. They are not so concerned about action in the environment, action as such.

K: What would you say they are concerned with?

PJ: Today, of course, there is a great change taking place, it is very difficult to say what the Indian mind is. Because the Indian mind today is looking at one level for the same material comforts...

K: ...progress in the technological world.

PJ: Yes, progress in the technological world.

K: And applying it in daily life.

PJ: And consumerism.

K: Consumerism, yes.

PJ: It has percolated very deep into the Indian spirit.

K: So what ultimately is the difference between the Indian mind, Indian culture, and the Western culture?

PJ: Perhaps still, in spite of this material overtone, there is a certain edge to the delving process, if I may put it. When it goes into the field of...

K: Parapsychology?

PJ: No, not parapsychology - parapsychology is very developed in the West. But I am talking about this delving into the self, delving into the within, the insights into things. For centuries the Indian mind has been nurtured on a ground of this feeling. Whereas, from a certain time in the West, there was a movement away. And there has always been a movement away right from the time of the Greeks towards the outer, the environment.

K: I understand. But the other day I heard on the television, a very well known Indian was being interviewed. He said the technological world now in India is humanizing the Indian mind.

PJ: No. I understand that.

K: I wonder what he meant by that, humanizing. Instead of living in abstractions, and theories, and complexity of ideations and so on, the technological world is bringing them to earth.

PJ: And perhaps it is necessary to some extent.

K: Obviously it is necessary.

PJ: So if these two minds have a different essence...

K: I question that very much, whether the Indian thought - I am sorry, I don't mean that - whether thought is ever East or West. There is only thought, it is not Eastern thought, or Western thought. The expression of thoughts may be different in India, and here it may be different, but it is still a process of thought.

PJ: But is it also not true that what the brain cells contain in the West and perhaps the centuries of knowledge and so-called wisdom in the East have given a content to the brain cells which make them perceive in a different way?

K: I wonder how accurate what you are saying is. I would like to question what you are saying, if I may. I find when I go there, there is much more materialism now than there used to be.

PJ: Yes.

K: More concerned with money, position, power and all that. And of course there is over population, and all the complexity of modern civilization. Are you saying that the Indian mind has a tendency to an inward search, much more so than the West?

PJ: I would say so. Just as the Western mind has...

K: ...a technical.

PJ: ...not only technological but environmental...

K: Yes, environmental, economic and so on, ecological.

PJ: The outer. There is the inner environment and the outer environment. I think if you take it that way I would say the outer environment is the concern of the West, and the inner environment has been the concern of the East, of India.

K: It has been the concern, but it has been the concern of a very, very few people.

PJ: But it is only the few people who create the culture. How

does culture come into being?

K: That is a question that we should discuss. Before we go into that, is there really a distinction between the Eastern thought and Western thought? I would like to establish that. Or there is only this extraordinary phenomenon of the world being divided into the East and the West.

PJ: But what has divided it?

K: Geographically, first; politically, economically, as a much more ancient civilization - if I can use that word - than the West. All that is the Indian mind - if you can use that word mind with regard to all that. The Western world is much more concerned, as far as I can see, I may be mistaken, with worldly affairs.

PJ: But what turned it in that direction?

K: Climate, much more, very much more, it is a colder climate, and all the inventions, and all the modern technology comes from the Northern part of the world, the northern people.

PJ: Yes, but if it was only climate then...

K: No, it is not only the climate.

PJ: Because Africa, Equatorial Africa...

K: Of course not, of course not.

PJ: ...would have the same mind.

K: No, no.

PJ: But it is not that.

K: It is not only the climate. It is the climate and the whole so-called religious way of life in the West is very, very different from the East.

PJ: That's what I am saying. Somewhere along the line people of one racial stock, seemingly, divided.

K: Divided, yes, from Sumaria and so on.

PJ: And the direction in which the West turned was the discovery of their dialogue with nature, out of which arose technology, out of it arose all the great scientific fine truths. India also had a dialogue with nature...

K: But of a different nature.

PJ: ...of a different nature. The dialogues were in themselves of a different kind.

K: So are you trying to say that the Eastern mind, the Indian mind, is more concerned with religious matters than the West? Here in the West it is all rather superficial, though they think it is rather deep. And there, in India, tradition, literature and everything says the world is not so important as the understanding of the self, the understanding of the universe, the understanding of the highest principle, Brahman.

PJ: This swiftness with which the mind can start the enquiry is perhaps different to the West, where enquiry, insights, the great insights have been in different directions.

K: Of course. But here in religious matters, doubt, scepticism, questioning, is absolutely denied. Faith is all important here. In Indian religion, in Buddhism and so on, doubt, questioning, enquiry becomes all important.

PJ: So out of this today somehow both the cultures are in crisis.

K: Yes, of course. Would you say not only cultures, but the whole human consciousness is in a crisis?

PJ: Would you distinguish human consciousness from culture?

K: No.

PJ: In a sense they are the same.

K: No, basically they are not.

PJ: So the crisis at the very root is making them search some way away from themselves. They feel an inadequacy so they turn to the other culture. It is happening in both countries.

K: But you see, Pupulji, I am questioning whether in their search from their materialistic outlook, if I may use that word, they have been caught by all kinds of superstitious, romantic, occult ideas, and these gurus that come over here, and all the rest of it. What I want to find out is whether human consciousness, if it is in a crisis, as it is, whether it is possible not only to resolve that crisis, without war destroying humanity, whether human beings can ever go beyond their own limitation. I don't know if I am making myself clear?

PJ: Sir, may I just?

K: Of course, this is a discussion.

PJ: The outer and the inner is like the material and the search within. It is two mirror images of these two directions in which man has moved. The problem really is that if man has to survive the two have to be...

K: They must live together.

PJ: Not live together, but a human culture come into being which would contain both.

K: Now what do you mean by the word culture? What do you mean by culture?

PJ: Isn't culture everything that the brain possesses?

K: That is, would you say the training of the brain and refining of the brain?

PJ: The training of the brain and the refinement of the brain.

K: And the expression of that refinement in action, in behaviour, in relationship, and also a process of enquiry that leads to something totally untouched by thought? I would say this is culture.

PJ: Would you include enquiry in the field of culture?

K: Of course.

PJ: Isn't culture a closed circuit?

K: You can make of it that way, or you can break it and go beyond.

PJ: But to take culture as a closed circuit, today culture, as it exists...

K: That's why I want to understand what you mean by culture.

PJ: As we understand it today, Krishnaji, it is our perception, the way we look at things, our thoughts, our feelings, our attitudes, the operation of our senses. You could keep on adding to this.

K: That is the religion, faith, belief, superstition.

PJ: The outer and the inner, which keeps on growing. It may be growing but it is all growing within that contour. It remains a contour. And when you talk of a search which in no way connected with this, would you include it...

K: Search?

PJ: Well, enquiry, search, observation.

K: I understand.

PJ: You can use any word.

K: Of course, of course.

PJ: But would you put it into the field of culture?

K: Of course. Would you say, I am just trying to clarify the matter, would you say the whole movement of culture is like a tide

going out and coming in, like the sea, going out and coming in. And the human endeavour is this process of going out and coming in, and never enquiring whether that process can ever stop. You understand? What I mean is we act and react. That's the human nature. Act and react, like the ebb and flow. I react, and out of that reaction act, and from that action react, back and forth. Right? Now I am asking whether this reaction of reward and punishment can stop and take a totally different turn? We function, we live, and our reactions are based on reward and punishment. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Physically, psychologically and in every way. And that's all we know, deeply. Now I am asking whether there is this reaction of reward and the avoidance of punishment, and so on, is there another sense of action which is not based on this action, reaction? You understand what I am talking about?

PJ: As this action, reaction is an impulse of the brain cells...

K: It is our conditioning.

PJ: And it is an impulse of the brain cells.

K: Yes, of course.

PJ: It is the way the brain cells respond, and the way they receive through the senses. Now the question you asked...

K: Our question is really, we are enquiring into what is culture.

PJ: What is culture, and we went into that. It can be expanded much further, but still it remains within the same field.

K: The same field but you can enlarge the field.

PJ: Would you say then that culture is that which is contained in the brain cells?

K: Of course.

PJ: Anything else?

K: All our past memories.

PJ: So if you take all that is there anything else?

K: I understand. Now this is a difficult question because one must be careful, very careful. If there is something else, if, then that something else can operate on the brain cells which are conditioned. Right? If there is something in the brain, then the activity of that something else can bring about freedom from this narrow, limited culture. But is there something else within the brain?

PJ: But even physiologically they are saying, Krishnaji, that the operation of the brain cells today is a very, very minute portion of its capacity.

K: I know that. Why?

PJ: Because conditioning limits it, and it has never been free of those processes which limit it.

K: Which means thought is limited.

PJ: Yes. It has put all its eggs in one basket.

K: Thought is limited. And we are all functioning within that limitation, because thought, experience is limited, knowledge is limited for ever, and memory, and thought. So thought is limited.

PJ: What place have the senses in the perceptive process in this?

K: No. That brings another question, which is: can the senses operate without the interference of thought? You understand my question?

PJ: As they operate today, Krishnaji, they seem to have one root. The movement of the senses as they operate is the movement of thought.

K: Therefore it is limited.

PJ: So when you ask a question is it possible for them, what does one do with a question of that type?

K: I am enquiring. I am enquiring with a lot of hesitation and a certain amount of scepticism, whether the brain, which has evolved through thousands of years, experience, untold sorrow, loneliness, despair, and all the rest of it, and its search to escape from its own fears through every form of religious endeavour, whether those brain cells in themselves can ever change, bring about a mutation in themselves. Otherwise a totally different new culture...

PJ: If they don't bring about a mutation in themselves and there is nothing else...

K: I understand your question.

PJ: You see this is a paradox.

K: This is also an everlasting question. I mean the Hindus raised it long ago, many, many centuries ago - you probably know much more about it than I do - they raised this question: which is, is there an outside agency, god, the highest principle and so on and so on, the higher self - that's wrong, a higher self.

PJ: The highest principle.

K: Whether that can operate on the conditioned brain.

PJ: Or is it, sir, can it awaken within the brain? There are two things. One is an outside...

K: ...agency.

PJ: ...agency, or energy operating; or from within the brain cells, the untapped portion of the brain cells, an awakening which transforms.

K: I understand. I understand this question. Let's enquire, let's

discuss it. Is there an outside agency, outside energy let's call it for the moment, that will bring about a mutation in the brain cells, which are conditioned? Right?

PJ: May I say something?

K: Please.

PJ: The problem is that energy really never touches the brain cells. There are so many obstacles one has built that the flow of energy from nature, from...

K: Energy.

PJ: ...energy never seems to touch and create.

K: What are we two discussing?

PJ: We are discussing the possibility of a human culture.

K: A culture which is not...

PJ: ...either of India or of the West. Which contains all mankind, if I may say so.

K: All humanity which is not Western, or Eastern.

PJ: And the division between the outer and the inner ends. And insight is insight, not insight into the outer or insight into the inner.

K: So what?

PJ: So for that the instrument is the brain cells, the tool which operates is the brain cells.

K: Is the brain.

PJ: The brain. Now something has to happen in the brain.

K: Yes, I say it can happen. Without the idea that there is an outside agency that will somehow cleanse the brain which has been conditioned, or invent an outside agency, as most religions have done. Right? Or can the conditioned brain awaken to its own conditioning and so perceive its own limitation, and stay there for a

moment? I don't know if I am making my point clear. You see we are all the time, are we not, trying to do something, which is the doer is different from that which is being done. Right? I realize, for example, suppose I realize, that my brain is conditioned and so all my activity, my feelings, and my relationship with others, is limited. I realize that. And then I say that limitation must be broken down. So I am operating on the limitation. But the 'I' is also limited, the 'I' is not separate from the other. If we can bridge that, that the 'I' is not separate from the limitation which he is trying to break down. Right? Both the limitation of the self and the limitation of the conditioning are similar, not separate. The 'I' is not separate from its own qualities.

PJ: And from what it observes.

K: And one part observes the other part.

PJ: When you say that we all the time are trying to do something...

K: Operate on the other.

PJ: ...operate on the other.

K: Our whole life is that, apart from the technological world and so on. I am this and I must change that. So the brain is now conditioned in this division. The actor is different from the action.

PJ: That of course, yes.

K: And so that condition goes on. But when one realizes the actor is the action, then the whole outlook changes altogether.

Let's come back for the moment. We are asking, Pupulji, are we not, what brings about a change in the human brain?

PJ: That is really the crucial point. What is it that makes it end?

K: Yes. Let's go into it a little bit more. Man has lived on this

earth for a million years, more, or less. And we are as primitive as we were before, psychologically. And we have not basically changed very much. We are killing each other, we are seeking power, position, we are corrupt, everything that human beings are doing in the world today, psychologically. And what will make human beings, humanity, change all that?

PJ: Great insight.

K: Wait. Insight. Now is so-called culture preventing all this? You understand my question? The Indian culture, take Indian culture, few people, great thinkers in India, have gone into this question. And the majority of the people just repeat, repeat, repeat, it is just tradition, a dead thing. And they are living with a dead thing. Right? Now, and here too tradition has a tremendous power...

PJ: Yes, because it is the other way - a few have great insights into science.

K: So looking at all this, what will make human beings radically bring about a mutation in themselves? Culture has tried to bring about certain changes in human behaviour. Right? And religions have said, behave this way, don't do this, don't kill, but they go on killing. Be brotherly, and they are not brotherly. Love one another, and they don't. These are the edicts, the sanctions, and we are doing everything quite the opposite.

PJ: But cultures have collapsed really.

K: That's what I want to find out. Whether it has collapsed and it has no value at all any more, and so man is now at a loss. If you go to America, for example, they have no tradition. Each one is doing what he likes, he is doing his thing! And they are doing the

same thing here in a different way. So what will bring about a mutation in the brain cells?

PJ: What you are saying is that it doesn't matter whether the Indian matrix is different, or the Western matrix is different, the problem is identical - the mutation in the human brain.

K: Yes, that's it. Let's stick to that. I mean after all Indians, even the poor Indians suffer as they suffer here - lonely, despair, misery, and all that, it is just the same as here. So let's forget the East and West and see what prevents this mutation taking place.

PJ: Sir, is there any other way but perceiving the actual?

K: The actual. That is what we have been maintaining for sixty years, that the 'what is', the actual, is more important than the idea of the actual. The ideal, the various concepts and conclusions have no value at all because you are away from the facts, from what is going on. Apparently that is tremendously difficult because we are caught up with ideas.

PJ: But in perceiving the actual there is no movement in the brain.

K: That's all I am saying. Facts, if one observes very carefully, in themselves bring about a change. I don't know if I am making it clear. Human sorrow is not Western sorrow or Eastern sorrow. Right? It is human sorrow. And we are always trying to move away from sorrow. Now could we understand the depth and the meaning of sorrow - not understand intellectually but actually delve into the nature of sorrow - and sorrow is not yours or mine. So what is impeding, or blocking the human brain from enquiring deeply within itself?

PJ: Sir, I want to ask one thing: you used the word delving, you

used the words enquiring into oneself - both are words connected with movement. Yet you say the ending of movement is...

K: Of course. Movement is time, movement is thought, the ending of movement - can that really end, or do we think it can end? You understand my question? After all, the people who have somewhat gone into this kind of thing, both in the past and the present, have always divided the entity that enquires and that which is to be enquired into to. That's my objection. I think that is the major block.

PJ: So when you use the word enquiry, do you use it as perception?

K: Perception, observing, watching. Now we will go into that in a minute, if we have time. But I want to come back to this, if I may: what will make human beings alter - very simply put - the way they behave? Very simply put. This appalling brutality, what will change all this? Who will change it? Not the politicians, not the priests, not the people who are talking about the environment, and the ecologists and so on and so on. They are not changing human beings. Who will change it, if man himself will not change, who will change it? The church has tried to change man and it hasn't succeeded. Religions have tried, throughout the world, to humanize, or make man more intelligent, more considerate, affectionate and so on, they have not succeeded. Culture has not succeeded.

PJ: But you say all this, Krishnaji, but that in itself does not bring man to that perception of that.

K: So what will make him? You perhaps, say for instance, you and another have this perception, I may not have it, so what affect

has your perception on me? Again if you have perception and power, position, I worship you or kill you. Right? So I am asking a much deeper question: I want really to find out why human beings, after so many millenia, are like this - one group against another group, one tribe against another tribe, one nation against another nation. The horror that is going on. A new culture, will that bring about a change? Does man want to change? Or he says, "Things are all right, let's go on. We will evolve to a certain stage eventually."

PJ: Most people feel that.

K: Yes. That's what is so appalling about it. Eventually, give me another thousand years we will all be marvellous human beings. Which is so absurd. In the meantime we are destroying each other.

PJ: Sir, may I ask you something? What is the actual moment of facing the fact? What is it actually, the actuality of it?

K: What is a fact, Pupul? We were discussing the other day with a group of people here: a fact is that which has been done, remembered, and that which is being done now. Being done now, acting now, and that which has happened yesterday, and remembered that fact - remembrance.

PJ: Or even arising of a wave of fear, horror, anything.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: So how does one actually...

K: Wait a minute. So let us be clear when you say, 'what is', the fact. The fact of yesterday, or last week's incident, is gone, but I remember it. Right? There is remembrance of something pleasant or unpleasant, that happened, a fact, which is stored in the brain. And what is being done now is also a fact coloured by the past,

controlled by the past, shaped by the past. So can I see this whole movement as a fact?

PJ: The seeing it as a fact...

K: The whole movement - the future, the present, the past.

PJ: Seeing it as a fact is seeing it without a cliché.

K: Without a cliché, without prejudice, without bias.

PJ: Or without anything surrounding it.

K: That's right. Which means what?

PJ: Negating, first of all, negating all the responses which arise.

K: Negating the remembrances. Just keep to that for the moment.

PJ: The remembrances which arise out of it.

K: Out of the fact of last week's pleasure or pain, reward or punishment. Now is that possible?

PJ: Yes, that is possible.

K: Possible, why?

PJ: Because the very attention itself...

K: ...dissipates remembrance. Now that means can the brain be so attentive that the incident that happened last week, the fact it happened and end the fact, end it, not carry on remembering. My son is dead. And I have suffered. But the memory of that son has such strong strength in my brain that I constantly remember it.

PJ: It arises.

K: It arises and disappears. So can the brain say, yes my son is dead, that is the end of it?

PJ: Does one say that? Or when there is a rising...

K: And then ending? Which means an endless arising and ending.

PJ: But there is an arising.

K: Which is remembrance. Let's keep to that word.

PJ: A remembrance. Out of that there is a movement of pain.

K: Pain.

PJ: The negation of that pain ends not only the pain but the arising.

K: Which means what? Go into it a little bit more. My son is dead. I remember all the things, etc., etc. There is a photograph of him on the piano or on the mantelpiece, and there is this constant remembrance - right? Flowing in and flowing out. That's a fact.

PJ: But the negating of that pain and the dissolving of this, doesn't it have a direct action on the brain?

K: That's what I am coming to. Which means what? My son is dead. That's a fact. I can't change a fact. He is gone. It sounds cruel to say it, but he is gone. But I am carrying him all the time. Right? The brain is carrying him as memory, and the reminder is always there, I am carrying on. I never say, he has gone, that's a fact. But I live on memories, which is a dead thing. Memories are not actual. And I am asking: the ending of the fact. My son is gone. It doesn't mean I have lost love, or anything. My son is gone, that is a fact.

PJ: What remains when the fact is perceived?

K: May I say something without being shocking? Nothing. My son is gone, or my brother, my wife, or whatever it is, is gone. Which is not an assertion of cruelty or denying my affection, my love. Not the love of my son, but the identification of love with my son. I don't know if you see.

PJ: You are drawing a distinction between love of my son and...

K: ...and love.

PJ: ...and love.

K: If I love my son in the deepest sense of the word, I love man, humanity. It's not only I love my son, I love the whole human world, the earth, the trees, the whole universe. But that is a different matter.

So you asking a really good question, which is: what takes place when there is the perception, pure perception of the fact, without any bias, without any kind of escape and so on, to see the fact completely, is that possible? When I am in sorrow of my son's death, I mean I am lost. It is a great shock. It is something terrible that has taken place. And at that moment you can't say anything to the person. Right? As he comes out of this confusion and loneliness and despair and sorrow, perhaps he will be sensitive enough to perceive this fact.

PJ: I come back always to this one thing: this perception of the fact, doesn't it need...

K: A tremendous attention.

PJ: ...a great deal of watching?

K: Watching, of course.

PJ: You can't tell a person who has just lost...

K: No, that would be cruel. But a man who says, my son is dead, what is it all about, death is common to all humanity, why do we... a man who is sensitive, asking, enquiring, he is awake, he wants to find an answer to all this.

PJ: Sir, at one level it seems so simple.

K: And I think we must keep it simple, not bring about a lot of intellectual theories and ideas into it.

PJ: Then why is it - is the mind afraid of the simple?

K: No, I think we are so highly intellectual, it has been part of our education, part of our culture, ideas are tremendously important, concepts are essential, it is part of our culture. The man who says, please ideas are not very important, facts are, he must be extraordinarily simple.

PJ: You see sir, what you are saying; in the whole field of Indian culture the highest is the dissolution of the self. And you say, you talk of the dissolution of the fact, which is essentially the dissolution of the self.

K: Yes. But the dissolution of the self has become a concept. And we are worshipping a concept - as they are all doing, all over the world. Concepts are invented by thought, or through analysis and so on, come to a concept, and hold that concept as a most extraordinary thing.

So come back to the point: what will make human beings, throughout the world, behave? Not behave my way or your way. Behave, don't kill, don't be afraid, don't - you know, have great affection and so on, what will bring it about? Nothing has succeeded. Knowledge hasn't helped him. Right?

PJ: Isn't it because fear is his shadow?

K: Fear, and also we want to know what the future is.

PJ: Which is part of fear.

K: Yes. We want to know because - it is simple - we have sought security in so many things and they have all failed. And now we say there must be security somewhere. And I question if there is any security somewhere at all, even in god, that is a projection of one's own fears.

PJ: What is the action of this dissolution on the brain cells, on

the brain itself?

K: I would use the word, insight. Insight is not a matter of memory, not a matter of knowledge and time, which are all thought. So I would say insight is the absence, total absence of the whole movement of thought as time and remembrance and thought. So there is direct perception. It is like I have been going north for the last ten thousand years, and my brain is accustomed to enter the north. And somebody comes along and says, that will lead you nowhere, go east. When I turn round and go east the brain cells have changed. Because I have an insight that the north leads nowhere. Wait, I will put it differently.

The whole movement of thought, which is limited, and which is acting throughout the world now, it is the most important action, driven by thought, thought will not solve any of our problems, except technological. Right? If I see that, I have stopped going north. And I think the ending of a certain direction, the ending of a movement that has been going on for thousands of years, at that moment there is an insight, which brings about a change, a mutation in the brain cells. One sees this very clearly. But one asks, what will make humanity change. What will make my son, my daughter change? They hear all this, they read something about all this, from biologists and so on, psychologists, and they continue in their old way. Is the past tradition so strong? I have thought about myself for the last thousand years and I still am thinking about myself - I must fulfil myself, I must be great, I must become something. This is my conditioning, this is my tradition. Is the past so tremendously strong? And the past is incarnating all the time. Right? Is that part of our culture, to continue in our conditioning?

PJ: I would say that is part of our culture.

K: Look at it. I have been watching this very seriously, how tradition has a tremendous stronghold - not tradition of superstition, I am not talking of that, but a continuity of something of the past moving, moving. The past carrying on in its own momentum. And we are that. Culture may be part of our hindrance, religious concepts may be our hindrance. So what is the brain to do? They are saying one part of the brain is the old, and the other part of the brain is something totally new, and that if we can open the door to the new there might be change. Because according to this specialist we are using only a very small part of our brain.

PJ: Obviously when there is attention the fragment has ended.

K: Yes, that's it. We can talk about it like this, what is attention, go into it, at the end of it a listener says, "All right, I understand all this, but I am what I am. I understand this intellectually, verbally but it hasn't touched the depth of my being."

PJ: But isn't it a question of that first contact with thought in the mind.

K: I don't quite follow you.

PJ: I have a feeling, sir, that we talk about observing thought. It is an entirely different thing to the actual state of attention.

K: That is, thought being aware of itself.

PJ: Yes. That one instant.

K: I understand that. We are going away from the central issue. The world is becoming more and more superficial, more and more money-minded, if I may use that word, money, power, position, fulfilment, identification, me, me, me. All this is being encouraged by everything around you. Right? Now you, who have travelled,

who have seen all this too, what do you make of all this business? There are these extraordinary intelligent people, clever people, and the most stupid people, the neurotic, the people who have come to a conclusion and never move from that conclusion, like the Communists - the Totalitarian world is that - they have come to a certain conclusion and that is final.

PJ: But those are all commitments which you can't touch. You can only touch the people who are not committed.

K: And who are the people who are not committed?

PJ: I would said today that is the one sign of health.

K: Are they young people?

PJ: Today, as never before in the last twenty or thirty years, there are people who are not committed to anything.

K: I question that, I would really like to question that.

PJ: Really, sir, I would say so. On the one hand you see this tremendous deterioration of everything, on the other somewhere this movement away from a commitment. They may not know where to turn, they may not have a direction, they may...

K: But don't belong to anything.

PJ: They don't belong to anything.

K: There are people like that, I know.

PJ: I mean they...

K: You see they become rather vague, they become rather confused.

PJ: Yes, because they turn these into concepts. It is so easy to turn what you say into a concept.

K: Of course, of course.

PJ: And to have axioms which contain what you say. But a

culture which is so living because it is only living on insight.

K: I wouldn't use the word culture.

PJ: Well, because you started with the word culture as something which contains more than just the... therefore I used it. But it is a human culture which perhaps will be the culture of the mind that dwells in insight.

K: Yes.

PJ: In such a state, if I may ask, what happens to all the civilizations which the world has seen and known?

K: Gone. The Egyptian civilization.

PJ: No, they may have gone but they are still contained in the human race.

K: Yes, of course, it is the same.

PJ: But when you wipe out...

K: Which means, Pupulji, actually, what is freedom? Are we aware that we are prisoners of our own fantasies, imaginations and conclusions, ideas, we are prisoners to all that, are we aware of all that?

PJ: I think we are.

K: Pupul, if we are aware, attentive to all that, the thing is burnt up.

PJ: This is, of course, at some point where we can't... because you don't admit an in-between state.

K: No, that is impossible.

PJ: This is the whole problem.

K: It is like a man who is violent and trying to be non-violent, in-between state he is violent.

PJ: No, not necessarily. Isn't that also a question of this whole

movement of time?

K: Time and thought and so on, which is what? Limiting. If we first acknowledge, or see the fact that thought, in any direction, is limited, in any field - surgery, technology, computers and so on, and also thought enquiring into itself, thought being limited, your enquiry will be very, very limited.

PJ: The difference is, sir, I might see that, but the attention necessary for it to remain alive in my waking day is not there.

K: No.

PJ: It is the quantum, the capacity, the strength of that attention which...

K: You see how do you have that passion? How do you have sustained movement of energy that is not dissipated by thought, by any kind of activity? And I think that only comes when you understand sorrow and the ending of sorrow, then compassion and love and all that. That intelligence is that energy which has no depression, none of the human qualities.

PJ: You mean it neither rises nor falls?

K: No. How can it? To rise and fall you must be aware that it is arising and falling. Who is it aware and so on?

PJ: No, not even that way. But is it possible throughout the day to hold that...

K: It is there. You don't hold it. It is like a perfume that is there. That's why I think one has to understand the whole conditioning of our consciousness. You know what I mean? I think that is the real study, real enquiry, real exploration into this consciousness, which is the common ground of all humanity. And we never enquire into it. Not we enquire as a professor or a psychologist enquires, and we

study it, but we never say, look, I am going to study this consciousness which is me, I am going to look into it.

PJ: No, one says that. I can't say that one doesn't. One says that.

K: But one doesn't.

PJ: One does it.

K: Partially.

PJ: I won't accept that sir. One does it, one attends, one enquires.

K: Then what? Have you come to the end of it?

PJ: Suddenly one finds that one has been inattentive.

K: No, I don't think inattention matters. You may be tired, your brain has enquired enough, it is enough for today. There's nothing wrong with it. But you see again I object to this question of attention and inattention.

PJ: But that is the basic question in most of our minds. Basically if you ask...

K: I would not put it that way. I would say that where there is this ending of something totally there is a new beginning which has its own momentum. It is nothing to do with me. That means one must be so completely free of the self. And to be free of the self is one of the most difficult things because it hides under different rocks, different trees, different activities.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION WITH PUPUL JAYAKAR 25TH JUNE 1983

PJ: I saw a short report in one of the newspapers that a spaceship had been released which would travel to the outer spaces of the universe. And that it would be part of the universe, there will be no ending to it because there was no friction, no time, that there would be no ending. Is the within of the self, of the human brain, the human mind, call it what you will, is there a within of things, whether of man, of the tree, of nature, which is a space without ending? Is it a mirror image of that vastness which exists?

K: Are you asking, if I may repeat what you have understood, what you have said, that within the human brain - I'd like to distinguish between the brain and the mind, which we will discuss a little later - whether in the human brain there is, or there can be, a space without end, an eternity out of time? We can speculate about it a great deal, as philosophers have done, but that speculation is not actuality.

PJ: No. But it was an insight into outer space.

K: The human brain has set a machine that has entered into the whole.

PJ: Not but it was an insight first into the possibility of that, which now made it possible for them to experiment and prove it.

K: I understand. To produce a machine that will go beyond, that will enter into the universe.

PJ: If you do not posit a thing then you cannot even...

K: No, I question whether - I want to be clear on this point - we are now in our conversation we are speculating, or theorizing, or

we are really trying to find out in ourselves whether there is such immensity, whether there is actually a movement which is not of time, which is eternal. Right?

PJ: But how do you start an enquiry like this? By examination, or posing the question. If you don't pose the question...

K: We have posed the question.

PJ: We have to pose a question.

K: We have put the question.

PJ: Now whether what comes out of it is speculation or examination depends on how you approach it. But the question has to be put.

K: We have put the question. We have put the question whether the brain can understand - not understand - realize the truth that there is either eternity, or not eternity. That is a question, we have asked that question. Right? Now you ask, how do we begin to enquire into it. How do you begin to feel gently, hesitantly your way into this really fundamental question, a question that has been asked for thousands of years, whether man is bound to time for ever, or there is, or there can be, not imaginatively, not romantically, but actually can there be within the brain - or the brain realizes itself in a state of eternity? That's the question we are asking.

PJ: Even to proceed into this you started by drawing a distinction between the brain and the mind.

K: Yes.

PJ: Would you elaborate.

K: We are saying, that the brain is conditioned, at least some of it, that conditioning is brought about through experience. That

conditioning is knowledge. And that conditioning is memory and experience, knowledge, memory are limited, and so thought is limited. Now we have been functioning within the area of thought. And to discover something new there has to be, at least temporarily, or a period, when thought is not in movement, when thought is in abeyance.

PJ: The brain is a material thing.

K: Yes.

PJ: It has its own activity.

K: Yes. It has its own activity not imposed by thought.

PJ: But for centuries the operation of the brain has been the operation of thought.

K: That's all, that's what we are saying. That's what we are saying, that the whole movement of the brain, at least that part of the brain which has not been used, is conditioned by thought. And thought is always limited, and therefore it is conditioned to conflict. That which is limited must create division.

PJ: What is mind then?

K: Mind is a wholly different dimension which has no contact with thought. Let me explain it. The brain, that part of the brain which has been functioning as an instrument of thought, that brain has been conditioned, that part of the brain. And as long as that part of the brain remains in that state there is no communication, entire communication, with the mind. So when that conditioning is not then there is communication between that mind which is totally on a different dimension, that can communicate with the brain and act, using thought.

PJ: But you have already posited...

K: Oh definitely.

PJ: ...a state which is outside the realm of thought.

K: That's right. Therefore outside the realm of time.

PJ: But as time seems to be the essential core of this problem...

K: Time and thought.

PJ: Thought is the product of time. I mean thought is time.

K: That's the real point. Where do you start, do you mean?

PJ: No. Perhaps if we could go into this whole business of the flow of time, and at what instant is interception possible?

K: What do you mean, interception? Because I don't quite understand the usage of that word. Nobody can...

PJ: I am not talking of an interceptor. But...

K: The ending of it.

PJ: I was going to use another word, but you can use the word ending.

K: Let's use simpler words.

PJ: Time is from a past immemorial.

K: Yes, which is thought.

PJ: Thought is also from a past immemorial, projecting into a future which is also eternal.

K: The movement of thought. No. The future is conditioned by the past, as a human psyche.

PJ: So unless the human being ends, unless he ceases to be...

K: Ceases to be conditioned.

PJ: No, but you will still use thought.

K: No.

PJ: The content will undergo a change, but the mechanism of thought will continue.

K: The mechanism of thought will continue - let's put it round the other way. Now thought is the chief instrument we have. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: And that instrument after thousands of years of various efforts, actions, has not only made that instrument dull, it has reached the end of its tether because thought is limited, and time is limited. Right? Therefore it is conditioned, divided and in perpetual state of turmoil. Now can that end? That's the question.

PJ: Now I used the word interception. This movement of the past as thought, as the yesterday...

K: ...as today.

PJ: But what is the today?

K: What today is the movement of the past modified, memory. We are a bundle of memories.

PJ: That is true. But contact with time...

K: Now wait a minute, what do you mean contact with time? Time is thought.

PJ: Time as a psychological process - I am not talking of contact...

K: Leave all that.

PJ: But contact with time as a psychological process is in the present, isn't it?

K: Pupulji, let's be very clear. Time is thought. Right? Don't separate time as though it was something different from thought.

PJ: No, time is thought.

K: So it is time/thought.

PJ: Yes. As the past, present and the future.

K: Are you asking, what is the now?

PJ: Yes, because this interception I am talking about - let me use my word until you...

K: All right. Interception, I don't quite understand.

PJ: Interception is contact with, contact with the fact.

K: Contact with the fact that the whole movement of thought...

PJ: Not even all that, just contact with 'what is'

K: Which is what?

PJ: Whatever is, is your statement now. Whatever you are saying now and my listening to you is the contact with 'what is'.

K: Ah, I understand now. That is, may I put it in the way I understand it? The past, the present and the future is a movement of time/thought. How do you realize it?

PJ: How do you realize it?

K: How do you come to see the truth of it, the fact of it?

PJ: You know, sir, there is such a thing as tactile touch.

K: Yes.

PJ: Now...

K: How do you touch this thing?

PJ: How do you touch this thing?

K: How do you - to use your word - come into contact with it, with the fact? With the fact that I am a whole series of memories, which is time/thought.

PJ: Let us be more concrete. The thought that I am going away this afternoon, and that I will be leaving you. It is a thought.

K: It is a thought. It is an actuality.

PJ: But out of that there is a certain pain of leaving you, which is the emotional, psychological element which come to cover up

the fact.

K: Which is what? In the French, partir.

PJ: So what is to be contacted? Not the fact that I am going away.

K: What?

PJ: But the pain.

K: The pain. I understand. Are you asking, the pain of going, the pain of a thousand aches of yours and centuries of pain of loneliness, and sorrow and all that, grief, the agony, the anxiety and all that, is that separate from me who is to feel it?

PJ: It may not be separate.

K: It is me.

PJ: At what point, how do I touch it?

K: I don't quite understand you usage - how do I touch it.

PJ: It is only in the present.

K: Oh, I see what you mean.

PJ: The whole of this edifice rests on that.

K: Yes, that's what I said. The now contains the past, the future and the present. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Let's understand this. The present is the whole past and the future. This is the present. The present is me, with all the memories of a thousand years, and that thousand years being modified all the time, and the future. All that is now, the present. Right?

PJ: But the present is also something which is not a static thing, it's over before...

K: Of course. The moment you have said it, it is gone.

PJ: Gone. So what is it that you actually see? What is it you

actually observe?

K: Actually observe the fact.

PJ: What fact?

K: The fact - just a minute - the fact that the present is the whole movement of time and thought. To see the truth of that - let's not use the word 'see' - have an insight, perception into that, that the now is all time and thought.

PJ: Does that perception emanate from the brain?

K: Either it emanates, comes from perceiving with the eyes, nerves and so on, or that perception is an insight which has nothing to do with time and thought.

PJ: But it arises within the brain?

K: Yes, or outside the brain, you are asking.

PJ: This is very important.

K: I know, that's why I want to be clear. Is it within the sphere of the brain; or it is that insight which comes when there is the freedom from its conditioning, which is the operation of the mind, which is supreme intelligence. Do you follow?

PJ: I don't follow.

K: Let's be clear. The brain, whatever part it is, is conditioned by time and thought, time/thought. As long as that conditioning remains insight is not possible. You may have occasional insight into something, but pure insight, which means comprehension of the totality of things - yes, I'll use the word 'totality', not wholeness because that word is now being used so much - it is the perception of completeness. Right? That insight is not of time/thought. Therefore that insight is part of that brain which is in a different dimension.

PJ: Without sight there cannot be insight.

K: That's all I am saying.

PJ: So seeing - perceiving.

K: Yes perceiving.

PJ: Perceiving, listening is contained in perceiving, seems to be the essential essence of insight.

K: Would you repeat that again slowly?

PJ: Let us take the word insight - it is seeing into.

K: Into, seeing into.

PJ: Seeing into. Seeing into seeing.

K: No. Seeing into. Just a minute, let's look at that word.

Seeing, comprehending the totality of something, the vastness of something. Right? Insight is possible only when there is cessation of thought and time. Thought and time are limited, therefore such limitation cannot have insight.

PJ: To understand what you are saying I have to have an open ear and eyes that see. Out of that sound, out of that form, out of that whole...

K: ...the meaning of the words and so on and so on.

PJ: ...arises a seeing which goes beyond. I am trying to get at something.

K: What are you trying to get at? I don't understand.

PJ: I am trying to get at - you talk of insight. Now insight cannot arise without attention.

K: No. Don't introduce the word attention.

PJ: Sight, seeing.

K: If we can stick to the same thing, that is, insight cannot exist as long as time/thought play a part.

PJ: You see which comes first?

K: What do you mean?

PJ: In consciousness, in my approach to this, I can't start with insight. I can only start with observation.

K: You can only start by realizing the truth that time, psychological time and thought are always limited. That's a fact.

PJ: Krishnaji, that is a fact.

K: Wait, start from that, and therefore whatever it does will always be limited and therefore contradictory, therefore divisive and endless conflict. That's all I am saying. You can see the fact of that.

PJ: You can see the fact of that outside of yourself.

K: Wait, wait. You can see it politically...

PJ: You can see it outside of yourself.

K: No, wait. You can see it politically, religiously, all throughout the world, this is a fact, that time and thought in their activity have brought about havoc in the world. That's a fact.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: So the question is: can that limitation ever end? Or is man conditioned for ever to live within the time/thought area?

PJ: You see the difficulty of understanding this is, what is the relationship of the brain cells and the action of the senses - I am not using the word thought at the moment - on a statement like this: do you see the fact that time, thought...

K: ...are limited.

PJ: ...are limited? What does it exactly mean, how does one see that? It is like telling me, you are an illusion.

K: What?

PJ: It is exactly like telling me that Pupul is an illusion.

K: No, I didn't say that.

PJ: But I am saying that.

K: No, you are not an illusion.

PJ: No, sir, it is exactly that, because the moment you say, after all Pupul is a psychological bundle of the past...

K: Psychological movement of time and thought, which is the psyche.

PJ: Which is the psyche. That psyche is limited.

K: ...is limited. Whatever it does is limited.

PJ: Then I would ask, what is wrong with it being limited?

K: Nothing is wrong. If you want to live in perpetual conflict nothing is wrong.

PJ: Move further. To end it, is not only to say, to feel that it is limited, but there must be an ending to it.

K: I said there is.

PJ: What is the nature of this ending?

K: What do you mean ending?

PJ: Just...

K: Let's take the word ending, I must be clear what you and I are saying, so that we both understand the meaning of the same word, to end something - to end attachment, to end, not to smoke, not to do this or that, to put an end to it - the ending.

PJ: The flow ceases to flow.

K: The movement of thought and time ceases, psychologically. What is your difficulty? You are making a simple thing difficult.

PJ: No, sir. There is a point of perception, which is a point of insight, what is that point of insight?

K: What do you mean, point of insight?

PJ: Where I see. In what time/space do I see it?

K: Look, Pupul, just let's be simple. Time and thought have divided the world, politically, geographically, religiously. That is a fact. Right? Right? Can't you see the fact?

PJ: No, sir. I look outside...

K: Wait, wait. Don't look outside.

PJ: I don't see the fact.

K: What do you mean you don't see the fact?

PJ: Because if I saw the fact, if I really saw the fact...

K: You would stop that kind of thing.

PJ: ...it would be all over.

K: That is all I am saying.

PJ: If it is such a simple thing, which I don't think it is, because it has such devious ways.

K: No. The whole point - this is where I am saying something which we are probably putting in different words - if you have an insight that the movement of thought and time are divisive, at whatever level, in whatever realm, in whatever area, it is a movement of endless conflict. That's a fact. Britain fought for some island, that's a fact. Because British, British, French, French, German, Russian - they are all divisive. And India against somebody. This is the whole movement of time and thought. That's a fact.

PJ: Yes but you can see it when it is a matter outside of you.

K: If you can see it outside, this movement, what it does in the world, what misery it has caused in the world, then inwardly the psyche is time and thought, is the movement of time and thought.

This movement has created that. Simple. The psychological movement, the divisive psychological movement has created the external fact. Right? I am a Hindu, I feel secure. I am a German, I feel secure in the word, in the feeling that I belong to something.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, I would say that all these, being a Hindu, greed, all those one has seen as a product of this movement of time/thought.

K: That is all I am saying.

PJ: But that is not quite...

K: What is your difficulty, Pupul?

PJ: There is within it all a sense of, "I exist".

K: That's it. I don't realize the psyche is that.

PJ: That's essentially the nature.

K: Why doesn't it? Because - it is simple, why do you make it complex - because you have thought the psyche is something other than the conditioned state. I thought there was something in me, or in the brain, or in somewhere, which is timeless, which is god, which is this, which is that, and that if I could only reach that everything would be right. That's part of my conditioning, because I am uncertain, confused, god will give me safety, perfection, certainty. That's all - god or the highest principle, or some kind of conviction.

PJ: What is the nature of the ground from which insight springs?

K: I have told you. Insight can only take place when there is freedom from time and thought.

PJ: It is a sort of unending...

K: No, it is not. You are complicating a very simple fact, as

most of us do. If one wants to live at peace, which to live in peace only is to flower, is to understand the extraordinary world of peace. Peace cannot be brought about by thought.

PJ: You see, please understand, Krishnaji, it is the brain itself which listens to that statement.

K: Yes, it listens. And then what happens? Just a minute. What happens? If it listens it is quiet.

PJ: It is quiet.

K: It isn't ruminating, it is not going on, "By Jove, what does he mean", it is not rattling. It is quiet. Right? Wait a minute. When it is actually, not induced quietness, actually when it listens, and there is quietness, then there is insight. I don't have to explain ten different ways the limitation of thought, it is so.

PJ: I see what you say. Is there anything further than that?

K: Oh, yes there is. There is a great deal more: which is, is listening a sound? A sound within an area, or I am listening to what you are saying without the verbal sound? If there is a verbal sound I am not listening, I am only understanding the words. But you want to convey to me something much more than the words, so if the words are making a sound in my hearing I can't deeply understand the depth of what you are saying.

So I want to find out something much more. We started with the present. The present is the now, the now is the whole movement of time/thought. Right? It is the whole structure. If the structure of time and thought ends the now has totally a different meaning. The now then is nothing. I mean when we use the word 'nothing', zero contains all the figures. Right? So nothing contains all. But we are afraid to be nothing.

PJ: When you say, contains the all, is it the essence of all human, racial and environmental, and nature and the cosmos, as such?

K: Yes. I am talking of the fact of a realization that there is nothing. The psyche is a bundle of memories, and those memories are dead; they operate, they function, but they are the outcome of past experience which has gone. I am a movement of memories. Now if I have an insight into that, there is nothing. I don't exist.

PJ: You said something about sound.

K: Yes.

PJ: And listening.

K: Listening without sound. You see the beauty of it?

PJ: Yes, it is possible when the mind itself is totally still.

K: No, don't bring in the mind for the moment. When the brain is quiet, absolutely quiet, therefore there is no sound made by the word.

PJ: There is no sound made by the word?

K: Of course. That is real listening. The word has given me what you want to convey. Right? You want to tell me, "I am going this afternoon". I listen to that.

PJ: But the brain has not been active in listening.

K: Yes. And the brain, when it is active, is noise, is sound. Let's go back to something more, we will include, come back to this sound business because it is very interesting what is sound. Sound can only exist, pure sound can only exist when there is space and silence, otherwise it is just noise.

So I would like to come back to the question: all one's education, all one's past experience and knowledge is a movement

in becoming, both inwardly, psychologically as well as outwardly. Becoming is the accumulation of memory. Right? More and more and more memories, which is called knowledge. Right? Now as long as that movement exists there is fear of being nothing. But when one really sees the insight of the fallacy, the illusion of becoming something, therefore that very perception, that insight to see that there is nothing, this becoming is endless time/thought and conflict, there is an ending of that. That is, the ending of the movement which is the psyche, which is time/thought. The ending of that is to be nothing. Right? Nothing then contains the whole universe - not my petty little fears and petty little anxieties and problems, and my sorrow with regard to, you know, a dozen things.

After all, Pupulji, nothing means the entire world of compassion - compassion is nothing. And therefore that nothingness is supreme intelligence. That's all there is. I don't know if I am conveying this. So why are human beings, just ordinary intelligent people, frightened of being nothing? If I see that I am really a verbal illusion, that I am nothing but dead memories, that's a fact. But I don't like to think I am just nothing but memories. But the truth is I am memories. If I had no memory, either I am in a state of amnesia, or I understand the whole movement of memory, which is time/thought, and see the fact as long as there is this movement there must be endless conflict, struggle, pain. And when there is an insight into that nothing means something entirely different. And that nothing is the present. It is not varying present, it isn't it is one day this and one day, the next day. Being nothing is no time therefore it is not ending one day and beginning another day.

It is really interesting if one goes into this problem, not theoretically but actually, the astrophysicists are trying to understand the universe. They can only understand in terms of gases, but the immensity of it as part of this human being, not out there, here. Which means there must be no sense, no shadow of time and thought. Pupul, after all that is real meditation, that's what 'sunya' means in Sanskrit. But we have interpreted it in ten hundred different ways, commentaries, this and that. But the actual fact is we are nothing except words, and opinions, judgements - those are all petty affairs. And therefore we have made our life become petty.

So to grasp, to understand that the zero contains all the numbers. Right? So in nothing all the world is contained - not the pain, and... those are all so small. I know it sounds, when I am suffering that is the only thing I have. Or when there is fear, that is the only thing. But I don't see it is such a petty little thing.

So having listened to all this, what is it you realize? If you could put it into words it would be rather good. What is that you, and those who are going to listen to all this - it may be rubbish, it may be true - who are going to listen to all this, what do they capture, realize, see the immensity of all this?

PJ: It is really an ending of the psychological nature of the self, because that is becoming.

K: Pupulji, I have asked the question because it is going to be very helpful to all of us if you could say, as you listen to all this, what is your response, what is your reaction, what have you realized, what have you said, "By Jove, I have got it, I have got the perfume of it".

PJ: Sir, don't ask me that question because anything I say would sound - because as you are speaking there was immensity.

K: Now wait a minute. There was that, I could feel it. There was the tension of that. But is it temporary, is it for the moment, for a second and it is gone? And then the whole business of remembering it, capturing it, inviting it...

PJ: Oh no, I think one has moved from there. And another thing one realizes, the most difficult thing in the world is to be totally simple.

K: To be simple, that's right. If one is really simple, from that you can understand the enormous complexity of things. But we start with all the complexities and never see the simplicity. That's our training. We have trained our brain to see the complexity and then try to find an answer to the complexity. But we don't see the extraordinary simplicity of life - of facts, rather.

PJ: In the Indian tradition, if I may move away a little...

K: I am glad.

PJ: Out of sound was born all the enemies.

K: You see...

PJ: The sound which reverberates and is yet not heard.

K: That's it, that's it. But, Pupulji, especially in the Indian tradition, from the Buddha to Nagarjuna, and the ancient Hindus, have said there is that state of nothingness, which, they said, you must deny the whole thing. Nagarjuna says, he came to that point, as far as I understand, I may be mistaken, what I have been told, that he denied everything, every movement of the psyche.

PJ: Every movement of the brain cell as becoming.

K: Yes. It is there in the books, or it is there in tradition. Why

haven't they pursued that? Even the most intelligent of them, even the most religious devotee, not to some structure, but to the feeling of the divine, the sense of something sacred, why haven't they pursued denying, not the world, you can't deny the world, they have denied the word, and made a mess of their own lives - but the total negation of the 'me'.

PJ: Really you know renunciation - let me use that word - is the negation of the 'me'.

K: Yes, but the 'me' exists still. I may renounce my house, I may get away from my memories but - you follow.

PJ: Basically the renunciation is never in the outer.

K: Inside. Which means what? Don't be attached, even to your highest principle, don't be attached to your loin cloth. So I think what is happening is that we are caught, really caught in a net of words, in theories, not in actuality. I suffer, I must find a way to end that, not escape into some kind of silly illusions. Why have human beings not faced the fact and changed the fact? You follow my question? Is it because we are living with illusions of ideas, ideals and conclusions and all that, unrealities? It is so obvious, all this.

PJ: We are living with the history of mankind. That is the history of mankind.

K: That is the history of mankind. And mankind is me. And me is this - endless misery. And so if you want to end misery, end the 'me'. The ending of me is not an action of will. The ending of 'me' doesn't come about through fasting, you know all that childish business that human beings have gone through, who have been called saints.

PJ: It is really the ending of time, isn't it, sir?

K: Yes. The ending of time/thought. That means to listen without the sound - listen to the universe without a sound.

We were talking the other day in New York, and there was a man, a doctor, I believe he was very well known. He said, all these questions are all right, sir, but the fundamental issue is whether the brain cells, which have been conditioned, can really bring about a mutation in themselves. Then the whole thing is simple. You understand? I said, it is possible only through insight. And we went into it, as we have gone into it now. You see nobody is willing to listen to this in its entirety, they listen partially - agree in the sense, go together up to a certain distance, and stop there. If man really says, I must have peace in the world, therefore I must live peacefully then there is peace in the world. But he doesn't want to live in peace, he does everything opposite to that - his ambition, his arrogance, his silly petty fears and all that.

So we have reduced the vastness of all this to some petty little reactions. Do you realize that, Pupul? And so we live such petty lives. I mean this applies from the highest to the lowest.

PJ: What is sound to you, sir?

K: Sound is the tree. Sound - wait a minute - take music, whether pure Indian chanting, Vedic chanting, Gregorian chanting, they are extraordinarily close together. And one listens to all the songs of praise - which are, you know what they are! Then you listen to the sound of the waves, the sound of strong wind among the trees, sound of person whom you have lived with for many years. You get used to all this. But if you don't get used to all this, then sound has an extraordinary meaning. Then you hear

everything afresh. Say, for instance, you tell me, time and thought is the whole movement of man's life, therefore limited. Now you have communicated to me a simple fact, and I listen to it. I listen to it without the sound of the word, I have captured the significance, the depth of that statement. And I can't lose it. It isn't I have heard it now and it is gone when I go outside. I have listened to it in its entirety. That means the sound has conveyed the fact that it is so. And what is so is absolute always. I believe only in the Hebrew tradition, Jehovah, or whatever, the nameless one, can only say, "I am", like 'Tathata' and so on in Sanskrit.

NEW DELHI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 6TH NOVEMBER, 1983

We are going to talk over many things. This is not a lecture. A lecture is intended to instruct and inform. We are not going to do that. But what we are going to do is talk over together, as two friends, the very complex problem of living, daily living, not theoretical, or philosophical, or some speculative concepts and theories. So together, you and the speaker, are going to explore the very complex and confusing world in which we live. So it is your responsibility to listen, not only to what the speaker is saying but also to listen to the world, not a particular part of the world, but the whole of the world - America, Russia, the Asiatic world and the Western world. We must look at the world as a whole, not as Indians, or as Europeans, or British, or French, or Germans, or Americans, or Russians, and the rest of the world - we must look at humanity as a whole.

So please, from the very beginning of these talks we must be very clear that this is not a lecture, this is not an instruction, telling you what to do or what to think. We are not an authority. We must question all authority, the physical, the psychological, the authority of war, the authority of governments, whether it is totalitarian, or so-called democratic. In investigating, in questioning, in exploring, we must have a brain that is sceptical, doubting, asking questions. And if we are going to explore together, as we must, if we are at all serious, explore not from any particular point of view, or belonging to certain tribes, communities, religious or non-religious, we are going to look together at the world, what it is, as it is, not what we

would like the world to be. So please, if you would kindly listen and take the responsibility of observing the actual affairs of the world, as it is.

In the world there is no peace. Though governments are talking about peace, there has never been peace in the world. For the last five thousand years historically there have been wars practically every year. Man has killed man in the name of religion, in the name of ideals, in the name of certain dogmas, in the name of god, man has killed man. And it is still going on. That is a fact. And we, inhabiting this unfortunate but beautiful world, we seem to be incapable of doing anything about all that. We are tribal-minded, as Hindus, as Sikhs, as Catholics, Protestants, as nationalists, whether the Western nationalism or the Eastern nationalism, it is a tribal continuity. And that is one of the major causes of war. There are other causes, economic, social, linguistic, religious and so on.

And to bring about peace in the world requires great intelligence, not sentimentality, not some emotional demonstrations against a particular usage of instruments of war, but to understand this very, very complex situation of the society in which we live, requires not only humility, not only objective observation, and also it requires that you as observer, put away all our tribal instincts: you are no longer a Sikh, or a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Christian, or a Buddhist, but you are a citizen of the world. If that is very clear, we can proceed to investigate. But if you hold on to your particular tribalism, to a particular nationalism, to a particular religion, then investigation into this question whether it is possible to live in this world peacefully, intelligently, sanely, rationally - is that at all possible. Or human beings who

have evolved through millions of years have reached a certain point, whether we are going to destroy ourselves, or can we create a different kind of society, moral, ethical, non-communal, not belonging to a particular guru, and all that nonsense. So please don't get angry with the speaker, because all of you belong to a certain tribe, belong to various gurus, you are either Christian, or belong to some community of religious body, and when we explore, as we must, if you are at all intelligent, aware of what is going on in the world, one must put aside completely all that. And it is your responsibility, not that of the speaker. He is not a Hindu, though he was born in this country, he does not belong to any community, to any society. There is no guru, nor authority in spiritual matters.

So we are going together to investigate freely. So please put aside your ideals which is very difficult to do, your conclusions, your intellectual theories, and let us together, as friends, we can talk to each other amicably without trying to influence each other. And it would not be possible to have a dialogue. A dialogue means a conversation between two people. But as that is not possible with such a large audience it must be a conversation, a conversation between two friends, not attacking each other, whether you wear a turban or do not wear a turban, whether you are a Christian, or not, as two friends who have lived on this earth for millennia upon millennia, as two amicable, non-persuading friends, we are walking together through the paths of the world. And if that is understood very clearly, that we are not instructing, we are not informing, we are not telling you what to do, we are not doing any kind of propaganda, it is a horror to the speaker to do any kind of

propaganda, nor to convince you of anything. And I mean it.

Now let us look at the world. The world is divided into nationalities, geographically, linguistically, religiously. The world is divided into business, spiritual, religious, non-sectarian, it is broken up, fragmented. You belong to a certain guru, and another belongs to another. And in this matter there is no guru, there is no authority of any book, however ancient, or however modern. We are together exploring. There is war going on in different parts of the world. Society is corrupt, immoral. There is great corruption throughout the world. These are all facts. It is not an invention of the speaker. There is great confusion, disorder, politically, so-called religiously. And we have created this society, each one of us is responsible for the ugliness, the brutality, the violence, the bestiality that is taking place in the world. Unless we put our house in order there will be no order in society. I hope this is clear that each one of us, at whatever level of society we live, each one of us has contributed to the confusion, to the immorality, to the insanity of the world. Unless we change, each one of us, fundamentally, psychologically, there will be no peace in the world. You may think that you will have peace, some kind of peace in your mind, but you will never have peace if you do not have order in your daily life. Right? Is that clear that we, in our investigation, have come to a point where we see the world as it is, and we see the society in which we live, corrupt, immoral, religiously nonsensical, with their superstitions, with their rituals, with their so-called meditations, we are responsible for all this. I wonder, one wonders how many of you, of us, feels this responsibility. You may listen to the talks this evening, tomorrow and the next weekend, but how

many of us take all this seriously? We are too occupied, we have no time. That is an excuse. What we have to do, if one may point out, we have to put our house in order. And we are going to investigate together what are the implications of that order.

First, what is disorder? One wonders if one realizes, if one is aware that we live in confusion, each one of us, uncertain, seeking security. One must have security, physical security. Millions are starving, unemployed; in Europe the unemployment is very great, so it is in America, and here too. And those unemployed have no security. And is disorder - please, I am putting the question to you, and please consider it - is disorder brought about by each one of us seeking his own particular security? You understand? You want security. One must have physical security. And to have that security, lasting, abiding, you cannot have wars, you cannot have communal conflicts, you cannot possibly belong to a particular guru, or a particular system, because then you bring about conflict. Conflict is disorder, whether that conflict exists between you and your husband, or your wife, between you and the government, between you and your guru. Right? I hope you are following all this. Don't shut your ears - 'lend me your ears' - not only hear with your ears but also hear much more deeply.

It is necessary to use words to communicate. We are now speaking English, and one has to use certain words in that language to convey certain meaning give to those words, certain significance. But the words are not important. What is important is the content of the word. When one says, I am a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or a Christian, the words do not matter, but the content, what lies behind the word. And words divide people, whether

language conditions the brain, probably you haven't thought about all this, it doesn't matter. And one has to see whether conflict in oneself can end. That is the first thing to understand, whether conflict, struggle, the pain, the anxiety, the jealousy, the ambition, the enormous amount of suffering human beings have borne, the struggle to become something, both psychologically as well as outwardly, there is a perpetual conflict in each one of us. That is a fact. To meditate becomes a conflict. To follow somebody becomes a conflict. In our relationship with each other, both sexually, in a family, in a community, conflict exists. And that is one of the major causes of disorder, not only in society, but in ourselves. Would you agree to that? That conflict at whatever level, in depth or superficial, when that conflict exists between people there must inevitably be disorder.

So is it possible to find out, if we are serious, if we want order in our lives, whether it is possible for conflict to end. Conflict ultimately is war. Conflict between two ideologies, the totalitarian ideology and the democratic ideology. You are following all this? Ideologies - the Christian ideology and the Buddhist ideology, the Hindu versus some other ideology. So conflict must exist wherever there is ideology, wherever the brain is entrenched in tradition. You have your tradition, another has his tradition. So to end conflict there must be freedom from tradition, freedom from ideology, theories, hypothesis, and national division, which is really glorified tribalism.

So we are asking whether this conflict can end, not in society, because that society human beings have created. No god, no extraordinary outside agency has created this society in which we

live. We have made it with all the confusion, injustice, the brutality, the violence, the bestiality, we have brought it about, each one of us. And if you are at all serious, and we must be serious, in a world that is disintegrating, in a world that is being torn apart, we must be serious, if not for yourself for your grandchildren, for your children. It is necessary to be very serious, committed, urgent, not to any theory, not to any ideology, but to find out for ourselves the cause of conflict, because where you can find the cause that cause can be ended. That is the law.

If there is pain in our body the cause for that pain can be found, and in the finding of the cause there is the remedy and therefore the cause ends. Similarly, if you are really earnest, not playing about with ideas, with speculations, with all that nonsense, if you are really serious, the cause of conflict is very clear. There are many causes, but essentially one cause: that each one of us is egocentric, in the name of god, in the name of good works, in the name of improving society, social work, joining parliament and so on, seeking power and money. That is what most human beings want, not only physical power but spiritual power, to be somebody in a spiritual world. Personally the speaker dislikes that word, 'spiritual'. We all want to be illumined, find illumination, happiness, so we say, we will ultimately achieve that. Time is the enemy of man. Yes, sir, look at it, we will go into it more deeply about the question of time.

As we said, time is the enemy of man. You have to live now, find out now and if you say, 'We will gradually find out', you will never find out. That is an excuse. So the cause of conflict brings about disorder. And so we must first put our house in order - our

house, not the physical house, but the psychological world which is very complex. Do you understand? When we use the word 'psychological' we mean the brain that holds all the content of our consciousness, what you think, what you believe, your aspirations, your fear, your jealousies, your antagonism, your pleasure, your aspirations, your faith, your sorrow, all that is the content of your being. That is the very centre of your consciousness. That is what you are, not some extraordinary spiritual entity dwelling in darkness, as some of the people believe. You are what you think, what you believe, what your faith, what you follow, your ambition, your name and so on, that is what you actually are, psychologically as well as physically.

We are not concerned for the moment with the physical side, because when one understands deeply the psychological nature and structure of oneself then you can deal with the physical activity, sanely, rationally. So that is what you are, that is your human condition. That is the human condition that has existed for thousands of years. Man has always quarrelled with another man, always lived in conflict. If you find some of the old ancient monuments in caves and other places you will see man fighting man, fighting animals, which is the same thing. It is symbolical, perpetual conflict. That is the lot of man. When we talk of man we are including the women too, so don't get too feministic. We are human beings. And perhaps a few have escaped from conflict, a few people who have gone into this question deeply, which is to understand the nature of conditioning, human condition.

There are those philosophers in the West who say, human condition can never be altered, it can be modified. He must live in

that prison, that prison can be made congenial, more respectable, more suitable and so on. That human condition, which is his anger, his jealousies, his search, his everlasting burden, he must put up with it, that is his condition. That is what the modern and recent philosophers have stated, man cannot be changed at all, but he can be modified in his brutality, in his violence, in his belief and so on. But we are saying, the speaker is saying quite impersonally, emphatically, that the human condition can be radically changed; that is, if he has the intention, if he observes very clearly without any prejudice, without any direction - it is going to be difficult - without any motive, what he is.

Now we are going to, together, and I mean together, you are not sitting there and I am sitting here, this platform is only for convenience. Sitting on a little platform does not give the speaker authority. But what he says may have some significance, and may have a meaning, and you have to follow the significance the meaning, the depth of it. Our condition is that, that condition has been brought about through thousands of years of experience, through various accidents, incidents, that condition has been brought about through the desire to be secure, that condition has been brought about through fear and the perpetual pursuit of pleasure and the never ending of sorrow. We are what we have been more or less for the last million years as human beings. That is our condition. We have created the society. Then the society controls us. So we try to blame the environment, blame education, blame governments and so on, but we have made all this environment. So we are responsible. So we must understand our conditioning. Our conditioning is to be British, to be French, to be

a Sikh. Right, sir? To belong to some guru. That is our conditioning. Can one observe very closely and clearly your conditioning? If you say, it is not possible to be free from conditioning, you have blocked yourself, you have created a barrier for yourself. Or, if you say, that it is possible, that possibility also creates a barrier. Do you understand? Both the positive and the negative become a barrier. But if you begin to investigate, look, observe, then you can discover a great deal.

So we must question, what is observation, what is looking? How do you observe yourself? By becoming a monk, by withdrawing from society, by becoming a hermit? Or do you discover what you are through your reactions in your relationship with another? Don't you? That is very close and very near, your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your girl friend, whatever it is. In that mirror of relationship you see yourself as you are. Right? Are you doing this, or just agreeing with words? Are you listening? If I may most respectfully ask, are you listening to the words, listening your own interpretation of the word, or are you actually now, sitting there, observing in the mirror of your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour, with your guru, whatever your relationship is? In that relationship you see your reactions, physical as well as psychological. Right? That is so simple. You start very near to go very far. But you want to go very far first, but you don't start near at home.

So we are saying that relationship is one of the most essential things in life. Relationship is a reality. You cannot possibly exist in solitude, alone. The word `alone' means something else. Alone

means, all one. But we are not using that word in that sense. You are solitary and you remain solitary. You think you are an individual and you treat another as an individual. You are two separate entities and trying to establish a relationship between two images. Are you following all this? Does it interest you all this? Or you are accustomed to go to lectures, be talked at, argue and never listen?

Here we are trying to find out a way of living, really a way of living, a daily living in which there is no conflict. And to understand the way of that life one must end conflict, first in ourselves, then in society and so on, to examine, to observe ourselves. So we must comprehend the meaning of that word 'to observe'. Have you ever observed anything without a motive, without the word, without a direction, just to observe. Have you ever observed the ocean, the tree, the birds, the beauty of the land, or the beauty of the tree, just to observe, not use the word, 'how beautiful'. Have you ever observed your wife, your children, if you have them? Or you observe them belonging to you, as a parent with all your authority? Have you ever observed the evening star, the slip of a new moon without the word? And observing, you begin to discover your reactions, your physical sensory reactions first and then observe your psychological reactions. That sounds very simple. But our brains have become so complex that we hate anything simple. We want it all made complex, theoretical, then we follow. But to begin very simply and to begin very near, which is yourself and your relationship, that is the only thing that you have. For god's sake see that, not your temples, not your beliefs, not your turbans, your beards, or whatever you wear. We are human beings.

We cannot exist without relationship. It is the most important thing in life. And in that relationship which is based on image-building, you have an image about her and she has an image about you because you have both lived together for twenty years, for ten days, or one day. You have already created an image. And those images have relationship. And images cannot love. Please do understand this. If you have an image about your wife, about your guru - thank god, I have not got any, but if I have a wife, I have lived with her sexually, she has nagged me, I have bullied her. I possess her and she likes being possessed. And so I have created an image about her and she has created an image about me. And our relationship is based on those images. Right?

I wonder if you see this fact. And when there are images built by thought, built by various experiences and incidents translated by thought and retained as memory, how can there be love? You may love your god, but you don't. You may love your scriptures through fear, because you want to be saved. And where there is fear there is no love. Perhaps you don't ever know, or use that word 'love'. So please seriously with our heart and with your brain, look at the fact. So the question arises whether it is possible not to create images. Do you understand this question? You have images, an image about yourself, haven't you, as a great man, as a powerful man, belonging to a powerful nation, ambassador, commissioner, or you are a politician belonging to a certain party, you have power, position, you have that image. And you have an image of your following some guru that you are gradually coming to nirvana, nearer god. You have all kinds of images, all of us, most people have, but the most intimate image is between you and your wife, or

between you and your husband, or your girl friend. You know, the closest. There is the root of conflict. There you must put order. You cannot put order, only you can remove disorder, then there is order. If you remove confusion from your brain there is clarity.

So in relationship conflict is brought about by thought. Right? Please go with the speaker into the question of this, which is of great importance. The speaker is saying that thought is responsible for the image that you have about yourself and you have about another, thought is responsible. Right? We will go into it. We are going to point out. We are going to think together, if it is possible, why thought throughout the world has become so important. And the world has been divided into Eastern thought and Western thought. There is no Western thought and Eastern thought. There is only thought, conditioned according to climate, food, clothes, religion and so on. But there is only thought.

You are not tired, are you? Are you tired? Shall I go on? No, no, you are not encouraging me. I don't want your encouragement because we are going to go into something that requires your attention, not your tiredness" not you acquiescing to what the speaker says, but you have to think, use your brain, not your intellect. Intellect is only part of the brain. We are saying that thought is the root of conflict. Thought has brought about disorder in the world by dividing people into nationalities, into religions. Thought has divided the world as technicians who have invented most extraordinary things in the world. And thought has clothed itself in its psyche. Thought has created the most marvellous cathedrals, most marvellous temples, the mosques, great architecture and great means of destruction, the atom bomb.

Thought has also put in the cathedrals, in the temples, in the mosques, in the places of so-called worship, all the things that are in them. Thought has invented all that. Without thought you could not exist. Thought, having created the image, then worship the image. So we are, the speaker is saying that thought, thinking is the root of conflict. We will go into it. Don't reject it. Don't say, what shall we do without thought. You cannot do without thought, you have to use thought. You use thought to come here, you use thought when you use language, when you do your business. If you are a scientist you have to use your thought. If you are a businessman you use your thought, you may use that thought crookedly, probably you do, but thought is neither East nor West, it is thinking - whether the thinking is of the guru, or the authority, or your own, it is still thinking.

So what is thought which has dominated all our existence, which has controlled, shaped our life. All the so-called sacred books are put down by thought, there is nothing sacred about those books. Your own particular book which you call sacred, the Bible, the Koran, your own literature, it is all put down by thought. You may say, it is revealed - but it is still the activity of thought. Right?

So thought has brought about most extraordinary things in the world, hygiene, surgery, medicine; thought has also brought about the atom bomb, the instruments of war; thought has also divided people as Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs, you know all that nonsense that is going on in the world. So we have to understand, go into this question of what is thinking, what is thought. I am - the speaker is not telling you. He is not describing what thought is. Together we are investigating, we are going into it, so you must

share, partake in the investigation, not just say, tell me about it, I will say whether it is true or false, whether I agree with you or not. That's rather cheap. That is just an escape, But whereas if you are concerned to find out why thought has done all this, the most extraordinary things and the most diabolical things. Thought has created the image in the temples, in the mosque. Thought has created your guru, your scriptures. So there is nothing sacred which thought has created. So what is thought? Ask yourselves this question, please. I am asking you, but ask yourself, what is thought, what is thinking. Is not thinking limited? All thinking is limited. Don't agree. Please look at it. You will ask, why is it limited, why thought is limited when it has created all this, created the society in which we live, created the ideals, the historical ideals, dialectical. So we are saying thought is limited. And you may ask, why it is limited. It is limited because all experience is limited, all experience, whether the experience of nirvana - please listen carefully - the experience of paradise, sitting next to god, of your achieving - experience is limited, whether it is scientific experience or physical experience or psychological experience. That is a fact, it is limited. Right? Do you see that? And because it is limited, knowledge is always limited - the scientific knowledge which is being gathered day after day, a scientist never says, my knowledge is complete. It is only the guru who says, my knowledge is complete. That is the idiocy of those people.

So knowledge, experience is limited. Knowledge is limited. That is clear if you observe historically, the process of science from the Galileo, from the ancient scientist to the modern scientist they have been gradually building up day after day, and based on

experience. So knowledge is based on experience. So knowledge and experience are limited. And that experience is carried, that knowledge is carried in the brain as memory. Right? Memory then responds as thought. So thought is always limited. As all knowledge is always limited either of the future or in the past, or in the present, there is no complete knowledge about anything. And therefore thought is limited. And that which is limited must invariably create conflict. Do you understand this?

If you are living in your backyard, and you are all living in your backyards, self-centred, limited, if you are thinking about yourself all day long, which most of us do, whether you are progressing, whether you are good, whether you look beautiful, whether you are achieving, you are becoming, you know, you are self-centred, when you are thinking about yourself you are very limited, aren't you? Don't be ashamed, you are limited. It is a fact. And that limitation has been brought about by thought, because you are thinking all day long, in your business, in your science, in your philosophy. You are thinking but always from your centre. And that egotistic, egocentric activity is very limited. And therefore you are creating a havoc in the world, creating great conflict in the world. So one asks, please, we will go into it, is there another instrument rather than thought? Do you understand my question?

If you have gone into this question of thinking, and looked at the whole problem and see how limited it is, on the one hand create wars, and the other seek security. The war destroys security, your nationalism destroys security, your worship of one guru, or one clan destroys security of man, for man. And thought is responsible for all this. And so thought is limited. When you really perceive

this as an actuality, not an idea, but actually, as you see actually this microphone, then you are bound to ask if you are at all following seriously: is there another instrument rather than thought? Right? Is there another quality in the brain? We will go into the question of the brain, perhaps tomorrow: is there a quality which will find an instrument, discover an instrument that is not thought? Do you understand my question? One can only find out if there is a different totally untouched by thought, is there such an instrument? And to find out one must be very, very clear, the nature and the structure of thought: its responsibility, its usage, where it is limited and recognize its limitations and move away from that limitation. Then one can begin to enquire whether there is totally a different instrument which is not contaminated by thought. Right?

We must stop here. We will meet perhaps tomorrow at the same time, if you want to.

NEW DELHI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 7TH NOVEMBER, 1983

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday evening? We were saying, weren't we, that we all have images not only psychological images but images outside of us. And these images separate man from man - the national images, the religious images and so on. They have been one of the causes, perhaps the major cause of war. Ideals have divided man, ideologies, the Left, the extreme Left, the extreme Right and the centre, they are all ideologies and they have separated man. Ideas. The original meaning of that word 'idea', from the Greek, meant to observe, not to make an abstraction of what one observes. Ideas, ideals, beliefs, faith, a particular devotion to a particular ideal, image and so on, throughout the world for the last millennia, they have divided man against man. And we still carry those ideals, those images, conclusions. And we seem to be never free from any of those things. One asks why, if one is at all aware of what is happening in the world, what is happening in ourselves, psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin, as it were, why do men, intelligent, who have studied history, why do such people carry ideals? Why do you, if I may ask, if one may ask most politely, why do you have ideals? Are you aware, if you have them, that they separate people and therefore bring about conflict? Is it because in those ideals, conclusions, opinions we find security, however fleeting, however transient they be, we find a certain sense of protection, a certain sense of achievement, trying to achieve something. And that gives us a great deal of energy. I do not know if you have not observed

deeply committed idealists, how dangerous they are.

And if one is aware that these images created by the hand or by the mind, by thought, have been again a great contributory factor to war. That is, to kill man by another man, inhumanity, bestiality, that has been the lot of man for thousands upon thousands of years. And we are still going on with it, though we are supposed to be more advanced, more progressive, but we are really, inwardly, psychologically quite primitive, quite barbarous, barbarians. I hope, one hopes, you do not mind the speaker using all these words. They apply.

And as we were saying yesterday, in relationship, however intimate, however casual, however passing, in that relationship we create images about each other. You certainly have an image about the speaker, otherwise you wouldn't be sitting here. And so the image becomes far more important than what is being said. What is being said becomes irrelevant when the image, the reputation, all that nonsense, intervenes, acts as a block, so that you do not actually listen to what the speaker is saying. So, could we, this evening, put aside our opinions, our images and look, because where there are images there is no humility. The essence of humility is to be free of all images. You cannot cultivate humility, because we are arrogant people, proud in our knowledge, in our achievements, in our thinking. And so knowledge prevents us from being extraordinarily aware of the depth and the beauty of humility. It is only when there is such humility one begins to learn about oneself, about the world and ask if there is something far beyond the measure of thought.

And as we were saying yesterday, we have lived with conflict

all the days of our life. Until we die everything has become a conflict. And one of the causes of conflict, as we said, is the formation and the cultivation and the nourishing of these images. And, as we said yesterday too, you are not hearing a lecture, a sermon, but together, as two friends who are concerned seriously with the world, the appalling state it is in and our own confusions, our own anxiety, fear, our own sorrow, which is our daily life. To understand that daily life, hypothesis is not necessary, no theory, no conclusions, because those conclusions, theories, hypotheses, suppositions, all are unreal. What is real is our daily life. And if our daily life is confused, is in disorder, our society, our environment becomes also disorderly, confused. We have said all this yesterday.

We also said that our brains which evolved through millennia upon millennia, our brains which is the centre of all our thinking, which is a centre of all our reactions and actions, it is the centre also for all our consciousness. That brain which has extraordinary capacity in one direction, the direction of war, science, medicine, surgery, hygiene, transportation and so on. It has got extraordinary capacity, far more perhaps than the computer, though they are trying to find out the ultimate mechanical intelligence which is the computer. I don't know if you have gone into that question, or even talked to people about it. They are trying to bring about a computer that can think, act, invent gods and all that the human beings do much more rapidly, instantly, though perhaps it cannot look at the beauty of the sky, the evening light, or the solemn stillness of the evening. So our brains in one direction materially, technologically have been capable of doing the most astonishing things. And in the other direction psychologically, inwardly the brain has remained

more or less what it has been for thousands of years, primitive, brutal, violent and so on. And we are concerned not with the technological aspect of the brain and its capacity in that direction but with the condition of man, of human beings who have lived for so long upon this beautiful earth and are still very violent, without any sense of compassion, without any love and so on. Whether that brain, that is, your brain, can be freed from its own condition. That is, to understand the whole content of its activity, the whole content of its consciousness with its reactions, its inventions of gods and so on, the whole content. Content is what you are, what every human being in the world is, his fame, his belief, his anxiety, his guilt, his remorse, his fears and the pleasure pursuit and the burden of infinite sorrow and the search for permanent security. This is our consciousness. Nobody can deny that. You may add to it, or take away something, but it is still consciousness with all its reactions and responses, all the things that man throughout his existence has collected through experience, through knowledge, through thought. That is our consciousness. That is what we are.

I hope, one hopes, that you and the speaker are sharing this thing together, not merely listening to what he is saying, which is also important, but far more important that we look at the thing together. Not the speaker looks and then conveys it to you, either to accept or deny, but rather together intelligently, sanely, with a sense of affection, look, look what we are, not what we should be. What 'we should be' is unreal. It has no meaning, whether you are going to be a great man next life or a saint, all that stuff, it is unreal, it has no validity, it has no stability. And if we lay our foundation on something unreal, a world of make-belief, then we

are escaping, running away from reality of our daily life.

And we are thinking together, please this is important, not that I think and then convey it to you, but rather that you and the speaker are treading the same road, taking the same journey however slowly, however carefully, observing every detail, not skipping anything, avoiding anything. Then we can communicate with each other. Then there is no resistance, it isn't the speaker knows and you don't know, but together to understand this extraordinary complex society which human beings have created and their own life, their own house which is in such disorder, if we see it together, then you don't want a leader, either politically, religiously or in any other direction. If you see it for yourself, the fact, not translate the fact according to your tradition, your desire, but to look at the fact without any reaction. Then by looking at the fact very carefully, then the fact then reveals its whole content. So please be good enough to think together.

Our concern is whether the human brain which is so conditioned, whether that brain which has such immense capacity and which has been held by condition, and as long as that condition exists it has no holistic energy. Do you understand the word 'holistic', a scientific word which means the whole. And to find out for oneself by careful observation, not analysis. When you analyse, who is the analyser? Right? Is the analyser different from the analysed? You may analyse a tree, or the seas, the waves, the dolphins - one does not know if you have seen the beauty of a dolphin. I won't go into all that for the moment. Those you can analyse by careful study something outside of us. So when you analyse yourself who is it that is analysing? Do you understand that

question? Is the analyser different from the analysed? Why does one have to explain a very simple thing? One does not have to explain the beauty of the sky, the beauty of an evening star, the love a person, you don't analyse, you love. You see, if you begin to analyse love and find out you love somebody because it gives you comfort, gives you a sense of security, then that is not love. So please find out for yourself the significance of analysis. Apart from the professional psychiatrists, psychologists, apart from them, you have to learn, understand your whole structure of yourself. If you depend on a therapist, a psychotherapist, a psychiatrist and so on, then you are always depending on someone. But if you can discover for oneself the truth of all this, then there is no dependence on anything. That gives you tremendous energy, vitality and clarity.

So it is not a question of analysis. We are not analysing the content of consciousness. We are observing. If you observe as though it was something outside of you, then there is a gap between you and that which you observe. What you observe, is it not yourself? You cannot separate yourself from what you are. You may analyse, but that separation is still the analyser who is also being analysed. Do you follow all this? So analysis is totally irrelevant. What is relevant is observation, how you observe yourself. If the observer is examining what he sees, or translates what he sees, then the observer separates himself from the thing which he is observing. Are you getting nearer to what I am trying to explain? That is, when you are angry, is that anger different from you? When you are jealous, as most people are, is that jealousy different from you? You are that jealousy, at that moment,

you are full of it, that feeling, which includes hate, antagonism, violence, at that moment, at that second you are that. Then a few seconds, or minutes later, you say, I have been jealous. Then you begin to analyse jealousy. You follow? You have separated yourself from the fact. So the observer is the past. Right? The past accumulating knowledge about jealousy. And that accumulated knowledge is the observer who says, I am different from that feeling which I have had some time before. So, can you observe, is there an observation without the observer? Do you understand all this? I don't know what I have got to explain all this.

When you look at your friend, or your wife, or your husband, or your girl friend, can you look, observe, without a single thought? You can't. To observe your wife and so on, it is not possible because of all the knowledge you have acquired, gathered about her and she about you. That knowledge prevents you from looking. Right? That is simple. If I have met you before I have a certain image of you and the next time I meet you I project that image. Therefore I do not meet you at all. Whereas to observe without knowledge - if I want to understand you, I can't say, he is a Hindu, he is a Sikh, he is German, British, that prevents me from understanding. My opinions about you prevents me from understanding you. Therefore, if I want to understand you with all my heart and mind, I put all that aside. Then I observe. Are you doing that? Are you doing that now as we are talking, or you are going to do that some time later? The 'later, some time' becomes an impediment. What is to be done is to be done now, not tomorrow. So if that is at least slightly clear, and I hope, one hopes, that is more clear than your faces show, we can proceed.

We can proceed to examine, to observe - I won't use the word 'examine'-to observe the content of our consciousness which is what we are, what each one of us is. This consciousness is shared by all humanity. You go to the far west, California, there the human beings like you with a different affluent world, they are like you, angry, jealous, violent, insecure, uncertain about themselves, just like you. Right? You come nearer, Europe, German, British, Czechoslovakian or Yugoslavian and so on or the amusing Italian, they are all like you. They worship their own particular god, and you worship your own particular god out of fear. If you are free of fear you don't have gods. We will go into that later.

So this consciousness, which you think is yours, is shared by all humanity. Right? That is a fact. You don't need to have to have proof, you talk to an Englishman, he may be proud, reserved and so on, but then you get behind it he is just like the rest of mankind. He is unemployed, he goes to church, hoping somebody will help him, somebody will give him a sense of sense of security. Right? Just like you, the rest of the world is. Right? You have to see that fact. It is not the speaker's invention. It is a fact. So if your consciousness, which you have thought is yours, you find that it is shared by all humanity then you are no longer an individual. Right? It is a shock, you are no longer an individual. And humanity throughout the ages, has thought each person is separate, is a separate soul, separate atman. You know all that stuff. And the whole sociological structure is based on that, you and me. You have power, and I have no power, but when you realize the fact, the reality, the truth that all human beings share the same consciousness, because all human beings go through great travail,

great trouble, great confusion, they hate, they quarrel, they are jealous, they are sexual and so on and so on. So you are no longer an individual. Do you understand that? You may like to think you are an individual, individual freedom, individual success, individual god, my own path different from yours. Do you understand? To realize that fact that you are no longer individual means a tremendous psychological change. It is not mere verbal description, but it is a fundamental, radical revolution in the psyche that you are the entire humanity. When one realizes that, you will never kill another human being. It is like, it is our earth, it is not Indian earth, it is not European earth, or the Russian earth, or the American, it is our earth, and we are the rest of humanity. Do you understand what that means? This needs a great sense of compassion, a great sense of responsibility.

So let's proceed. To observe, not as you observe a fish in an aquarium, but to observe what we are. First of all, to observe we must understand the nature of thought, which we went into briefly yesterday, and also the nature of time. This becomes serious, please. Not that what we have said a few minutes ago was not serious, it still is, but this requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of, not concentration - concentration is deadly to attention. It requires attention for you to look, to give your energy, the whole of your being, to find out. We said, thought is limited, yesterday, because thought is based on knowledge and knowledge is based on experience. You see in the scientific world, through constant experience, one hypothesis after another, one theory after another, breaking it down, trying to prove it, accumulating more and more knowledge. No scientist worth his salt will ever say, knowledge is

complete. No book, no religious book can ever be complete, it is written down by thought. The words used are the symbol of thought.

So please observe for yourself that your knowledge, your experience is always, everlastingly conditioned, limited. That is a fact. So your thinking is also limited. And any action born of thought which is limited must inevitably create conflict between you and another. Right? Because the very nature of thought is divisive, because it is limited. You follow, not what the speaker is saying, but you yourself are observing, seeing the fact, the truth for yourself that thought will always be limited, because it is based on knowledge, based on experience. And as thought itself is a fragment, because it is limited, therefore, the solution for all our problems is not through thought.

What is a problem, the meaning of that word, not the problem itself, but what you say, problem - what does that word mean? The root meaning of that word is something thrown at you, something that acts as a challenge to you. Right? That is the meaning of that word, from Latin and Greek and so on, I won't go into it - something that is actually thrown at you. That's a problem. And our brains from childhood have been trained, educated to solve problems. Right? A child goes to school and he has to learn mathematics, which is a problem to the child, then geography, history, biology, physics, everything becomes a problem. So his brain, which is your brain, is conditioned to solve problems. Right? So you never solve problems. Do you understand? If my brain is conditioned to solve problems I look at life as a problem, so we are always trying to solve problems. As the politicians are doing

throughout the world, they are trying to solve problems, and so increasing problems. And they have never solved any problems because their brains - are there any politicians here? Forgive me! - so their brains are trained, educated from childhood to solve problems. And therefore they have never solved any problems. On the contrary they have increased problems. Don't laugh at the politicians. You are also a politician. The politician is not different from you.

So please understand this very important fact that as long as your brain is trained to solve problems, as the brain itself has become a problem, it can never solve it. Do you understand? So is it possible to have a brain that has no problem? Then only it can solve problems. Do you understand this? Please capture this, please understand this as depth, not superficially. To live a life without a single problem, that means to be free, the brain being free of its education to solve problems, so that it can look at problems, because it is only when there is freedom you can observe. You know that word 'freedom', implies, affection, love. A mind burdened with problems can never love.

I do not know if you understand all this, at least some of you do, I hope. Understand not intellectually, but actually and then put it in life.

So our consciousness is not separate from the rest of humanity. That is a tremendous revelation, greater than any other revelations in any other books, because it then brings about a tremendous, radical change. You are humanity. Do you understand this? So if you are, if your house is not in order, the rest of humanity is not in order. So let us together examine, let us together observe the

content of our consciousness, of ourselves. One of the factors is thought and time. Thought has become the major factor. It is the only factor because it has accumulated the whole content of our consciousness. Thought, as we said, is born of experience, knowledge, stored in the brain as memory and from memory thought exists. This whole process is instantaneous. And that thought is limited. Right? This is clear, simple.

Then you must look at time, because for us time is extraordinarily important: the tomorrow with its hope, with its danger, with its sense of achievement, the tomorrow - that tomorrow may be a hundred tomorrows, but it is still tomorrow. That tomorrow is the time of yesterdays. Right? Do you understand this? Yesterday, when you say, yesterday, it is already the past and therefore it is part of time, when you say, it's twelve o'clock, it is past eleven o'clock. So yesterday and many thousand yesterdays are the result of a continuous movement of time. Right? Do you understand? Time, not only physical time, but psychological time: I will be, I am not, but I will be. That is time. I am not good - will any of you say that? You won't! - but I will be good. I am ignorant, but I will be learned. This life has been unsatisfactory, miserable, perhaps next life. The next life is what you are now. Right? If you don't change now you will be what you are tomorrow. Only we postpone to the next life - if there is a next life. But we won't go into that for the moment. Time to achieve, to learn, to become, to become a success, to find enlightenment, to meditate, takes time, both chronologically as well as psychologically is tremendously important. Right? Because your whole life is based on time. Your business, your learning about technology, learning about computer,

learning a new language, learning how to drive a car, how to play a violin, or this or that, that requires time. Please listen to this carefully. To learn a language requires time. To learn about any technology requires time. That same, requiring time, is extended to the psychological field. Do you understand?

I need time to learn how to drive a car. So I also need time to learn about myself. It is the same movement. Are you following this? So we must understand the nature of time. There is time outwardly, the sun rises, sun sets. The sun rises at a certain time in the winter and sets at a certain time. The sun rises at mid summer at a certain time, sets at a certain time, and so on. All that is external time. But also we have an internal time which is based on becoming. Right? I have an ideal of non-violence, which you are so fond of, and in the meantime I am violent and one day I am going to get there. Right? In the meantime you are violent. So non-violence is a fallacy. It sounds good. All your saints have preached it, even the recent ones. And you like that, but the fact is that you are violent. That is fact and non-violence is a non-fact. Face it. If you are pursuing non-violence you are really avoiding the actual fact of your being violent. And to face that is more important than the pursuit of non-violence. However much you may talk about non-violence you are actually terribly violent.

So there are these two factors in our lives, major factors: thought and time. You cannot deny that. It is a fact. Are they separate? Is not thought time? Right? You are following all this? Please, I am not teaching you. I am only pointing out - not even pointing out, we are thinking together. We are both of us sharing the food, sharing the food that has been put before us. It is the food

that matters, and the food, if it is properly balanced food, nourishes. And this food is thought and time which you must share with the speaker. That means you must understand the nature of time, which is also very complex, as thought is. We are pointing out, both our movements. Thought is a movement and time is a movement. So they are one; it is not thought is separate, time is separate. Thought has created time. Right? I am this and I will be that. That movement is brought about by thought. I will be, I will achieve my ideal. That is a movement of thought including in time. When you say, I will achieve, achievement means time. Right? I hope you see all this together.

So these are the major factors of life, time plus thought. And to look, to observe the content of our consciousness which is shared by all humanity, and therefore you and the rest are humanity. that's a marvellous thing if you understand it. That you are the rest of mankind, that you are not separate from the rest of mankind. So we can examine, so we can observe the content, which is shared by all living things. Do you understand? Then that thing is sacred, that is the holiest of things, because then there is no separation, there is no division. Then your wife is you and you are the wife.

The thing we worship is not love. Your scriptures, your books, your gurus, temples, in there, there is no truth. Truth is to be found in the understanding of your whole being. And is it very near. You don't have to go very far to find truth. You don't have to go to Kashi, to Mecca, to Rome. It is there where you are. Forgive the speaker for his passion.

So let us observe one of the contents of our consciousness. From childhood we are psychologically being hurt. That is a fact.

The parents hurt, society hurts, the school with their examinations, with their marks, with their comparison, hurt the child. This is a fact. And we carry this hurt throughout life. And that hurt makes us build a wall round ourselves, so as not to be hurt any more. Have you not noticed this? Have you not been hurt from childhood, all of us? Of course, obviously. It shows from your face. And what is it that is hurt? You say, I am hurt - what is 'you' that is hurt? The image that you have built about yourself. Right? That is hurt and you have identified yourself with that image. If you had no image you would never be hurt. Right? Which means you have no identification with anything. Where there is identification, with a family, with an ideal, you are always going to be bruised, shaken, hurt, frightened.

So can you live - please, this is a very serious question - can you live without a single image? Otherwise you will always be hurt and also you will never have the beauty of humility. So to become aware of your image that is hurt and in that awareness be intensely aware without any choice-don't choose, you can't choose in awareness. If you are aware now, as you are sitting under a tent, if you are aware of all the colour as you come in, the shape of the tent, the person sitting next to you, the clothes he is wearing - just to observe, not say, I don't like that colour, or the man I am sitting next to he smells, or he is not clean, or his shirt not what I like. So awareness is limited. But if you are aware without any choice, without any direction, then that awareness reveals everything.

So to be aware of the image that you have about yourself, about another, that image of nationality, identified with a nation and so on, that image, as long as you have it, you are going to have grief,

pain, it gets hurt. So the question is: can you live without any image? One can. If you understand, if you see the fact, the fact that as long as you have an image and identify with that image you are going to have great problems. And your brain is trained to solve problems, therefore you are caught in problems. But if you see the fact, not as a problem, that as long as you have an image it must be shattered by somebody, therefore you get hurt. Which means one of the contents of our consciousness is fear. Shall I go into it now?

It is a very complex problem because we have lived with fear all the days of our lives. It is a dark shadow, it is something humanity has borne, carried for millions of years. Each one, we know what fear is, fear of the past, the remorse, the guilt, the things that have been done and should not have, the regrets. Fear is very complex. And to understand fear, not verbally, not merely intellectually, but to face the fact that each one of us is scared, frightened. And we have never been able to solve that problem. We carry it with us as our shadow. Fear means to be alone, finding oneself lonely, unloved and seeking love, fear of what might happen, lose my job, I will be one of the unemployed. There are people in the world who do not know what work is. For the rest of their lives they will never work, not because they are crippled, but because society, governments are so limited, so narrow, so brutal, thousands upon thousands, in England nearly four million people are unemployed, and in this country, god knows how many - those people are afraid. You may have a good job, you may have security, but there is always this fear of tomorrow; not only the fear of tomorrow, but the fear of death, fear of never being whole, complete. So fear is an extraordinarily complex problem, not to be

dealt with in a few minutes. It is a vast area of our life and in that area you must tread very slowly, carefully, tentatively. It is not how to end fear, but in the very understanding the depth of it, the quality of it, there is an end to fear completely, that can never return, a freedom absolute, psychological freedom from fear. Then no god, no prayer, no scriptures exist. It is only the fearful mind, fearful brain that seeks security in things illusory.

So, as it is now quarter past seven we have to stop. We will go into all this next Saturday and Sunday.

NEW DELHI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH NOVEMBER, 1983

May we go on with what we were talking about last Monday? We were trying to go into the question of fear, which is a very complex problem. But before we go into it rather deeply, if one may remind you this is not a lecture as is commonly understood, to inform and to instruct, but rather it is a conversation between us, conversation between two friends who are concerned with the problem of existence, with all its complexity and intricacies, and they are not to convince each other of anything. They are not persuading each other. They are not doing propaganda at all. What they are trying to do together is to think of the various issues that contain in our daily life. Only in our daily life, not theories, not speculations, not philosophical or intellectual assumptions and conclusions. But rather enquire, think together. And to think together one must listen to each other. There is an art of listening which is to listen not only with the ear but the hearing of the ear, much deeper, more attentive, more concerned, affectionate, not translating what is being said into your own terminology, into your own particular conditioning, but rather to listen to each other. And as it is not possible with a large audience like this to have a dialogue, which is a conversation between two people, we will assume that there is only one person here, and talking to each other.

We were saying the other day, weren't we, that relationship is of enormous importance, because all life is based on relationship. If in that relationship there is conflict of any kind then that relationship brings about division, all the rest of the confusion that lies in our

relationship, whether it is intimate or not. And we said too that as long as there is an image forming mechanism about each other then communication is not possible, or relationship, deep relationship, is not possible. We went into that very carefully.

So, please, we are thinking together if that is possible, because most of us are so obstinate, so definite in our opinions, in our convictions, in our conclusions, in our ideals, in our own importance, so we hardly listen to each other, or think together. Perhaps it may be possible, this evening, to think together, not about something, that is fairly easy. If you are a businessman you would think together about doing somebody in the eye and so on, or gaining money, planning for it, then you co-operate. But here thinking together means not about something, the capacity, the urge to co-operate in thinking.

So we are going to think together about fear, what fear is, how it arises, what is its cause, where it leads, to violence, to various forms of neuroticism, psychosis and how it darkens our lives, how fear, both biological as well as psychological, shrinks one. And we were saying also when we briefly talked about it the other day that thought and time are one of the major factors of fear. We went into the question of thought, thought being limited because all experience is limited, all knowledge whether in the past or in the future, knowledge will ever be limited, always continuously limited. And from that experience knowledge is stored in the brain as memory and from that memory springs thought. And so thought is always limited, whether you invent god which is the invention of thought, and all the paraphernalia that goes on in the various temples, churches, mosques is invented by thought which is always

limited. Thought can imagine the illimitable, the timeless, the immeasurable, but it is still the movement of thought. And thought is a material process. So there is nothing sacred about thought.

I hope we are meeting each other, we are walking along the same road together. Not that we are trying to persuade you, but that is an obvious fact. You may not be willing to look at the facts, because one may be superstitious, ideological, afraid to look at facts. And so we like to live in illusions. That is our lot, we have lived for millions of years in illusions.

One of the illusions, major illusions, as we pointed out the other day, is our consciousness with all its reactions, with all its content, fear, belief, faith, anxiety, remorse, guilt, you know, pleasure, pain and suffering. All that is our consciousness. And that consciousness is not individual. It is shared by all human beings, whether in the East, West, whatever country they belong to, that consciousness is shared by all human beings. We have talked about that considerably. So when one realizes the sharing of this consciousness by all humanity, you then are humanity, therefore you are no longer individual. This is a statement you won't accept. But it is a fact. Look at it carefully, logically, sanely, with a sense of questioning, with a quality of a brain that doubts, questions authority. And when you begin to investigate, not others, but enquire into your own thoughts, actions, responses, your fears, your anxieties, then you will discover for yourself that all human beings whether they are in the totalitarian governments, or in the so-called democratic governments, broken up by religions, you all share the same anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, searching for security. So we are, we share this enormous burden.

And one of the major burdens of our consciousness is fear, why human beings, however sophisticated, however learned, however devoutly worshipping some idol made by the hand or by the mind, there is always fear: fear of death, fear of tomorrow, fear of that which has happened weeks ago and so on. We are discussing not a particular form of fear, but the cause of fear, whether that cause can be totally, completely eliminated. So we must begin with the structure of the psyche, not how to get rid of fear outwardly, but psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were. When there is fear inwardly, not spoken about, not enquired into, then that very fear creates externally, in the outward world, a great deal of confusion - which is obvious. You can see that.

So we are going to think together, enquire together, what is the root of fear, whether that root can be totally rooted out. Fear takes many forms: fear is part of violence. Violence is a very complex affair. Aggression, both physical and psychological, is part of fear. And we have never understood or been free from all violence. In this country we have talked a great deal about non-violence. That is one of our favourite slogans, cliches, that we are all attempting to be non-violent. These two words are used politically and by ordinary people. But non-violence is not a fact. It is an idea. What is a fact is violence. Right? We never deal with a fact, but we rather run away from the fact into a concept called non-violence. And that concept is created by thought and we pursue that and sow violence in the pursuit of non-violence. Right? Are you following all this? Are you interested in all this? Am I speaking to somebody or to myself in my room, or writing a book about it all. Are we together in this? I hope so, otherwise I don't know why you should

sit here. It is a waste of your time.

So what is the root of fear? Violence, aggression, and when one is uncertain, not clear, that confusion brings about a state of anxiety and where there is anxiety there is also fear. And where there is fear there is the desire to hurt people and so on. And we are not talking therefore of a particular fear, not your particular fear, you may be afraid of your wife, or your husband, or your government, or the boss above you, but fear as a whole thing. Is that clear, that we are not thinking together about a particular form of fear, but rather enquiring about why human beings for thousands of years have carried this burden, why, however intellectual, learned, sophisticated, or technologically advanced, this fear continues. So if we can this evening think together and see if it is possible to totally eliminate psychological fear, not how to be free from fear. When you ask, how to be free, then you want a system, a method, a practice. And that very system, method, practice brings about more fear - whether you are doing it rightly - you follow? Fear is sustained. Are we together in this? I am afraid not. Some of you, some of us, are so trained to systems, methods, so conditioned, 'tell me what to do', 'tell me how to get rid of fear, I will practise it'. Then your brain becomes mechanical. Right? If you practise over and over again it is like a gramophone record playing the same old tune. But whereas if both of us want to go into this question very deeply, and enquire, not 'how', enquire, so that we find out the root of it. When you go to a doctor, he not only deals with the symptom but he wants to find out the cause. And in diagnosis he finds the cause and says, don't eat so much, or take this or that and so eliminates the cause - at least one hopes. But in

the same way we are enquiring into the very causation of fear. What is the cause? We are thinking together. I may put into words. I may, one may describe it, by putting into words, the speaker is not helping you to understand fear. You are doing it yourself. Right? You are doing it for yourself, though the speaker may talk about it. Right?

What is the cause of fear? Please, if you find it act, don't carry on with fear. What is the cause of it? Is it thought? Is it time? Thought - I have had certain anxieties, fear last year, or last week and I hope it will not occur again. Follow. The fear has a continuity. Right? Clear? Fear has a continuity, duration, and that continuity implies time. So thought, time is the root of fear. Right? You can't get round that fact. Thought itself creates fear. I have a job, I am quite happy at the moment, but I may lose it. So thought projects into the future a condition which I may live in and that creates fear. Or I have had certain pain, physical pain, the remembering it and hoping it will not happen again. So it is both, thought and time are the root fact.

Now you have listened to it. What can be done? Do you understand? Now you have listened to the fact that thought and time basically, fundamentally is the cause of fear. The next question naturally arises, how am I to put aside thought? Right? Or how am I to stop thought? You are following this? If I could stop thought and the continuity of the movement as time, is that possible? I hope you are asking this question yourself. I am not putting this question to you. You are asking this question of yourself. One sees the truth that thought and time are the essence of fear. Now how do you observe this fact, that thought and time

are the causation of fear? How do you look at it, receive it or approach the question? Do you understand me? How do you, when you listen to this fact, what is your response to it, actual response, not calculated response? You naturally say you are stuck. Right? You are stuck in that position. And if you ask 'how', again your reply is mechanical. So you are also stuck there. You are blocked. Right? Are you being held by a fact? Right? I wonder if you see this. You are held down by an actuality, and you have no response to that. Right? If you are quite honest with oneself you see this truth and you know you cannot do anything. Right? That is, for the first time in your life have said, I cannot do anything. Right? Before you have always done something. I wonder. You have always acted on fear: I must control it, I must suppress it, I must rationalize all fear and so on. You always took action about it. Now you can't. Right?

So you observe without reaction, you watch the fact and that the fact is not different from you. The fact is you. Is that clear? Fear brought about by thought and time is you. Like anger is you, greed is you, your ambition is you, your name, your form, your way of thinking is you. So you are stuck with yourself. There is nobody to help you. You have understood it? No. Nobody to help you to be free of fear, because the guru himself is afraid. He wants to reach some other state and all the rest of the nonsense. So you are for the first time in a position, in a situation where there is nobody to help you, no god, no angels, no governments, no saviour. Then what happens to your whole being? Do you understand all this?

Then if you can look at it totally without any reaction, because you are that, then you will see, because you have brought all the

energy which you have been wasting and searching for an escape and trying to suppress fear, trying to worship gods to save you from fear, all that wasted energy is brought together as complete energy. And that energy dissolves totally fear. Do it sirs, do it as you are sitting here, listening now, not when you go home, then it is too late. That is mere postponement, avoidance. Whereas, if you can face the fact, then you will always be dealing with facts. Facts are that which has happened in the past and that which is happening now. Facts do not exist in the future. Right? The fact that there has been an accident. It is a fact. I was caught last year in a car accident, and that is a fact. And it is a fact that I am now sitting here and talking and so on. So to always live with facts, not with opinions, not with conclusions, not with ideals, but actually that you are angry, that you are greedy, that you are ambitious, you are violent. That very act of living with the fact of fear because that fact demands your total attention. And where there is total attention, which is bringing all your energy, it is like throwing a bright light on an object, then you see things clearly and therefore totally free from fear. To the speaker this is a fact psychologically. You may not believe it, I don't care. But the fact is when there is freedom from this fear then only there is love.

We will go into that presently, into the quality, the nature of love, compassion and intelligence. But one cannot come to it where fear exists. And also we should consider why human beings throughout the world are pursuing everlastingly pleasure - aren't you? Sexual pleasure, pleasure of achieving, pleasure of power, pleasure of position, pleasure of being somebody. Right? This has been the pursuit of man: power, money, success-why? What is

pleasure? Go into it, please, we are thinking together. I am not, the speaker is not lecturing. What is pleasure? To achieve success, to become successful, not only in this ugly world - the world is very beautiful, but we have made it ugly - not only be successful in this world but also to be successful in the other world, it is the same movement, they are not two different things. We have divided this. That is one of our peculiarities of thought, to divide, to divide the world, the materialistic world and the so-called spiritual world. In a spiritual world, if I may use that timeworn word, 'spiritual' - the speaker doesn't like that word but we will use it - in the spiritual world there is tremendous pleasure in achieving: I am this today, but I will be that tomorrow. And in the physical world it is fairly obvious.

So one asks why, why not only this division, but why this search for pleasure, the repetition of it, the mechanical content of it. Do you understand, whether it is sexual or otherwise, it becomes mechanical, habitual. Which means what? Our brains have become, have become so mechanical. Right? You go to school, college, university, acquire knowledge and you function there for the rest of your life. Either skilfully or not, you have set the pattern, the tradition and you follow it. Face the fact, sir. You are going to do exactly what you want to do. You may listen to all this very politely, perhaps a little respectfully and perhaps even less affectionately, but after having listened very carefully for an hour you are going to do exactly what you want to do. That is your pleasure. And why have human beings who are so extraordinarily clever, inventive, open in one direction, the technological world, and why they are so caught in this narrow pleasure, the routine of

it? Is it still thought? Is it still time? So thought is both the creator of fear and the continuity of pleasure. Right? Am I making it clear? That is a fact. So we ask the next question: is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love the instrument of thought? Please, we are, you are asking this question, not me, not the speaker. Or you are only concerned with pleasure and desire? So we have to enquire, if you are not too tired, into what is desire. We have enquired into fear, and facing the fact and not moving away from the fact. We see what thought has done; time and thought have brought about fear, brought about a continuity and a demand for pleasure. And we are asking, is love part of thought? Is love a continuity of time? Right? So we are going to find out together if it is possible to understand, not intellectually or sentimentally, emotionally, because emotion is very limited, narrow, restricted like sentimentality. Sentimentality and romanticism breed violence. I won't go into all that now, there is no time.

So what is love? Do you love your wife, do you love your husband, do you love your children, love. If you really loved your children, really loved them with your heart, there would be no wars. Right? You would educate them differently to see the causes of war, nationalism and so on. If you really loved that perfume, that beauty, that quality and strength then there will not only be no wars, then religions won't divide people: the Christian, the Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic you know all that kind of intellectual divisions that have no reality at all. So together let us find out, not find out intellectually, you will never find out through words, through intellectual gambits. You have to delve into it to find out very deeply. So to ask, is desire love? And then what is desire? Why

human beings throughout the ages were slaves to desire. They suppressed it, they dedicated their desire to god. They became monks, sannyasis so as to suppress. Don't look at a woman. And if you are a nun, don't look at a man. Right? So desire has been trampled upon, controlled, suppressed, rationalized, transmuted to some higher purpose, to the service of mankind, to social service, all that bilge - sorry to use that word-all that nonsense, because they have not understood the depth of that word desire.

So together, please, let us enquire, think together, the cause of why human beings have become slaves to desire. We are not against desire. We are not saying suppress it, do something with it. We are enquiring into the nature of desire, the structure of it, origin of it. Right? Are you tired? Of course, you will say, no, because the speaker is doing all the work. If you actually applied your brain to find out then you would find you would have more energy, vitality to go much further into it. But if you merely say, yes, I agree with you, this is so, this is a fact and go home and continue with your own old ways, then it is meaningless. So please let us think together what is desire, not how to suppress it, or act upon desire, but what is the origin, what is the beginning of it? Shall we do that?

Have you ever observed a new moon, the rising moon, with all your senses, or you only say, how beautiful that is, or never look at it? Have you ever seen something with all your senses awakened? Perhaps not. But if you have, in that activity when all the senses are fully in action, there is no centre as the me. Right? Oh, you don't understand all this. So senses are important. Right? Unless you are totally paralysed, I hope you are not, your senses are in

action. When you eat, when you drink, when you have sex, all your senses are functioning. But they are never functioning as a whole, they are functioning partially. So the sensory responses are very important. Right? Unless you are partially paralysed, as most of us are, by fear, by anxiety, by all kinds of things, our senses are limited, controlled. So the senses respond. Right? The sense of seeing a car, a woman, a mountain, a tree, there is a response. There is sensation. Right? There is contact, the seeing, contact, sensation. Right? That's normal. We agree? Are we together in it? You see a beautiful, nice shirt in the window. You go into the shop, touch the material and you have a sensation. Right? Then what happens? This is important to find out. I enter a shop and see a good coat, touch the material, which is a natural, normal sensation. Then thought comes along and says, how nice I would look in that coat. Then thought creates the image of me in that coat. At that moment desire is born. Do you understand all this? That is, seeing a nice car, with new beautiful lines, highly polished - not the Indian cars, forgive me - the latest model, in that you can go very fast, control, safety and all the rest of it. You see it, put your hand on it, see how highly polished it is, metallic polish and thought comes and says, by Jove, how nice it would be to get into that car and drive. When thought uses sensation with its image, at that moment desire is born. Clear? Clear in the sense, see it for yourself, not the explanation the speaker is making. Right?

So the origin of desire begins when thought creates the image. Right? This is important, please, if you will kindly listen. Now we discipline desire, we control it, we shape it: this is right desire, this is wrong desire, this is a noble desire, holy desire and this is a

worldly desire, ignoble desire, righteous desire and unrighteous desire. But desire is desire. Right? Whether you call it holy or unholy, it is still desire. So unless you understand the beginning of desire, then all the problem of control, suppression and so on arises. Whereas - if you will kindly listen to this - if there is an interval between the seeing, contact, sensation, an interval, then thought does not interfere, then thought does not say, how nice it would be to get into that car and drive. There is an interval, a gap between the sensation and the activity of thought interfering with that sensation. If you can extend that gap - do you understand what I am saying, don't look surprised. I will go into it again. Must one explain all these things. Can't you capture it instantly without innumerable words, intellectual explanations? Apparently you can't so we will have to go into it.

You see that new car, an object in front of you. Then you go up to it and touch it. Right? See how beautifully the chrome is polished, the new colour. Now that is one state. Right? The seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought comes along, creates the image, you sitting in that car and driving off. Right? At that moment when thought creates the image of you in the car, at that second desire is born. Right? See the fact, question the fact, doubt the fact, find out if this is true or not. Desire exists only where there is sensation. Right? And sensation becomes the instrument of thought. Right? Thought uses sensation, in the car. Right? Or thought says, I have had that experience which was tremendously pleasurable, I want more of it. Right? So what the speaker is saying is very simple, that's why you find it awfully difficult. What the speaker is saying is: sensation and thought with its imagination, keep them apart for

a while. Do you understand? Look at the car with all the attraction, the sensation, and let there be an interval, a hiatus between thought and sensation - right? - not immediately act, act either physically or act intellectually. Do you understand the question? That means a sense of observation in which there is a certain quality of observation in which there is no attachment. Do you understand?

So we are asking is desire love? For most of us pleasure, desire is love. Don't get bored, don't yawn at this moment because it is rather an unpleasant moment for you. Do you love at all? Or love has become an exchange: you do this for me, I will do that for you. Is love reward and punishment? Do you understand? I am using ordinary English, simple language. That is, you train a dog by rewarding him, and punishing him when he does not do it. You must have dogs, you must have observed dogs, or you have your own dog; if you are training a dog, you reward, to heel, and then you pat him, or you punish him when he does not come, or do what you tell him. So he soon learns how to act according to your instructions, based on reward and punishment. And we are like that too. Right? I will do this if you give me that, that which is more pleasurable, I will do. If it hurts me I won't. The same principle. Do you understand? So I am asking, is love a reward or punishment business? Or has love nothing whatever to do with thought. If one has a wife or a husband, or a girl friend, which is the modern tradition, what place has love? Is love a remembrance? You don't ask these questions. Is love, I will give you this, you give me that, exchange, thought, dominance, attachment, possession, is that love? Or has love nothing whatsoever to do with me? Do you understand that? In love there is no me. Where there is love the self

is not. That means no ambition. How can an ambitious man love, a man pursuing power, either politically, religiously, or the power over a person, how can he love? Do you understand all this? Don't say, no, you cannot because you are caught in that position. You don't seek power in any form: political power, religious power, the powers of books, the powers of the gurus, the power of a leader is ugly, evil, brutal, you don't see. You worship power. Don't you? That is why the capitalists exist, because all the politicians flower. We all want power, in one form or another. And therefore where there is power love goes by the window. And that is why the world is in such a fearful mess.

And love has its own intelligence. And where there is love that intelligence acts. It is not the intelligence of thought, not the intelligence of calculation, of remembrances, rewards. Intelligence, which we cannot go into it this evening, there is no time, intelligence is not the instrument of thought. So one has to enquire into what is intelligence. The word means, not only to read between the lines, but to gather information and use that information intellectually, physically and so on. That is the ordinary meaning of that word 'intelligence', in the dictionary, the root meaning, *interlegere* is to read between. But we are not talking about intelligence that everybody has. We are all very clever. We are all very learned. We know too much, but we are not intelligent. When you know, for example, that one of the causes of war, killing other human beings, is nationalism, tribalism. You know that very well, but you are still Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, you know all the rest of it, so that, though you know the cause of war you perpetuate that war. That is the height of stupidity. And the people who are in

power are that, all over the world.

So, my friends, you have heard, and if you have listened carefully to each other, which means to listen to yourself, not to the speaker. If you have listened to yourself, he is only a mirror in which you see yourself as you are. If you see yourself as you are then you can throw away the mirror, break it. The mirror is not important. It has no value. What has value is that you see clearly in that mirror yourself as you are, one's pettiness, one's narrowness, one's brutality, the anxieties, the fears and all the rest of it. When you begin to understand yourself then you go profoundly into something that is beyond all measure. But you must take the first step. And to take that first step nobody is going to help you. Now we have heard all these three talks. What are you going to do with it? Just carry on in the same old way, follow the same old pattern, callous, indifferent, unconcerned, except for yourself, and the brutality of all the world which we have created, because we are also very brutal people.

So, please, let us think together, consider together and face the facts, not run away from facts, then the doors open to clarity. Then you abolish altogether confusion, you think clearly, objectively and see its limitation. And when you see its limitation then you are asking, looking trying to discover a new instrument which is not thought - which we will go into if there is time. We are going to discuss, to talk over together the question of death which is very complex, the question of what is a religious mind and what is religion, what is meditation, if there is something really sacred, holy which is not touched by thought. We will consider all this, if we have time, tomorrow.

NEW DELHI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH NOVEMBER, 1983

We ought to talk over many things this evening. If one may repeat again, we are thinking together, I'm not telling you what to do, or what to think. But rather that we are together walking a path that is beautiful, full of shade, love-birds and great tall trees and a lovely evening with the sun behind you, and the sunset is something most marvellous. And together we are walking down that lane full of quietness, great sense of beauty.

One wonders what is beauty. Have we ever considered that question at all. You may see some statue or a picture in a museum, or in a house, and you say, what a marvellous picture that is, that is really a lovely head of the Buddha, of some person. But behind the words, behind the structure of a painting, the shadows, the proportions, what is beauty? Is it in the way you look at it? Is it in the picture? Is it in the face of a person? When you see a marvellous mountain against a blue sky, with the great depth of valley and snow-capped peaks, when you look at all that great beauty, for a moment you have forgotten yourself. The mountain is so vast, so extraordinarily lighted by the morning sun, catching the highest peaks and your whole brain is struck by the grandeur, by the enormity of that sight and for a second you forget all about yourself, forget all about your worries, you forget your wife, your husband, your children, your country. And you look at that with all your being, and have a sense of contradiction, duality. It is there, its splendour. And the absence of the self, the 'me', is for a second put aside by the greatness of that beauty.

So this evening, to come down to earth, we are going to go together into the question of sorrow, of death. And we touched yesterday the quality of love, the perfume of it, the strength of it, the immensity of compassion with its great intelligence. And also we are going to talk over this evening, if we have time, what is the brain that perceives the true religious spirit, and what is meditation and if there is something which is utterly holy, sacred, not made by thought or put together for comfort. We are going to go into all this, if we can, this evening. They are really not separate things. Suffering, compassion, intelligence, the ending of sorrow and meditation and all that is one movement, totally related. They are not separate.

So can we look at all this, this human existence with all its problems, with all its confusion and misery, with its travail, with its endless poverty, both physical and the inward poverty? To look at all that as a total movement, not fragmented, not broken up, but as a whole, and therefore a way of living in which there is no contradiction, there is no duality, there is no opposition, a way of living that is entirely intrinsic, integral, whole. Is that possible? We will find it if we can look at ourselves, not as a dual movement of life, but a holistic way of living, which we will go into.

Sorry to make an introduction of this kind but as we entered the tent you look at that moon, very young, new, extraordinarily simple. And therefore one thought, what is the point of talking at all. What is the point of reading books, attending meetings, what is the point of all this existence when one cannot look at this simple thing clearly, with great love and affection, a simple thing, to approach life with all its complexity, simply, without all the

accumulated knowledge of our past, our traditions; just to look at this vast movement of life, simply and a brain that is not burdened, a brain that is active, alive, full of energy, with clarity, simplicity.

Having said that, let us proceed together. We human beings have suffered a great deal. There have been incessant wars; historically speaking, for the last five thousand years there has been practically every year a war, human beings killing each other, destroying what they have built, great monuments being destroyed overnight. This has been the history of man, perpetual conflict, war. And through wars man has suffered enormously. How many people have shed tears, their sons, their husbands left maimed for life, one arm, no legs, blind. Man has shed tears endlessly. And we too are shedding tears, because our life is rather empty, lonely. And we suffer too, all of us, not only watching the suffering of others but also the grief, the pain, the anxiety of our own life, the poverty of people, not the poverty of the poor only but also the poverty of our own minds and hearts. And when we begin to discover this enormous poverty in spite of vast information and knowledge that breeds also great sorrow. There is the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow brought about by inhumanity to man, the sorrow of losing your own friend, your son, your brother, your mother and so on. And we have carried this sorrow throughout our life for centuries upon centuries. And we have never asked if that sorrow can ever end. And we are asking now, together looking at this sorrow of the world and the sorrow in which one lives, in your own heart, in your own mind, in your own brain, and we are asking whether that sorrow can ever end. Or must man, including woman of course, always carry throughout the future and the past, can that sorrow

ever end?

You know there is an art in questioning. Like there is an art in painting, an art in friendship, there is an art in love and so on, there is also an art in questioning, doubting, doubting one's own conclusions, one's own opinions, to question why we tolerate this vast burden of sorrow. Sorrow is both self-pity, sorrow is the feeling of utter loneliness, the sorrow that is brought about through great failures, through comparison the whole movement of feeling, the sense of lack of relationship to anybody. I am sure you would all say that at moments, but we never go to the very end of it. We would rather escape from it, seek some form of comfort, some form of a drug that gives us solace.

So, if we could, this evening, not escape, not try to find an answer, not whether sorrow can be conquered, but to be aware, to see the full meaning of that word `sorrow'. Sorrow also means from the original etymological meaning, passion, not lust, passion. And without passion life becomes rather dull, meaningless. And the ending of sorrow brings about passion. So together we are looking at this word, the content of that word, the significance of that thing called sorrow which man has carried throughout his life. To look at it, not to explain it away, not to find the cause. There are many causes of sorrow - that is fairly simple to find out, the causes of sorrow, the death of a son, the failure of not being successful, not being able to fulfil, having no identification and so on and so on. There are many causes for sorrow. But if you are enquiring into the causes of sorrow then you are also preventing yourself from looking at the word, the beauty, the strength of that word. So could we look at that word. Sorrow means grief, pain, anxiety, desperate

loneliness, the meaninglessness of this existence. All that is contained in that word and more. So can you look at it wholly as you hold a precious jewel, a marvellous piece of sculpture, to hold it, to remain with it, and not in any way allow thought to come and interfere with that actuality. If you can so remain with that then that very word, the significance of that word is totally ended, but we never stay with anything. You always want to find an end and so we are always moving away from that very jewel that gives us great vitality, great strength, great passion. Are we walking together? Or are you merely listening to these words and getting emotional about it, romantic and therefore never looking at that thing, the pain of it, the grief, the emptiness of one's own being? If one can really completely hold that jewel, it is a great jewel, and man has tried to do everything he can to escape from it, volumes have been written about it, but the books, the explanations, the word, is not the actual. To remain with the actual, then that very attention brings an end to that thing which we call sorrow. Where there is sorrow there cannot be love. Love is not related to any activity of the human brain. Love is something that comes into being when there is no fear, when there is an end to sorrow, then that very love becomes compassion which is passion with its immense intelligence.

Also we ought to talk over together this evening the meaning of death. You are rather bored with all this, aren't you? I am bored with the explanation, because we never capture something quickly, instantly, have an insight into the whole nature of the human mind, brain, our heart, one depends on explanations, descriptions, what other people have said. And so we lose our own integrity, our own

perception, insight to look at things as they are and go beyond them.

So we have to talk over together this question of death. To understand what is death, not only the physical organism coming to an end, the ending, the end of the heart beating, which then doesn't supply blood to the brain and the brain then decays. This whole organism, with wrong usage, accident, some disease comes to an end, whether we are very young or very old. And that we consider death. And also we never consider what is living - before rather than after. We are all going to die. That is one absolute certainty, whether you like it or not. We are all going to pop off, 'gathered to your fathers' to use the phrase in the Bible. And we human beings put that as far away as possible from us. And so there is duality: living and dying.

Have you ever considered what is duality? If duality as the opposite exists at all? Are we together in this? We have been brought up by tradition, by education, by the books that there is duality, contradiction, man and woman, anger and not being angry, violence and non-violence and so on. So we have divided the whole of life into duality. Right? Go into it please. Is there such a thing as duality, is there an opposite, psychologically? Of course there an opposite between man and woman, between daylight and darkness, sun-rise and sunset. You are tall, another is taller, somebody is fair and the other is not, one is more learned, the other is not. There is that physical duality, the opposites, dark hair, fair hair, the beautiful and the ugly. Now psychologically, inwardly, is there an opposite? Right? Your tradition says there is. Books have been written about it: it's only the liberated are free from duality -

which is such utter nonsense. Sorry.

You and I can look at this problem very simply - simply, not with all the complications of philosophers. There is duality outwardly, but inwardly, psychologically, inside the skin there is only one thing: anger. And when you say, I must not be angry, it becomes duality - right - the ideal which thought has projected, thought has structured from the pain it has. Right? So there is only that fact, like violence is a fact, non-violence is non-fact. So why do we give such importance to non-fact which then becomes the dual, the opposite. Are you following all this? Give a little, if you are not too tired, give a little attention to what is being said, because we are caught in this ugly business of duality which means choice, to choose between the two.

So we are questioning, you and I whether there is an opposite, psychologically, in anything at all. There is violence. Right? You are angry, we hate, we dislike. That is a fact. But to invent a non-fact like non-violence, you must like people and so on and so on, is just unreal, therefore there is only the fact. And fact has no opposite. I wonder if you capture this. So when we live with fact then there is no conflict involved. Have you understood anything of this? Because our whole condition is based on duality: I am this, I must not be that; I am a coward, I must be brave; I am ignorant - ignorant not about books and all that - ignorant about myself, but I must learn this. We are caught up in this. And we are saying there is no opposite psychologically at all, actually. The opposite is structured, or put together by thought to escape from the actual: I am violent - that's actual - but I have been told, there have been great many people telling me that I must be non-violent. So the

non-violent is totally unreal, because I am violent. But if I remain with the actuality then I can do something about it, or not do anything about it, not to pretend. To pursue the ideal of non-violence is just playing games with yourself. While you are pursuing violence you are actually violent - you can see it in this country, for god's sake. So we are saying there is no psychological opposite. There is only `what is'. And if you understand that then the conflict of duality, does it exist at all. Right?

So with that quality of brain that has understood this question of duality, let us look at what is called living and dying. Are you working as hard as the speaker? One wonders, you hear all this which are facts and probably you will do nothing about it. We are trying to eliminate altogether this whole conflict between `what is' and `what should be'. Then the brain is free and full of energy to face things as they are. Right? So there is the living and the dying - two opposites. Therefore to understand both, the living and the dying, one must approach this question non-dualistically. Right? Are we together in this or not? Yes or no? We will go on.

What is living, what do you call living? Going to the office from 9 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the evening every day of your life for the next sixty years, being bossed, being bullied and you bullying somebody else, or you are a businessman always wanting more and more and money, expanding, enterprise, power, chief executive - right? - go home and quarrel with your wife, sleep with her, beat her up verbally, or you may do it actually. And this goes on, constant struggle, constant conflict, the utter despair, hopelessness of it all. Right? This is what we call living, whether you live in America, an affluent society, where it is hectic, making

money, becoming successful, you may one day become the President. And on the other hand there is the church trying to save you, save your soul - whatever that may mean - and you pray, worship and in your heart of hearts there is fear, despair, anxiety, grief. That is what you call living. This is actuality, isn't it? And you are frightened to leave that, because death is coming. One has so deeply identified with this, called living, taken roots in that and you are frightened to end all that. Right? And so you say next life. Next life is the continuity of the same old pattern, only perhaps in a different environment. If you believe in the next life then you must live rightly now - right? - morally, ethically, have some sense of humility - if you believe in the next life. But you really do not believe in the next life, you talk about it, you write volumes about it. But if you actually believe, in the sense, work, then you must live now rightly, because what you are now your future is what you are, your future will be the same, if you do not change now your future will be the same. This is logic. This is sane.

So for us death is total ending, the ending of your attachment - right?-ending all that you have collected. You cannot take it with you. You may like to have it until the last minute, but you cannot possibly take it with you. So please listen. So we have divided life into dying and living. And this division has brought about great fear. And out of that fear we invent all kinds of theories, very comforting, may be illusory, but it is very comforting, illusions are comfortable, neurotic. So is it possible, please I am asking you this question, is it possible, as we live, to die to things that we are attached to? Do you understand my question? I am attached to my reputation - God forbid - I am attached to it. And death is coming

along, because I am getting older and I am frightened, because I am going to lose everything. So can I be totally free of the image, of the reputation that people have given me? Do you understand? So that you are dying as you are living. I wonder if you understand this? So the division between the living and dying is not miles apart, it is together. I wonder if you understand this please. And if you understand the great beauty of it that each day, or each second there is no accumulation, no psychological accumulation, you have to accumulate clothes with money and so on, that's a different matter, but psychologically there is no accumulation as knowledge, as attachment, saying, 'It's mine'. Will you do it? Will you actually do this thing so that this conflict between death and living with all its pain and fear and anxiety comes totally to an end, so that you are - the brain is incarnated? Do you understand? I wonder if you understand all this. The brain is being reborn afresh, so that it has tremendous freedom. The brain, according to the scientist, has the left side and the right side. The left side is the old, the traditional and the right part of the brain is the new which is capable of thinking new things and so on. So again division. We are saying, to act with the whole brain not with the divided brain. I won't go into that for the moment, because that will lead somewhere else. It is very interesting if you go into it, not speculatively, but actually with your own brain to find out whether the two divisions, the left and the right brain, which are acting differently, but simultaneously, totally, wholly, so the whole brain is active. So there is no old brain or the new brain. That requires a totally different approach. I won't go into that because we have other things to talk about.

So when living be with death, so that you are a guest in this world. Do you understand this, that you have no roots anywhere, that you have got a brain that is amazingly alive. Because if you carry all the burdens of yesterday your brain becomes mechanical, dull. If you leave all the memories, psychological memories, hurts, pains, leave them behind, leave them every day, then it means dying and living are together. In that there is no fear.

And what happens to the person who does not do any of this? Do you understand my question? A vast number of people here are not going to do a thing about it - I was going to say, nothing about it, but I won't. Not a thing about it, they listen, they nod, they shake their head, they say, marvellous, marvellous and do nothing about it. Then what happens to them? Please this is being said with great humility, with great compassion and affection. I hear this from you, a way of living, a totally different way of living, you have persuaded me, not only persuaded me but I see the logic of it, the sanity of it, the clarity of it. I see it intellectually, verbally I have accepted it. And I pursue my own way. I pursue my old ways, the ways of my life, to which I am accustomed. And I am going to die and I am frightened, as most people are frightened. So what is going to happen? Will I be reborn? Will my consciousness accept this way of life and perhaps next life it will have a better chance. Right? So, is my consciousness, which I have said 'mine', is that consciousness mine at all? Now please do not agree, or disagree, just look at it. Because that consciousness is the consciousness of humanity, because all human beings throughout the world go through great agony, sorrow, loneliness, despair, depression, they have faith, they have gods, like yours. So we share, each one of us

shares this consciousness. So it is not yours. Please you may not accept it, I am sure you won't accept it, you should not, but you must question, you must question whether your consciousness is yours, your individual consciousness, or it is shared by all humanity. All humanity goes through what you are going through, in a different environment, in a different ambience, so you are not actually an individual. You may have a different body from another, you may have a better bank account. One may be lame, one may be healthy. But inwardly your being is shared by all the rest of humanity. Therefore you are humanity. I wonder if you see it, as it is a reality, it is not a fiction. So as long as you think you are an individual you are living in illusion, because your consciousness, your life is shared by everybody on this earth. They go to the office from morning till night, bullying, being bullied, gaining money, power and position, unhappy quarrelling, just like you. You may have more power, better position, there are also the others too. So your consciousness is shared by all humanity. And therefore you are not an individual psychologically.

So when you put this question, what is going to happen to me when I die, though I don't understand a word about what you are talking, your consciousness will continue, which is shared by all humanity. Right? You are following all this? And that consciousness manifests itself, through Mr Smith, through Mr somebody or other. And then he says. it is mine, I an individual, atman, soul and all that stuff.

So there is only a way of living which is totally different. Therefore you are no longer concerned with dying, but with living, living which contains, which moves with death. Do you

understand? I leave it to you. If you don't understand, please don't deny it, find out, question, doubt, your own individuality. The Communists tried to wipe out individuality, making them think what the top people wanted them to think. You know all this, what is happening. But they have not wiped out the `me', the self, the ego, which wants power, position; they go to the office like you every day, they compete more than you do, because if you don't compete, and succeed, you become a labourer, a minor degree and so on. I won't go into it. So, it is possible to live a life psychologically in which there is never a continual recording? Do you understand? The ending of recording. Oh, you don't understand this. Say, you are flattered, or insulted, that is recorded. Now not to record flattery or insult. Right? That is to have a brain that is free, not burdened by a thousand records of a thousand days.

And we ought to talk over - we have got a quarter of an hour - we ought to talk over together what is religion. The word `religion' etymologically has no beginning. They do not know the beginning of that word, but we know what religion means, the religion which exists throughout the world, the Christian religion, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Buddhist and so on, that is, accepting a dogma, accepting some fantastic beliefs, some meaningless rituals, performed every day of your life. In the Christian Church it is very - when you go to the Roman Catholic, high cardinals performing the mass is a beautiful sight. But it is a ritual, repeat, repeat. And people like repetition, it gives them some kind of satisfaction, a sensation, a stimulation, an excitement. And you go to the temples the same way - your sacred temple and the un-sacred temples. Yours is more sacred than the other. You have your faith, your

belief, your conditioning as a Hindu, as a Christian, as a Muslim, as a Buddhist. And this structure is called religion, both outwardly and inwardly. You believe god exists. You have never questioned it. If you do question it, as they have done, you are burnt, as the church did, tortured. But to ask what is god, to question, find out if god exists, are you willing to look at it. It is invented by thought. Don't be shocked. If you have no fear - right? - if you have no conflict, if you are living a life that is tremendously integral, whole, unbroken, then there is no place for god, because you yourself have understood the depth, the beauty of the universe. I won't go into all that. Because of our fear, because of our anxiety, our anomalies, we have invented this entity, god has not shaped us, we have shaped god. Right? We want somebody to protect us, an outside agency, somebody to save us from our daily monstrous and ugly life. And there are always saviours - your gurus is a saviour, but he too needs to be saved. So what is religion? If you banish all that, one must find out, one must doubt completely the whole thing, if you have the vitality, the strength, to wipe it out. But if you still cling to it, and say, please, tell me what you think, what you feel, it is like playing a game which has no meaning. So one must question, doubt, wipe away all the structure put together by thought, your scriptures, everything. Because they are the result of thought, the Bible, the Koran, your own Gita and so on. All of them are written down by thought, you say it is direct revelation, from the horse's mouth - sorry! But when you question all this, to find out what is the nature of a religious brain, religious mind, there must be freedom to enquire - if you have an hypothesis, it must be proved under a microscope, or under the clarity your own

attention.

So to find out if there is something sacred. That is what the intention of all these structures are. But the intention is destroyed by the priests. If a human being, you, have the intention, the drive, the energy, the passion to find out if there is something sacred, holy. And to do that there must be no fear, there must be no sense of anxiety, there must be complete freedom, that is meditation. I am going into the word meditation in a moment.

What is meditation, not how to meditate. The moment you ask 'how to meditate' then there are a dozen systems, Zen, Buddhist, Tibetan, Hindu, Christian, you know a dozen systems tell you how to meditate. You can invent your own systems, control, suppress, concentrate. You know the whole game. Become aware. What does the word mean? The word, not what you give to that word. The word means to ponder over, to think over. And also that word means to measure. Right? To measure, that is to compare: I am this, but I will be that tomorrow. I am progressing. This is all measurement. So meditation can only be actual, truthful, honest, when there is no fear, no hurt, no anxiety, no sorrow. Otherwise, if you are frightened you can sit down and meditate for the rest of your life, standing on one foot or sitting in a certain posture. But as long as there is this root of fear how can you meditate? Do you understand what I am saying? We say, through meditation, first learn meditation and the other things will disappear. Right? Is that possible? Do you understand? Then if you learn how to meditate, which means learn a system of meditation, then you apply to your physical or psychological state. That means you have already determined, and through that determination, planning, action takes

place and that you call meditation. Right?

So we are saying meditation can only take place when there is no conscious effort made to meditate. I am afraid it goes against everything you believe.

How do you come upon that which is sacred? Is there anything sacred? Man has sought throughout the ages something beyond. From the ancient Sumerians till now, from the ancient Egyptians, from the ancient Romans, they have always sought - is there? And they worshipped light, worshipped the sun, worshipped the tree, worshipped the mother, never finding anything. So can we together this evening discover, or rather, come upon that thing which is most holy? And that can only take place when there is absolute silence, when the brain is absolutely quiet. I do not want to go into the whole nature of the brain and all that, because the speaker is not an expert about the brain, he has talked with many brain specialists, with all their theories and so on. But one can discover for oneself if you are attentive, watchful, watchful of your words, meaning of the words, never saying one thing and doing another, if you are watchful all the time, you can find out for yourself that the brain has its own natural rhythm. But upon that natural rhythm thought has placed all kinds of things upon it. For us knowledge is tremendously important. To go to the office, to move from here to your house requires knowledge. To write a letter requires knowledge. To do anything physical requires knowledge, if you want to become a good carpenter you must study the wood, the tools, the grain, the quality of the wood and so on and so on. So knowledge becomes extraordinarily important. If you are an administrator of the government, knowledge is necessary. But

psychological knowledge, the knowledge you have accumulated about your hurts, about your vanity, your arrogance, your ambition, all that knowledge is you. And with that knowledge we try to find out if there is anything most holy. You can never find out through knowledge, because knowledge is limited, it will always be, whether physical, technologically and psychologically. So the brain must be absolutely quiet, not through control, not through following some method, system, not cultivated silence. Silence implies space. I do not know if you have noticed how much space we have in our brain. It's cluttered up, full with so many thousands of things, it has very little space. And silence, space there must be because that which is measurable, that which is unnameable, cannot exist or be perceived or seen by a narrow little brain. They are trying, the astrophysicists, to understand the universe through the telescope. They are discovering the nature of Venus, Saturn, various gases and all the rest of it. But if you go, take a journey into yourself, emptying all the content which you have collected, go very, very deeply, then there is that vast space, that so-called emptiness, which is full of energy and in that state alone there is that which is most sacred, most holy.

Sorry to have kept you so long.

NEW YORK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL 1983

This is not a lecture as is commonly understood; to inform or instruct. This is a dialogue between you and the speaker, a conversation in which you and the speaker are going to explore together the extraordinary problems that we are facing. We have to think together, which is quite arduous, because each one has his own particular opinion, his own values and judgements, experiences and so on, to which he clings to, obstinately, or willing to let go. And this is not a course an entertainment, not something you are told what to do, or be instructed in any way. But together you and the speaker are going to explore the extraordinary crisis, not only in the physical world, but in consciousness, in our way of life, in what we are doing.

One must consider together after forty five thousand years and more why human beings are what they are now. Together we are going to think, not the speaker thinks and then you listen, or wait for an answer from the speaker to your problems. But together we will investigate very carefully, in this very short time, why after perhaps thousands upon thousands of years we are what we are; violent, pursuing endlessly wars, conflict, confusion, uncertainty.

So please, if one may point out most respectfully that we are together going to find out the causes. And when one discovers the cause there is an end to the cause. So we are going to look, perceive together without any motive. Most of you, perhaps, have come here either out of curiosity, or to be intellectually entertained, or be stimulated. And one is afraid if you come with those intentions then we shall not be able to communicate with each

other. You are facing very great issues, and to seek an immediate answer is rather futile. We must together explore the extraordinary complexity, the way of our thinking, why we behave in certain ways, and so on. So together let us think and find out.

(Settle down please. You are used to football, to be entertained, to be disturbed. But this is a very serious affair.)

What has brought us to this present condition? Is it thought? Is it mere accident? Is it man everlastingly must live in conflict? Seeing what is happening all over the world, the extraordinary advance in technology, in surgery, chemistry, and the biological experiments they are making in one direction, in one field, all that is going on. Medicine, surgery, going to the Moon, putting some silly flag up there. And psychologically, inwardly, we more or less remain as we have been for centuries upon centuries. There is advance in the field of technology, computers, way of communication, and so on. In the other direction, inwardly, we have hardly moved at all. We are more or less what we have been from the beginning of time: conflict, envy, brutality, violence, the state of anxiety, loneliness, despair, hopelessness, seeing that man cannot possibly change. Either one becomes very, very depressed, or tries to find a way out of all this. Is there a way out of all this? Please, we are thinking together, we are questioning together. The speaker may put it into words, but it is a conversation between you and the person who is speaking, a dialogue with two friends, serious, committed to find out.

Is there a way out of this at all? Politically all the world over, whatever problems they have, and the solution of those problems, there are a hundred other problems in the solution. There is a

political division, ideological divisions, religious divisions, national divisions, and the divisions between man and man, between man and woman. These divisions, as the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, and the Muslim, with all their sub divisions, wherever there is division there must be conflict. Wherever there are nationalities, the American, the Russian, the Chinese, and so on, there must inevitably be various forms of economic, social, military, political struggle. Perhaps most of us are aware of this. But we seem to be unable to do anything. We see that where there is division of any kind there must be conflict. The world is divided into nationalities, into racial divisions, colour, religious and so on. All these divisions exist, they are actual, they are not theoretical. And these divisions have brought about wars. Not a particular kind of war, the nuclear and so on, but wars. Apparently nobody is interested in stopping wars, nobody is interested apparently to find out the causes of war, and whether those causes can be totally, completely eliminated. Neither the politicians, nor the religious hierarchy, whether they be Catholic, Buddhist or Hindu, are interested in ending wars. They may talk endlessly about peace. But you cannot have peace if there is division, division as nationalities.

Who has brought about these divisions? Please, this is an important question, to find out for ourselves, not be instructed by the speaker, he is not a guru, thank god! We have to think very seriously, deeply, by asking who and what are the causes of this division, this endless division. Is it thought? Is it that thought, which has been necessary in the world of technology, in the world of surgery, and medicine, communication, where thought must be

employed, and is it thought that has created this division? Thought has built marvellous cathedrals, great paintings, lovely poems, great literature, and so on. To find out for ourselves what is the cause, the basic cause, the fundamental cause, why humans have lived through centuries upon centuries divided, endless tribal wars - the American tribalism is called nationalism, it is still tribalism. And they apparently glory in their tribalism, as they all do all over the world. Glorified nationalism is still tribalism. Who has brought about all this misery, confusion, sorrow; and there is so little compassion, love. I hope - one hopes that you are asking the question: who is responsible for all this? Who has created this society in which we live, the immoral society, the society in which man has to work from morning until night, going to the office every day for the rest of his life, until he dies? His fears, his deep anxiety, the desperate struggle to become something, and the all consuming sorrow of mankind. You might ask that each one of us is responsible. Each one of us is responsible for what is going on in the entire world, because our consciousness, with all its reactions, is not your consciousness, or mine; it is the consciousness of the entire humanity. The entire humanity suffers. The entire humanity goes through great agonies of suspicion, of confusion, sorrow, fear, loneliness. All that every human being here, in this country, or in the far away countries, they all share that same anxiety and so on. Your consciousness is not yours. Your consciousness with all its content, your gods, your disbelief, your faiths, and so on, is common, the ground on which all human beings stand. So you actually, if one may point out very carefully, that you are not individuals. We like to think we are individuals because our

consciousness, which is our heritage, tradition, the conditioning is shared by every human being living on this earth.

Please investigate it, don't reject it, but find out if one may ask, for yourself find out if this is true or false. If it is true then you will find out for yourself what you are, what the religions have said, what society has said. Everyone encourages this spirit of separation as the individual. And the individual is struggling against everybody else, for his happiness, for his success, to overcome his own obstacles and so on. Surely our consciousness, I hope we understand what we mean by our consciousness: all that we are, the name, the form, the qualities, the fears, the faith, the disbelief, the content of our consciousness is what we are. And that content is common, shared by all human beings. So it is not personal consciousness.

And that consciousness is the movement of thought. Thought is always limited because thought is the outcome of experience and knowledge, stored in the brain as memory. So knowledge is always incomplete about everything. That's a fact. All the scientists are always adding more and more and more. Our knowledge about your wife, or husband, is limited. You actually don't know your wife, or your husband. Your experiences are limited. So thought is always limited. That thought is shared by the greatest scientist, greatest philosopher, or by the most ignorant man who does not know how to read, he may live in a small hut far away from all so-called civilization. He thinks and so does the rich scientist. They may express their thinking in different ways, but they all think. So thinking is not individual thinking. All this may sound rather absurd, or irrational, but if you carefully examine without any bias,

without any prejudice, or conclusion, you will see the actual truth of it: that your thinking is not yours, it is the thinking of all man, mankind.

So when one realizes that truth, that it is not your individual thinking, individual consciousness, then you are responsible, one is responsible for everything that is happening in this monstrous, ugly world. As long as each one of us is violent we are sharing the violence of all mankind. If we are envious, we are sharing all the complications of envy of every human being on this earth. And so on. This is a fact. It is not some speculative theory of the speaker. So thought is responsible for all this; for the technological advancement, for the glory of a great poem, or a great painting, and all the things that are contained in the cathedrals, in the churches, in the mosques, in the temples, they are all the result of thought. Thought has created god. I hope this is not too much of a shock to many of you. If you are really shocked, so much the better. But if you merely accept it as an intellectual statement, and go along with it, it will have no value. Words are merely a means of communication. Words, which are common between you and the speaker as English language, are a convenience of communication; but the word is not the thing. The word is not the actuality, the fact, nor the explanation, nor the description. But most of us are caught easily in descriptions and explanations and are satisfied with those. But if one goes into the matter very, very seriously, as one must, when we are facing such an extraordinary crisis, one must find out if thought, which is always limited, because all knowledge is limited. We have discussed this matter with a great many so-called scientists, philosophers. They admit that thought is limited. And so

is knowledge. There are other scientists and philosophers who say, through knowledge man advances, ascends, Bronowski, and others. We are questioning that. Can that which is limited, because knowledge is limited which they admit, can there be advance, evolve through limitation? If thought is limited, its evolution will always be limited. Therefore whatever it does must create conflict.

I hope we are together in this, not merely intellectually, verbally, but actually. That we see together, perceive the actual truth that thought, which is the outcome of experience, knowledge, and knowledge and experience are always limited, therefore thought is ever limited. And what is limited must inevitably create conflict.

Thought has created all these problems; the problems of war, thought has divided human beings into different nationalities because thought said, perhaps there is security in a group, as in a family, and the greater community, the nation and so on. And in dividing human beings into nationalities, hoping to find security, it has brought about total insecurity, which is war, and all the diabolical inventions to kill human beings. Thought is responsible for this. There is no question about it, you can't argue against it. You can show what thought has done in surgery and so on and so on, in the technological world, but thought in human relationships is what we are talking about.

Thought has created these innumerable, intricate problems in our life. And thought having created the problems tries to find solutions to the problems it has created. Right? Are we together in this, somewhat? Thought has led us to the present condition. And our brains have been educated, trained, conditioned to solve

problems. If you are an engineer, you have problems which must be solved. A scientist, he has problems, and he must solve those problems, mathematicians, or those who are guiding the Challenger and so on. We are trained from childhood to solve problems. Our brain has the capacity, is conditioned, trained to resolve problems. So we treat life as a problem to be solved. Please consider this.

And as thought has created the misery, the sorrow, the conflict among human beings with their separate ideologies, and these ideologies are the product of thought, whether it is the communist ideology, or the democratic ideology, or the dictatorship ideology, they are all the result of thought. Thought has created the problem, this present problem. And thought is being used to solve those problems. And you see what is happening: multiplication, deepening of problems. So when one realizes that, the actuality of it, the truth of it, then one asks, is there a different instrument other than thought? Please we are asking this very, very serious question. Is there a different kind of instrument rather than that instrument which we have used, which is thought, which apparently has found no answer to any of these problems? Are we aware of this fact, that thought has created the religious divisions; thought has created your saviour, and all the rituals, however beautiful they are. The speaker was once in Venice, and a Cardinal was performing a mass. It was the most beautiful thing one saw. It was a great sensation. And people were genuflecting, crossing themselves, it was great fun. Day after day, for some length of time, this went on. And that religion, not only the Christian religion, but the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Islam, have nothing whatsoever to do with our daily living. They are romantic, sentimental. And all that is the

product of thought, the gods and all the circus that goes on in the name of religion.

So when you actually see the truth of it, then you begin to ask, and you can only ask this if there is tremendous doubt, scepticism, of all the things that thought has put together, not only your consciousness, your behaviour, your conclusions, your opinions, your values, which are all the activity and the movement of thought. One must doubt all that to find out the truth. But most of us are frightened to doubt because when we doubt there is great uncertainty. It evokes fear.

So we are asking, is there another instrument? Before we can investigate into that we must question also the whole problem of time. Time is a series of movements, both the outer, time by the watch, by daylight, sunlight, sun rising, sun setting, full moon and so on. To learn a language I must have time. To learn a skill one must have time. And psychologically time may be the enemy of man. The speaker is saying that, please don't accept it. Look, please consider it. Together we are looking into it. We have been told, and our tradition says, we must become something, not only in the outward world but also inwardly. The becoming implies time. We carry over from the becoming something in the world to the psychological field. I am this, but I will be that. I am violent but through time, which is evolution, there will be the end to violence, or become non-violent, which is absurd. Violence can never become non-violence. I know it is one of the catchwords which Tolstoy, and others in India, have propagated: that you are violent, human beings are violent, inherited from the animals, apes and so on, and gradually through time, which is evolution, he will become

non-violent. Please see the importance of this. Evolution, which is the movement of time, time being a slow inward movement, that evolution through forty, fifty thousand years on this earth, has brought us to this state, to the present condition of what we are: jealous, envious, angry, violent, brutal, cynical, bitter, frightened. After forty thousand years or more, we are what we are through evolution. And we hope through evolution we will be changed. Which seems rather ridiculous. If evolution has not changed us now, will evolution ever change us? Please put these questions to yourself.

So one may ask: time may be the enemy of man, psychologically. There is no psychological evolution. If you and the speaker are the result of forty thousand years or more, and we have come to this peculiar state that we are in, will we, give me another forty thousand years, change? You understand the question? It seems so absurd, nonsensical. Which is, I am violent; through time, through evolution, I will be without any violence. And if I am eventually going to be non-violent, the end of violence, in the meantime I am violent. You understand?

So time, psychologically is the enemy of man. Thought is time. So thought which is a material process, and time is a series of movements from this to that, from here to there, psychologically, and they have brought man to this present condition, to the present condition of great pain and sorrow and passing pleasure. Time will not resolve it, nor thought. If this is very clear, not as verbal explanation, but an actual fact then only we can ask if there is a different instrument rather than that which we have used, which is thought. Like a good carpenter, like a good mechanic, he throws

away something that has no longer any use. But we don't. We cling to it. We say, show me the other instrument, then I'll give up the other. And nobody is going to show it to you, including the speaker. Because this is a matter of great serious investigation. Because we all want to be helped. We are in sorrow, pain. If there is physical pain you go to the doctor, which is natural, necessary. But psychologically, inwardly, we want to be helped. And you have been helped. The priests have helped you for the last seven thousand years, as far as civilization is known. From the Sumerians there have been priests, the ancient Egyptians had priests, they told you what to do, as the modern psychologists tell you what to do. There isn't much difference. If you are in trouble you pay a hundred dollars, or more, for an hour, and trot along to the psychologist and he will promptly tell you what to do. Perhaps he will take three months, at a hundred dollars an hour. And we want to be helped. So we invent the guru, who says, "I know, follow me, I will tell you exactly what to do." And the dictators also have told us what to do. And the totalitarian states; the elite know and the layman doesn't know, any dissent, concentration camp, or psychological hospital. So we depend on others to help us. Please this is again a very serious matter. And there is nobody that will help you, psychologically. If one realizes that truth, that fact, because for the last million years, or long centuries, we have sought help and we have created the helper, including god.

Where there is disorder in our life, confusion, that very confusion and disorder creates the authority. There was at one time in Italy a great confusion, physically, trains were late, things were stolen. We were there. And Mussolini came along and created

order. Out of our disorder we create the authority. We are responsible for the authority. And then we worship the authority, whether it be the Christian authority, and so on. Because we live in disorder, our lives are confused, uncertain, frightened. There is great sorrow in our life. We are always seeking help from another. And probably, I hope not, you are here for that reason too. There is no help from this person. When one realizes there is no help from outside, either from god, or the angels, the so-called evangelists of this extraordinary country, or the philosophers, the books, and the psychologists and so on, on which we all have depended, and all that dependence has led us to that misery. When one realizes that, that there is no outside authority to help us out, when one realizes that you may get depressed, which is another reaction. Or become hopeless. But such reactions are symptoms of our present day existence; we jump from one thing to the other.

So we have come to a point when you realize really, truly, actually, that time is a series of movements of thought, both are limited, they are similar, time is thought, and thought is limited. And that limitation has brought about this misery, this chaos in the world. When one comes to that point, not verbally, not merely intellectually, but deep down in one's heart and blood, it is not a conviction. You are not convinced that the sun rises and the sun sets, it is a fact. So time and thought are not the answer because they are limited. To come to that point requires great meditation, not just verbal acceptance, or intellectual conceit.

So now we must here ask if we have come to that point, that one is not seeking help from anyone to put our house in order. We have created the disorder in our house, and as human beings with some

intelligence, we must put that house in order. If we do not, we create the authority, the authority dictates and creates more disorder. Are we together, treading the same road, going along together on the same path? If we have not, then we must stop and investigate where you have stopped, why we do not proceed further. You understand my question. This is said most respectfully. Do we realize how serious all this is. It is not a Saturday morning passing time, or tomorrow. It concerns our lives, what is the future of man, what is the future of your children. That is, the future tomorrow, that tomorrow extended for a thousand years. Are we responsible for our children, for the future of man? Not American man, not America, or your particular group, or your particular family, but the future of mankind, of which you are. If you separate yourself into families, small group, then that very limitation creates disorder. Please see advisedly this.

So one asks: what is the future of mankind? What is the future of each one of us? And for those who are responsible? Is it all a casual affair, send them off to schools to be educated, and that peculiar conditioning through education, to become soldiers. You understand? To become something or other. One has to earn a livelihood, which is becoming more and more difficult in an over populated world. Here in this affluent society, somewhat affluent, you don't know what poverty is. We have lived through it, from childhood we know what it is. And there are millions and millions who have hardly one meal a day. And when we are only concerned with ourselves, that concern, self-centred concern is limited, and therefore you are responsible for the misery of mankind. Each one of us. And one must ask where are we going, with the

extraordinary technology, with the computer, the computer may take over our human thinking, it is doing that, almost, creating a robot. I hope you know what is happening, and what is going to happen to the human mind. We are programmed, our minds are programmed to be a Christian, to be a Hindu, to be this and to be that. And after being programmed for two thousand years as Christians, and Hindus for perhaps three to five thousand years, we repeat. Clever, cunning, destructive. So can a human mind be free from all those states of being programmed? You understand? That means freedom from conditioning.

Can the human condition, what we are now, can that human condition be changed, moved, broken? There are those who say they cannot, great philosophers, great writers have said this. They can only continue in their condition, modified. But if you have gone into it very deeply, it can be, the conditioning can be radically changed, otherwise there is no freedom for man, and he will everlastingly, endless in conflict.

If we may we will continue tomorrow.

NEW YORK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH APRIL 1983

May we continue where we left off yesterday? We were talking, were we not, about the urgency of change. It is becoming more and more important, as one observes what is happening in the world, that human beings after millenia upon millenia have not fundamentally in any way, psychologically, changed. They have produced out of their psyche a very cruel society, a society that is immoral, brutal, violent. And in the twentieth century there have been tremendous advancements technologically. But we have changed very, very little, if at all.

And, as we said yesterday morning, we have been programmed. Our brains though they have extraordinary capacity, probably infinite capacity, which has been shown in the technological world what extraordinary things are being done. And in the psychological world if we could unprogramme ourselves we would then have, there, infinite capacity, the brain. I think most of the brain specialists who have gone into the question of the activity of the brain must inevitably ask if and when the brain can be unconditioned. Though it has its own rhythm, its own movement, but the self imposed conditioning, religiously, politically, economically, if the brain could uncondition itself then it has infinite capacity. Capacity is not merely the accumulated knowledge of experience. As we pointed out yesterday, such experience and knowledge is limited. And is it possible for us human beings who have been conditioned, programmed, definitely moulded in a certain pattern psychologically, is it possible to

radically, fundamentally bring about a change?

And that change must be urgent. As we pointed out yesterday, time is an enemy of man. Time as evolution. We have evolved for the last, according to scientists, biologists and so on, forty, fifty thousand years, we have evolved, our brain has grown. But during those forty thousands years psychologically we have remained more or less the same. It is a fact. This is not a pet theory of the speaker. He has no theories, he has no belief, no conclusion. But if one observes very, very carefully, quite impersonally, these are obvious facts. And is it possible, one must ask oneself this question if one is at all serious, and the present crisis demands that we human beings be terribly serious, frighteningly serious, committed to the enquiry of the urgency of change. Which implies, whether it is possible for the whole content of our consciousness, which has been put together there by thought, thought itself being limited, and therefore our consciousness is equally limited, and therefore conditioned. What is limited must invariably bring about division, conflict. And we ask in all seriousness whether that brain which has been programmed for, according to the Christians, if you believe in all that stuff, four thousand years ago, which is rather incredible, and according to the scientists and biologists, perhaps forty, fifty thousand years.

One wonders if one is aware entirely of the present state of the world, and our relationship to the world. And is our relationship different to the world and to the family, to the small unit of the community, however large that community be?

As we said yesterday, if one may remind each of us, that this is not an entertainment, you are not being stimulated, you are not

being told what to do, or an exotic philosophy from India or from the Far East. We have gone beyond all that kind of nonsense. There is no eastern thought and western thought, there is only thinking; thinking that can be expressed in eastern terminology, and western philosophy, but it is still thinking. And this thought, being limited, and all the content of our consciousness is put there by thought. And in the enquiry whether it is possible to bring about the urgency of change, one must look into our consciousness. That's what we are. Into our psyche. Not analytically because that takes time. The analyser and the analysed. I hope we are following each other. As we said, this is a dialogue between two friends, without any conclusions, without any belief or bias, but having a friendly dialogue, serious and deeply committed to the discovery whether it is possible for human beings, which is both of us, to be totally free from the conditioning which thought has brought about.

So we are enquiring together into the nature of ourselves, what we are. Not according to any psychologist or philosopher, or what the ancient Greeks, or Hindus have said about what you are; but examining actually what we are now.

Our psyche, which is the consciousness, the awareness of our consciousness, and we are enquiring into the content of it. The content is what we are: our beliefs, our experiences, our faith, doubt, questioning, desires, superstitions, fears, pleasures, and the great agony of loneliness, suffering, and what we call love, which has become merely sexuality, sensory pleasures. And the religious enquiry, if there is something beyond all the manifestations of thought, if there is something utterly untouched by thought, something sacred, holy, which doesn't belong to any religion. All

that is our consciousness, is our psyche, is what we are. And our consciousness is limited, and we have made that consciousness as the individual consciousness, my consciousness and yours. And so where there is this division, this limitation as the individual there must be conflict, which is so rampant in the world at the present time. So there is man against man, ideologies against ideologies, my country, my god, and your country and your god; each conclusion opposing other conclusions. This is the whole content of our consciousness, our psyche. That's what we are. Again, this is an indisputable fact. It is not that the speaker is telling you what it is. If you enquire into it quietly, unbiased, deeply, this is what you are, with your name, with your particular form, female or male, your bank account, if you have one - fortunately we have not. And this is our life; conflict from the moment we are born until we die, the fear of death, the fear of living, the fear what lies beyond.

So we are asking whether there can be a fundamental change in this content. I hope we are thinking together, knowing our thinking is limited. That we are communicating with each other not only verbally but much deeper. Because otherwise there is no communication at all, then it becomes a series of ideas, a stupid lecture without any significance. And it would be a waste of your time and of the speaker's. So please we are together going into this matter: the urgency of change.

There are those who say it is not possible, man will always be conditioned. Volumes have been written about it by specialists. You are conditioned and you will always be conditioned, and modify that conditioning, put up with it and do the best you can, making the best of it. And the speaker says this conditioning can be

totally, radically changed, not modified. If one has talked or discussed or read what the specialists say about the conditioning, and living in that conditioning, modifying it, if you have read it, if you have enquired into it, please listen to what the speaker has to say, what you and the speaker are enquiring into together. We have to find the truth of the matter, not the opinions of the experts. I do not know if one is aware that we are becoming slaves to experts; not to the experts of medicines, doctors, surgeons and the specialists in computers and so on, but the specialists who tell you what we are, how you should behave and so on. We are gradually becoming overwhelmed by the specialists. And here the speaker is not a specialist, he has no profession. This isn't a job he is doing for personal achievement or entertainment. This is a very serious matter. And so we are together, always please remember that we are together enquiring into this. We are not asserting any authority, any specialized knowledge. But walking together, perhaps hand in hand as two friends, along the same path, the same narrow road of enquiry.

It is your responsibility to enquire, not just follow what the speaker is saying. That means one's brain must be active. And it is very difficult when one is tired - I hope you have all had a good night, fresh, not weary, so we can walk rapidly, because we have limited time, through the content of our consciousness and see whether it is possible to be free from all the misery, confusion and the agony of living.

So briefly we are going to go into it step by step. First we must enquire into our relationship, however limited, however intimate, the relationship between man and woman, between the parents and

the children, and our relationship to the world. Because relationship is very important, relationship is life. Without relationship no man can exist. Even the most exclusive hermit, he is related to the world, and all the monks and the sannyasis of the world have relationships. So we must begin with the enquiry into our relationship with each other. Are we related at all when each person is pursuing his own desire, his own ambition, his own fulfillment, his own success? The man and woman who are doing each separately the same thing, each wanting to fulfil, to become in his own way, how can there be relationship at all? Like two parallel lines running, never meeting, perhaps for sensuality purposes, but otherwise apparently in this world the divisions are so deep between man and woman, psychologically they hardly ever meet at that level. And is it possible to meet, not merely sexually, but to have deep relationship with each other? Which means no separation at all. Please, this is a very serious enquiry and don't just accept the words, and twist the words to suit your own particular way of thinking.

Can human beings, man and woman, without each one forming an image about the other, can they live together, with the world? That is, the world of the two individuals with their problems, with their whole being, meet together. That's only possible when each one doesn't make an image about the other. And what place has love in this relationship? Is there love at all? Or merely that love which is called sensual pleasure? Please, you are enquiring with the speaker. Is love desire? Is love pleasure? And if there is love, then what is the quality and the nature of that word, the significance of that word, the holding of that word in your heart

and your mind to find out the depth of that word? Do we ever hold a word like that, like suffering, loneliness, anxiety and so on, do we ever live with a word, see the depth of it, the beauty of it, the energy of that word? To learn about that word means to look at it, to feel it, to go into it. And is it possible to have a relationship in which there is no conflict whatsoever? And that is possible when there is no thought building the image about the other, about each other. That means being aware, attentive, diligent. And love has that quality.

And is love desire? And what is desire? Please, if I explain the movement of desire, if the speaker goes into it, you are going into it too, not merely accepting the words and agreeing or disagreeing. We are moving together, enquiring together. So what is desire? How does desire arise? And desire then becomes so potent, so driving, astonishingly powerful. All commercialism is based on it; to acquire more, more, more, desire. So what is desire? We will go into it together, though the speaker will point out, but we are learning together about it. I do not know if you have ever enquired into the nature of learning, what it is to learn. May we go into it? All this is not boring to you? Even though you may be familiar, some of you may have read what the speaker has said before, which would be unfortunate if that remains merely as a memory. But if you could enquire into the nature of desire.

The speaker is enquiring, and so please what he says, question, doubt, be sceptical, strong, when you are enquiring. Surely desire is a movement of time. When does desire begin, what is the origin of desire? First there is sensation: seeing, contact, sensation. You see a beautiful picture, touch it, then from that seeing, touching,

there is sensation. That's a natural, healthy reaction, the sensation. Then thought creates the image of you having that picture in your house, in your room. At that moment when thought shapes the sensation by its image, at that second begins desire. Please see this for yourself, not accept what the speaker is saying, he has no authority, he is not a specialist, a guru; he has a horror of all that. So please see this for yourself, discover it: that where there is perceiving, seeing, visual, then contact, touching, smelling and so on, out of that arises sensation. Then thought creates the image and at that second desire arises.

So one asks, can there be a hiatus, a gap, between sensation and the moment when thought creates the image? The awareness of that intrusion of thought requires great attention. You are following all this? You know, we have all been taught to discipline ourselves, to control ourselves. The word 'discipline' means, the etymological meaning arises from the word disciple. The disciple is one who learns, not who imitates, not who conforms, but is one who is learning. And if we are learning together there is no teacher and the taught. Then you are both the teacher and the disciple. I don't know if you are following all this, if it interests you.

So one has to learn the nature of desire. As one learns one begins to understand how desire is born, and be attentive to that movement, not controlling, suppressing or fulfilling, but be in a state of learning. Obviously desire is not love, it can never be. But we have translated in the modern world that love to mean pleasure and sensation, sensuality.

And in enquiring into the nature of love, what it is, we must also look into the content of our consciousness, which is fear, part of

that consciousness is fear. We are all afraid of something or other: from this smallest to the greatest, from losing a job, from being lonely, from growing old and dying, from not becoming somebody in this beastly world. There's fear of losing, and the fear of gaining. Everybody in the world from the poorest to the most highly educated, sophisticated human being knows what fear is. You know it, don't you? It is nothing new to you. And what fear does to each one of us. We may have our own pet fear, and we want our particular fear to be solved. But if we understand not the particular fear, but what is fear, in the larger the lesser is included. The lesser is my particular fear, or your particular fear, but if we understand the root of fear, the cause of fear, not how to resolve fear, but in the understanding and the learning of what causes fear, then if you are serious and committed to the understanding and learning about fear, giving your time and energy to find out, then there is an ending to fear completely, not relatively, not for the moment, but the total complete abnegation of that fear.

So we will go into it, and I hope there will be time for other things too, because life is very complex. We ought to discuss what is pleasure, what is sorrow, what is the meaning of death, what is meditation, and if there is something that is beyond all time. All this within an hour! So we will have to go into all this only very briefly, succinctly, hoping that each one of us understands.

So we are enquiring what is the root of fear, not a particular fear but the root of all fear. The root of fear is time: what I will be, what I have been, what I might not be. Time is the past, the present and the future. The past modifying itself in the present and continuing in the future. Fear of something that has happened psychologically,

or physically, last week, or last year, and hoping that it will not continue in the future. So time is a factor of fear. The poor man, fear of not being able to find the next meal. You don't know all that. The fear of having no home, no shelter, no food. And the effect of fear, both on the physical organism, and on the psychological, on the psyche, and the very psyche may be made up of fear. Please understand that. The psyche, what you are, may be the result of fear. And probably is. So it is important to understand the depth and the meaning of fear. And that is time and thought. Time as the future, I might die, I might lose, I might be nobody, I am somebody now - which I doubt - but I want to be somebody in the future, the next day and so on. So time and thought are the root of fear.

We went into the question of thought, limited, and therefore one must ask a much more serious question: whether time and thought has a stop. Not fictional, scientific fictional time and thought, but actual thought and time. When we discuss, if we have time, meditation, we shall be able to find that out. Meditation is not all the silly nonsense that is going around, imported by the fantastic gurus, with their nonsensical systems and all that. But to enquire into the ending of time and thought, because as long as those two have movement fear will exist. Fear is related to pleasure. To have an amusing evening, or tomorrow, which is time, thought is already looking forward to some exciting pleasure, and that thinking about that particular form invokes fear, pleasure. So time and thought are related to fear and pleasure. We are not suppressing fear, or overcoming fear, or escaping from fear and pleasure, but understanding, learning the depth of it. When one

understands, not intellectually, verbally or ideationally, or theoretically, but by watching, diligently, every movement of thought, not letting one thought escape from the awareness, then you begin to perceive - then there is the perception of the nature of fear and pleasure.

We have very little time, we must go on to the next thing, which is sorrow. Why man throughout the ages, from time beyond measure, why man has suffered, and is still suffering after so many centuries of existence. What is suffering? Why do we tolerate it, why do we carry it in our heart, in the recesses of our mind, why? We have had two terrible wars in this century, in this last hundred years, terrible wars, brutal. You have seen all the horrible pictures, soldiers being decorated, heroes for killing so many; and imagine, or aware of how many women and men have cried, maimed, and been decorated by some silly people for killing others. That is the sorrow of the world. Are we responsible for this sorrow of the world? Of course we are, there is no question about it. As long as we are nationalistic, separatist, tribal, economically, socially, and religiously, we are responsible for these wars, for the killing of millions of people. Probably the Christians have killed more than anybody else. There is only one religion that has more or less avoided killing; first Buddhism, and Hinduism - not recently - and this is what religions have done to us. The religious people from the highest authority of the church talks about everlasting peace. But they never stop talking and say we will excommunicate anybody who indulges in killing another.

So there is sorrow of the world. Then there is this sorrow of each one. Losing somebody through death, and in the loss of that

person suddenly becoming aware of one's own terrible incalculable loneliness, shedding tears and so on. One cannot avoid sorrow. It is there. One may seek comfort, and that comfort is so shallow, meaningless, because after a little comfort and the passing of that comfort, sorrow is still there. We all know this. And is there an end to sorrow? Or man is destined, it is his nature, his condition, that he must suffer endlessly? The Christians try to avoid it by saying, one figure has suffered for you and you perhaps will suffer less. But that has been meaningless too. Then there is the whole world of Hinduism with all their explanations of sorrow, karma and so on. I won't go into all that.

So is there an ending to sorrow? That is, is there an ending to self-centred activity. You understand? It is this self-centred activity that has brought about sorrow, not only outwardly, but inwardly. As long as the content of our consciousness is not diligently explored and broken down, there must be sorrow. There is no avoiding it, or escaping it, it is there. Therefore it behoves us, if we are at all serious, that the ending of sorrow is far more important than the pursuit of pleasure, which the world is committed to. This vast entertainment industry, which is spreading all over the world, sports, entertainment, it is taking further and further away each one of us from ourselves. And computers are doing that too. We won't go into that too for the moment.

So unless we understand what we are, what is our actual state, and to question whether it is possible to change it. I will go into that briefly because there is no time, we are limited, we have to discuss death and meditation.

Take sorrow, you know what it means. You look at it, you feel

it, you shed tears, become aware of the deep loneliness of one's life. And that brings about sorrow. We never stay with the feeling of that loneliness. Is that loneliness - please follow this for a minute, give your attention, if you will - is that loneliness separate from you? Or you are that loneliness? You see the difference? You see the question? I suffer, and that suffering reveals that I am really an extraordinary lonely person, that loneliness brought about by my self-centred activity, by my asserting, aggressive individualism; that I see as though something different from me. But is that loneliness separate from me, or the very loneliness is me? You understand all this? Are we together in this, a little? When you are greedy, envious, is that envy different from you? Or you are envy? Of course. But when there is a division between envy and you, then you do something about envy, control it, shape it, yield to it, and so on. So where there is division between you and the quality, there must be conflict. Clear? But the actuality is you are envy. That is a fact. You are not separate from envy. You are not separate from your face, from your name, from your bank account, from your values, from your experience, from your knowledge. You are all that. So when one realizes this truth, that you are not separate from that which you feel, which you desire, which you want, which you pursue, which you fear, there is no conflict. Therefore you stay with that. You understand? When you have conflict with envy, you are trying to avoid it, trying to suppress it, trying to do something about it. Here if you are envy, if you are grief, if you are sorrow, you stay with it. You understand? You don't move away from it, you are that. Therefore you have tremendous energy to look at it. You are following? There is a

wastage of energy when you suppress, analyse, escape, or try to find a way out of it. That is a wastage of energy. But when you see that you are that, there is no division between that suffering, that loneliness and you, you stay with it. You stay with it like when you hold a precious jewel in your hand. I don't know if you have ever held something very beautiful in your hands. If you have, you stay with it. You look at it, you watch it, you play with it. You understand? There is such a sense of release, freedom.

We ought to enquire quickly into what is death. Why human beings from generation after generation, from the ancient people to modern times, why they have feared death. Why we have separated living from dying. Is it not far more important to enquire before, not after? That is, before dying, is it not much more important to enquire what is living? Isn't it? Not what is death, we will come to that. But isn't it far more urgent, important to see what is it we call living. You can answer perhaps better than I can. What is living? Endless struggle, conflict, work, labour, all the rest of your life. From 9 o'clock to 5 o'clock in the factory, in the office, earning money - we are not saying you shouldn't, please. Battle, sorrow, pain, this is what we call living, with pleasure, excitement, imagination, hoping, living in a great turmoil. And when death comes along, that is the end of it. Your bank account, your friends, everything comes to an end. You understand? And there are those in the Asiatic world who believe that there is a life after death, a life of what you have lived now, continued in the next life. You understand? So you keep going until eventually - it is called evolution - eventually you are freed from this turmoil. You follow? That's what they believe in. And if they really believed it in life,

actually, they would change now, not ten years later, or the next life. But to change means disturbance, and they don't want to be disturbed, like you. So we carry on.

So what does death mean? The ending of things we have remembered, which we have now, and the hope of something in the future. A great confusion, turmoil, sorrow. This is our life. And death comes and says, all this will end. So is it possible - please listen if you are interested - is it possible, take for example one thing, attachment. You are attached to a person, to an idea, to a conclusion, to a belief, to some imaginative, romantic pictures, you are attached to it. And death says, it's over, you can't be attached any more, it is finished. So while you are living can attachment end? You follow what I am saying? You understand? Which is death. I am attached now to my experience, to my knowledge, to my wife, husband, children, to the various conclusions I have, I am attached to it. And in that attachment there is fear, jealousy, anxiety, all that. And when death comes there is a break, there is an ending. So can I knowing this, being aware of the whole nature of attachment, can there be freedom from attachment, now, living? So if there is an end I am living with life and death together. You understand? Are we following each other, a little bit? There is no separation from living and dying. There is great beauty in that. There is great truth in it. Not some romantic nonsense. So the brain then becomes more free. And then it has infinite capacity, infinite energy.

Then we ought to talk about what is religion. What is religion? Again man has sought something that is not of this world. From the most ancient of people, until now, man has sought something that

time, thought, has nothing to do with that. He has sought it. And in his search he has been trapped by the priests. The priests of the world, who become the interpreters of that - we know, you don't, we will tell you all about it. And the established religions are just nonsense - please don't accept this. For the speaker they are just entertainment, excitement, the thing to do for a while. If you are young you avoid all that nonsense, as you grow older you get frightened and you become this, or that. And all the things that are in the churches, temples, mosques, are put together by thought. God is an invention of thought. So if we can scrap all that from our brain, from our belief, from our hope, then we are free to enquire what is religion. Etymologically that word has not an exact beginning, it is not to bind, as was originally thought.

So we are enquiring into what is the religious mind. Not the believing mind, that is very simple, very easy to explain. But the religious mind, because the religious mind alone can create a new culture; not the believing mind, not the mind that has faith. So we are going to enquire into it, if you are not tired.

To enquire into it very deeply one must ask what is meditation. Not how to meditate, not what are the systems of meditation, whether Eastern, Far Eastern, Near East, or the present gurus, gurus from India, or gurus from America, they have got systems, methods, which have all become money making concerns. It has no depth to it. So you can abolish all that, put aside all that. That means you are free from all authority to enquire what is meditation? To go into it one must be, as we said, be free from fear, pleasure. The ending of sorrow is the beginning of meditation. In meditation there is no motive. Please understand this. There is

no motive to achieve, to arrive, to become illumined, or find illumination. All that is not meditation. Meditation means to have no measure. To have measure means time. Please understand all this. When you have measure, which is comparison - I am this, I will be that, or I'll have more, the better, the words 'the more, the better', the measurement, has completely come to an end in meditation, it must do. There is no motive, or the will to meditate.

But meditation implies a mind, a brain that is freed from the pain of existence. That's the beginning of it. And meditation means attention, to attend, not that you attend. I don't know if you have gone into this question of attention. If you have, when you attend, when you give your attention to something, there is no centre from which you are attending. Right? Have you ever done this? Just watch, when you attend, music, for example, when you go to a concert, not the modern noise, when you go to hear Mozart, or Beethoven, or Bach, when you listen attentively, in that attention there is no you attending. You are listening. Not that you are listening, there is only the act of listening. So where there is attention there is no centre which is the self, the 'me', the psyche. That is meditation, to attend so completely and diligently there is nothing of negligence, then there is the beginning, the real depth of meditation. For in that there is no measure, no time, no thought. And out of that, or in that, there is deep abiding silence. That means the brain is utterly quiet, not chattering. The brain has its own rhythm, let it act out of itself, but not the self imposing, thought imposing something on the brain. The whole structure, the organism, and the mind are utterly quiet. I don't know if it has ever happened to you. It may happen occasionally when you are

walking in a beautiful lane, in a wood of trees and birds and flowers, and the beauty of a sunset, or a morning dawn, then for a second or two you are quiet, breathless, watching the beauty of the world. But that is external.

But when the brain is quiet, though it has its own activity, quiet in the sense thought is not functioning, so time and thought come to an end where there is deep attention. And then in that silence, which is not the man-made silence, silence has no cause, then in that silence there is that which is nameless, which is beyond all time. Such a mind is a religious mind. And it is only such minds can bring about a new culture, a new society. And because that is eternal it has immense significance in life.

May I get up now? Please don't clap. If it entertains you, clap. But you are not entertained. It is a waste of energy. May I get up please?

OJAI CONVERSATION WITH JONAS SALK 27TH MARCH, 1983

K: ...not the atomic war or conventional war, but it is man against man.

JS: Yes. I am sure you must have an opinion about that.

K: I don't know if I have an opinion. I have observed a great deal. I have talked to a great many people in my life, and there are very, very few who really are concerned.

JS: What would you like to talk about?

K: What shall we talk about?

JS: I'd like you to tell me what is your deepest interest, your deepest concern.

K: It is rather difficult to put it into words, isn't it, for the cinema?

JS: Yes.

K: But I think, seeing what the world is becoming, I think any serious man must be concerned about the future, what is going to happen to mankind.

JS: Yes.

K: Especially if one has children, what is their future? Are they going to repeat the same old pattern, which human beings have been doing for a million years, or more or less. Or is there going to be a fundamental change in their psyche, in their whole consciousness? That is really the question, whether it is - not the atomic war or conventional war, but it is man against man.

JS: Yes. I am sure you must have an opinion about that.

K: I don't know if I have an opinion, I have observed a great

deal, I have talked to a great many people in my life, and there are very, very few who really are concerned, committed to something to discover if there is a different way of living, a global relationship, global inter-communication, not merely stumble over language; not the religious and political divisions and all that nonsense, but really find out if we can live on this earth peacefully, without killing each other endlessly. I think that is the real issue we are facing now. And we think the crisis is outside of us; it is in us.

JS: It is in us.

K: The crisis is in our consciousness.

JS: There is an expression that comes from a cartoonist, Pogo, who says that we have met the enemy, the enemy is us.

K: Yes.

JS: And so what you are saying is that we have now come face to face with ourselves.

K: Yes, with ourselves and with our relationship to the world, both externally and inwardly.

JS: So that the fundamental issue with which we are confronted is relationship; relationship to ourselves and relationship to each other, and I might even go so far as to say to the world and to the cosmos.

K: Yes, sir.

JS: We are really confronted with that eternal question of the meaning of our lives.

K: The meaning of our lives, yes, that's right. Either we give a meaning to our life intellectually, fix a goal and work towards that, which becomes so artificial, unnatural. Or understand the whole structure of ourselves. I feel now, we have advanced so

extraordinarily technologically, it's fantastic what they are doing, as you know, but in the other field, in the psychological field we have hardly moved. We are what we have been for the last umpteen years.

JS: Even at the point of having developed what we call artificial intelligence.

K: The computer and so on.

JS: Computers and such devices, and are beginning to focus our attention on how we use this artificial intelligence without recognizing the need that we have to learn how to use our own natural intelligence.

K: Sir, have we natural intelligence, or have we destroyed it?

JS: It's innate, and we destroy it in each individual as they come along. I think we are born with that natural intelligence, but I sometimes think...

K: I really would like to question that, whether we are born with natural intelligence.

JS: We are born with the capacity, with the potential for that, in the same way that we are born with the capacity for language.

K: Yes.

JS: But then it must be exercised, it must be activated, it must be brought out in the course of life's experiences. And it is for this reason that we really have a need to understand what I like to think of as the conditions and circumstances for evoking that potential.

K: As long as we are conditioned...

J: ...we are always conditionable. That's in our nature.

K: But is it possible to uncondition ourselves, or must it go on?

JS: Are you asking, is it possible to uncondition the individual

who has become conditioned?

K: The individual who becomes conditioned by society, by language, by the climate, by literature, by newspapers, by everything he has been shaped, impressed, and influenced, and whether this conditioning - whether he can ever step out of it.

JS: With great difficulty, because it does have a tendency to become fixed, and it is for this reason that we must give attention to the young, to each new generation that are brought into a new context, and are shaped by that context, shaped by those circumstances. We have an opportunity with new and as yet unshaped, unformed minds to influence them in a healthier fashion.

K: One has had, if I may speak about it, lots of young people, thousands of them one has come into contact with. From the age of five to twelve they seem intelligent, curious, awake, full of energy and vitality and beauty. After that age the parents are responsible for it, society, newspapers, their own friends, the family, the whole thing seems to drown them, make them so ugly, vicious, you know the whole human race has become like that. So is it possible to educate them differently?

JS: I think so. I have said in something I wrote not so long ago, that we are in need of an immunizing education. The analogy that I am using is of immunizing against a crippling disease.

K: A crippling disease.

JS: In this instance I have in mind the crippling of the mind, not merely the crippling of the body. And I believe...

K: Could we go into that a little bit. What cripples the mind basically, not superficially of course? Basically, if I may ask, is it knowledge?

JS: Wrong knowledge.

K: Knowledge, I am using the word knowledge whether it is right or wrong, but knowledge, psychological knowledge, apart from the academic knowledge, scientific knowledge, the technological of the computer and so on, leaving all that aside, has man inwardly been helped by knowledge?

JS: Are you referring to the kind of knowledge that comes from experience?

K: The whole question of knowledge. Knowledge is after all the gathering of experience.

JS: I see two kinds of knowledge: I see the organized body of knowledge that comes, let us say, through science; and I see the kind of knowledge that comes through human experience.

K: Human experience: just take human experience. We have had probably over seven thousand years, wars.

JS: Yes.

K: And wars now - in the old days you killed by an arrow or a club, two or three people or a hundred people at the most, now you kill by the million.

JS: Much more efficiently.

K: Much more efficiently. You are up in the air and you don't know whom you are killing. It might be your own family, your own friends. So has that experience of ten thousand years of war, or five thousand years of war, has that experience taught man anything about not killing?

JS: Well, it has taught me something. I see no sense in it, and there are others who share that view, growing numbers, there are growing numbers of people who are becoming conscious and

aware of that absurd kind of behaviour.

K: After ten thousand years! You follow me?

JS: I follow you.

K: We must question whether there is a learning at all. Or just wandering blindly. If after ten thousand years, or less or more, human beings haven't learnt a very simple thing: don't kill somebody, for god's sake, you are killing yourself, you are killing your future. And that hasn't been learnt.

JS: It has been learnt by some, but not by all.

K: Of course there are exceptions. Let's leave the exceptions. Exceptions will always be there, fortunately.

JS: Fortunately.

K: Fortunately.

JS: It's a very important point.

K: But the majority who vote for war, for the presidents, for prime ministers, and all the rest of it, they haven't learnt a thing, they will destroy us.

JS: If we let them.

K: It is happening.

JS: The ultimate destruction has not happened yet. You are quite right, but we must become conscious and aware of that new danger. And something must arise within us now.

K: Sir, I would like to go into this because I am questioning whether experience has taught man anything, except to be more brutal, more selfish, more self-centred, more concerned with himself and his little group, with his little family, with his little... The tribal consciousness which has become national consciousness, glorified, and that is destroying us. So if ten

thousand years, more or less, has not taught man, don't kill, there is something wrong.

JS: I'd like to offer a suggestion, a way of looking at this problem, at this question. I'd like to look at it from an evolutionary point of view, and speculate that we are evolving through a period of time, in which the exception to which you referred earlier may some day become the rule. Now how might this happen? It has to happen or else there will be nothing to speak about after the event.

K: Of course.

JS: Therefore we are confronting a crisis now.

K: That's what we said.

JS: That crisis is imminent, it gets closer and closer.

K: Yes, sir.

JS: And it is for this reason that we may very well have to enter the arena ourselves in a conscious way, and as we are speaking about this fully conscious of what we are saying, aware of the risk and of the danger, some effort must be made, some way must be invented to raise the consciousness of the world as a whole, as difficult as that may be.

K: I understand all this, sir. This is - I have talked to a great many politicians and all the rest of it - this is their argument: you and people like you must enter the arena. Wait a minute. We always deal with a crisis, not what has brought about the crisis. When the crisis arises we are so concerned: answer the crisis, don't bother about the past, don't bother about anything else, just answer the crisis.

JS: That's wrong.

K: That's what they are all doing.

JS: I understand that. And that's why they need your wisdom, and they need the wisdom of others like yourself, who see the future, those who can anticipate, can see the 'handwriting on the wall', and will act before the wall begins to crumble.

K: Therefore I am just saying, shouldn't we go and enquire into the cause of all this?

JS: Yes.

K: Not just say, well, here is a crisis, deal with it.

JS: Oh no. I agree with you.

K: That's what the politicians are saying.

JS: Well, I won't play that game. And I am not suggesting that we do.

K: Only silly people play that game.

JS: Yes.

K: Foolish people. But I mean the cause of all this is obviously the desire to live safely, protected, secure inwardly. I divide myself as a family, then a small group of people and so on and so on.

JS: We are going to discover that we are all one great big family.

K: Ah!

JS: And our greatest security will come from being concerned about others in our family. It will be of no great advantage to us to have others suffer and be a threat to us as well as to themselves, which is the state of affairs now with nuclear war.

K: Therefore I am asking whether we learn through suffering, which we haven't; whether we learn through the kind of agony of wars, we haven't. So what makes us learn, change? What are the factor of it and depth of it? Why have human beings who have

lived on this poor unfortunate earth for so long, they are destroying the thing on which they are growing, the earth, and they are destroying each other. What is the cause of all this? Not speculative causes, the actual, deep human cause? Unless we find that we will go on for the rest of our days.

JS: That's quite right. You are asking for the cause.

K: Or the causations, which have brought man to this present crisis.

JS: As I see it, to satisfy the needs for survival under circumstances of threat, when there is something to be had, something to be gained by war, war is something that men engaged in. Now when the time comes when nothing is to be gained, and everything is to be lost, we may be give a second thought.

K: But we'll have lost, sir. You understand? Every war we are losing. Why haven't we learnt that? The historians have written about it, all the great scholars have written, and man has remained tribal, small, petty, self-centred. I am asking what will make him change? The immediacy of change, not future, gradual, because time may be the enemy of man. Evolution may be the enemy.

JS: Enemy? Evolution may be the only solution.

K: If man hasn't learnt after all this suffering and is going on perpetuating this thing...

JS: He hasn't evolved sufficiently as yet. The conditions have not, as yet, been propitious for solving the problems that precipitate war.

K: Sir, if we have children, what is their future? War? And how am I, if one is a parent, how is one to see all this? How is one to awaken, to be aware of all that is going on, and their relationship to

what is going on? And if they don't change this thing will go on endlessly.

JS: Therefore a change is imperative.

K: Yes, sir, but...

JS: How are we going to bring it about?

K: That's what I am asking. Change is imperative.

JS: I understand that.

K: If the change is through evolution, which is time and all the rest of it, we are going to destroy ourselves.

JS: But I think we have to accelerate the evolutionary process. We must do it deliberately and consciously. Up until now we have been evolving unconsciously, which has led to the condition which you have just been describing. A new change must occur, a different kind of change, a change in our consciousness, in which we ourselves are using our intelligence.

K: Agree, sir. So I am asking what are the causes of this? If I can find the causes - every cause has an end. So if I can find the cause, or causes, or the many causations that have brought human beings to the present state, then I can go after those causes.

JS: Let me suggest another way of looking at it: let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the causes that have led to this will persist unless some outside intervention is brought to bear to change the direction. Let me suggest the possibility of looking at the positive elements in human beings, the possibility of strengthening those.

K: That means time.

JS: Everything in the human realm occurs in time. I am suggesting that we accelerate the time, that we fore-shorten the

time, that we not leave it only to time and only to chance, that we begin to intervene in our own evolution to that extent, and we become the co-authors of our evolution.

K: I understand that. Now I am asking a question that perhaps may not have an answer. I think for myself it has an answer, which is can time end? This way of thinking, give me a few more days before you slaughter me. During those few days I must change.

JS: I think time ends in the following sense: the past ends and the future begins.

K: No. Which means what? For the past to end, which is one of the most complex things, memory, knowledge, and the whole urge, the desire, the hope, all that has to end.

JS: Let me give you an illustration of the ending of something and the beginning of something new. When it was observed that the earth was round and not flat there was a change in perception. From that point on the earth was no longer seen as flat, it was seen as round. The same thing was true for the revolution of the sun around the earth, which then became apparent that it was the earth that revolved round the sun.

K: Galileo, he as nearly burnt by the church for this.

JS: Indeed. And the same thing is likely to happen again.

K: Sir, so my question is this: is time an enemy or a help?

JS: We must use time to our advantage.

K: How am I to use time? That is, I have a future. Right? I have another hundred or fifty years to live, and during those fifty years can I shorten the whole human experience, shorten the content of my consciousness, and in the very shortening bring it to a very, very tiny point so that it is gone? Has the human brain capacity - it

has infinite capacity in one direction, technologically, infinite capacity, we don't seem to apply that extraordinary capacity inwardly.

JS: Let's focus on that.

K: Yes, that's what I am saying.

JS: That's the central issue. I agree.

K: If we could focus that tremendous energy on this, we would change instantly.

JS: Instantly. There you have it.

K: I know, sir. Now what will make man to focus that capacity, that energy, that drive on this one point? Sorrow hasn't helped him; better communication hasn't helped him; nothing has helped factually - god, church, religions, better statesmen, the latest gurus, none of that.

JS: That's right.

K: So, can I put all that aside and not depend on anybody? Scientists, the doctors, psychologists, nobody.

JS: What you are saying is that the means has not yet been invented for accomplishing what you have in mind.

K: I don't think it is means, the means is the end.

JS: I accept that.

K: Therefore don't look for a means. See that these people have not helped you in the least; on the contrary, they have led you up the wrong path. So leave them.

JS: They are not the means.

K: They are not the means.

JS: Because they do not serve the ends of which we are speaking.

K: They are not the means. The authority outside is not the means, so inside. That requires, sir, tremendous - I don't like to use the word 'courage' - to stand lonely, to be alone, not depend or be attached to anything. And who is going to do this? One or two.

JS: That's the challenge.

K: So I say, for god's sake wake up to that, not the means, not the end.

JS: I share your view as to where the solution lies. I share your view that it is perhaps the most difficult of all of the things with which human beings have been confronted, and it's for that reason it's left to the last. We have done all of the easy things, for example, we are manipulating artificial intelligence, but not our own intelligence. It is understandable because we are in a sense both the cause and the effect.

K: The cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause, and so on, we keep in that chain.

JS: Yes. Now since we are at a point at which the human race can become extinct, it seems to me that the only invention, if I may use that term, we are awaiting now to bring that to an end is to find the means for exercising self restraint upon all of the factors and conditions and circumstances that have led to war.

K: Yes, sir. I wonder, sir, it may be irrelevant, the world is bent on pleasure. You see it in this country more than anywhere else, tremendous drive for pleasure, and entertainment, sport, which is, be entertained all the time. In the school here the children want to be entertained, not learn. And you go to the East, and there they want to learn. You have been there?

JS: Yes.

K: They want to learn.

JS: And that's pleasurable too. It can be.

K: Yes. Of course, of course. So if man's drive is to find and continue in pleasure, apparently that has been the historical process: pleasure whether it is in the church, all the mass, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, or on the football field, that has existed from the ancient days. And that may be one of our difficulties, to be entertained by specialists, you know, the whole world of entertainers. Every magazine is a form of entertainment, introducing a few good articles here and there. So man's drive is not only to escape fear, but the drive for pleasure. They both go together.

JS: They do, that's right.

K: Two sides of the same coin. But we forget the other side, fear, and pursue this. And that may be one of the reasons why this crisis is coming.

JS: It will not be the first time that a species will have become extinct. I think we must ask the question whether or not there are some cultures in some societies that are more likely to endure than others, that have the characteristics and attributes necessary to overcome the problems, the weaknesses to which you have been drawing attention. It seems to me that you are prophesying a time of great difficulty and of great danger. And you are pointing out the differences that exist amongst peoples and amongst cultures, and amongst individuals, some of whom, exceptions there may be, could well be the exceptional ones that will survive and will endure after the holocaust.

K: That means one or two, or half a dozen people survive out of

all the mess. No, I can't agree to that.

JS: I am not recommending that. I am simply giving a picture, a number, a quality and a quantity to it so as to make people aware of their responsibility in respect to that future.

K: Sir, responsibility implies not only to your little family, but you are responsible as a human being for the rest of humanity.

JS: I think I said to you, showed you the title of an address I gave in India, which was 'Are we being good ancestors?' We have a responsibility as ancestors for the future. I share your view completely. And the sooner we become aware of this and begin to address ourselves to this consciously as if it were an imminent threat.

K: Again, I would like to point out there are exceptions, but the vast majority who are not in the way of looking at things, elect the governors, presidents, prime ministers, or totalitarians, they are suppressing everything. So as the majority elect those, or the few gather power to themselves and dictate to others, we are at their mercy, we are in their hands, even the most exceptional people. So far they have not done it, but they may say, 'You can't speak here any more, or write any more, don't come here.' You understand? So there is one side the urge to find security, to find some kind of peace somewhere.

JS: Would you be willing to say that those who are now ruling, leading, are lacking somehow in wisdom?

K: Oh, obviously, sir.

JS: Would you say that there are some who have the wisdom with which to lead and to guide?

K: Not when the whole mass of people want to be guided by

somebody they elect, or don't elect, but by tyrannies. What I am asking is really, how is a man, a human being who is no longer individual - for me individuality doesn't exist, we are human beings.

JS: Right.

K: We are humanity.

JS: We are members of the species, we are cells of humankind.

K: We are humanity. Our consciousness is not mine, it is the human mind.

JS: That's right.

K: Human heart, human love. All that human. And by emphasizing, as they are doing now, individuals, fulfil yourself, do whatever you want to do, you know the whole thing, that is destroying the human relationship.

JS: Yes. That is fundamental.

K: There is no love, there is no compassion in all this. Just vast mass moving in a hopeless direction, and electing these extraordinary people to lead them. And they lead them to destruction. My point is this has happened time after time, centuries after centuries. And if you are serious either you give up, turn your back on it, I know several people who have said to me, 'Don't be a fool, you can't change man. Go away. Retire. Go to the Himalayas and beg and live and die.' I don't feel like that.

JS: Nor do I.

K: Of course. They have seen the hopelessness of all this. For me, I don't see either hope or hopelessness. It is not. I said this is the state of things, they have got to change.

JS: This is the reality.

K: Instantly.

JS: Exactly. All right. Having agreed upon that, where do we go from here?

K: I can't go very far if I don't start very near. The 'very near' is this.

JS: All right, let's start here. Let's start right here, right here.

K: Right here.

JS: What do we do?

K: If I don't start here but start over there I can't do anything. So I start here. Now I say, who is me who is struggling for all this? Who is I, who is the self? What makes me behave this way, why do I react? You follow, sir?

JS: Oh, yes, I follow.

K: So that I begin to see myself, not theoretically but in a mirror of relationship - with my wife, with my friends, how I behave, how I think, and in that relationship I begin to see what I am.

JS: Yes, that's correct. You can see yourself only through reflection in another.

K: Through relationship. In that there may be affection, there may be anger, there may be jealousy. I discover in all that monstrous creature hidden in me, including the idea that there is something extraordinarily spiritual in me, all that I begin to discover. The illusions and the lies that man has lived with. And in that relationship I see if I want to change I break the mirror. Which means I break the content of my whole consciousness. And perhaps out of that, breaking down the content, there is love, there is compassion, there is intelligence. There is no other intelligence, except the intelligence of compassion.

JS: Well, having agreed on what the ultimate resolution can be, and having agreed that one has to begin here now.

K: Yes, sir.

JS: Here and now.

K: Change now, not wait for evolution to throttle you.

JS: Evolution can begin now.

K: If you like to put it that way. Evolution in the sense moving from this, breaking down to this to something which thought cannot project.

JS: When I use the term, 'evolution can begin now', I am speaking of a mutation event.

K: A mutation, I agree. Mutation is not evolution.

JS: But I am going to add one other factor that I think is important. I believe that individuals see the world in the same way as do you and I, there are others besides ourselves. They are others besides ourselves who see the problems, who see the solution that you speak of. Now let us refer to individuals such as that as exceptional, extraordinary. We might even think of them as unusual, as mutations, if you like.

K: Biological freaks!

JS: If you like. Curious in same way, different from the rest. Can they be gathered together? Can they be selected? Will they select each other and come together?

K: Yes. They come together, not select each other.

JS: I am using the term in the sense of coming together because there is some sense of recognition, something that draws them together, some self selecting mechanism. Now can you imagine that making a difference?

K: Perhaps a little.

JS: Can you imagine anything else making a difference?

K: Not imagine, sir. I see - could we put it this way, sir? Death has been one of the most extraordinary factors in life. We have avoided it, to look at it, because we are afraid of what it is. We cling to all the things we have known, and we don't want to let that go when we die. We can't take it with us, but etc., etc. Now to die to all the things I am attached to. To die, not say, 'What will happen if I die, is there another reward?' Because unless dying and living go together...

JS: Yes, death is part of life.

K: Part of life. But very few move in that direction.

JS: I agree. We are talking now about the same exceptional individuals.

K: And I am saying those exceptional individuals - I am not pessimistic or optimistic, I am just looking at the facts - have they got affected mankind?

JS: Not sufficiently, not yet. Not sufficiently. My contention is that if we do something about it consciously and deliberately we can make it happen sooner.

K: But consciously and deliberately may be another continuation of the self-centredness.

JS: But that is part of the condition we must not include. I understand that. That must be excluded. It must be species-centredness - if you like - humankind-centredness, humanity-centredness. It cannot be the same self-centredness to which you have been referring up to now. That will be the mutation event.

K: Yes, sir. The end of the self-centredness. Do you know they

have tried to do this through meditation, they have tried to do this by joining Orders, by renouncing the world - the monks, the nuns, the sannyasis of India. If I may point out something rather interesting: once when I was in Kashmir I was walking behind a group of sannyasis, monks, about a dozen of them. And it was a beautiful country, a river on one side, flowers, stream, birds and an extraordinary blue sky. And everything was really laughing, the earth was smiling. And these monks never looked at anything. Never. They kept their heads down, repeating some words in Sanskrit, I couldn't gather what it was, and that was all. They put on blinkers and say, 'There is safety'. That's what we have done, religiously, politically. So I say one can deceive so enormously. Deception is one of our factors.

JS: Deception, and denial. Negation.

K: Sir, we never start, as in Buddhism and Hinduism, with doubt. Doubt is an extraordinary factor. But we don't. We don't doubt all that is going on around us.

JS: That is very unhealthy. And healthy doubt is necessary.

K: Scepticism.

JS: We must question rather than accept the answers that have been given us.

K: Of course. So nobody can answer my problems. I have to resolve them. So don't create problems. I won't enter into that. The mind that is trained to resolve problems, solutions, such a mind is always finding problems. But if the brain is not trained, educated to solve problems, it is free from problems. It can face problems but it is essentially free.

JS: There are some brains, if you like, some minds that create

problems, and some that solve problems. And what you are posing now is the question: can we solve the ultimate problem, the ultimate question with which we are confronted, which is: can we go on as a species? Or will we destroy ourselves?

K: Yes. Death. That's why I said death, I brought it in earlier. Death to things that I have gathered psychologically.

JS: We have to accept the death of those things of the past that are no longer valuable. And allow the birth of those new things that are necessary for the new future. I quite agree that the past must come to an end.

K: Oh, yes.

JS: War must come to an end.

K: The brain must record. But the brain is recording...

JS: ...constantly.

K: ...constantly. Therefore it is recording, then it plays the tape.

JS: It is recording and it is recognizing.

K: Yes.

JS: It is re-cognizing. It is re-examining what it already knows. Now we must at this point in time recognize what has happened in the past, and become aware that there must be a new way.

K: Which is, don't record. Why should I record - language and so on, let's leave all those out - why should I psychologically record anything? You hurt me, suppose. You say some brutal thing to me, why should I record it?

JS: I would relegate it to what I call the 'forgettery'.

K: No, no. Why should I record it? Or somebody flatters me, why should I record it? What a bore it is to react in the same old pattern.

JS: It records itself, but it must be relegated.

K: No, watch it sir, whether it is possible not to record at all. Psychologically I am talking about, not the recording of driving a car or this or that, but psychologically not to record anything.

JS: Are you able to do that?

K: Oh yes.

JS: You must be able to discriminate between what you record and what you don't record.

K: The memory is selective.

JS: Yes, and that was why I used that humourous way of putting it: you select by putting some in the place of memory, and some in the place of forgettery. We are selecting that which you choose.

K: Not choose. I have to record how to drive a car.

JS: Yes.

K: Or how to speak a language. If I have to learn a skill I have to record it. In the physical world I have to record: from here to go to my house or to Paris, I have to do various things, I have to record all that. But I am asking, why should there be recording of any psychological event, which then emphasizes the self, the me, the self-centred activity and all the rest of it?

JS: Well let's deal with that for a moment because it seems to be very central to what you are saying, and to what I implied earlier when I used the word 'self-restraint'. I think we are talking about the same category of phenomena, the need perhaps to liberate ourselves from those experiences in life that make us vindictive, that make it difficult for us to join together to relate to those who may have injured us in the past. And we see this amongst nations now, between religious groups and others, who are incapable of

forgiving the present generation who have nothing to do with the perpetration of events at some previous time in history.

K: Yes sir.

JS: Therefore we are now beginning to approach the question that I posed earlier: what is it that we must do, what might we do now, to deal with the cause of the effects that we want to avoid? You have identified these as psychological. You have identified these as within the human mind.

K: So the first thing I would say is, don't identify yourself with anything - with a group, with a country, with a god, with ideologies. Right? Don't identify. Then that which you identify with must be protected - your country, your god, your conclusions, your experience, your biases. This identification is a form of self-centred activity.

JS: And let us assume for the sake of argument that there is a need to identify with things, or to relate to things or to each other. This is the basis for religion, which means - it comes from the word 'religio', to tie together - and there is a need that human beings have for relationship. Now they may very well enter into relationships that are harmful, that in fact are self destructive. Now is it possible to address ourselves to the kinds of relationships which, if developed, would allow us to relinquish those that are now harmful? For example, the most fundamental relationship is to ourselves, not in the self-centred sense, but ourselves as members of the human species, and to each other.

K: That is my relationship as a human being with the rest of humanity.

JS: Yes.

K: Now, just a minute, sir. Relationship implies two: my relationship with you, with another. But I am humanity. I am not separate from my brother across the ocean.

JS: You are not.

K: I am humanity. Therefore if I have this quality of love I have established a relationship. There is relationship.

JS: I think that it exists. I think you have it. And your brothers across the sea have it, in all of the countries of the world this exists, but we are taught to hate. We are taught to hate each other. We are taught to separate ourselves from the other. There is a deliberate...

K: Not only, sir, taught, but isn't there this feeling of possessiveness in which there is security and pleasure? I possess my property, I possess my wife, I possess my children, I possess my god. I am trying to say this sense of isolating process is so strong in us that we can't train ourselves to be out of this. I say, see the fact that you are the rest of mankind, for god's sake see it.

JS: Well what you are saying is that we are both individual and also related to the rest of humankind.

K: No. I say you are not an individual. Your thinking is not yours. Your consciousness is not yours because every human being suffers, every human being goes through hell, turmoil, anxieties, agonies, which every human being whether west, or east, north, south, are going through. So we are human beings, not, I am a separate human being therefore I am related to the human beings; I am the rest of humanity. And if I see that fact I will not kill another.

JS: Now contrast that with what exists today.

K: What exists today? I am an individual, I must fulfil my own

desires, my own urges, my own instincts, my own - and all the rest of it, and that is creating havoc.

JS: Now we want to transform one state to another.

K: You can't transform.

JS: All right, what can you do?

K: Change, mutate. You can't change one form into another form. See that you are actually, the truth, that you are the rest of mankind. Sir, when you see that, feel it in your - if I may use the word - feel it in your guts, in your blood, then your whole activity, your whole attitude, way of living changes. Then you have a relationship which is not two images fighting each other. A relationship that is living, alive, full of something, beauty. But again we come back to the exception.

JS: They exist. Now let's focus.

(Short gap on tape)

K: Suppose, sir, you are one of the exceptions - not suppose, please.

JS: I understand.

K: What's your relationship with me who is just an ordinary person? Have you any relationship with me?

JS: Yes.

K: What is that?

JS: We are the same species.

K: Yes, but you have stepped out of that. You are an exception. That's what we are talking about. You are an exception and I am not. Right? What is your relationship with me?

JS: I am...

K: Have you any?

JS: Yes.

K: Or you are outside trying to help me.

JS: No, I have a relationship with you and a responsibility because your well-being will influence my well-being. Our well-being is one and the same.

K: No, sir. You are an exception. You are not psychologically putting things together. You are out of that category. And I am all the time gathering. Right? You know, all the rest of it. There is a vast division between freedom and the man who is in prison. I am in prison, of my own making, and the prison made by politicians, books and all the rest of it, I am in prison, you are not, you are free. And I would like to be like you.

JS: I would like to help liberate you.

K: Therefore what's your relationship? A helper. Or you have real compassion, not for me, the flame of it, the perfume, the depth, the beauty, the vitality and the intelligence of compassion, love. That's all. That will affect much more than your decision to help me.

JS: I agree with that. We are in complete agreement. That's how I see the exceptional. And I see that the exceptional individuals possess the quality of compassion.

K: And compassion cannot be put together by thought.

JS: It exists.

K: How can it exist when I have hate in my heart, when I want to kill somebody, when I am crying, how can that exist? There must be freedom from all that before the other is.

JS: I am focusing my attention now on the exceptional.

K: I am doing that.

JS: And do those have hatred in their hearts? The exceptional ones?

K: Sir, it is like the sun, sunshine isn't yours or mine. We share it. But the moment it is my sunshine it becomes childish. So all that you can be is like the sun, the exceptional, like the sun, give me compassion, love, intelligence, nothing else - don't say, do this, don't do that, then I fall into the trap, which all the churches, religions have done. Freedom means, sir, to be out of the prison - prison which man has built for himself. And you who are free, be there. That's all. You can't do anything.

JS: I hear you say something very positive, very important, very significant. I hear you say that there does exist people, individuals, a group of individuals who possess these qualities for emanating something that could help the rest of humankind.

K: You see that's the whole concept - I don't want to go into that, that's too irrelevant - that there are such people who help, not guide, tell you what to do, it all becomes so silly. Just like sun, like the sun giving light. And if you want to sit in the sun, you will sit in it, if you don't, you will sit in the shade.

JS: And so it's that kind of enlightenment.

K: That is enlightenment.

JS: That we are on the verge of receiving. I think that that is what you have given us today.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 14TH MAY 1983

May one remind you, if I may, that this is not an entertainment. It's nice to sit under trees on a lovely morning, cool, fresh, but in spite of all that, this is not in any way to entertain you; neither intellectually or emotionally or to try to convince you of anything. We are not doing any kind of propaganda. Nor is this a lecture, as it's commonly understood; on a particular subject to be informed, to be instructed. It is not a lecture. But together we should look at the world as it is, the whole world, not a particular part of the world or a particular group, or be concerned for the moment with our own particular problems, of which we have many, but to look at the whole world, the whole earth upon which human beings are living.

This world in which we live has been broken up into various forms of nationalities, linguistic differences, nationalistic, patriotic divisions, religious divisions: the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Tibetan, the Muslim, the Christian; and also the recent religion of Communism, Marxism; the totalitarian states through certain parts of the world where there is no liberty, freedom to think what you like, to do what you like. Wars are going on in different parts of the world. Human beings are killing each other for some idealistic, nationalistic or racial division. Human beings are slaughtered by the latest machinery of war. We are not judging, nor looking at all this from any prejudiced point or from any bias; but we are looking at it together to find out for ourselves why this is happening: why there is so much misery in the world; so much confusion; great uncertainty. And the world is becoming more and more dangerous

to live in.

In this part of the world you may not have wars, but you are preparing for war. And in this world there are a great many institutions, foundations, organizations, little groups with their particular leaders; the gurus with their absurdities; each person or each group, each community is separating itself from others. This is what is happening all over the world; more so in this part of the world where each one wants to do what he likes; to fulfil himself, to express himself, to assert himself. There are threats of various kinds. This is what is actually going on in the world.

And when one looks at all this: the terror, the suffering, the bad management, inefficient management of governments, each country preparing, accumulating the instruments of war, perhaps helped by religions. And when one looks at all this quite objectively, without any bias, one must ask, if one is at all serious, and I hope - one hopes that you are, not only this morning for an hour but this is a human problem. It's a great crisis. And who is responsible for all this?

One can easily say that it's the environment, the society, the mismanagement, and so on. But in spite of all that, if we can look really seriously, objectively - not as Americans and Hindus or a particular group, but look at all this; take a journey together to find out for ourselves without being told, without being instructed or informed, who is responsible for all these terrible things that are going on. Not only in the technological world, which is becoming more and more complex; such tremendous advancement: computer, the robots, the missiles, the submarines, you know, all that's what's happening: great surgery, medicine, all that. Looking

at all this, one asks not only what is one to do, but also, who is responsible, who has brought this about: the chaos, the confusion, the utter misery of man.

And this society, in which we all live, this society is corrupt, immoral, aggressive, destructive; and this society has been going on for thousands of years modified or primitive; but it is the same pattern being repeated thousands of years upon thousands of years. These are all facts. This is not the opinion or the judgment of the speaker.

So, as one must ask, and I hope you will ask, who is responsible? And what is one to do, confronted, facing this enormous crisis; if one is at all aware of this crisis?

Is the crisis outward, outside of us - economic crisis, social crisis, crisis of war; the building of enormous armaments, the appalling waste of all this. And inwardly, psychologically, we are also very confused. There is constant conflict, struggle, pain, anxiety and so on, inwardly. Please remember, this is not a lecture; we are together taking a journey into the whole structure which mankind has created, the disorder that human beings have brought about in this world. So there is misery, chaos, confusion outwardly, in the sense in society, economically, religiously; and inwardly, that is psychologically, the psyche, the consciousness, with its content is pain, beliefs, struggle, and so on, and so on, so on.

Which we'll all go into during these three talks here. And since you have taken the trouble to come here you must ask: what are you going to do about all this? Turn to leaders? Better politicians? This one isn't good, but the next one will be better; and the next one will still better. And so we keep this game going. We have looked to

various so-called spiritual leaders, the whole hierarchy of the Christian world. They are as confused, uncertain as we are.

If you turn to the psychologists or the psychotherapists, they are like you and me: confused. And there are all the ideologies: Communist ideologies, Marxist ideologies, the philosophical ideologies, the ideologies of the Hindus and the ideologies of those people who have brought Hinduism here; and you have your own ideologies. You follow all this? The whole world is fragmented, broken up, as we are broken up, driven by various urges, reactions, each one wanting to be important, each one acting his own self-interest. This is actually what is going on in the world, wherever you go; the most poverty-ridden villages in India or the most highly sophisticated people in the west, it's the same issue, the same problems: poverty, hunger, man against man; one ideology against another ideology. This is the actual fact. And what are we all going to do about it all? Who has been responsible? Is each one of us responsible? You and another, are we responsible? Please, do ask this question of yourself. Please, for this morning, if you will, be serious for an hour.

If you look to another to instruct you, to guide you, to tell you what to do - and there are people who will do all that, and they too have not through the centuries helped man to bring about a different world: neither so called spiritual leader - one doesn't like that word 'spiritual', it's an ugly word - nor so called statesmen. So where will you look? If you don't look for leaders, and all leaders are like the led, and the various gurus are, like the disciples, greedy, money-making - you know all that stuff that's going on. So, if all the leaders in the world have failed, not only in this

generation but in the past generations, and in the future generations, leaders have not helped, Statesmen throughout the world (if there are any, which I doubt, at the present time), they too have not brought about a different society; put an end to wars. So where will you look? The priests have failed, organizations, institutions have lost their meaning; they have not helped: the foundations, the little groups, the little self-assertive selfish little gatherings, none of that has helped to bring about a change in man.

And man has not changed, though he has evolved from the animal to the present so-called civilized human beings; during all long evolution psychologically we are still rather primitive. That's a fact. So where will you look for help; and can anyone help?

Please, if one may remind you again and again, this is not a lecture. It is not that the speaker is going to tell you what to do or what to think, but together you and the speaker are looking at all these problems, facing them, not avoiding it, not running away. And we have been trained, educated to run away, to seek some kind of comfort, some kind of an answer from somebody. The books can't answer this question. All the religious books cannot possibly answer this question. So knowing no leader of any kind, the local or the imported, the very erudite, the philosophers, the psychologists, none of them have helped man to change himself psychologically. And we are facing a very dangerous world: one ideology, like the Russian Marxist ideologies facing the so-called democratic ideologies.

So there is nobody you can turn to. I wonder - one wonders if you really realize that. Nobody on earth or in heaven is going to help you. You can pray, and that which you pray to is the creation

of your own thought. One wonders if you actually face this fact, or surreptitiously, in our anxiety, in our confusion, we turn to another. And probably you are all here for that; if you are not curious, if you are not saying, what is he going to talk about, let's hear for a few minutes, and if it doesn't interest us, we'll get out. It's a nice morning, let's go out for a picnic. But one is confronted with this very, very serious problem of life, realizing that there is nobody that can help us, nobody on earth, or any outside agency. God is the creation of thought, of man, out of his fear, out of his anxiety, desire for comfort, seeking somebody to help. The thought has created this so-called entity, God. That's a fact.

So, realizing all this, facing all this, each one of us is responsible for all this; for any kind of war that is happening in the world, the war that's going on in Beirut, in Vietnam, and I believe about forty five wars are going on now. Because in ourselves we are divided, fragmented, in ourselves we are nationalistic, patriotic - patriotism is not the love of land. If you love the land, you don't want to destroy the land, as it is being destroyed right throughout the world. Each one of us wants to fulfil, immediately. Whatever is the desire, fulfil it - encouraged by the psychologists. So, each one of us is responsible as long as we are violent, as long as we are in disorder, as long as we are trying to fulfil our own particular urges, competitive, aggressive, brutal, angry, violent - which we are. Again, this is a fact. As long as we are all this, our society is going to be that. So we have created this society and nobody else. And to bring about a change in society, in the world - I wonder, one wonders if you really realize what is happening? If you are not too self-centred, occupied with your own particular little problems and

desires, pleasures, I wonder, one wonders if you are really aware in spite of the newspapers and so on, aware what is happening. And if you are aware, not merely intellectually observing the things that are taking place, you must be greatly concerned; not only for yourselves, but for your grandchildren, children, for the future. What's the future of man? These are all fundamental questions that one must ask. Not ask someone else, ask oneself.

So, who has been responsible? And, what can each one of us do? What's our action, facing this, not only crisis outwardly, but crisis in ourselves. How has all this been brought about? We have evolved technologically from a bullock cart to the jet, and so on; tremendous evolution. But inwardly, psychologically we have hardly moved. We are still very, very primitive. So what shall we do?

To find out one must be not only free to look, free from all bias, free from all conclusions; the word 'conclusion' implies to conclude, to shut down. We conclude a peace, that means ending of a certain war; conclude an argument, that means to end that argument. So without any conclusion, without any bias whatsoever - if that's possible, and it is possible if you are willing, not from a self-centred point of view. If you look at all this, is thought responsible for all this? Thought that has created the extraordinary world of technology, the inventions, the extraordinary communications, the subtle surgeries, medicine; the whole infinite movement in the technological world, thought has been responsible for all that. Right? Again, that's a fact. Nobody can deny it.

Thought also has created nationalities, divisions, and hoping in divisions to find security. You believe (if you believe) in a

particular form of religious ideology. That again is the activity of thought not only political divisions that exist in the world, the religious divisions that exist in the world, the marvellous architecture, the great cathedrals of the world and the small churches, and all the things that are in the churches and the cathedrals, in the temples and mosques throughout the world, are put there by thought: the rituals, the ceremonies, the costumes of the priests when they perform; all that is the result of thought. Do you accept that?

Q: No!

K: I thought you wouldn't. You are thought, aren't you? You are memories, you are remembrances, you are the past; the past which is the accumulation of experience and knowledge; with your tendencies. You are memories. Right? A simple fact. Subtle, sublimated, crooked, one thought suppressing another thought, thought is utterly responsible for all the things that are going on in the world.

Please examine it, don't deny it or say it's right or wrong. Look at it. Have the patience, courage and be serious enough to look at it. It's easy to say no or yes, but to see the truth of it, the actuality of it: what you believe is the activity of thought. Your relationship with another is the remembrance of thought. So you are basically a bundle of memories. You may not like the fact; you may reject it; but that's a fact. If you had no memories of any kind, you would be in a state of amnesia, in a state of utter blankness, vagueness, vacant. This is a hard thing to face.

So thought is responsible for the divisions: religious, political, personal, racial, the wars that are going on between the Jew and the

Arabs, between various religious groups, it's all the result of thought. Do you really accept that? If you do, see the fact; see the truth of it. Not the superstition; not some exotic idea; not something imposed upon you by the speaker.

So if you see the truth of it, objectively, impersonally, without any bias whatsoever, then the question arises: can that thought be aware of itself? Please listen to all this, if you will kindly. If you don't want to listen, it's all right too.

What is one then to do with thought? If, and it is a fact, that thought has brought about this disorder in the world, then who is to put order in the world? Who is to bring about order in the world? Or in oneself? The world outside, apart from nature, is the result of our activity: our activity of thought has brought about disorder in ourselves. So the society is in disorder. Unless we put order in the house, there'll be no order in society, in our relationship. That's a fact!

Now, who is to put order in us? Who is to bring about, out of this disorder, clear, strong, irrefutable order? Is the thinker separate from thought? You understand all these questions? Are you interested in all this? If you are not, why are you here? Just to sit under trees and look at the blue sky; and look at those lovely hills? You can do that too. But since you are here, and since the speaker has come a long way, we must together understand this question and find an answer for ourselves, not be told like children! To find answer which is right, correct, precise, true, and not depend on anyone.

Therefore we must examine together. We have separated thinker and thought. The thinker is always correcting thought.

Have you observed it? Controlling it, denying it, shaping it, putting into a mould. So the thinker we think is separate from thought.

Please, go into it slowly, I'll go into it patiently, let's go together; it's a long journey we are taking, so if you take a long journey, you must carry things lightly, patiently; hesitantly. And to take a long journey, you must begin very near; which is you.

So, the question arises, that there is a division between the thinker and the thought. The thinker is always correcting thought, controlling it: this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this must not be; and so there is a division between the thinker and the thought. Right? That's clear. Is that division real? Or fictitious? There is no thinker without thought. Is this all a little bit complex? It doesn't matter. It's up to you. There is a division between the thinker who is the past and the thought that is taking place now. And the thinker says that thought is correct or wrong, right and so on. He controls it, so there is a division between the thinker and the thought. So that is the basis of fragmentation in us. Right? Are we together in this? At least a little bit.

We are asking why, in human beings, inwardly, Psychologically, there is this division, as there is division in the world: the separation, this fragmentation of human beings, Christian, Jew, all the rest of it. What is the root of this fragmentation? The root of it is, there is a division between the two, the thinker and the thought. There is no thinker apart from thought. The thinker is the past, so is thought. Thought is the result or response or the reaction of memory. Memory is the result or reaction of knowledge. Stored in the brain, knowledge is experience; in the scientific world, in the technological world, even

the inward world, psychological world, knowledge, experience, memory, and the response of that is thought. That's a fact. And where there is knowledge, knowledge is always incomplete; either in the present or the future or in the past. There is no complete knowledge about anything. There can never be. Even the scientists, biologists and archaeologists and so on, they do admit knowledge is limited.

Where there is limitation of knowledge, there must be limitation of thought. When you say, "I am a Christian," it's limited. When you are thinking about yourself, your problems, your relationship, your sexual pleasures and fulfillment, that's very, very limited. And thought is limited. It can invent the limitless, but that is still the product of thought. It can invent heaven; or hell or whatever - it can invent, it is still limited. So where there is limitation, there must be fragmentation. I wonder if you are following all this? Please do follow this, because it's your life. We are talking about daily life. So where there is limitation there must be conflict. When I say I am a Hindu, it's limited. When I say I am a Catholic, obviously. Where there is limitation there must be division. Where there is division, there must be disorder. And we live in disorder.

In the old world, there was order of some kind, because they followed certain traditions. In the modern world, tradition is thrown overboard, and there is nothing left, so you do what you want to do. And each one of us in this world is doing what he wants to do; his thing. And look at what chaos it's bringing about: politically, with the lobbies, each individual following his own particular inclination religious or otherwise. I wonder if one is aware of all this, of what we are all doing. The immense

propaganda that's going on, in the name of religion, in the name of this or that.

So, our question then is, in our relationship, intimate or otherwise, in our actual daily relationship, there is fragmentation. The wife or the girl or the boy or the man follows his own inclinations, his own desires, his own sexual demands and you know all that. There are two separate entities having a relationship - perhaps sexual - but otherwise they have no relationship at all, actually. That's a fact. Each one is pursuing his own ambition, his own fulfillment, his own urges, inclinations, the obstinacy of each one. And we call this conflict relationship.

That relationship is brought about - this division, which is not relationship at all. You may hold the hand of another, embrace another, walk together, but inwardly you are separate from the other. That's a fact. Do face it. And so there is perpetual conflict between the two.

And if one asks, is it possible to live in relationship with another without conflict? The hermits, the monks, those who live in solitude whether in the great mountains of India or in this country. Relationship is the greatest thing in life. You cannot live without relationship. You may withdraw from all relationship, finding that relationship is painful; always living in struggle, conflict, possessing and not possessing, jealous, you know all that happens. There are those who withdraw from all relationship. But they are related, they cannot possibly escape from any kind of relationship.

So is it possible, as it is necessary, to live in relationship without a single shadow of conflict? You are asking this question, please, not the speaker. This is an important question, a deep,

fundamental question. If they cannot live in relationship with each other without conflict, then you will create a world which is full of conflict. Even the quail agrees.

So we are asking, what is the cause of this conflict, of this disorder; in ourselves, in our relationship, and the disorder that exists outside of us? What is the actual fact of relationship? The fact, not romantic, you know, all that kind of sentimental stuff, but the actual fact, the brutal fact of it. Because if one doesn't really understand the beauty, the depth, the vitality and the greatness of relationship, we do make a mess of our lives.

Is our relationship based on memory? Is it based on remembrances? Is it based on the past incidents accumulated as various images, pictures? If it is remembrance, if it is various images, then all that is the product of thought. Then one asks is thought love? Do please ask this question of yourself, not that I am prompting you. You are all grown-up people; I hope. Is the accumulated knowledge of each other - which must always be limited and therefore that very knowledge is the root of conflict - is that knowledge, that conflict, is that love? Not love of some romantic idea: love of God, love of, you know all that kind of stuff, love between human beings, a friendship, a sense of communication, communion, nonverbal, verbal.

So, is it possible to live with another without a single image: without a single remembrance of the past which has given you pleasure or pain. Do think, look at it.

And is it possible not to build images about the other? If you do build images about the other, which is knowledge, then it is perpetual division. Though you may have children, sex, and so on,

but it's fundamentally division. Like the Arabs and the Jew, the Christian and the Muslim and so on. So where there is division there must be conflict. That's a law. So can I, can you, can each of us have a relationship in which there is no conflict whatsoever? Yes, sir, go into it.

This is part of meditation; not all the silly things that are going on in the name of meditation. This is meditation, to find out; to probe into oneself; whether it is possible to live with another happily, without domination, without suppression, without the urge to fulfil, all that kind of childish stuff. To live with another without any sense of division. The division must exist as long as thought is in operation, because thought is limited; because knowledge is limited. And in that division there is great pain; anxiety, jealousy, hatred; me first and you after.

To observe this fact, to observe, not say, I must have no division, that's all silly. To observe the fact that you are first divided, like to parallel lines never meeting - except perhaps sexually - otherwise two separate lines, two separate rows, two separate railway lines each pursuing the other, his own way; clinging to each other. All that brings about great misery in one's life. So to observe the fact, that you are divided; delve deeply into the fact. When you say, my wife, my girl friend, or this or that, look at the word, feel the word, the weight of the word, the weight of the word 'relationship.' To weigh the word means to hold the word.

To observe the whole implication of relationship; not only human relationship, but also the relationship with nature. If you lose relationship with nature, you lose relationship with man. To

observe; to observe without any bias, to look at it, to feel the division, and when you so observe, which I hope you are doing it, when you so observe, that very observation is like a tremendous light put on the the word 'relationship.' You understand? To observe; we'll go into it. To watch; which means to watch without any direction; without the word without any motive, just to watch all the implications, the content of that word 'relationship.' To live with that word; even for an hour, for tea minutes, for a day, find out! To live with it. To so observe, which means live your complete attention to that. When you attend completely, the obstacles, the division disappears. It's like bringing great energy to something that is being broken. You understand all this?

So it is possible - not that you should accept what the speaker is saying; he is not an authority - it is possible to live without a single conflict.

But you may live without conflict, but the other may not. You understand the problem? You may have understood, gone into the question of relationship; shed tears, laughter, humour about it; weighed the word, lived with the word; you may have seen and gone into it, and comprehended it, seen the truth of it. But the other may not. Right? Your wife may not or your husband may not, or the girl friend may not, and so on. Then what is your relationship with the other? What is the relationship between a very, very intelligent man and a stupid man? Suppose you are very intelligent, in the ordinary sense of that word for the moment, which is not intelligence at all, suppose you are very intelligent, then what is my relationship to you? I am dull; I am rather stupid, I cling to my own prejudices, obstinate, my own opinions, and I am rather stupid,

what is your relationship to me then? Go into it, please look at it. You will tolerate me? Be sympathetic with me? Be kind to me? That means there is still the division. You understand?

So when the conflict ends - suppose you have ended it - does it imply that there is the sense of love in it? We'll talk about love later on, or the implications of that word, and the depth of that word, the beauty of that word. But, when you have that quality, that perfume, and I haven't, and I am your wife or husband or whatever it is, your father, mother - it's strange in this country, the fathers and mothers don't count any more. They are packed away in some place; right? Sent to old women's home or men's home. Go to Asia, where there is no Social Security, the father and the mother live with their children. And that's why they say, we must have children. That's one of the reasons why population is growing so tremendously. There must be a boy, a boy especially, because when the parents are old the children will look after them. Here, all that's gone. Please consider all this when you talk about relationship with nature; how we are destroying the world, polluting the world, the air, the earth, the sea; destroying the beauty of the earth. And the beauty of relationship, to live completely at peace with one another.

Talking about peace, can there be peace in this world? Not in heaven, that's an old, old traditional disease. Can there be peace between human beings, whatever their colour, their race, their language, their so-called culture? And to find that peace, there must be peace between you and another, between you, your wife, your children. You understand? Can there be peace? Which means no conflict. Where there is no conflict, there is something far

greater than the activity of thought. That's an actual fact, if one comes to the truth that to live without conflict. Which doesn't mean you become lazy, a vegetable; on the contrary. You have tremendous energy. Not to do more mischief, but to live rightly.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 15TH MAY 1983

May we go on with what we were talking about yesterday and continue with it? It's a lovely morning and I'm glad we have such a nice day.

We were talking, weren't we, about the general chaos in the world, not only in society and the divisions that religions are creating throughout the world, the threat of war, and the general chaos, and we were asking who is responsible for all this mess. And we were saying, weren't we, that thought, which has so extraordinarily evolved technologically, but psychologically, inwardly, we are still very, very primitive. And this primitivism - if there is such a word, I doubt it - is creating this misery and confusion. And from there we talked about relationship. How without relationship there would be no humanity, without relationship there would be no existence at all. Relationship, we said, was one of the most important things in life. And that relationship is generally, with most people, based on remembrance and things past. And we went into it somewhat in detail yesterday morning; I don't think it would be necessary to go over it again. Remembrance and pleasure, we said, is not love. Desire to achieve, to become something, denies that perfume which we call love. That's where we stopped yesterday, and we briefly talked about peace.

Man has evolved probably a million years or less or more biologically, and man has always been crying for peace on earth; pacem in terris, the old Latin phrase. And apparently there is no peace in the world. Without peace we cannot possibly flower; we

can possibly, not evolve, but see the extraordinary depth of life, the beauty of it; the immensity of all living things. One must have peace. And that peace is denied wherever there is poverty. In this country, there is a great deal of poverty too, though this society is affluent. As you go further east, poverty increases: Africa, Middle East, and India and so on. Where there is poverty, which no special nationalistic government can ever solve, because it's a global problem; a problem of the whole world, not of a particular government, whether it is totalitarian, Marxist, or so-called democratic. And poverty, not only outwardly - if you have lived in a country where there is immense poverty, you see the effect of it: the degradation, the utter slavery of it; the brutality. We have lived through all of it. And this poverty, not only of the mind, and the poverty of the mind is not enriched through books, through institutions and organizations and foundations or forums - that mind is enriched when one understands the whole existence of oneself and one's relationship to the world at large.

And religions have not encouraged or brought about peace in the world. They talk a great deal - all the Christian world talks about *pacem in terris*, peace in the world - but religions have divided man. There are the Catholics, the Protestants; I don't know how many religious groups there are in this little village, probably dozens of them, institutions and foundations, each trying to tell the other fellows what to do; or inform them. Religions have prevented peace, they have had wars - 'Hundred Years' War in Europe; torture; all the brutality of this particular culture based on certain religious concepts, dogmas and beliefs. And religions throughout the world, in India and Far East and Near East, have prevented man

from right relationship with humanity. These are all facts. There has been 5,000 years of war. This is historically stated, and we are still going on with wars; killing each other - perhaps in the beginning with a club, now you evaporate man, vaporize man by the million. We have not psychologically evolved, inwardly. And as long as we are primitive psychologically, our society will be equally primitive.

And can there be peace on this earth? This is a very, very serious question. Not only in oneself to live peacefully, without conflict, is that at all possible? Or man, is condemned forever to live in conflict. (Is that bothering you? The aeroplane? All right.) Is man forever condemned to live in conflict, in wars? Or is there a way out of all this? Certainly not through religions, as they are; not through political organization, whether it is democratic or totalitarian or Marxist. Nor through divisions of nationalities. As long as you remain an American, and the speaker remains a Hindu or a Buddhist or Muslim, we'll have no peace on earth. Nor the racial divisions, as the Jew, the Arab, and the Hindu, and so on. Nor culturally. So it's a very important question to ask of ourselves; not of another, not whether governments can bring about peace. Governments are created by what we are. They have been structured, put together by our own demands.

So, one asks, is it possible to have peace on this earth? This has been a cry for centuries; long before Christianity came into being. 2,500 years ago the Buddha was talking about peace. And we are still talking about it. And so realizing all this, what is one to do? Individuals, so-called individual effort to live in peace doesn't affect the whole world. You may live peacefully in this lovely

valley; quietly, not too ambitious, not too corrupt, not too competitive; and live here quietly. Perhaps get on with your wife or your husband, but will that affect the whole of human consciousness? Or, the problem is much greater, much more profound. To find that out, if we are at all serious - and please, if one may remind you, this is not an entertainment, this is far too serious. We have to think together; not the speaker thinks and explains and describes, but together look, like two old friends, sitting under the shade of the trees, and talking about all this, not merely intellectually, but their hearts are disturbed. They are greatly concerned about what is happening in the world and what is happening to themselves. Like two old friends who have an amiable conversation; not convincing one or the other; not stimulating one or the other; not sticking to one's opinions and judgments and conclusions; two old friends who have lived together, walked together, seen many things of the world. You and the speaker are like that; so that we can think together, not what to think, or how to think, but think, observe together; observe the same tree, the skies, the birds, and the astonishing beauty of the mountains. And so together, actually together, not you listen to the speaker, but together explore into this question; the question being - one puts to the other - can we live not only you and I, but the rest of humanity? Because this earth is ours, not the American or the Irish or the English or the French, it's our earth. We are its guests. We have to live here peacefully.

And the one says to the other, what is the cause of all this? If one can find the cause, then the effect can end, the symptom. War is a symptom. The cause is very, very deep, complex. As when you

can find the cause of a disease, that disease can be cured. So the two friends - I hope we are friends talking over together - two friends say, what is the cause of all this? Why have human beings become like this? So thoughtless, only concerned with themselves, and nothing matters except their own desires, their own urges, their own impulse; their own ambition, their own success; whether the success be in business world or in the professorial world. And also psychologically, inwardly, we want to be somebody, become somebody. So please, one says to the other, do listen carefully what I am telling you. Is there psychological evolution at all? That's a very, very serious question. That is, is there a becoming at all, psychologically? And that becoming, inwardly achieving, from 'what is' to 'what should be', from misery to some form of happiness, from confusion to enlightenment, which is to become - from that which is to what should be; that is becoming.

That becoming implies time. And this becoming, each one trying to become psychologically something, may be the same movement as physically to become from a clerk to whatever it is - bishop. No - local priest to become a bishop; like a clerk to become an executive. It's the same movement, the same wave, brought over to the psychological realm. I hope - the friend is asking the other - I hope I am making myself clear. He says, you are not quite clear. Go into it a little bit more.

In all religions and psychological world, the idea of change is to become. Right? I am confused, I must change this confusion to become clear. I quarrel with my wife, but the change to stop that, or to end that quarrel is to move from the violence to non-violence. That is, there is always the attempt to be something which is not.

Right? So the friend says, that's fairly clear; fairly, not too clear. But we'll go on with our conversation; it's a lovely morning, we have plenty of time, the sun is warm, and the shadows are many. And the shadows matter as much as the sun. There is great beauty in the shadows; but most of us are concerned with light, enlightenment, and we want to achieve that. This very psychological achievement may be one of the factors of conflict in life. So - my friend says - let's examine that fact. What is it to become? I hope my friend is very interested - and I hope you are too; and listening to this conversation; which is you and the speaker. You and the speaker. There's no friend outside you and the speaker. So, he says, is that the fundamental cause of division? Division must exist, the other explains, as long as there is the psyche, the self, the 'me', the ego, the person, separating himself from the other. But the other says, this has been a long history, this is what the human condition is; that we have been trained, educated to accept both religiously and economically and so on that we are individuals, separate from the rest of mankind, separate from an other. And the friend says, is that so? Are we really individuals? I know this is the tradition, this is what all religion have said - separate souls in Christianity, and the Hindus, and so on. But together, you as the friend and the speaker as the other, are going to examine whether we are really individuals at all. Be patient, please. See all the implications of it before you deny or accept. Now you accept it; it's your condition, as an individual, free to do what you want to do. And the totalitarian denies this; they say you are just a cog in the whole social structure.

So we are questioning not only the psychological becoming

may be an illusion, and also psychologically we are not separate; because you suffer, you are confused, you are unhappy, you are anxious, uncertain, insecure; you may have security outwardly - even that is becoming more and more uncertain. There are millions unemployed in this country; and in England. Four million people are unemployed in England; a small country. And the unemployment in India is something they don't know. This unemployment is causing great misery, unhappiness, and conflict, hate.

So we are questioning together - you and the other friend are questioning - whether we are individuals at all. Or, we are like the rest of humanity; the rest of humanity is unhappy, sorrow-ridden, fearful, believing in some fantastic romantic nonsense; they go through great suffering; uncertainty, like you. And our reaction, which is part of our consciousness, is similar to the other. This is an absolute fact. You may not like to think about it, you might like to think that you are totally separate from another - which is quite absurd. So your consciousness, which is you: what you think, what you believe, what your conclusions, prejudices, your vanity, arrogance, aggression, pain, grief, sorrow, is shared by all humanity. That's our conditioning; whether you are a Catholic or a Protestant or whatever you are.

So, our consciousness is your essence, what your life is. That is the truth. And so you actually share the rest of humanity; you are the rest of humanity. You are humanity. This is a tremendous thing to realize. You may believe in a certain form of a saviour and the other believe in certain form of ideologies and so on; belief is common to all of us; fear is common to all of us; loneliness, the

agony of loneliness is shared by the rest of humanity. So when one realizes the truth of that, becoming - that is, to change from 'what is' to 'what should be' - has a totally different meaning. The friend says, I don't understand that at all. What do you mean by that? The friend says, I don't quite know, but let's examine it. I hope you are all following all this; because it's your life, not mine. It's your daily life - whether you live in this valley, New York or other big cities, all the cities of the world - it's our life. We have to understand that, not from another, but to examine the facts of our life; to look at ourselves as you look at yourself when you comb your hair or shaving: objectively, sanely, rationally, without any distortion, seeing things as they are, and not be frightened or ashamed; but to observe.

So the friend says, all my life I have tried to change from 'what is' to 'what should be'. I know violence, disorder, I've known all that very well. And that disorder and violence, I've tried to change; that is, to become from violence to non-violence; from disorder to order. Now is there - the other friend says - is non-violence a fact? Or just an imaginary conclusion, a reaction from the fact of violence? I hope we understand each other. I am violent; I project the idea of non-violence, because that's part of my conditioning. I have lived in disorder and I try to seek order; that is, to change 'what is' to 'what should be'. That's part of becoming. And that may be the cause of conflict. And so let's examine that carefully. You're examining it, not the speaker is examining it. I must constantly - one must constantly remember that. And the speaker will constantly remind his friend that it's not a one-sided conversation; it's not one-sided communication. We are both of us friends, you

and the speaker are observing all this. The speaker is expressing it in words, but you are also observing it, not only the words but the fact. So the friend says, can this violence end? Not become non-violent. Can envy, greed, fear end? Not become courageous, free from this or that. That's the question. So the other friend says, I'll show it to you. Only perhaps this may be new to you, so please kindly listen most attentively.

First realize what we are doing; that is, 'what is' to become the ideal, which is 'what should be'. The ideal is non-existent, is non-fact. But 'what is' is a fact. Right? So let's understand 'what is' and not the idea of non-violence, which is absurd. This has been preached by various people in India, beginning with Tolstoy and others. This is our tradition, this is our conditioning; this is our attempt to become something. And we have never achieved anything. We have never become non-violent. Never. So let's examine carefully whether it is possible to end that which is, to end that disorder or violence. End, not become something. I hope we understand each other. The becoming implies time. This is very important to understand. When we talk about fear, which shall presently, we'll go into the question of time; which is extraordinarily complex.

So, sir, let's understand whether it's possible to end what is; not to change 'what is' into that which we would like to be. We'll take the question of violence. And if you prefer disorder, both are the same; it doesn't matter what you take. Violence is inherited from beyond all time, from the animal, from the ape and to us. We have inherited it. That's a fact, we are violent people. Otherwise we wouldn't be killing anybody; we wouldn't be hurting anybody; we

wouldn't say a word against anybody; but we are by nature violent. Now what is the meaning of that word? To hold that word, feel the weight of that word, the complications of that word. Not merely physical violence: the terrorist throwing bombs; those terrorists who want to change society through various forms of disturbance and bombing and so on, they have never changed society. And there are the terrorists who do it for the fun of it. Violence is not only physical but psychological, much more. Violence is conformity, because to conform to something, not understand 'what is', but to conform, imitate. And violence must exist as long as there is division outwardly and inwardly. Conflict is the very nature of violence. The friend says, yes, I see that. That's fairly clear. Now how do you end it? How do you end the whole complex question of violence? He says, I understand very well that to become non-violent is a part of violence. Right? Part of violence; because you have projected from violence non-violence. And I understand that very clearly, that projection is really illusion. So I have rejected that concept, or that idea, that feeling that you must become non-violent. He says, I understand that very clearly. There is only this fact. Now, what am I to do?

And the friend says, don't ask me - listen carefully - don't ask me, but let's look at it. The moment you ask what to do, or how to do, you put the other fellow as your guide. You make him your authority; therefore friendship ceases. Right? So together let's look at it. Being free, work together from the idea of non-violence; observe what is violence; look at it; give attention to the fact, not escape from it, not rationalize it. Don't say, why you shouldn't be violent, it's part of myself. But if that is part of yourself, you'll

always create wars, of different kinds: wars between yourself and your wife, wars, killing others and so on.

So look at it without conflict; you understand? Look at it as though it was not separate from you. You understand all this? This is rather difficult. Which is: violence is part of you, you are violent, like you are greedy. Greed is not separate from you. Suffering is not separate from you. Anxiety, loneliness, depression, all that is you. But our tradition, our education has said, you are separate from that. Right? So where there is separation, where there is duality, there must be conflict. Like the Jew, Arab, I'm taking that, probably you'll understand that better. Between the conflict of two great powers, division, and so on. So, it's you; you are that. You are not separate from that. The analyzer is not different from the analyzed. Right The friend says, I follow this a little more. Go on, explain a bit more. He says, I will.

We observe the tree, the mountain, you observe your wife and your children, and who is the observer and who is the observed? Please, I am going into it carefully, follow this. Is the observer different from the tree? Of course he is different, I hope. The observer is different from that mountain. The observer is different from the computer. But, is the observer different from anxiety? The anxiety is a reaction, put into words as anxiety, but the feeling is you. The word is different - please follow this - the word is different, but the word is never the thing. The thing is the feeling of anxiety, feeling of violence. The word 'violence' is not that. So watch carefully that the word doesn't entangle your observation. You are following? Because our brain is caught in a network of words. When I say, you are an American, you feel very proud.

When I call myself South African or a Zulu, I feel - you follow - something totally different. So one must be very careful that the language doesn't condition our thinking. This is quite a different problem. Right?

So the friend says to the other, observe this feeling without the word. If you use the word, you strengthen the past memories of that particular feeling. Are you following? This is the act of observation in which the word is not the thing and the observer is the observed. The observer who says, I am violent, that observer is violence. Right? So the observer is the observed. The thinker is the thought. The experiencer who says I must experience nirvana or heaven or what, is the experience. Right? The analyzer is the analyzed and so on. So look at that fact, of that feeling, without a word, without analyzing it, just look. That is, be with it. Be with this thing as is. Which means you bring all your attention to it. Right? By analyzing, examining, that's all waste of energy, whereas if you give your total attention, which is give all your energy to the feeling, then that feeling has total ending.

The friend says, are you mesmerizing me by being so vehement, by being so passionate about it? I say, no. I'm not stimulating you, I'm not telling you what to do. You yourself have realized that non-violence is non-fact, it's not real. What is real is violence. You yourself have realized it. You yourself have said, yes, I am violent; not I am separate from the violence. The word separates. But the fact of the feeling is me. Me is my nose, my eyes, my face, my name, my character, that's me. I am not separate from all that. When you separate, you act upon it. Right? Which means conflict. Therefore, you have fundamentally erased the cause of conflict

when you are that, not separate from that. Is this clear? Right?

So we have - the friend says, I have learned something. I have learned a great phenomenon, which I have never realized before. Before I have separated my feelings as though I was different from my feeling. Now I realize the truth that I am that. Therefore I remain with it. And when you remain with it, hold it, you are out of that, that gives you tremendous energy. And that energy dissipates, ends that violence completely. Not for a day, not while you are sitting here, but it's the end of it.

So we can go on to the next question, if we have time. Oh, good, plenty of time. I hope you are not tired. We must now take up the question - two friends are asking - how to end fear? Because that's been one of our problems; from time beyond time, man has lived with fear. Fear of various kinds: fear of ending, death, fear of not gaining, fear of being a failure in life, fear of losing a job, fear of darkness, fear of what public will say; fear I might lose my wife, fear of so many kinds. Fear of being dull. When I see a bright man, intelligent, capable, alive, I am jealous of him; that's part of fear.

So, to understand the nature of fear, and the structure of fear; because out of fear we have created gods - you understand? If we are not afraid at all, we are the most liberated man on earth. Then you don't want gods. You are a god yourself. So to understand the nature of fear, we must examine very carefully time. Time is fear. I'm afraid of tomorrow; I'm afraid of that which has happened two years ago. Two years ago is the past; the past is time, and I'm afraid of what might happen tomorrow. That's part of time. I have a job, but I might lose it. That's time. Right? So we must understand, if we can, and go into this question very carefully, what time is.

Time exists not only physically, but psychologically. Time to learn a language, time is necessary to go from here to your home, time by the watch, time by the sun, rising and setting, the darkness of night and the light of day. There is physical time. To put together a computer needs time. You'll understand that better because you're all mechanically minded. That's not a sneer, please. So time is necessary at a certain area. Now we are questioning whether time exists at all psychologically, inwardly. That is, the word 'hope' - don't get depressed by all this; just look at it - the word 'hope' implies time. I hope to be; I hope to become; I hope to achieve; I hope to fulfil; I hope to reach heaven, enlightenment. All that psychologically demands time. We are saying time in one direction, one area is necessary, whether this psychological time may be a total illusion. The word illusion implies, the root meaning, etymological meaning of that word is, to play; to play with something. We play with illusions. Because that's fun. We take great pleasure in having a dozen illusions. The more the better, because the more neurotic they are. The word - that's why we are examining the word itself, the root meaning of that word is 'ludere', to play.

So, is there psychologically tomorrow? Look at it, don't deny it - I am asking my friend - don't get upset about it. Don't throw up your hands and say, buzz off. Look at it, watch it. Don't deny it or accept it. And you might deny it because you are conditioned. And being conditioned, you might say, I can't live with the idea of not having hope. That involves conditioning. Is it possible not to be conditioned? All these questions are interrelated. Conditioned: what does that mean? To be limited. Our brains are conditioned.

Please listen to all this - the friend is saying to the other, please listen to this. Because this is really important if you can understand it. Then you'll be an extraordinary person if you are free of your conditioning. Not that you will be extraordinary, therefore unconditioned, but understand it first, then naturally it happens. There are many scholars and scientists and others who say, human beings, the human brain will always be conditioned: by their language, by their food, by their clothes, environment, society, and all the rest of it. And you can modify that conditioning, but you can never be free from it. Great writers have written about it. We have discussed with prominent people who are convinced that human beings cannot be free from all conditioning.

So my friend says, tell me about it. Is it possible not to be conditioned? What is the factor of being conditioned? What causes the brain to be conditioned? First of all, it's conditioned, there is the demand for security. We're not advocating insecurity. Just listen to the whole story of it. We want security, both physically, which is natural - food, clothes and shelter, that's natural. Everybody in the world must have it, not just the few. And that security is denied when it is only for the few. There's poverty, therefore there must be conflict. So when the brain seeks - which is thought, naturally, you understand? The essence of the brain is thinking. That is the root, the nature of the brain, to think. But thinking has realized that it is in itself uncertain, therefore it seeks security. And that security through division - I am an American, my family, your family - and that security now is being denied; you can see it. So, is there a security which is not of time? You understand? Which is not of hope. You are following? Is there a security which is not put

together by desire? Right? The friend says, yes; there is absolute security. Irrevocable security. The other friend says, show me. Don't be too clever about it. Don't say lot of things, just show me where there is security. But the other says, don't be so impatient. Look at it very carefully; that we need security; physical security. And that's being denied by all the division in the world: religious, political, racial, division of ideologies, wars. Physical security is gradually being eroded. So do something about that. So the desire to find security inwardly as separate human being is causing that. I hope you are following all this.

So find out if there is security inwardly. There is no security in attachment. Right? Attachment to my wife, to my friend, to my girl, to my man or attachment to an idea, to a concept, to an image. There's no security - right - in those. When you say, "I agree with you, there is no security in that," what happens? Before you had not examined this, you've just attached. But now, by examining it, there has been a radical change. You are following this? The brain has been conditioned by attachment. There in that attachment it sought security: to my wife, to my job, to an ideal; to some god. So, discovering that there is no security in any of that, what has happened to the brain? Please follow, watch this carefully. What has happened to your brain, which has been traditionally conditioned to be attached, hoping to find security in all this, and suddenly discovers there is no security in all this, what's happened to the brain? You follow this? There has been a total change. You understand all this?

As long as you cling to a particular comforting attachment, and in that attachment you sought security, and you find now, after

very careful observation, that there is no security in that. The whole movement has moved away from it. So your brain is unconditioned. Right? And that unconditioning has been brought about because you saw the truth that in attachment there is no security. The seeing that there is no security in illusion is intelligence. That intelligence, the beginning of that, gives you absolute security in intelligence, not in attachment. You have got it? Right? Is this clear?

So, the friend says, now let's go back to fear. It's very interesting, all this, if you go into it; more fascinating than any cinema in the world. You take a long journey; an endless journey; that is, endless, infinite. Which implies, where there is intelligence, there is compassion. We'll go into that later.

So now, my friend and I are talking about fear. The friend says, is there an ending to it? Not for one day, or few hours, but the total ending of it. Because he realizes, he says, I realize what fear does. It darkens my whole life; it cripples my thinking; it's a physical shrinking; a nervous tension. I know very well, the friend says, what fear is. I know several forms of fear; but I am not concerned about the forms of fear, because if I can root out the cause, then I don't have to bother with the branches of it.

So the friend says, I am not concerned with the trimming of the tree of fear, but I am concerned with the ending of fear. Is that possible? Or must we everlastingly live with fear? Man has lived with fear, from thousands of years. And you come along and say, you can end it. What right have you to say it? Is it just another verbal friction Or is it a fact?

So the friend says, we'll go into it together. You must see it for

yourself, not I see it and I tell you, and then you reject or accept; but together let's take the journey to find out whether it's possible to end fear; totally, psychologically. Then outwardly it will have its own expression. Right? When psychologically there is an ending of fear, then the ending has its own expression outwardly. Not the other way round. Is that clear? So the friend says, time is a factor of fear. That's a fact. And also thought is a factor of fear. I think tomorrow may be dangerous; I think I am going to be ill; I think what the public might say; I have a job but I might become unemployed.

So time and thought are the root of fear. Go into it slowly. We explained the nature of time. Right? Time is hope, time is becoming, time as learning how to drive a car and so on; outwardly and inwardly. Now, we see time is a factor of fear; obviously. That's clear. And also thought is a factor of fear. I am here; I might die. Thought says, I might die. So thought, without too elaborating the movement of thought, which is, thought is experience, knowledge from experience, knowledge is stored in the brain as memory, memory is the reaction to thought. And thought is always limited, because knowledge is always limited; experience is always limited. In the scientific world, in the biological world, however much knowledge they have, they have to have more, more. So knowledge now or in the past or in the future will always be limited. This is a fact. And so thought is limited. And whatever thought does, its action is limited. So time and thought are the root of fear.

The friend says, yes, I see that, but how am I to stop thought? I say, don't ask how. That's the easiest question to ask. And whom

are you asking? I'm your friend, I'm not your guide, I'm not your guru, I'm not your authority; don't ask anybody ever how. But observe! Look very carefully. If time and thought are the root of fear, which they are - please listen, the friend says to the other, please listen carefully: they are the root of fear. And it's not how to stop thought or time; but see the fact that thought is the originator of fear. Realize that, see it. But you need time to go, or thought, to go from here to there. Right? You are sitting here, you have to go home, that requires time and thought. Otherwise you couldn't move. But psychologically, time and thought have bred fear. And you are fear; you are not separate from fear. Right? So the examiner of fear is the examined. Right? The examiner who says, time and thought are the root of fear, after looking at it carefully, that time and thought is you. You are the trap of fear. Get it? You are fear. This is a revelation, you understand; before you said, I am afraid, I will do something about it. I'll run away from it; I'll become courageous, I'll be this, I'll be that. Therefore there is conflict in that. Right? Whereas now you see for yourself that you are that, time and thought. So you can't do a thing about it. Right? I wonder if you realize this.

The friend says to the other, do you realize the immensity of that statement, the depth of it, that you are that, therefore you cannot possibly do a thing about it. Which means what? All action with regard to fear has ended. Right? See what happens then. Before you acted upon it; now you are not acting, you are no longer the actor. You are that; you are both the actor and the act. Right? You are that. What takes place when you are that? This is - please, this is part of meditation - look at it very carefully; take it in

your hands, like a precious jewel, and look at it. You are that when all movement stops. You understand? When you realize you are that, all movements naturally stop. Movement is a waste of energy. Therefore - you understand - when there is no movement, you have that tremendous energy to look. And therefore there is the ending of it.

The friend says, I am tired. You have taken a long journey together through valleys and mountains and the meadows and groves. I have understood a great deal. I have not learned. I have learned nothing, but I have observed, and that observance has brought great light, great intelligence; and that intelligence operates - not me operating on that. Right?

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 17TH MAY 1983

One thinks it is right to put questions, but to whom are you putting questions? To oneself, or to somebody that you hope will answer correctly, precisely, perhaps logically and sanely? Is the question more important than the answer? Does the answer lie in the question? Please, we are talking it over together. The question and the answer, are they similar? Or is the answer more important than the question? So we are going together to find out. In understanding the question, in delving deep into it, we might come upon the answer. The answer is not outside the question. When we go into it perhaps you will see it, we'll see it together, the full significance of that. If one puts a question, you expect someone else to answer it. In that is involved the whole problem of somebody who knows, and he will answer according to his knowledge, according to his information, his data, and so on. Is there somebody who will answer all our human questions, or we have to rely entirely upon ourselves, and not depend on anybody.

Please, we are talking the thing over together. We are not the final oracle, from Delphi. You know that? And in investigating the question, seeing what the question implies, perhaps in that very implication we'll be able to understand the answer. So the answer does not lie outside the question.

And it's important also to put the right question. Then one asks, what is the right question? A question can be quite superficial: what kind of food should I eat? There are lots of questions like that. Should I take exercise? Do you advocate yoga? Those are

rather, one considers, rather superficial; though they have certain necessities. But to delve deeply into a question, and to find out why one puts the question. As we have been saying in all these talks, during all these years, doubt, scepticism are necessary: to doubt one's own thinking, questioning one's own attitudes and conclusions and perceptions, to be sceptical what another says, whether he is very learned, a specialist, and so on. Questioning, doubting, being somewhat sceptical helps the brain to clear itself. I hope we are following this together. Because our brains are rather clouded and conditioned. And one can put a question from that background and wait for somebody to explain, go into it, as the analyst and the analyzer, and find out the answer from another. And as we have no leaders, no gurus, no specialists in the human problems, one has to understand all this oneself. I hope this we are clear on this matter. If we are clear, then we can go on with the questions.

I haven't read these questions.

1st QUESTION: What is an artist - no, sorry - what is the role of the artist in life and what is the significance of music, poetry, and all art in our relationship to each other and the world.

Are you interested in this question?

First of all, we must be clear what we mean by art. The word 'art', The word art from Greek and so on, Latin, is to join; to adjust; to put things together. That's the root meaning of that word. It also, in Sanskrit means measure, manner, use. The root meaning, we are talking of the etymological meaning. And the questioner asks, what is the role of art in our lives? Having seen what the root meaning of that word is, the root meaning, what is beauty?

Beauty is not something put together. So, we are going to enquire together into the meaning of that word, the significance of that word, the content of that word. I'm not a professor. I'm sorry to sit on a platform, which I don't like, but one has to do it for the convenience of others; otherwise you wouldn't see me if I sat on the ground. I would like to sit on the ground, but I have to sit here.

It's a very complex question, this. If we can go very deeply into it, it has great significance. Art implies, doesn't it, a flowing melodious manner of space, weight, grouping together, and depth. Are there some artists here? I said - the speaker said, a flowing melodious manner of space, depth and grouping together, of words, sentences, or a painting on a canvas or a sculpture or a poem, or literature. Is that right? A flowing melodious manner of space, of depth, of grouping certain things together: trees, people, words; all that is a form of art. Do you agree to this at all? That is, if there is no space, if you see something, say a painting - I hope somebody will correct me if I am wrong - if you see a picture, a painting by the masters, classical masters or recent ones, really great painters, there is space, a sense of space. The figures are grouped together in a certain way; there is a certain depth to it, in colour; in the sense of movement, and it must be melodious. And when you see some of these paintings of landscape, they may paint a little cottage in a field, with a few trees, but there is space; and there is depth of colour, proportion, a sense of harmony, Right? And that would be great painting.

And one has visited - as perhaps you as a tourist, most of the major museums of the world, and one sees all these great masters, from Holland, Italy, England, America, and so on. So we are

asking: What is beauty? Is beauty according to a principle? According to certain rules? You follow? Or, beauty is something entirely different, though there must be proportion and all the rest of it.

When we look at a mountain there, when you see those mountains, those hills: range after range, blue in the evening, and early morning when the sun touches it before everything else; when you see that the reaction is either great silence - you keep quiet; there is space, enormous space, between you and that; and beyond. And when you see such marvellous beautiful mountains, snowclad against the blue sky, for an instant you become silent. The very beauty, the very grandeur, the majesty of the mountain keeps you, makes you absolutely quiet. You can say, the shock of beauty. I hope you are looking at those mountains, not at me. The speaker is not important, at all. But what he says may be important and may not be important, but you have to discover for yourself. So when you see something extraordinarily grand, of great height and depth then the very shock of that beauty drives away for the moment all your problems. There is no self wondering, worrying, talking to itself, there is no entity, the self, the me, looking. At that moment when the self is not, there is great beauty. Right? I wonder if you follow all this?

And the questioner asks, what is the role of art in our lives? I don't know. But we're going to find out together.

Why should anything play a role? Please, this is an important question. Why should anything play a role in our lives? The greatest art is the art of living; the greatest, not the paintings, the sculpture, the poems, and the marvellous literature. That has its

certain place, but to find out for oneself the art of living, that's the greatest art, it surpasses any role in life.

So, some of the great painters in their lives are neurotic; very, very disturbed lives, like Beethoven, and others, very disturbed. And that disturbance perhaps may help them to write great music. Or, if one led an aesthetic life - are we following each other - aesthetic life, and that life is based on - life is based on relationship; there is no life without relationship. And aesthetic is the capacity of perception; right? Are we meeting each other or am I just talking to myself? Capacity to perceive, which means one must be extraordinarily sensitive. And sensitivity is not shouting, yelling. But sensitivity comes from the depth of silence. Shall I go on? It's no good going to colleges and universities to learn how to be sensitive. Or go to somebody to teach you how to be sensitive. As we said, aestheticism is the capacity to perceive; and you cannot perceive if there is not a certain depth of silence. If you look at these trees in silence - there is a communication which is not merely verbal, but a communication, a communion with nature. And most of us have lost our our relationship with nature: with the trees, with the mountain, with all the living things of the earth.

And sensitivity in our relationship, to be aware of each other, is that at all possible? That's the art of living, to find out; a relationship that is not conflict, that's a flow of a melodious manner, of living together. You understand this? Without all the rows, quarrels, possessiveness and being possessed, fear of loneliness, you follow? The whole cycle of human struggle.

The art of living is far more important than the art of great painters. It may be that we are escaping through music from

ourselves; through going into all the museums of the world and talking about them endlessly; reading about books on art. All that may be an escape from our own troubles, anxieties, depressions. So can we live an aesthetic life of deep perception? Be aware of our words, be aware of the noise of this country; the vulgarity of human beings. Because one learns far more in silence than in noise. This all may sound platitudes, but they are not. This requires a great deal of observation of oneself. That observation is prevented by any form of authority; looking to another to teach us how to observe; just to observe, watch, the way we walk, the way we talk, the noise, you know all that goes on. Then out of that comes the art of living.

Art, as we said, is putting things together harmoniously; to observe the contradictions in oneself, one's desires that are always so strong, to observe all that, not create an opposite of it, just to observe the fact and live with the fact. It seems that's the way to bring about a life of melodious harmony. Have we answered the question? Sir, don't bother to clap. I don't know why you do, maybe you like to feel that we have said right things and you appreciate it, but what the speaker has said is what you are thinking, I hope, therefore, don't clap for the speaker.

2nd QUESTION: Is not the observation of thought a continuing use of thought and therefore a contradiction?

Let's examine the question first. Is not the observation of thought a continuing use of thought and therefore a contradiction? When you observe that tree, are you looking at it with all the memories of trees that you have seen, with the shade under the tree under which perhaps you have sat, and the pleasure of a morning;

sitting quietly under a tree looking at all the beauty of the leaves, the branches, the trunk, and the sound of the trunk. When you observe all that, are you observing through words, or you are observing through remembrances? Or the memories of those pleasant evenings you have sat under a tree or looked at a tree, then you are looking through the structure of words. Therefore you are not actually observing. Is that right? So, are we aware that we look at everything through a network of words? Words being the past meaning the usage of certain words with their content, with their remembrances and so on. That is, are you looking at a tree or a single star in the heavens, as it was last night with the new moon and Venus behind, together - are you looking at it with words, or you are looking at the whole phenomena of yesterday evening without a single word.

So is observation a perception, a process of thought? Which is a verbal communication to each other, the usage of words which contain the past memories and incidents and so on, or there is pure observation without time; time being thought; time being memory. So please find out. Let's find out what we actually do. Can we look at a person with whom we have lived for a number of days or years without all the past remembrances and incidents, and the pleasures and the comforts that one has derived from that person; or the antagonism, you follow, the whole process of it? Can you observe as though you are meeting the person for the first time? You may remember his face or her face; of course, that is necessary, otherwise it's rather troublesome. But to look at a person, to be so sensitive to a person; and that sensitivity is not possible when there is always the past memory projecting itself all the time. Right?

So from that one asks a question: can thought be aware of itself? This is a rather complex question, I hope - one hopes you don't mind looking at the complexity of it. Can thought, the whole process of thinking, can that thinking be aware of itself, or there is a thinker who is aware of his thoughts? You understand the question? Is this becoming difficult for you? You are interested in all this?

(3rd) Questioner: May I interrupt a moment, sir? I wonder if the group might find it a little more interesting if you could address yourself to some of the striking statements that are in your tapes and books that I have read. I will give you an example of the sort of thing that could be answered, I think relatively briefly, and might be very stimulating. In one tape you refer to marriage as 'that terrible institution'. My question would be, could you elaborate? Do you think a young man and a young woman, for example, should live together without marriage? People should not live together, that kind of thing. And I have other things.

K: All right, sir. Let's have some fun.

Let's answer that question; we'll come back to this. One may live with another person, sexually or in relationship with another, and take the responsibility, entire responsibility, both of us, and continue with that responsibility, not change when it doesn't suit you. When that other person doesn't satisfy you in various different ways. Right? Or, you go through marriage, which is, get a license, go to church and the priest blesses the couple, you know, and there you are tied, legally. And that tie, legally, gives you more the feeling of being more responsible. Right? That you are held by a law. Are you waiting for me to answer this? You are held there by

law, and with it goes a responsibility that's one thinks is enduring, lasting. What's the difference between the two? You're legally controlled, it takes time to get a divorce, you have children, and the children may hold you together for a while, until they grow up; and then when they grow up, you say goodbye to each other perhaps; or get a divorce and all the rest of it. If the other, which is not legalized marriage, and if there is a responsibility as much as in the other, and perhaps more, then what's the difference between the two? Either it is responsibility based on law, either the responsibility of convenience, necessity, comfort, and sexual and all the other demands - where is the question of love in all this? Right?

Each one of us, each one, wife and the husband or girl and the boy or whatever it is, are they ever together, except sexually? Whether they are legally married or not legally married, together. They may hold hands in public as they embrace each other in public, as they do in this country - right? In Asia, that's rather considered immoral, immodest, and they do it quietly by themselves in their house. So what's the difference between the two. And where is love in all this? Please answer this question for yourself.

Is love the pursuit of desire? Is love pleasure? Sexual and other forms of pleasure? Is love mere companionship, depending on each other? Is love attachment? Go on, sir, enquire all this. And if one negates intelligently - because you see the reason of it, that attachment is not love, nor detachment, remembrance of each other's past incidents and pressures and insults and all that, living together day after day, month or year after year; the stored-up

memories, the pictures, the imagination, all that's not love, surely. When you negate all this, which is through negation, you come to the positive. But if you start with the positive, you end up with negation. That's what you are all doing. Right? Am I saying things which are true or incorrect?

So, that gentleman asked a question, why doesn't the speaker talk about all that? Sir, what is important in life? What is the root or the basic essential in life? As one observes more and more, in television, and literature, magazines, and all the things that are going on, it is becoming more and more superficial; quick answers. If you are in trouble, go to a specialist; they'll tell you what to do. It's all becoming so superficial and vulgar. If one may use that word without any sense of derogatory or insulting. It's all becoming so superficial and rather childish.

And one never asks what is the fundamental questions or fundamental necessity or the depth of life. Surely not beliefs; not dogmas; not faith; not all the intellectual rigamarole, whether in the Communist theology or the Catholic theology, Marxist theology or Lenin or St Thomas Aquinas; they're all the same theory; conclusions and ideologies, based on belief, faith, dogma, rituals. So all that is becoming more and more, in one's life, outwardly, very, very, very superficial. Just out there. And we live like that. This is a fact, I am not saying anything which is not so.

And this marvellous world of entertainment, both religious and football; anything to escape: yell, shout, never quiet conversation, never look at anything quietly, beautifully. So what is the fundamental, basic demand or basic thing that is really of the utmost importance in one's life?

Q: Do you want us to answer?

K: You can answer, sir, if you want to.

Q: The answer is compassion. Compassion.

K: I know, I know, I've heard it. When you use that word, are you again using that word superficially or there is compassion in you? You understand? When you say, yes, compassion, that becomes utterly superficial, you have already stamped it. The word compassion means passion for all; not just for your family. And you cannot have compassion if you are attached to any belief, to any dogma; if there is not complete freedom, there cannot be compassion. And with compassion there is intelligence. So if you say compassion, love is the root of all things in life, in the universe, in all our relationship and action; to find that out, to come upon it; to live with it and act from there - then marriage or not marriage - then you are no longer an individual, there is something else entirely different from one's own petty little self.

Right, sir? Is there another question you would like to ask on that level? Or can we go on with this question; which is really quite important, if we can go into it seriously. We asked: can thought be aware of itself?

That is, thought has created the thinker - right - separate from his thought. Isn't that so? Have you got it? That is, there is the thinker who then says I must be aware of what I think; I must control my thoughts, I must not let my thoughts wander. So there is the thinker separate from his thought. And the thinker acts upon the thought. Right? Now, is the thinker different from thought? Or the thinking, thought, has created the thinker. You understand the question? There is no thinker without thought. Right? Do we meet

each other on this? Please, because this is rather important, because if we can find out why this duality exists in us, the opposite, the contradiction, the 'me' and the thought: the 'me' as the thinker, the one who witnesses, the one who observes, and the thing to be observed. That is, the thinker then controls thought. Right? Shapes thought, puts thought into a mould; but is the thinker different from thought? Has not thought created the thinker?

Q: I can see it logically.

K: Wait, sir, first of all let's be logical. Or let us see it intellectually, which is what? Verbally. Verbally I can see very clearly that there is the division between the thinker and the thought, and thought has created the thinker. So the thinker is the past, with his memories, with his knowledge, all put together by thought, which has come into being after experiences and so on, so it is the whole activity of the past, the thinker. Agreed? Clear? And then it says, thinking is something different from me who is the thinker. Right? You accept that logically, intellectually; why? Not you, sir, but we all do. We all say, yes, I understand it intellectually very quickly. But why? Why do we say that, I understand it intellectually?

Q: It seems obvious.

K: No. No. Go into it, sir, why do we say, first reaction, I understand intellectually. Why? Is it not because we never look at the whole thing. We only look at something intellectually. Now, the speaker explained very carefully, logically, the thinker and the thought. And you accept that logically. And I say, why do you do that? Why does one do that? Is it that the intellect is highly developed with most of us, or developed much more than our

sensitivity, our immediate perception. Right? Of course. Because we are trained from childhood to acquire, to memorize, right? To exercise the brain, certain parts of the brain, which is to hold what has been told, informed, and keep on repeating it. So when you meet something new, you say, I understand intellectually. But one never meets the new totally, whole, that is, intellectually, emotionally, with all your senses awakened; you never receive it completely. You receive it partially; right? And the partial activity is the intellectual activity. It's never the whole being observing. You say, yes, that's logical. And we stop there. We don't say, why is it that only part of the senses are awakened? Intellectual perception is partial sensitivity, partial senses acting; to create a dynamo, to do that you have to think intellectually. In creating a computer, in putting computer together, you don't have to have all your emotions and your senses, you have become mechanical, and repeat that. So the same process is carried when we hear something new, say I understand intellectually. We don't meet it entirely. So the statement has been made but we don't receive it totally.

So the problem arises out of this, why is it that we never meet anything, especially when you see a tree or the mountains, or the movement of the sea, with all your senses highly awakened. Why? Is it not that we live always partially? That is, we always live in a limited sphere, limited space in ourselves. It's a fact. So to look, if you will now, look at those mountains with all your senses. Which means when that act takes place, all your senses - your eyes, your ears, your nerves, the whole response of the organism which is also the brain, look at that whole thing entirely. Then when one does, there is no centre as the 'me' who is looking. Right?

So we are asking, can thought be aware of itself? That's rather a complex question, because this requires very careful observation. Thought has created wars; right? Through nationalism, through sectarian religion; Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist. Thought has created all this; right? You are quite sure? God has not created all this: the hierarchy of the church; the Pope, all the dress, all the rituals, the swinging of the incense, the candles; right? All that paraphernalia that goes on in cathedral or in a church is put together by thought, copied, some of it, from the ancient Egyptians, and so on; from the ancient Hindus, Egyptians, Jews and so on. It's all thought. Right? So God is created by thought.

A man who has no fear whatsoever of dying, living, problems, no fear whatsoever, does he need god? So thought has put all this together. One can see what thought has done, step by step; right?

So thought can be aware of its own action; you are following? I wonder if you are following all this. So that there is no contradiction between the thinker and the thought; between the observer and the observed. When there is no contradiction, there is no effort. It's only when there is contradiction, which is division, there must be effort. So to find out whether it's possible to live a life without a single shadow of effort, contradiction, one must investigate the whole movement of thought. And one hasn't the time or the inclination; one is too busy; too much to do. But one has plenty of time when one wants to do something; when you want to play golf you have any amount of time.

So to find out what's the activity of thought, to watch it - that's part of meditation.

4th QUESTION: You have said that quietness, silence, comes

unsought. But can we live in ways that will allow it to come more readily.

I don't quite know what it means.

Oh, yes, it can, by taking a pill. No? By taking a drug; get drunk. Look at the question. He wants something readily, you don't want to squeeze the orange, but you buy the orange in a tin. You follow? Something readily, quickly.

Have you ever enquired into what is silence? What is silence? What is peace? Is peace between two wars? That's what's happening, what we call peace, it's between two wars. This war, like the next war, is to end all wars. Do you understand that? You have understood that phrase? This war, like the next war, is to end all wars. That is, is peace between two noises, is peace between two wars, is peace between two rows, quarrels? So what is silence? It cannot naturally be bought in a shop or pharmacy; right? We would like to buy it quickly and get on with it. But silence cannot be bought nor peace cannot be bought. Right? If that is so, what is silence?

Silence must mean space, mustn't it? I can be very silent in a small space. Enclose myself, shut my eyes, and put a wall round myself, concentrate on some potty little affair, and in that there can be certain amount of peace, certain amount of silence. Right? I can go into my den, my reading room or quiet room and sit there; but the space is limited when I do that. Not only my little room, but in my brain also, the space is very, very limited. Right? Because most of us have never even asked about, thought about all this.

So what is space? Is space from one point to another? Is space a limited dimension? Or, space without a centre? Therefore without a

centre, therefore no border. You understand? As long as I have me, my problems, my selfish demands, my, my, my, it's very limited. Right? That limitation has its own small space. But that little space is a form of self-protective wall, to remain in there, not to be disturbed, not to have problems, not to have - you follow - all the trouble and so on. So, as for most of us, that space of the self is the only space we have. And from that space we are asking what is space. I wonder if you follow all this?

Am I making the question clear?

Q: Sure. You are saying we've got to have space, so that we can have an understanding of silence. We need to have space so that we can have an enjoyment, find the time for the pleasure of silent melody; space; we can't enjoy. or understand silence or have silence without space.

K: Of course. Space to understand, space to enjoy. But always that's limited, isn't it? So where there is limitation, there cannot be vast space. That's all. And space implies silence. Noise doesn't imply space. I don't know if one sees that. All the noise that is going on in towns, between people, and all the noise of modern music, there's no space, there is not silence anywhere, just noise. It maybe pleasant or unpleasant, that's not the point.

So what does it mean to have space? Space between two notes on the piano; that's a very small space. Or silence between two people who have been quarrelling, and later on resume the quarrelling. Right? All that is a very, very limited space, so is there a space that's limitless? Not in heaven; not in the universe, but in ourselves, in our whole way of living, to have space; not imaginative, not romantic, but actual feeling of vast sense of space.

Now, you will say, yes, I understand that intellectually. But to receive that question, what is space, what's the content of that, to receive it, entirely, with all your senses, then you will find out what it is, if there is such a vast space which is related to the universe.

What time is it?

Q: Quarter to one.

K: May I go on with one more question? You aren't tired?

5th QUESTION: Is there such a thing as a true guru? Is there ever a right use of mantra?

I think it is necessary to understand the meaning of that word, those two words, guru and mantra. They are two Sanskrit words. Guru: do you know what it means? The root meaning of that word, I've been told by many Sanskrit scholars, the real meaning is 'weight'. W-e-i-g-h-t, you know. And also it means, one who dispels illusion. Right? And also it means, one who points. Points; not a way, just points. And one who does not impose his illusions on you; his stupidities on you. Please, this is the meaning of that word.

And also, the meaning, the root meaning of the word mantra means to ponder over not becoming. And also it means, dissolve, put away, all self-centred activity. You understand? Ponder over not becoming; and also dissolve, put away, banish all self-centred activity. Right? Guru means all that, mantra means all this.

And the questioner asks, is there a true guru? In Northern India, they call an educator, teacher of a elementary school 'guru'. They call them guruji; because he is teaching; informing. Now, the word 'guru', has been brought over from that unfortunate country to this country, and they are making millions and millions and millions of

money out of it. Telling you what to do, Giving you mantras for \$500 or \$100 or \$2, to repeat it. And when you repeat something constantly day after day, your brain becomes what it is.

And there is no right guru, there is only the wrong guru. Because nobody can teach you anything except for yourself. They can teach you how to read, write, mathematics, biology, and so on; but nobody can teach you what you are, about yourself and whether there is freedom from all that tradition, from all the tremendous conditioning of centuries. That implies you are the teacher and the disciple, there is no teacher or a disciple outside you, You understand the implication of this?

We depend on others; which is natural. I depend - one depends on the postman, on the doctor, on the computer expert; how to put together a motor; you depend on all that. On the pharmacist, chemist. And also we think it is necessary that we depend inwardly on others; on my wife I depend, of course, in several ways I have to depend, she has to depend on me, I have to depend on her. But the dependence becomes gradually attachment and all the agony of attachment begins.

So learning about oneself is infinite. You understand? Learning is infinite. Not about books, that has certain limitations; all knowledge is limitation. Obviously, sir, obviously, right? There is no complete knowledge about anything, even the scientists admit it. They are always adding - more and more and more, so knowledge is always limited, now or in the future. And outward knowledge is necessary and that same wave, that continues inwardly, Right? That we must know ourselves. Right? The Greeks - before the Greeks they said 'know yourself'. And 'know yourself'

doesn't mean go to somebody and find out about yourself. It means watch what you are doing, what you are thinking, your behaviour, your words, your gestures, the way you talk, the way you eat, watch. Not correct, not say this is right or wrong, just watch, And to watch there must be silence. And in that watching there is learning. And therefore when you are learning you become the teacher. So you are both the teacher and the disciple; and nobody else on earth.

I do not know if you have not noticed in this world, more and more, there are institutions, foundations, associations, for various things, outwardly and inwardly. Right? Foundation for right action, for right thinking, foundation; each holding on to his own little foundation. You might just say, why do you have foundations? I'll tell you. This foundation exists merely to maintain schools, ordinary schools, both in India, where there are six schools, in England, and here at Ojai. And to publish books and to arrange the talks, and nothing else! No spiritual - I dislike that word - no religious content behind that word.

So when one understands the meaning of the word guru, and mantra, they become very, very serious. Mantra means to dissolve the whole structure of becoming. So it means there is no evolution for the self, for the psyche. That's very complex, I won't go into that. And there is nobody that can free oneself, nobody outside, except one's own inward integrity, great humility to learn.

OJAI 2ND QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 19TH MAY 1983

May we go on with the questions?

One wonders, if one may, why you all come. I'm not insulting; I'm just asking. What is the motive of your coming? What is the background or what's the intention that we all get together here? Is it out of curiosity or trying to find out for oneself what it's all about - life, I mean; or you want to hear the speaker; or you want to gather what kind of person he is, either he is a hypocrite, or sane or rational. I wonder why one comes to all these meetings, or goes to any meeting.

If one is sceptical, which I hope some of us are, and questions, not only what others might say, or what one might oneself do, but question, be doubtful of one's own judgments, evaluations, one's own case. Then that has extraordinary importance. But just to listen, or hear a few words, agree or disagree, but if you could be very clear, the intention of our coming here, then that intention, if it is right and honest, has some kind of depth in it. If it's merely to gather a few ideas, few statements, I'm afraid that it'll have not much value.

So may we go on with the questions?

1st QUESTION: Why don't you be more practical and not so abstract in what you are saying?

I wonder what one means, practical? The word practical means 'fit to act'. And also it has another meaning: action repeated, habitual action. And more complex explanations of that word.

Are we practical? When there are wars going on, after many,

many thousands of years and the continuation of war, is that practical? Or is it a habitual performance? We have done this for thousands of years, killing each other not only with guns and other means of destroying people but calumny, hate, all the violent things that are going on in the world. Is all that practical? Or we are so used to it - that kind of way of living, and we accept that as the most practical. And the questioner says, why don't you be more practical, and not so beastly abstract? The word 'abstraction' means to divide; to separate; to draw away; to draw away from the fact; to draw away from what one is, actually is; make an abstraction; to separate from that which we feel, which we realize to be so, make an abstraction of it separate from what we feel to what we should be. That's an abstraction. So the questioner asks, why don't you be more practical and not so abstract in what you are talking about?

So are we practical at all? Except perhaps earning a livelihood, having a skill, being a good carpenter, good chemist, a good writer or an excellent thinker. But to be practical, that is, to live a life, if one may point out - we are not advising, only fools advise, but just pointing out, because we are both of us thinking together what it means to be practical. We have defined the meaning of the word according to various good English dictionaries, and dictionaries are the common usage of words, and the meaning of those words.

Practical means, doing, acting repeatedly; thinking, hating, calumny, all that. Being violent: is that all practical? Or we are so used to it, we keep on repeating this action and reaction: you hate me and I hate you; you are violent, I become violent. You hit me, I hit you. This is the pattern that we have repeated through centuries.

You might say, have you not done something? Not practical.

That is, have you done anything, you, the speaker, which is not reaction; which is habitual response; repeated action. We must be clear about what we mean by action. Either one has a moral action, action based on some kind of moral values, moral, aesthetic perception, and if one does something, if another does something which is not correct, which is not moral, then you have a certain relationship, certain responsibility to act. That may not be habitual; a repeated action.

And the questioner also wants to know: why are you talking in abstraction. Are we? Is the speaker talking in abstraction? Or he is pointing out what we are all doing, each one of us; not judging each other; not condemning or slandering, but watching.

In that watching oneself and others, if there is not that quality of silence, then from that watching you can make an abstraction from what actually is, separate it into an idea. The original meaning of the word 'idea' and 'ideals', the Greek meaning and so on, 'to observe.' Idea means to observe. Not make an abstraction of what you observe. I observe the tree, the thing called tree, and I make an abstraction of it, separate it from my perception from that, make an idea of it, and so the actuality of the tree and the idea of a tree are two different things.

Suppose I am afraid. That is an actuality, fear is an actuality. But the abstraction of that, which is to separate from the fact into, "I should not be afraid" is an abstraction. Or, I must cultivate courage, that's an abstraction of the fact that I am afraid. So the idea, which we now accept, is something separate from the fact. Right? So when we are talking about abstraction, we mean bringing about a division between the actual and make an idea of

it, and pursue the idea, not the fact. That's what we are doing all the time. The Communists have certain ideologies; very strong, brutal, and all the rest of it. So the so-called free countries have also certain concepts, values, judgments. There is poverty in the world. Now the abstraction of that is, what to do. And each one of us, or each group, or each political party, says this should be done, that should be done. So they are involved in ideas, not with the fact. You can't quarrel about a fact. Right? The sun is hot today; that's a fact.

So to solve a question like poverty, it's no good making an ideology about it, make an abstraction about it. But face the fact whether it's possible to solve poverty in the world. Not through ideas, through concepts. And that's only possible when there is a global relationship, not political relationship. That global relationship can only exist when, there are no nationalities. Right? Obviously. And as poverty is increasing in the world, that poverty can only be solved, not by political parties or socialist parties or various type of parties, but the realization that - which is a fact, not an abstraction - fact that as long as there are these divisions, which are abstractions from the fact, this problem of poverty cannot possibly be solved. Right?

Then one says, what am I to do? As a person living in a country that's full of nationalistic and patriotic spirit, what am I to do? It's very simple: don't be a nationalist. Don't belong to any group, any association, you know, all the rest of it. As long as there is a separative action with regard to a problem, that problem will never be solved. Or rather, that problem in the resolution of that problem there'll be a thousand other problems. I hope this is clear.

So what we are saying seems to be fairly practical; practical in the sense, something that can be done. Not the habitual repeated action, but something that is practical, obvious, sane, rational. Right? Is the question answered? Or shall we go on to the next one.

Americans are supposed to be very practical people, and that's why they pollute all the rivers; pollute the air, destroy the forest, all the marvellous animals of the world, they're all very practical people. Killing baby seals - you know all that, what's happening. And we never question why human beings kill. Not make an abstraction of it; but why do we kill; either with words, with a gesture, with some kind of tricks and so on. Or actually kill each other and nature and the animals of this world. Why has killing become a pattern of our life? You might say, we have done this for the last million years, that's the habitual, repeated action. And so that we call very practical. We never question these so-called practical, habitual, repeated actions: going to the church every Sunday - if you do at all; or obeying some clique or leader, a small group, enclosing by itself and resisting everything else - why do we do all this?

Is it that we want security? And is there security in separation? In division? There is a marvellous example of what is going on in Beirut, or the Israelis and the Arabs. We're all one, human beings, and we have separated ourselves into races, religions, and keep to that pattern, that programme. We have been programmed, like a computer, and we keep on repeating that. And that we call very practical.

So is it possible to be somewhat different? Or I was just going to say, impractical.

2nd QUESTION: Most of my energy and time goes into the struggle to earn a living. Is it possible for me and those like me to be deeply unselfish and intelligent?

Do you want to go into this question? Why are you so eager? Not about the other - the other question was being practical and not abstract, not talk in abstractions.

This is our life; this is our everyday life. Those who are lucky have their own means and they don't have to work endlessly. There are very few of such type. And there are those who have been fortunate or unfortunate to gather money that doesn't necessarily belong to them and live a secluded, somewhat selfish life. And those people who have to earn daily bread from nine to five, factory, office, labour, carpentry and so on, we spend a great deal of energy in all that. And so we, the questioner says, I have very little time to enquire into this business of selfishness and intelligence. I have not much energy. My energy is dissipated; in work; in doing. Right? Is that so?

One has to work, as society is structured, one has to work to earn a livelihood. Or you can live on dole, or what is called Social Security. If we really enquire whether how we waste our energy; not, all my energy is taken away through daily work, but we should enquire really how we waste our energy; whether it's possible to conserve energy, and use it when necessary, and retain it when it's not. Am I making myself clear?

How do we waste our energy? Please understand my question. Not how to use energy, that energy which demands enquiry in being unselfish and intelligence, but rather let's enquire, approach this question from a different point of view, which is, to find out

how we waste energy. Right? Then it'll be very clear. Do we waste energy by chattering? Endless talk? Right? Most of us do - endless talk. And is it a wastage of energy to be constantly in conflict - in the office; at home; and so on? Right? Is not conflict within oneself and outside a wastage of energy?

Not how to be free of conflict, for the moment; but to observe how we waste our energy: conflict, the concept or an illusion that we are individuals, and so fighting everybody. Right? Against everybody; enclosing ourselves in a little, neurotic state, building a wall round ourselves through fear, and so on. That's also a great deal of wastage of energy. Right? And to pursue an ideal is a wastage of energy, not the ending of a fact. I don't know if I am making myself clear.

Suppose one is violent; you pursue non-violence, which is non-fact. The pursuit of non-violence is a wastage of energy. Whereas to understand the nature of violence; go into it deeply, the complexity of violence, and see if it is possible to end it, that's not a wastage of energy. But to pursue a non-fact, which is the ideal, whether it's a political ideal, or Marxist ideal, Communist ideal, is a wastage of energy. Isn't it a wastage of tremendous energy, building armaments against each other? No? I don't know if you have been listening to some of the television explanations of how Russia is building up its armament, and America - as you listen to it very carefully, it all seems so insane. So extraordinarily irrational. So one wonders if one is going mad. Probably most of the people who are involved in all this are rather neurotic in different ways. Probably most of us are.

So to find out for oneself how we waste our energy. And the

greatest waste of energy is to be concerned with oneself. No? Because to be concerned with oneself, with one's neurotic state, and to be unaware of it, to be concerned with one's own issues and one's own problems, one's own achievements, is a very, very limited energy; it's very limited. And therefore your energy is limited. But when there is freedom from that there is immense energy. But to be free from that concern with oneself and with one's hurts and in return wanting to hurt others; that concern with oneself is bringing about great chaos in the world. To seek one's own enlightenment, following your own particular little guru, is such a wastage of energy. We'll talk about it more when we talk about meditation. So is it possible not to waste energy along all these lines?

And if you have that energy, what will you do with it? Will one become more mischievous? More violent? More beastly? So in the conservation of energy - you follow? - which comes about by understanding the wastage of energy, conserving that energy, not that you conserve energy; when there is energy not wasted, there is energy. In the discovery how you waste your energy, there is the beginning of intelligence. Right? That intelligence is not wastage of energy. That intelligence is extraordinarily alive.

One cannot possibly be intelligent if one is selfish. Right? Selfishness is part of division; separation: I am selfish and you are selfish; in our relationship we are selfish. So to understand the nature of the wastage of energy, not only superficially, but very, very deeply, out of that investigation, probing, questioning, one comes to a certain quality of energy which is the outcome of intelligence; not merely setting aside wastage of energy. I wonder

if you understand this. Can I go on with it or do you want to go to the next question

So we really should ask also here: what is intelligence? Are those people who are very, very learned, are they intelligent? I'm not saying they are not, I'm questioning. Are those people who are politicians and building armaments and so on, are they intelligent? Is intelligence merely the activity of thought? However that thought be attenuated, more subtle, more complex. Is the very activity of thought intelligence? I hope you are questioning. One hopes that both of us are thinking together in this matter, in all these matters; not that the speaker is saying and you are listening, but together we are investigating this question of intelligence, as we did the wastage of energy and what is practical, what is abstract. So we are questioning together what is intelligence. We are asking, is thinking, however subtle, however complex, all the activities of thought, including invention, putting very, very complex machinery together, the computer, like a robot, like a missile, or the extraordinary machine of a submarine, or these beautiful aeroplanes; they're all the result of tremendous activity of thought. And also the activity of thought is how we use them. Right? Basing on our ideologies, use, profit, various forms of motives.

So we are asking a very fundamental question: whether thought in all its extraordinarily complex activities and very superficial activities, is intelligence the root of thought? Thought is limited, because thought is based on experience, knowledge derived from experience, as memory stored in the brain, and the reaction to that brain is thought. If there is no memory, if there is no knowledge, if

there is no experience, there is no thinking. Right? Every little thing on this earth, the smallest little thing, must have the quality of thought; instinct. But human beings like us, we have evolved - supposed to be. And our greatest instrument is thought. And that thought is actually very limited; because knowledge is always - past, present and future - will be limited. Obviously. As in the scientific world, in the biological world, in the world of machinery and so on, so on, so on, anything born, brought about, put together by thought is limited. That limited thought can invent a limitless, but it's still the result of thought. Thought has divided the world into various religions and all the things that are in the churches, temples, mosques, are the inventions of thought. You can't get beyond that, that's a fact. And what thought has created, then we worship it. Marvellous self-deception!

So we are asking: is intelligence the activity of thought? Or it is totally outside the realm of thought. Which then can use thought. You follow, not the other way around. I wonder if I'm making myself clear? So one has to enquire into the nature of intelligence. One must very carefully examine the only instrument apparently we have, which is thought. Thought includes emotion, sensory responses, and so on, so on, so on. All that is centred in the brain, which is the whole structure of human beings.

The speaker is not an expert with regard to the brain, but one watches; one's own reactions, one's own responses, hurts, illusions, you know - watches. And when one watches silently, without any motive, then that watching reveals a tremendous lot. One learns a great deal more in silence than in noise. Right? That's a different matter. So are we intelligent? Therefore practical? Therefore never

bring about a division.

We'll talk more about it when we talk about the whole world, what is the significance of death, suffering, and the great question of compassion.

3rd QUESTION: You travel about a great deal in the world but I must stay with my family in one place and live in a limited horizon. You speak of a global vision. How am I to have this?

I'm sorry, I've never talked about global vision. The speaker doesn't indulge in visions. Or in imagination. Or in fanciful romantic nonsense. He was saying, you cannot have peace in the world, physical world, if you have no global relationship. Not vision, something fanciful, utopian; some ideal which is non-fact. The fact is that we are divided, as nationalities, religions, sectarian, little groups, smaller groups - divided. And there is this question of war, which is being heightened, threatened. And whether man wants to understand the nature of peace, which is very complex. Outwardly there must be a global relationship which means no nationalities, no religious divisions - Catholics, Protestants, Hindu, Buddhists and all that business. He is not talking about business at all. This is practical; the other is impractical. To kill each other by the million through atom bombs and so on is most impractical. But apparently our minds are so conditioned that we stick to the impractical.

The questioner says or asks, you travel about a great deal but I must stay with my family in one place and so my horizon is limited. Do you mean to say your house, your family, prevents you from having a global outlook on the world? Right? I'm asking this question, if I may. One may live in a small village, work endlessly,

or live some place where your neurotic attitudes and all that can have full play, play - but while you are living in a small village, you mean to say one can't have a global attitude, a holistic approach to life? I am asking this question most respectfully: does one have to travel all over the world to have global attitude? Most of you have travelled probably all over the world; tourists do, and wherever the tourists go, they destroy that place. I know there used to be lovely villages and towns, not these enormous hotels and so on, before the tourists came. And when the tourists come, you know what happens. Food becomes more expensive, tourists are cheated - you know all that business. So: what is it to have an outlook, a feeling, rather, of humanity? What does it mean to have a feeling that the whole world, human world, is you?

The human world has great troubles; great anxieties and miseries and confusions; and beastly, neurotic activities. And one realizes that what you are is the rest of humanity. That's a fact, if you go into it, simply, not theoretically; not in abstraction, intellectually, but even if you do go into it intellectually, it's a fact that our brains are not individual brains. They have been evolving through thousands of years. And when you observe from one's little village and brook, one can observe what is happening in the world: wars, wars, wars; hatreds; man against man; the eternal quarrel between people, one blaming the other, and taking them to court or divorce, or this or that. All this can be settled if you are somewhat yielding, intelligent. But we are not. And what we are is very, very, very limited.

And you cannot ask, how am I to break through this limitation? To have a feeling that you are the entire humanity. There is no

'how; that's one of our most impractical questions. There is a 'how' when you want to learn to drive a car. There is a 'how' when you want to learn mathematics, or a new language, and so on. But psychologically, there is no 'how'. If you have a 'how', it means a system, a method, and when you practise a system, a method, you're back again the same old limited, narrow, dull mind. So it's not a question of how to get out of this limited way of life to understand the global, holistic way of perception, but to observe the limitation, one's own limitation, one's own narrow, ugly prejudices, conclusions about another; or one's own conclusions and sticking to it. The very word conclusion means the ending. We have concluded a peace, we have concluded a war. So there is no conclusion, but enquiry, probing, questioning, doubting. And the walls which we build round ourselves, that is the real problem: the religious walls, the personal walls, the neurotic walls; that is the problem; to be aware of all this. To observe without motive; and that's very difficult for a neurotic person, for a person who has concluded he is this, he is that, or the other person is that or that. Global relationship alone can solve our human problems, as war, poverty. And to be aware of one's own limitation.

4th QUESTION: You have stated that if one stays with fear and not try to escape and realize one is fear, then the fear goes away. How does this come about, and what will keep it from returning on other occasions in a different form?

Have you understood the question? You want me to repeat it once more? May I repeat it again? You have stated that if one stays with fear, not try to escape from it, but actually realize that one is fear, that is, one is not separate from fear, then apparently,

according to you, fear goes away. How does this happen, how does this come about, and what will keep it from returning on another occasion in different form? Clear, this question is clear now.

Please don't accept what the speaker has stated. That's the first thing. Doubt him, question him. Don't make him into some kind of stupid authority. If I may remind you of that.

Someone, or you heard that if one actually stays with fear, then that fear goes away. To stay with fear implies - we are discussing it together, the speaker is not stating anything - if we stay with fear, which means not to escape from it, not to say, search out the cause of it, for the moment; we'll go into it, I'm going to go into it very carefully. To stay with it means not to escape, not to seek the cause of it, not to rationalize it or to transcend it; to stay with something means that. To stay when you look at the moon - to look at it. Right? Not say, how beautiful, how this, how that; but just to look at it; be with it. Then, it is stated, that fear goes away. And the questioner says, is that so? He wants further enquiry into it.

You and the speaker are doing the enquiry. The speaker may put it into words, but we are both taking the journey together; not only verbally, but actually.

As it is said, what is fear? Fear can only take place when there is time and thought. Time as something that happened yesterday or a year before or forty years ago, and that something you should or should not have done, or somebody is blackmailing you about it - look at it. Right? Time is that which has happened, which you are threatened with, and afraid of that threat, because you are protecting yourself; and the future is, not to be afraid. Right? So the whole movement of fear is time, the past - right - meeting the

present creates the feeling, the reaction of fear - right - and it continues in the future. So that's a problem of time; right? Is this clear? Are we together in this? Time is a factor bringing about fear. Right? I have a job now, but I might lose the job. Right? The factory might close. It is not closed, but it might close, which is future. It may be tomorrow, or 20 years hence; but the fear it might close. That is, thought, thinking about the future which is time, creates the fear. Right? So thought and time create fear. That's simple enough. Right? One has done something wrong or right or some incident which is there, and you come along and threaten me with it. Right? And I get frightened. Or not frightened. I say, go ahead. You follow? So time and thought are the factors of fear. Clear?

Time is thought. They are not two separate movements. Right? Time is movement, isn't it? From here to there. I need time to go from here to that place. I need time to learn a language, and so on, so on. Thought is also time; because thought is based on experience, acquiring knowledge is time. Right? And memory is time, which is the past. So thought, time are together; they are not two separate movements. Right? Are we together in this? So that is the cause of fear. I might die; I am living, but the idea of ending, which is in the future, causes fear, distance from the living, and the ending. Which we'll talk about another time. You understand? So, those thought-time is the factor of fear.

One has faced this quite recently. Right? We all do. We are threatened by some persons. This is happening the world over. Threatened by one nation against another - you know all that. Or one individual against another; threat is a form of blackmail; you

have done... and so on, so on, so on. And to be aware when you are threatened, whether fear arises, or you just observe. You understand? You cannot observe without any reaction when there is an understanding of the nature of time and thought.

The questioner says, how does this happen? Right? How does fear end when you watch? Right? When you understand the nature and watch. To escape, to rationalize, to sublimate it and so on, to go off to an analyst and so on, is a wastage of energy. Right? Isn't it? Be clear on this; let's be clear on this matter. It's a complete waste of energy; to escape. Because if you do, it's always there when you come back - from your football; from the church, it's always at home. Or after you have taken a lot of drink, it is there. And you can keep on drinking, perhaps that may be one way out. Then become more and more sick or mentally ill. So escape is a wastage of energy.

To analyze and gradually discover the cause of fear, either through your own analysis of yourself or the analysis of another, is a wastage of energy. Because if you watch, you can find out what's the cause; instantly. Which is time and thought. Right? You see unfortunately, we are trained to be dull. I won't go into this question. Knowledge may be making us dull. I won't go into it, now, that's too complex a question. We are saying, where there is a cause, there is an end. Obviously. If I have some kind of disease, and the doctor discovers the cause of it, it can end it. Or it cannot be ended. Where there is a cause, there can be an end to the cause. That's a fact.

So watching fear as it arises, and living with it, not escaping from it, you begin to see the fact, time, thought are the root of it.

That's the cause. And, as we said, it's a wastage of energy escaping, analyzing, searching the causes and spending days and months and years to find out. That's a wastage of energy. When you conserve energy, and that is not to escape, etcetera, you have energy. Right? Then that very focusing of that energy on the fact of time, which is something that happened yesterday, might cause, etcetera, etcetera, so the very conserving the energy dissipates fear completely.

Right? Yes. Wait!

That is, fear is you. Fear is not separate from you. Right? Is that a fact? We have separated fear from me. Right? Which is an abstraction, a division. Right? I am angry; there is anger, and I say, I have been angry. Which is, I am separate from anger. But I am anger, there is no separate person from anger. This one must really go into very carefully; or you can understand this instantly. You are greed, aren't you? Greed is not separate from you. We have separated it. You say, greed is separate from me and I then can act upon greed. I, the thinker is separate from thought then I control thought. Right? I try to control, I try to, you know, concentrate and all the rest of it. But the thinker is the thought. Thought has created the thinker, right? No? Otherwise there would be no thinker.

Right?

So when one realizes the actual fact that fear is you then the division ends. Right? And as long as there is a division, there is conflict between you and fear. But if you are fear, therefore there is no division, the conflict ends. I wonder if you realize this. Alright? Is this clear? As long as there is a division between the Arabs and the Jews, the Muslims and the Hindu, Christians and - you know all that division - that creates conflict. This is logical, sane; right?

So as long as there is a division in me, as the me and fear, and me and the greed, me and violence, there must be conflict. But the actual fact is, violence is me. Greed is me. Envy is me. So this division which thought has created between me and fear ends; and therefore you have no conflict and therefore there is great energy; right? That's a fact, naturally when there is no conflict, there is energy. Can we go on from there? This is clear?

I am not teaching you; you are learning from your own observation. So you are your own guru and your own disciple. You are your own teacher and your own etcetera. So. And the questioner says, and what will keep fear from returning on other occasions in different forms? Right?

Fear has many branches; right? Many ways, many expressions; many forms: fear of the dark, fear of public opinion, fear of what you might do, fear of what I have done, fear of so many things. Fear of one's wife, fear of one's losing something, gaining - you know - fear has a thousand branches. And it's no good trimming the branches - right - because they'll come back. So one must go to the root of it; and not cut the superficial expression of fear; one must go to the root of the cause of fear; which is thought and time.

If one really sees the fact of this, the truth of it, and remains with it, not run away from it, then fear - don't accept, please, most respectfully we are saying, don't accept what the speaker is saying. To the speaker, this is a fact. You might say, what nonsense. You live in illusion. You've a perfect right to say it, but it's not so for oneself.

5th QUESTION: Is it some lack of energy that keeps us from going to the very end of a problem? Does this require special

energy? Or is there only one basic energy at the root of all life?

First of all, what is a problem? That's what the questioner says, when we go to the very root of the problem, and that requires, the questioner says, energy to go to the very end of it. So we are asking, what is a problem? The word 'problem' means, the Latin, Greek and so on, something thrown at you. Something that you have to face, something different from you. Now, from childhood we are trained to solve problems, mathematical problems, geography, how to write, that's a problem to a child. How to go to the toilet is a problem to the child. So from childhood, our brain is trained to solve problems: how to go to the Moon, how to ride a bicycle, how to drive a car, how to live with another person without problems arising. Our brain is actually trained to solve problems. Right? That's a fact. So our whole life becomes a problem to be solved. Right? See for yourself how this operates. Right? Are we clear on this matter? Then we can proceed from there.

Our whole instruction, information is to resolve problems. We are conditioned from childhood, the brain is. And problem means something thrown at you. You can look it up in a good dictionary, it will tell you, the Latin and so on. So we are always resolving problems. We look at the whole of life as a problem to be resolved.

And the questioner says, does some kind of energy keeps us from going to the very end of a problem. Right? I am asking, not how to end a problem, but why do we have problems? Not that there are not problems. You say, attack me, that becomes a problem, legally or this way, or that way. That becomes a problem, there are problems. But why do we have problems, the mind that

says, have problems. You understand? I wonder if we can go into this a little bit. Are you interested in this?

So another question arises from that, which is to live without a single problem. Not that there are not problems, but to have no problems. We will come to that presently. Why do we have problems? You attack me. Or I attack you, for various reason, moral, immoral, various issues because you hold to certain conclusions, neurotically or some idealistic reasons, you hold to them. And you insist that way, never yielding, never apologizing, never concerned except for yourself, and your neurotic way of life. And the questioner says, to go to the very end of a problem, does it require energy? Obviously. Not any special energy, but just ordinary energy of investigation.

Now to investigate very closely, very delicately, deeply, all the intricacies of a problem, you cannot have a motive. Right? If you have a motive in the resolution of a problem, that motive will dictate the answer, not the problem. Right? Are we getting together in this? Suppose I have a problem - personally I haven't, whatever happens happens, I'll deal with it. But I am not going to have any problems. It is stupid to have problems, for myself I am saying. And I need energy to investigate a problem - the problem of war, why human beings kill each other. To go into it, look at it, closely, step by step, that requires energy. And to resolve a problem of relationship, and relationship is extraordinarily important, I need energy to go into it very, very carefully. Right? And other problems. So energy is necessary to investigate closely, delicately, never coming to any conclusion, moving, moving - you follow? But if you are attached to a tether you can't investigate. Right? A

tether, a post, tied to it, you know, when you are tied to a post you can only go that far, whatever the length of that rope is. So there must be freedom from any conclusion, any motive, to investigate. That's clear. Obvious. Like a scientist, he may have a great many hypotheses, theories, but he puts them aside to investigate. And then he says that theory is true; but he doesn't insist that that theory is true before investigation. Right? But we do!

So you need energy to go to the very end of a problem. Take any problem that one has - what? Fear we went into.

Q: Loneliness.

K: Is that a problem? All right, loneliness. Why have we made that into a problem? It is there. Right? It is there. You are lonely. Why are you lonely? That is, separated, right, divided. You may be married, have a great many friends but there is this sense of deep loneliness of human beings. How does that loneliness come about, what is its quality? Isn't it brought about by our daily action? Our action is based on our own selfish motives, self-centred activity. I must be a great man, I must be a successful man, I must meditate, I must do this, I must do that. Everything is me, I am the most important person. You hear that on that television everyday. Right? So when you emphasize all day long this limited quality, limited state of mind, it must inevitably lead to a form of a word called loneliness, which is to have no relationship with anybody. Right? Which is brought about by our daily activity of thought and action. And then you say, I am lonely, I must take a drink. Right? To escape from it. I am lonely, therefore I am going to the club, or go to a night club, or whatever you do. Or hold on to your wife, hold on, cling, because you are afraid of being lonely.

Now you see the cause of it, which is very simple, very quick; and to hold the whole thing together and not use the word 'lonely'. Because the word lonely is an abstraction of the fact. You understand? The fact is not the word. But the word has become important rather than the fact. And the cause of the fact is this constant struggle, neurotic or otherwise, constant thought of oneself: I am hurt, I want to be great, I want to be this, I want to be that. You know, sir, all that goes on within the human brain. So there is the fact, and the word is not the fact. When you use the word lonely, it is already used and has its associations with the past. So you never look at that feeling afresh when you use the word lonely. I wonder if you see.

So to live with that feeling afresh, because you can do that only when you see the cause of it - daily concern with oneself. Then you might ask, mustn't one be concerned with oneself. You know, the good old question! And if you want that, to be concerned with yourself, and at the end of it feel lonely, unhappy, miserable and all that, that's your affair. If you want that, pursue it. But if you want to understand a way of living which is totally different, then you have to look at all this very closely, and ask fundamental questions. You can only ask fundamental questions by doubting, questioning, asking.

6th QUESTION: Could you go into the nature of intelligence which manifests itself when perception takes place and is this the only true source of action?

K: This is the last question. What's the time sir? Five minutes? Can we go on with the last question? Sorry, if one is kept with all these questions.

Could you go into the nature of the intelligence which manifests itself when perception takes place? And is this the only true source of action which is intelligence?

...part of my family, it's a part. The earth is for the whole of man, for the mankind but we say, it's my earth, my country, part. Why have we done this all along? Dividing the whole world into nationalities, into - you know all that is going on, why? Isn't it - I am suggesting this, don't accept it, question it, doubt it, all that. Isn't it that thought which has divided thinks it will be secure in the part, secure in being nationalistic, secure in being a tribal, in the tribe, belonging to a tribe, belonging to a particular form of thought which is religion, right? So we are always seeking security in the part. That's a fact, not a theory, it's a fact. My property - I am not against property, I am just saying - my property, my country, my wife, my god, what I think. So we have always cultivated the part and the part is the intellect. And in that intellectual comprehension, we think there is security. Of course, more clever you are, more cleverly you discern, you know. You know, don't you know all the world with professors, scientists, all the writers, when they are intellectual everybody adores them. They become great people. That is, part means the superficial, right? Is perception only a part, perceive by a part - do you understand - by the intellect or only emotions or only a sensory response? Or perception implies a seeing totally, not partially. Do you understand?

One perceives the cause of fear not verbally, intellectually, emotionally. Perception is an action of seeing the whole of nature of fear - right - not the various branches of fear but the whole movement of fear. The movement of fear is time, thought. We

went into it. To perceive it not verbally or idealistically but to see instantly the whole nature of fear, right?

Now when you see something wholly, completely, what takes place is something quite different. I am going to go into it if you will have the patience, if you are not tired by hearing the only speaker. For the moment - when you go home, you can all speak but now, unfortunately there is only this person speaking.

Look, let's make it very very simple. Suppose I am being a nationalistic all my life or clinging to my particular "religion", religion in quotes. That is my brain has been conditioned to be a nationalist, to be a particular - belonging to a particular sect, whether that sect has hundred, thousand, million, it is still a sect. My brain has been conditioned that way. You come along and tell me, nationalism is the root of war, one of the causes of war. I listen to you. You explain to me logically if I am willing to listen. If I am not then of course, you can't do anything with it. But if I am willing to listen - which I am, you then explain to me one of the factors or the causes of war, nationalism, racialism. You point it out, various implications of war. I listen to you and I say, look, I tried. Either I accept it intellectually and it does not have great value or I see how true that is. The moment I perceive how true it is, I have moved away; the brain has been unconditioned from the old pattern. Do you get this? The moment I perceive the truth of what you have said, the brain cells which have been conditioned to nationalism, to sectarianism disappears. So perception or insight into what you have said brings about a radical change in the very cells themselves. The speaker has discussed this matter with scientists. Not that you must accept what the scientists say or what the

speaker says but he has discussed it. We have argued about it. They agree to this - some of them but the others say, it's not so, it's pure romanticism, etcetra. But the fact is, the fact: I have been going north. You come along and say, that way leads to danger and I listen to you. I argue with you, discuss with you, I may have quick insight into what you are saying and I see the truth of what you are saying. So I move away from going north. I go south or east or west. That very movement contrary to the old habit has brought about a radical change in the brain itself. Because you understand the pattern will be broken. When the pattern is broken, there is something different.

So where there is a perception in which there is not merely intellectual comprehension but a total insight into the problem. Insight to say for example, all organized religions have no value. They are mere entertainments, excitements, sensations, all the - they are essentially - no human, it doesn't bring about human change. In all that you have quick insight. So it's finished. You don't belong to any group.

Q: (inaudible)

K: I explained, sir, fear. If you have an insight into organized or institutions which etcetra etcetra - if you have an insight, that is a quick, instant perception of what is true. But most of us aren't capable of that because we are not quickly sensitive. We are rather dull people. I am not saying, please, I am not saying you are. We are all rather conditioned people. And this condition cannot be changed, bring about a total mutation if there is not insight into conditioning. And insight is not remembrances, conclusions. It's not a process of time and remembrance. It's seeing things as they

are quickly, instantly.

Now the questioner says or asks, when perception takes place, there is intelligence and this, the questioner says, is this intelligence the source of life - the source of action, sorry? Do you understand? When there is perception that tribalism which has become glorified nationalism, is the most destructive element in life, bringing wars and so on, if you have instant insight into it, that insight has its own action. It's not insight and then action but insight itself is action. Do you understand? That is the moment when there is a perception that tribalism is one of the factors of war, that insight is action. You are no longer - there is an action that wipes away your particular tribalism in you - wanting to, belonging to a group. Right?

That's the end of the questions. At the end of all this one asks, what have we, what has one seen, learnt, observed? Do you go on with the same old pattern of hate and reaction, action, blackmailing each other? Or all that end - that is quarrels, a sense of communion, affection, all that.

I have stopped. May I get up?

Q: (inaudible)

K: What sir?

Q: It's a goodbye to you.

K: What for? (laughter).

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 21ST MAY 1983

May we continue where we left off last Sunday. We were saying that this is not a lecture about any particular subject, to instruct or to inform. Nor is it a form of entertainment, stimulated by the speaker; nor an intellectual journey into various forms of theories and concepts and ideals, but rather together we are taking a journey, not that the speaker is taking a journey and informing you about the journey, but rather together we are friends taking the very long journey into the human condition. Why human beings, who have evolved apparently for about a million years or less or more, are still about the same: violent, primitive, divided, wars, frightened, insecure, and so on, suffering. And apparently the time as evolution has not solved our human problems. They are increasing, not decreasing, more and more. Life is becoming more and more complex.

And we have had various forms of leaders, both religious, political, social and so on. And various forms of institutions and organizations, foundations and forums. They too have not in any way brought about a fundamental change in man. And when we together, without any bias, without coming to any conclusion, look what is happening all over the world: starvation, insecurity, confusion, great sense of human suffering through wars, through various forms of religious and national divisions, and so on. Technologically we have advanced enormously within the last hundred years. There thought has operated with a capacity that's almost infinite. But psychologically, inwardly, deeply we are about the same: primitive. So it's a lopsided evolution; a process where

thought has brought about extraordinary physical results: communication, transportation, and all the rest of it. But thought also has created various divisions in the world: religious, racial, and so on. And we said where there is division there must be conflict, wars. We went into that fairly sufficiently.

And we talked about relationship. We are journeying together; I am not - the speaker is not talking to himself. We are taking a journey together, thinking, observing, watching, not only what is happening outside of us, outside the skin, as it were, but also inwardly, psychologically, what's going on in the whole arena of the psyche. Together we are taking a journey. So please, if one may repeat this often, which we shall during this talk and tomorrow's talk, we are taking a journey together: not an intellectual, verbal, ideological journey but actual observation of facts, what is actually happening. So we have talked about relationship, how important it is in life. And without right relationship there must be conflict, not only between two people but in the world, because the psyche always overcomes whatever regulations, rules and orders are placed exteriorly, the inner always overcomes the outer. This is also an obvious fact, as one has watched in a Communist, totalitarian world.

And also last Sunday we went into the question of fear very carefully. Not the various branches of fear, or the expressions of fear. There are many many forms of fear. But we were together examining, asking, questioning, doubting the root of fear; what's the cause. Where there is a cause and one is able to discover it, then the cause can come to an end; if one is sane, not neurotic. And we said thought and time are the factors of fear. We went into the

question of time, not only from here to there, outwardly, but time devised by thought as human psyche becoming something, achieving something. That is, 'what is' should become or try to become 'what is not'. I hope we are taking a journey together! That is, if we are violent, as human beings apparently are from the beginning of time, it's utterly useless to invent or project a concept of non-violence. Non-violence is not an actuality, it's a theory, it's a concept, it's a conclusion. So there is only violence; but when we create an opposite of it, we create a division and where there's a division there must be conflict. So to deal with violence is the only thing that matters, not the ideological invention of non-violence. We went into that carefully.

And also together we must examine this morning not only pleasure or the whole implication of pleasure, gratification, satisfaction, and the complex of desire, but also we should talk over together in our journey the nature of suffering, why human beings have suffered endlessly, not only in their relationship but through wars and so on. Whether suffering can ever end, or man, that is his conditioning that he must suffer forever. And also we should in the journey talk over together the nature of compassion and love and intelligence. And if we have time, we should talk over together also the whole complex problem of death.

So if you are not too tired on a lovely morning like this, pleasant, lovely sunshine, to sit quietly under trees with all the shadows and watching the mountains in the distance, to be aware of all the beauty of the land, the glory of a fresh, new morning, we should together take the journey into all this. Perhaps tomorrow we should talk over also together what is religion. Why religions have

existed for thousands upon thousands of years, and why religions have had so little effect on the human being. And also we should go into the question of what is meditation. Religion and meditation we generally put at the end of the talks because unless we have established in ourselves, are very clear and free from all the divisions, fragmentations in ourselves; and the ending of conflict and so on, meditation has very little meaning. We'll go into that tomorrow. But that's not an invitation for you!

We are so eager to learn from another, to be told what to do, how to meditate and all that nonsense, we never find anything for ourselves. I do not know if you have gone into the whole question of knowledge. Knowledge is always in the past, and we live upon the accumulation of experience and knowledge which is the past. That past may be 10,000 years or the past of a yesterday. So we are always living in the past. And we try to live in the present, which is impossible unless one understands very deeply into the nature of the past. Not analyze, investigate, but to observe without any motive or direction, just to observe the whole human psychological accumulation. That is, to observe, not only with the eyes, but to observe in silence. Because when you observe in silence, beauty, it has great significance. But if you are chattering about silence and beauty, you fail to understand both of them.

So we are going together to go into the first question this morning: the nature of pleasure. Why human beings throughout the world, and especially in this country, pursue this thing called pleasure. What is pleasure? We are together examining what it is; exploring. And when one explores, there must be a certain quality of doubt. That's part of scepticism. Otherwise exploration is not

possible. Doubt one's own conclusions, theories, concepts, ideals, experiences, then one is free to examine. But if one clings to one's own particular form of idiosyncrasy, particular tendency, then exploration is very, very limited. To understand pleasure - not that we are condemning it - to watch those mountains, see the blue sky through the leaves, and the dappled light, to watch all this is a great delight; to see it all, the wholeness of nature, there is a great beauty, and beauty never fails when there is silence in this observation. So together we are going to observe pleasure; the root of it, the cause, and see the whole complexity of pleasure.

To go into pleasure one must understand desire; why human beings are driven by desire, craving for something, looking for something that'll be gratifying ardently, hankering after, seeking satisfaction in every direction: sexually, power, position, knowledge, try to dominate, not only the earth, air, but also each other. So without understanding the nature and the structure of desire it'll be rather difficult to comprehend the nature of pleasure. So please, together, and one must repeat this phrase over and over again, together examine the nature of desire. Desire means the want of something; longing for something, craving for something. That's the meaning, dictionary meaning, of desire, as in Sanskrit, and so on. What is desire? Why have all the religions in the world, organized, orthodox, traditional religions, have told their adherents to suppress desire? The monks all over the world suppress desire, or identify the desire with a particular symbol, with a particular figure, trying to transcend desire. This happens in Christianity, through prayer, and so on. So we are not condemning or denying desire, but we are questioning why human beings right throughout

the world have desire for food, clothes, and shelter, which is normal, and that is denied by this terrible nationalism in the world for all people. That desire for food, clothes and shelter is denied through ideologies, of Communists, socialists, capitalists; through nationalism and so on. Desire is essentially the search for satisfaction.

If we are together in this, understanding the verbal significance of those words, desire, we are asking then, what is desire? How does it come about and why has it such a strong hold on man? You are asking the question. The speaker may go into it, but you are asking the question. And together - we mean together - examine very carefully how it comes about and why it has taken such a strong hold on man. Biologically one can see the activity of desire, sexual and so on. But we are talking about the psychological urges, the reactions, the demands of desire and trying through desire find deep satisfaction, gratification, contentment. Surely desire is something separate - please listen first, then question, it, you may doubt it, but just let's watch it together. Sensation is normal. When you see those mountains, the perception of that is a sensation. The seeing, visually, and then reacting to what you see, which becomes the sensation, that's normal, healthy, actual. And when is desire born? Is it born out of sensation? You are enquiring together? You see a beautiful garden, or a nice motor bike, or one of those marvellous new cars, beautiful lines. You see it, and you touch it - the polish, the lines of it - and out of that perception, seeing, contact, there is sensation. That's natural. When you see the tree, touch it, look at the beauty of the branches, the leaves, and the light upon the leaves, the shimmer, the glitter, and become sensitive to

all that, that's natural. So we are asking, does desire come out of sensation? You see a marvellous dress in a shop; a shirt, if you are a man, or if you are a woman, see a marvellous dress. You go in, touch it; there is a sensation, feeling how nice, smooth it is. Then what takes place? Go slowly, you will see it for yourself. Then what takes place? You see the shirt, touch it: sensation, then thought says, how nice it would be if I had that dress, if I had that car, if I had that shirt, or if I had that garden, whatever it is. When thought creates the image of you sitting in the car or in the shirt, at that moment when thought creates the image, then desire is born. Right?

Are we together in this? You are not accepting what the speaker is saying, but we are together examining the nature of desire. That where there is sensation thought inevitably, apparently, comes with its image and desire with its satisfaction is born. Right? Is this somewhat clear? Somewhat. Because unless we understand this movement of sensation and the thought taking over the sensation with its image, and out of that comes desire which is to find satisfaction: satisfaction in the robe, in the shirt, in the car.

That is, one has observed the whole movement of sensation, desire, and fulfillment in satisfaction. This observation, this close watching of the whole movement of desire in oneself, out of that watching comes intelligence. Right? Before we just accepted desire as our condition, and the desire to fulfil, and if it is not fulfilled, feel frustrated, and the agony of frustration and all the neurotic results of being frustrated. And that's generally our process; the way we live. The way we live obviously is rather idiotic, unintelligent. Please, I am not condemning, I am just watching.

And when you observe this whole movement: the seeing, the contact, sensation, and desire which is brought about through thought with its image, if you observe this whole movement without any control, without any motive, that very observation is the beginning of intelligence. Then that intelligence will - if I may use the word discipline - discipline the whole movement of desire. You understand? You have understood? It's not desire must be controlled or suppressed or as in America it happens, how to have everything you want! but rather, the understanding of desire is intelligence. And that intelligence will discipline desire. Please listen, if we can listen to each other carefully, discipline.

What do we mean by that word 'discipline'? The word comes from the word disciple, the one who is learning, the one who receives instruction from the teacher. But we have made discipline into conformity, into following certain mode of operation, of habit, of thought: to discipline oneself according to an idea; according to something that must be done. If you are studying any particular subject, scientific or psychological, the study of it makes its own discipline; right? If you are a carpenter - I am afraid you are not, most of you are too educated - if you are a carpenter, that very career disciplines the way you use tools, understand the wood and the nature of the wood and the quality and so on. But we have made it, discipline to follow, to obey, to conform, to restrain. But where there is discipline there is learning. Right? Learning. And learning is infinite. There is no end to learning; not recording. Can we go into this little bit? You don't mind?

Recording - the brain records an incident, an experience, a hurt, both physical as well as psychological, a wound received from the

outside, bodily, and a wound from another hurting the psyche. Right? And all these things are recorded. Record is the past; naturally, like repeating a gramophone record. So the past, this constant recording, if you have ever gone into it - we are talking as two friends - if you have ever gone into it, why should everything be recorded? One needs to record how to drive a car, how to write a letter; you need to record if you are a specialist, or a worker, or businessman, or a psychologist and so on, you need to have recording, which becomes your knowledge and according to that knowledge you act, skilfully or not. There recording is necessary: the brain must record. But we are asking: why should the psyche record at all? You understand all this? Please, it's a fundamental question; put it to yourself and find out. One records a hurt. Right? And from childhood we are hurt, and that is recorded, with its result of always fear of further being hurt, so building a wall round oneself isolating oneself, and getting more and more hurt, you know, the whole problem of recording. Why should that hurt be recorded? You hurt me by - suppose you have hurt another, why should that hurt be received and recorded and held? Please, this is an important question to ask. You are flattered and you accept that and record it; insult and flattery are both the same; they are the two sides of the same coin. And we keep that very carefully recorded.

This recording, which is essentially memory, is the whole structure of the psyche, the 'me', the ego, the person. So the psyche is essentially memory, the recording machine, or rather the record on which the present plays a part. You understand? Can we go on? So is it possible not to record? Only those things that are absolutely necessary. That is real freedom. Never to have a record,

psychological memory, of things that have happened, pleasant or unpleasant. Then, where there is that sense of great, vast freedom, there is a totally different dimension. But we cannot go into that now, but we are considering desire. And we said the comprehension, the watching of that whole movement of desire, in that watching there is intelligence. That intelligence will naturally bring about order, which is the essence of learning, that intelligence will bring about order where there is disorder created by desire. I have got it. I've got it myself. Right? I see the truth of it. Are we together in this journey? I afraid some of you are not - if you are not, it's no good going over and over again: perhaps you will talk it over, if you are willing, with your friends, - or read something or other. Books are useful but they don't instruct, they don't tell you. You have to search, ask, demand, question, doubt, stand alone if necessary - and one has to stand alone and not depend on anything. The word 'alone' means 'all one.' Right?

Then we ought to talk over together what is suffering. Why man, including woman, please don't be so particular if I mention man. It includes humanity, which is man and woman, not woman separate from her rights, and all the rest of that business. We are together. Why has man, woman, suffered for centuries: why are we suffering now? What is suffering? And what's the cause of it; and can there ever be an end to tears, to human misery, to unhappiness, to the grief that we carry throughout life? We are looking at it, not becoming sentimental, romantic, tearful, but we are actually facing this fact that human beings, whether they're rich or poor, they have high position or low, all human beings throughout the world suffer. That's a fact; undeniable, true fact. Some escape from it through

Christian dogmatism or some person suffering for whole of mankind for their sins; the original sin is invented by thought. So we try to overcome sorrow because of various reasons.

Wars have created sorrow in the world. And there are still wars going on. How many millions of women and men and wives and girls have cried through wars. So there is suffering of the whole of humanity. And also there is suffering of persons, of separate individuals. The word 'individual' means indivisible, not fragmented. But we are fragmented, broken up, so we are not the word. Individual means not only the word individual, but not being broken up, fragmented. So we are not individuals, but that's another statement which you have to go into another time, if we have time. So persons, separate persons, and the whole world have suffered through wars, through great starvation; poverty of mind, poverty of body; and revolutions have tried to change the social structure but they have not succeeded. But through that revolution killing millions of people. That too has brought great sorrow in the world. Perhaps some of you may not be suffering now, but look at the world as it is. You suffer when you don't fulfil. You suffer when you see a poor man; you suffer when you see great ignorance prevailing in the world - not ignorance of books and so on, the ignorance of the actual fact that war destroys human beings. You see all the generals, the politicians throughout the world accumulating the materials of war. And when you see all that, talk to some of them, that is sorrow of their ignorance.

So we are asking, can man live on this earth peacefully without suffering? Please ask that question of yourself on the journey you and the speaker are taking together. Why do we suffer? The loss of

a son, the loss of a husband, wife, divorce, you know the various forms, symptoms of suffering. One is not beautiful, somebody else is beautiful, you know the whole business of sorrow. And can it ever end? To go into this question together, trying to find out what is the root of it. As long as there is separation, division, there must be conflict and conflict brings about sorrow. As long as I - as one is separate from his wife, not biologically, but psychologically, inwardly, when there is that separation between two people, however intimate they are, and that separation, that division brings about conflict, and conflict is the very nature of sorrow, because in that conflict we are destroying each other. I wonder if you follow all this? When I - when one quarrels with one's wife, or when you possess your wife and the wife possesses you, or when you are attached to her and she attached to you, that very attachment brings conflict, jealousy, anxiety, pain, sorrow. So can two people live together without conflict, which is a very, very fundamental question, very complex question. Can two people, can a group of people - you see, the very word 'group' means divided - can people, humanity, live together on this world, on this earth? It's their earth, it's our earth, not the American earth or the Russian earth; it's our earth.

Can we live together without conflict? I may have hurt you, and you may have hurt me; why should we keep that going? Why should we keep that record of pain? One has lost one's son, one loved that son or the brother or the husband, what you will; and there is shedding of tears, trying to escape from the actual fact that he or she has gone, and feeling the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness of it; trying to escape from that loneliness. You may escape but it's

always there, deep in one's heart and in the deep recesses of one's own brain. What are we holding on to? The image, the memory, the past? We never seem to let go that image; the past. There is a constant memory, reminder of a photograph or a remembered incident. And if we are aware of this, put away the photographs and the memories, then one may feel disloyal; which is again such a false sentiment. The fact is that while we lived together there was a division between us; and that division has brought great conflict and some happy memories. Both are remembrances recorded, and those records keep on repeating endlessly, and so a constant reminder. So when one watches without any motive, without any sense of direction, just to watch this whole movement of suffering, not only one's own suffering, but the whole of humanity's suffering, of which we are a part. We are humanity. If you understand your own sorrow, watching it like a precious jewel, then that very observation - and observation of that with that clarity and purity can only come when there is no sense of escape from it. Then there is an ending of that suffering. Then you are not contributing to the world's sorrow. That means you are no longer separate from the rest of humanity. You are no longer an American, Russian, Chinese, all these silly tribal divisions. You are the entire humanity. So if you are violent, you are contributing to violence: if you have ended sorrow, then you are bringing about freedom from the human mind, human brain's sorrow.

Without understanding the nature of sorrow, love cannot be. If I suffer, how can I love? I know, the tradition is that suffering is part of love; like jealousy is part of love. Jealousy is not love, nor hate, nor ambition, nor trying to become somebody psychologically. So

love is something that is not all the movement of thought. Love is not a remembrance, is it? Ask, please, we are asking that question of each other. How there be compassion if I am attached to a particular ideal, and you are attached to a particular ideal? That is, where there is a limited outlook on life, not one's particular life, but life, the life in nature, all the loveliness of nature, from the tiniest thing to the great elephant and to the tiger. The speaker was once very close to the tiger - not in the zoo, thank God - but in the forest. It was the most extraordinary thing to see it. Where there is love, the self is not. Pity is not love; going out and helping the poor, whether in India or here, the social worker, that's pity; generosity: but love has its own generosity. Compassion cannot exist if I am a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and all the rest of it. And where there is compassion, it has its own intelligence.

So this is the whole business of life; not this battle with each other; not this constant dread of insecurity, anxiety, loneliness, pain and the pursuit of pleasure. Life is a whole movement, unbroken.

And if we have time we ought to talk over together the question of death. It's not a morbid question, it's not an old man putting a question. But whether we are young or old, whether we die through an accident, through disease, this is a human problem. The problem that each one of us has to face. We are all going to die; sorry, perhaps not you; but we are all going to die. Have you ever thought if all the people who have lived on this earth never died, what would happen to the earth? So we're all going to die one day, that's inevitable, that's absolutely certain. There is a great deal of humour in this. And we must understand together as two friends who are facing this problem, whether young or old, they are facing this

thing called death. To have a conversation with death, to have a conversation with ending, which is death. What does this conversation mean? Who is it that is going to die? Apart from the organism, the organism has a name, you have watched your face for the last fifty or ten years, or two days, or eighty years, you have watched your face, you are familiar with your face, you are familiar with that name, you are familiar with all the things around you, outside of you. You are not familiar with yourself, you don't know yourself. You have been told what you are, by psychologists and that business. But actually their explanation, their statement is not what you are. So you are never familiar with yourself. So your conversation with death is meaningless unless you are familiar with yourself. Right? I hope we understand each other. So I am going to be familiar with myself. So I am asking, what is myself? Myself is the body, all the sensory responses: the name, the form, outwardly, the address, the bank account, the job, all the familiar things of daily life, and the daily activity of life. And so we are asking, let us, you and the speaker, get familiar with ourselves. That is, to know ourselves very clearly: not theoretically, not some ideological, religious, speculative illusion or superstition, but what are you, what we, each one of us? Unless we know ourselves very, very carefully, study it, watch it, learn, see the whole complexity of the 'me', until I am totally familiar with every little thing, every corner, I cannot possibly have an intelligent conversation with death. Right? So we are going together to find out what we actually are. Not be afraid; not get depressed and say, how terrible I am: or how ugly, or how I should be differently, I am not, you know. But actually what we are. Unafraid to look.

We are what we have been told; that's one. We are part of the vast tradition of mankind socially, communally, all the knowledge that we have acquired; that's one part. And also psychologically, inwardly, what are we? Each one of us - first each one of us, and then we'll find out each one of us what we are, whether we are not the entire humanity. Do you understand and my question? We are sorrow, pain, grief, happiness, unhappiness, pain, grief and anxiety, loneliness, faith in god, no faith in god, beliefs, dogmas, rituals, vast recording of all the past incidents and accidents, influences, vast complex memories. Right? Or, you say, I am a soul, separate from my body; which the Christians believe. But that soul is invented by thought. We must be logical, sane in investigation. The Hindus have their own particular division, atman and so on: and there too that idea is invented by thought. So we are the entire result of this movement of thought. Right? You can say, I am infinite. That very statement is put together by thought; and thought can invent the infinite, the super, super-something. But it's still thought. So we are the whole network of thought. Right? Network of memories, experiences, knowledge, which is the past, our reactions and actions; all that is our consciousness. All that is me; the 'me' is not separate from that: that is me, my anger, greed, envy, ambition, loneliness, sorrow, uncertainty, seeking security, satisfaction; all that is me. Losing a job, holding on a job, fearful of the tomorrow of losing a job, that's me. I am not the lathe, the instrument, but the 'me' is the fear of losing. Right? That's me. That me has sustained by separating itself: I am me; I am totally different from you. That's the tradition, that is the accepted norm from childhood. And religions sustain this, because it's very

profitable to encourage an illusion. But you, your consciousness, is shared by all human beings. Right?

Please bear in mind that we are talking over together death. So our consciousness, which is its content, the content is the belief, the dogmas, the rituals, the tradition, the recording, the memories, the whole of that, that very complex movement in consciousness, is the movement of all humanity; it's not yours. You may pretend or stick to the idea that you are separate person, that you are working for yourself, that you must fulfil - this is what every human being in the world is doing. So you are the whole of humanity; because your consciousness is the consciousness of the Russian, of the Hindu, of the most primitive human being on earth. Yours may be a little more sophisticated, better fed, but you are like the rest of mankind, therefore you are mankind, your consciousness. When you understand, when you have really seen the truth of it, not intellectually accept a perhaps illusory conclusion or a statement - it's not a statement, it's not a conclusion, it's a fact. When you suffer, your neighbour has also suffered. That neighbour may be next door, few yards away, or ten thousand miles away; he also suffers like you. So this is the common ground which we all stand on. It's not your ground.

When one sees the absolute truth of that, then what is death? You understand? This fact is there, that is a fact. My consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of humanity, therefore I am the rest of humanity, I am humanity. If one realizes that it's got tremendous meaning, depth to that; passion behind it; the responsibility of that is immense: not to another, but to the whole of humanity.

So what is death? Death is the ending of the organism, that is

certain. Death is the ending of what I have considered is mine. Do you understand? Mine - my possessions, my quality, my experiences, my wife, the ending of 'me'. The 'me' is the rest of mankind. So what is death then? Please this is a very serious question, this is not just to be understood this morning, or if you have an insight into it, that is, see the whole truth or of it instantly; not take time, thought, and say, I hope what you are saying is nonsense, but I prefer my own individuality. You're perfectly welcome. But to see the fact of it and to remain with the fact that you are nothing but a bundle of memories. And all the noise that bundle makes, rattling about, creating such great misery for the rest of mankind.

And the organism dies. My consciousness is the consciousness of mankind; that's a fact. As long as that consciousness with all the travail and the noise and the bundle of memories, that consciousness is going on infinitely. Right? But if you step out of it, which means, the ending; the ending of your beliefs, the ending of your tradition, the ending of your racial prejudices, the ending of all that, ending of your attachments. Then you are out of it; then there is totally a different movement, because there is no longer that movement. There is no longer the movement of thought with all its travail. To go into all this requires tremendous enquiry, meditation, not just verbal assertions. And knowing the word is never the thing.

So as long as you are contributing to violence, violence will go on. As long as you are envious, you're contributing, encouraging, sustaining, the envy which exists in the world. So can you end envy? This is what death is going to be. End envy completely;

attachment to ideals, to experience, to systems, end. Where there is an ending without any motive, ending, there is a totally different movement. That's not an encouragement to end. So while one is living to end. You understand? To end your antagonism to your wife, to end your hurts, to end your psychological ambitions to be somebody. So that in that ending there is the total movement away from the other. That is the depth and the beauty of death.

Immortality is not for the individual. Because individual, the you, is just a structure of memories and bundle of ideas and so on. How can that have immortality? Eternity is not for the limited. There is only that when this idea of total separation is completely gone out of our system.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND MAY 1983

This is not a sermon. Generally sermons mean a kind of moralizing, semisuperstitious religious character. We are going together to take a very long journey. The last three talks were about our daily life and we went into various aspects of our life, the way of our days, our existence, our struggles, conflicts and miseries, and the ideological divisions that divide the world: religious, social, political, and so on. These divisions have brought about great wars and we are still, after so many millennia, we are still preparing wars to kill each other. Very few people seem to pay attention to the insanity that's going on; to all the terrible things that man is doing against man. We have been talking about all that together as two friends walking in a wooded lane, talking about not only their personal problems but the problems that exist in the world: the problems of human fear, the problems of relationship, and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure.

And we were asking yesterday morning whether it is possible to end all sorrow, this constant battle between human beings, the sorrow of the world, and the sorrow of each one of us. And also we were pointing out, together, to each other, why human beings live the way they do. Why human beings, after so many centuries, from the ancient Sumerians, the Hindus, Egyptians, and the modern civilization, we have never stopped killing each other and destroying nature - overpopulation, poverty, the extraordinary divisions that are going on in the world. The scientists don't seem to pay much attention to the ending of war. Of course the politicians can never do that; that is their metier, their job, to sustain

this conflict. And also we were talking about, yesterday, the nature of compassion and its intelligence. And we should talk about together today whether it is possible at all, whether our brains, which have been conditioned, programmed, like a computer, so heavily conditioned, if it is possible to bring about freedom that conditioning.

If one is aware at all that one is conditioned, religiously, morally and that there is no freedom at all, as long as we are conditioned there can be no freedom whatsoever. So we're going to talk over together this morning, not only freedom, justice, goodness, and whether there's the possibility of human beings ever moving away from the stream of so-called conditioned civilization.

So first we should examine if there is justice at all in the world - justice being that which is law, that which is moral, correct, and equality. Law says we are all equal; but some are more apparently equal than the others. Clever lawyers can make anything of law, they can support anything, justify anything. So one asks if there is equality at all; because that has been one of the questions, not only Aristotle, Plato and all the Greek philosophers, but also long before then an has always been asking if there is not a possibility of equality, correct justice for all of us. Apparently there is no equality, there can never be. You are tall, one is short. one is very clever, erudite, scholarly, capable of a great many things, and the other is not: dull, obeying, conforming, mere machine or a cog in a social structure. There is a vast difference between the two. You are beautiful, the other is not; you have a sense of the aesthetic, sense of beauty, the other is not sensitive at all. So where does one find justice, equality? Or it doesn't exist at all apart from the

philosophers and theoreticians, whether they be Marxist or theologians - and Marxists generally become theologians - and where does the sense of justice, equality exist? Apparently on the earth, on this earth it doesn't exist among human beings. So if one is enquiring into it as we are doing it now together - please, again, if one may remind you with due respect, that we are taking a journey together, not that the speaker is talking and you are just listening to a lot of words, ideas and concepts; but rather you and the speaker, as two friends walking down a lane in their friendship, who have known each other for a long time, talking about all these things. Neither of them are imposing their ideas on the other, there is no sense of authority - among friends there is no authority. Among friends there is not only sympathy, friendship, affection, but a sense of investigation. And there can be investigation when there is not only freedom from all bias, prejudice, but also a sense of wanting to understand the whole business of human existence. These two friends are communicating with each other. That's our relationship: you sitting over there and the speaker sitting up a little higher. We are taking a journey together. If you don't want to take a journey together, deeply, it's your affair. But if you are going to sit here on a lovely morning, cool, fresh, and if one is aware of the beauty of every day, every fresh morning, the wonder of the world, it's a marvellous world and we are destroying it, in our relationship with each other and in our relationship to nature, to all the living things of this earth.

So please, if one may constantly repeat, we are together in this journey. And this is a serious affair; not something to be got over on a Sunday morning; this is not an entertainment; and as most

people are given to entertainment, religious and otherwise, we are, the friend and the speaker are very serious. They are having conversation not only at the superficial verbal level but at greater depth with greater significance. So if one may remind you that you and the speaker are taking a long journey. This journey never ends; that is the beauty of it.

So we are asking, is there equality among human beings? Legally, apparently, we cannot find it. Nor by social dictum; nor religious, saying that we are all brothers in the name of something or other. And when there is no equality there is no justice. So where does equality exist? Because that's a very important question. If there is no equality we are going to perpetually destroy each other. To find that equality, there must be compassion. Only in compassion is there equality and justice, not in law, not through lawyers, not through various forms of United Nations and so on, not through little groups, little communes; but together can we find compassion? Which is not a thing to be invented by thought. It's not a thing to be put together by determination, by desire, but that compassion comes when there is right relationship between each of us. We went into that question very, very seriously in the last two or three talks.

So as our relationship is a perpetual conflict, the ending of that is the enquiry, the absolute immediate urgent change. Otherwise we are going to destroy each other. And he and the speaker are saying to each other, we should talk about goodness. That word is old-fashioned, one hardly uses that word nowadays. The word 'goodness' means together; to bring together many things; to bring together many facets of our life so that all the broken parts,

fragmented as we are, are put together, made whole, made harmonious; and from that goodness act. That's the meaning of that word, goodness: to live a life in which there is no fragmentation of ourselves. And a brain that's pursuing fulfillment is fragmented always. So goodness, equality, justice and freedom.

Freedom: the word 'freedom' means love. Freedom is not from a prison; that's only a reaction. Freedom from pain - we are not talking of physical pain, but psychological pain, freedom from it is an entrapment into another bondage. Freedom is not from something but freedom is in itself. If there is psychological hurt - and most of us are hurt from childhood - and that hurt is creating great pain and great misery to oneself and to others, mere freedom from hurt is not actual freedom. Therefore freedom implies a sense of goodness that is whole; a holistic - if I can see that scientific word - a holistic way of living, not one fragment seeking freedom and the other fragments in bondage. There can be only freedom when there is this gathering together of all the fragments and living a life that is whole. The word 'whole' means healthy, physically; the word whole means sanity, rational, and the word also means holy, h-o-l-y. And goodness implies all that.

And we are asking whether the brain, which has been conditioned, been programmed to be a Catholic, to be a Protestant, and all the divisions of Christianity, the worship of one person constantly repeated over and over again, as they do in India and Buddhist countries. There they take a name and that name symbolizes something which they hope to be true, as a Christian world does. In the Christian world you have been programmed, my friend has been programmed for 2,000 years - whether the person

existed or not, that is not the point. There is a doubt of his existence, but what the church and all that have made of that person is obviously so unrealistic, such superstition, such idealistic, romantic, sentimental business. They do exactly the same thing in India, in Islam. In the Buddhist countries where they don't believe in God - that's one of their sayings, the Buddhists don't believe in God - but they have made the Buddha into a god. It's the same pattern repeated throughout the world generation after generation. And this is called religion. We'll talk about it presently. So we are conditioned by this. We have been programmed; we receive great many impressions, coercions, propaganda. Day after day to if you listen to the commercials in this country - buy, buy, buy. And the religions do the same thing. So our brains are conditioned; not only by exterior influences, pressures and propaganda, but also inwardly, psychologically, our desires, our fears, our greed, our beliefs, all that, our sorrows and pain, conditions the brain.

So one of the questions, which is very important to ask, can the brain cells - please, my friend and I are talking together, there is no disturbance, we are both together aware of the question, and asking each other that question: whether the brain cells can themselves transform, change, otherwise conditioning will go on forever. There is a whole school which says, conditioning can never be radically changed. It can be modified, it can be made more habitable, easier to live with; there is that whole school. But the friend and I, we are saying to each other, is that so? Or, is it possible to change radically? Not bit by bit, partially, but totally. Unless there is that radical change, man is going to live forever in conflict, pain, sorrow, destroying each other; each one asserting his

own demands, his own desires, his own pursuits, his own fulfillment. And so there is never coming together and therefore there is never peace in the world. So the friend says, is it possible? It is possible when you perceive the total content of consciousness. Our consciousness, with all its reactions, is like a tide going out and coming in: action, reaction; it's the movement, that's perpetual movement. And all the content: the belief, the dogmas, the rituals, the pursuits of various kinds, the desires and so on, the whole content of our consciousness is what we are: our name, our form, our bank account, not exact bank account, the attachment, and all that is what you and the friend are. That consciousness is the consciousness of humanity. It's not yours or mine; the consciousness of all mankind. Because all mankind goes through agonies, through great pain, loneliness, despair, depression; chattering away. That's the consciousness, whether you go to India, Japan, Russia or here. So we are humanity. We talked about that yesterday. So is it possible to bring about a radical change in our consciousness?

It is possible if you are aware without direction, without control, without motive, just to watch all the thoughts, the anxieties, just to watch it; not run away from it. Like watching a great jewel in your hand, watching all the facets of it: the colour, the brightness, the dull spots, the open spaces: to watch it without any movement of thought. Then that brings about radical change in the very brain cells themselves. We have talked about it briefly yesterday morning.

We ought to talk now about what is religion. Because religion has apparently, from the most ancient of days, has played an

extraordinary part in life. Each civilization, however ancient, have had their idea of religion: worshipping the sun, worshipping the trees, worshipping thunder, lightening - probably that's better than all the other things. From the most ancient days man sought something beyond himself, transcending himself; the ancient Sumerians, the ancient Hindus, the Egyptians, and much later Christianity and still later Islam, all those people through generation after generation of thousands and thousands of years, have established various kinds of religion. And out of those religions came culture, civilization. Christianity, Buddhism - Buddhism exploded all over Asia, and Christianity is doing the same in the Western world, trying to spread its own doctrine, its own philosophy, its own saviour and so on. Man has been seeking throughout his days if there is something beyond.

And in his search for something beyond, thought created God. Please, don't get upset with it, examine it. My friend says, I'm not upset, but I'm listening. I'm cautious; I don't want to become an atheist, a non-believer, but I am willing to listen to you. Thought has created that thing which we call God. Because ourselves are so confused, so insecure, so uncertain, so fearful, suffering, lonely, and I do not know how to solve all those, and I look for somebody outside, somebody to guide, somebody to protect, somebody to give me security. Thought is perpetually seeking security. And as it discovers there is none as long as there are individuals fighting each other, as long as groups are separated from each other, as long as there is tribalism of any kind, there must be wars, insecurity, no protection, therefore thought says, let me have some great figure, father entity - or mother entity, whichever you choose. Both in

India, there are many gods and goddesses, there are about 300,000 of them. You can choose one or two as you please; that's more fun. But to have only one god is rather tiresome. But man has always sought this thing. And the priest comes along - he is like the rest of us - he says, I'll help you. He becomes the interpreter, because in the ancient days the priest was the only person who was capable of reading and writing. He interpreted that which he called God. And then he invented all the paraphernalia to make himself important, the robes, mitre, you know, the whole circus.

So man, in spite of all the churches and temples and mosques, has always sought something beyond. And that which is beyond is not to be described or put into words; but a man who discovers it, sees something beyond. His friend says, let's get it organized so we can spread it to all the people. So organizations, religious organizations, kill truth. I hope my friend sees the fact. So we are asking, in spite of all the religions and their nonsense, meaningless words and rituals, with their dogmas, and superstitions - it's really a network of superstitions - whether in spite of all that, what is religion.

The word religion has no etymological meaning. They haven't been able to discover the origin of that word. But generally it's ascribed as 'attention'. To be attentive, to diligently work, think, act, live, behave. And, in asking this question, whether there is something sacred beyond all thought, we're going to enquire together into that; whether in spite of all man's endeavour, his superstitions, his rituals, the terrible things they have done in the name of religion - I wonder if the Christians realize they have killed more people than anybody else - in spite of all that, is there

something holy, something totally sacred, not invented by thought, which is not the result of some romantic, sentimental imagination; or sentimental longing? Putting aside all that, we are asking the question of each other, if there is something sacred - not something which is sacred to you and not to the other. Which is beyond all time and measure.

Now the enquiry into this is meditation. The word 'meditation' means 'to ponder over.' To think over, to observe exactly things as they are, not try to escape from what the 'what is', but to understand not verbally or intellectually, to delve deeply into 'what is'. So the word meditation means not only to observe, ponder over, but also it means both in Sanskrit and in Latin, and so on, to measure. As long as there is measurement, psychologically - technologically, from Greeks and from the ancient Hindus and so on, measurement has been necessary. Otherwise you couldn't build a temple; you couldn't bring about the whole world of technology. Measurement is necessary. But measurement psychologically is comparison; to compare 'what is' to 'what should be'. To compare what I was yesterday with what I will be tomorrow. You understand? The whole process of comparison. Where there is comparison, there must be measurement: I am dull, but you are clever, you are beautiful, I am not. There is this constant comparison in us between the ideal and the fact; the fact of violence and the ideal of not being violent, that is comparison. In meditation, that comparison must totally end. Right?

And physically, sometimes it's necessary to compare: between a good car and a bad car; between a good material and a bad material; between a good painting and a bad painting. Comparison

between tall and short, comparison between light and darkness and so on; there it's obvious; it exists. But psychologically, inwardly, why do we compare at all? Can one live without comparison? Have you ever tried to live without comparison? Then you start with actually 'what is'. Then you can put your teeth into 'what is'. But if you are always comparing yourself with something else, yourself with a hero, with all examples, then you are never coming face to face with yourself or becoming familiar with yourself. So is it possible never to compare? Comparison breeds conflict. Comparison is a form of competitiveness; aggression.

The speaker generally puts religion and meditation at the end of the talks because for a very simple reason: you cannot possibly find out that which is sacred - if there is such thing as sacred, or what meditation means, unless you have established firmly what is right relationship in which there is no conflict, but learning, where there is no fear, psychologically. We went into this, and the understanding of desire and pleasure; and the ending of sorrow. Unless that is well-established like a great foundation it is meaningless to meditate. You may repeat endlessly various words, whether they be Sanskrit or your own words; whether you repeat the Indian word 'mantra' - lots of people have made money on that. One of these chief business-givers of mantras is a multimillionaire. The word, as we explained, 'mantra' means, to ponder over not-becoming psychologically. And also it means to put away altogether self-centred activity. That's the real root meaning of that word, which is a marvellous word, but look what they have made of it. So what is religion and if there is anything sacred at all or there is no such thing as sacred, just nothing. Or there is something

but to find out or to come upon it or for it to exist, meditation is necessary.

Meditation generally has so many forms: there is a Zen meditator. I hope the friend, we are asking the friend, I hope you don't mind going through all this nonsense - there is Zen meditation, there is the Tibetan meditation, there is the Buddhist form of meditation, various forms of Hindu meditations, and in this country it is called contemplation, in the Western religious world. Now all those imply, from the Zen to the latest guru with his twaddle, nonsense, to control thought. And all so-called serious people who have meditated, controlling thought, apparently have never - I hope some of them have - apparently they never have asked, who is the controller? Who is the controller who controls thought? Is not the controller part of thought? Is not the controller the entity who has remembered all the past incidents, travail and anxiety, that remembrance is the controller. The controller is part of thought. As long as there is division between the controller and the controlled, there must be conflict. But the controller of thought is thought itself. So all the advocates of meditation, so many forms of it, practising day after day some system, method, becoming more and more dull, more and more insensitive - it is essential to be sensitive, sensitive to nature, sensitive to each other, sensitive to all the living things of the earth. But if your mind is constantly occupied, whether with sex, whether with god, whether with your own achievements, your own worries, that brain becomes more and more dull, stupid and insensitive. So on the contrary, meditation implies tremendous activity of the senses, and sensitivity, aware of all this.

All this requires a great deal of energy. Not only the energy created by thought, by conflict, but energy which is not being wasted. You understand? Wasted through conflict, wasted through endless chatter, chatter; wasted in the pursuit of innumerable desires without understanding what is desire and so on. We have got tremendous energy - to go to the moon requires tremendous energy and thousands of people. So we have untold energy if that energy is not misused or wasted.

And to find that which is sacred, one must have doubt, scepticism; because that doubt, scepticism, healthy scepticism, you can't doubt everything, but in the process of doubting you clear the brain of all its stupidities, superstitions, its illusions. The brain then becomes extraordinarily alive, subtle. So meditation is not controlling thought, or practising some system or method, but freeing the mind, freeing the brain from its own conditioning.

That's only the beginning of it. When there is that freedom, then we can enquire into what is a brain that is silent. Because, it's only through great silence you learn, you observe, not when you are making a lot of noise. To observe those hills, and these beautiful trees, to observe your wife and your children, or your husband and your relatives, or whatever they are, to observe you must have space and there must be silence. But if you are chattering, gossiping, you know, you have no space or silence. And we need space, not only physically, but much more psychologically, that space is denied when we are thinking about ourselves. It's so simple. Right? Because when there is space, vast space psychologically, there is great vitality, great energy. But when that space is limited to one's own little self, that vast energy is totally

contained with its limitation. So that's why meditation is the ending of self.

One can listen to all this endlessly, but if you don't do this, what is the point of your listening? If you actually are not aware of yourself, of your words, your gestures, your walk, the way you eat, why you drink and smoke and all the rest of the things human beings are doing - if you are not aware physically of all that, how can one be aware at depth profoundly of what's going on. If you are not aware, if one's not aware, then one becomes so shoddy, middle-class, mediocre. The word 'mediocre' means, the root meaning of that word means 'going halfway up the hill', going halfway up the mountain, never reaching the top of it. That's mediocrity. That is, never demanding of ourselves excellence, demanding of ourselves total goodness, demanding of ourselves complete freedom - not to do what you like, that is not freedom, that is triviality; but to be free from all pain of anxieties, loneliness, despair, and all the rest of it.

So to find out or to come upon or for that to exist there must be great space and silence. Not contrived silence, not thought saying, I must be silent. Silence is something extraordinary, it's not the silence between two noises. Peace is not between two wars. Silence is something which comes naturally when you are watching; when you are watching without motive, without any kind of demand; just to watch, and see the beauty of a single star in the sky, or to watch a single tree in a field, or to watch your wife or husband, or whatever you watch. To watch with a great silence and space. Then in that watching, in that alertness, then there is something which is beyond words, beyond all measure.

We use words to measure the immeasurable. So one must be aware also of the network of words, how words cheat us; how words mean so much: a Communist, to a capitalist, means something terrible; socialist, or some stranger. You follow? Words become extraordinarily important. But to be aware of those words and to weigh the words, to weigh, to live with the word 'silence', knowing that the word is not silence, but to live with that word and see the weight of that word, the content of the word, the beauty of that word. So one begins to realize, when thought is quiet watching, there is something beyond all imagination, doubt, seeking, and there is such a thing - at least for the speaker. But what the speaker says has no validity to another. Unless you listen, learn, watch, be totally free from all the anxieties of life, then only there is a religion which brings about a new, totally different culture. We are not cultured people at all. You may be very clever in business, you may be extraordinarily capable technologically or be a doctor, professor; but we are still very limited. The ending of the self, the 'me', to be nothing. The word 'nothing' means 'not a thing.' Not a thing created by thought. In Latin 'res' means 'thing.' And thing is that which is created by thought. To be nothing; having no image of yourself. And we have a great many ages of ourselves. To have no image of any kind, no illusion, to be absolutely nothing. The tree is nothing to itself. It exists. And in its very existence it is the most beautiful thing, like those hills: they exist. They don't become something, because they can't. Like a seed of an oak, of an apple tree; it is apple; it doesn't try to become the pear, or another fruit - it is. So when there is nothing, there is. You understand? This is meditation. This is the ending of the

search and truth is.

RISHI VALLEY 1ST TALK WITH STUDENTS

12TH DECEMBER 1983

Krishnamurti: What would you like me to talk about?

Student: Fear.

K: You know we have been talking with the teachers, educators, for the last ten days, would you not like to know what we discussed?

S: Yes sir.

K: We talked about what is going to happen to you, as students. What is your future? And also we talked about, the danger of the world, tremendous catastrophes that are going on in the world, the nuclear bomb, the wars, the over population of this country, disease, poverty, tremendous unemployment throughout the world. And I believe there are forty wars going on at the present time. And you, when you leave this place, you are going to face all that: overpopulation unemployment, and if you are going to pursue a career - for that career, of a particular job with about another three thousand people after it. So we talked about that. We said, how are you, as students, going to face all that-intelligently or just follow the routine, the pattern, getting a job, if you can, getting married and settling down. You may be awfully clever, but cleverness is not intelligence. We talked about all that.

We also talked about whether Rishi Valley, the educators here, could help you to be free of fear which we are going to talk about now. Whether you are afraid, not only to pass examinations, but general fear - fear of your parents, fear of your teachers, fear of your friends and so on. We talked a great deal about that. And also

we talked about whether you can be a good human being. The word `good' means, an unbroken human being, not fragmented, a whole being. We went into that very carefully.

And I thought you should know what we discussed, because it is your responsibility also, to help the teachers to see, that you have no fear here - that when you leave, you are not just really clever boys and girls, because there are millions of clever boys and girls - but, who are really intelligent. We went into the question of what is intelligence, we will go into that with you, if you permit us during the next three talks. So let us talk over together this morning, whether you can be free of fear - that is what you wanted - didn't you?

And what is your future? This is a very serious question - not only your future, but also the future of the educators, the teachers here - and so, what is the future of mankind, the future of the world. They are destroying animals, all over the world. I believe over fifty million whales have been killed, elephants are disappearing, there are very few tigers left and the dolphins - you know about the dolphins - do you? Yes? Have you been told about them? They are marvellous animals. I used to know a friend who had a private dolphin, in his backyard - he kept it there, until the government found out that he had it and they asked him to remove it, put it back in the ocean or into a larger tank. They are extraordinary animals, great intelligence, I won't go into all that because I don't want to entertain you with stories.

If I may go on with what I am saying about the future, what is your future, the future of the educators here, and so the future of mankind. That is very important to discuss. Now don't keep silent,

please, discuss, question, argue, don't sit there without expressing yourself, whether you express it badly or well, does not matter, it is good to express yourself verbally, clearly, if you can. Because we are going to discuss after I have talked. See that your minds are active. The other day nearly two months ago, I was in California. There was a car in front of me - I was being driven by a friend - with a sticker on the bumper, which said, 'question all authority' - and you are going to question, this morning with me. You are going to argue, doubt, not believe - question so that your brains become active, not just merely gathering information, memorizing and passing some silly examination, and equally get a silly job.

So, we are going to talk over this morning, first, we will come to the question of fear later, what is your future? This applies to the smallest child here to your 'A' level or 'O' level, or 12th or whatever it is. What is your future? If you are lucky enough to pass some exams, enter college or university and then seek a job, if your father is fairly powerful politically or locally, then you will fall into the trap, which he has created for you, comfortably or uncomfortably, and then settle down for the rest of your life struggle, conflict, unhappy, miserable, caught in a wheel like a rat, and that is what your future is going to be. Wars, tremendous unemployment, even though you may have a good job, if there is a war, not in India but in Russia, or China or in Europe, all of you will be affected. Face all this - look at all this.

S: How do you connect the problem of a career with a war, and even a mediocre person will go and take up something as a career.

K: What is the relationship between a war and a career and - what else? S: A mediocre person.

K: Are you mediocre? All of you? You know what that word means? The word etymologically, that is, the root meaning of that word - going half the way up the hill and never going to the top of the hill. You understand? You might have a good job either in Madras, in Bombay, or in Delhi - or even in Europe and America - you will still remain mediocre. You may be excellent in your job, but your thinking, your feelings will be mediocre, ordinary. And education throughout the world is turning out mediocre people, without any integrity, without any quality of beauty and sensitivity and so on. So the question which the boy asked was: what is the relationship between wars, career, and mediocrity. Right? Was that the question? Don't be nervous - that is your question, isn't it? No? What do you think is the relationship of a war in India or Pakistan or China with another country and your own particular job. What is the relationship between the two or is there no relationship?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Come over here - you don't mind sitting next to me?

S: No.

K: Good of you. Now what is the question?

S: I said there is no connection - because both are trying to earn a living. You said a person in India - what is the connection between the career, I thought that was what you were trying to say.

K: I am not trying to say - you are trying to say. Don't be nervous - you can say what you like.

S: I am saying both are trying to earn a living - that's all.

K: Yes sir - and what is the relationship between earning a livelihood and war? That is your question - isn't it?

S: No, what I was trying to say was - even if you are educated

after a career, you are not going to, and the person who is not after it, both are going to experience, I mean the war or whatever it is.

K: Do you understand what she is saying?

N: Everybody is going to experience the war, in spite of the career.

K: Is that it? Are you experiencing the war in Lebanon - what is going on there? You know there is a war in Lebanon. One group against another group, Christian, Muslims, Syrians against Israel, and so on and so on. There is tremendous murder going on there. Right? Are you related to that?

S: Not at the moment. But may be - K: What do you mean by - by not at the moment.

S: I mean - if is in India - K: No darling, just listen. Are you related to what is happening there or not at all?

S: Yes, in some way.

K: What way?

S: Because, I mean it is happening in a place - and you know of it - K: Then what is your feeling about it, what is your relationship?

S: Sir, mediocre people like us are creating war.

K: Would you come over here - I like a boy and a girl - that is better. What sir? Don't be nervous - I am also nervous - sit comfortably - what were you saying? Mediocre people create wars. Do you understand what he said, he said - mediocre people like us, including him, including you are responsible for creating wars. You agree to that, why? It is easy to agree, but why?

S: We have some ideas and we don't want them to be broken. And so for these ideas, we fight.

K: That is right. Perfectly right. You have ideas that you are

Indian. Right? That you are a Hindu and across the border the Muslim thinks he is a Muslim, because that is an idea. And also there are totalitarian countries like Russia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary and so on and all those countries - including Russia have one set of ideas. Right? And democratic countries have another set of ideas - they are fighting with each other. So, would you consider all ideas are mediocre? Use your brain. Would you consider all ideas, all ideals are mediocre, which create wars? Come on old boy, argue, discuss, don't accept what I say, do you understand, think it out. Think out for yourself if ideas, ideals, are separating people - like India, Russia, you follow - nationalities. Nationalities are creating wars. Right? Agree? So, don't be national.

S: If I am a national I will be helping to create wars.

K: That's right - so, would you stop being a national calling yourself a Hindu, or a Parsi or a Sikh, or a Muslim - you know all that business. But you may say, yes I like the idea, you are quite right but inside I will be a Hindu still. That will be hypocrisy - won't it? So, would you? If you are not, then you are moving away from mediocrity. So you see sir, wars are created by tribes. Wars have existed in this world, for the last six thousand or seven thousand years, wars practically every year all over the world and we are still having wars after all these long centuries of evolution; and these wars are caused by ideals, religious ideals, national ideals, and ideals created by thought - which is, I am a Hindu, you are a Muslim, I am a communist, you are a democratic and so on. This is the world you are going to face, whether you have a good job or not. So what is your future? Answer my question sir - what

is your future? You understand? You are the result of long series of movements in evolution, you are here now. Your brains have evolved from a very minute cell to this very, very complex brain - you have studied biology. And this brain has become mediocre, because we are frightened, we are nationalistic, we want to follow the same old pattern, so we have become mediocre. You may be very clever. You may be a scientist, you may be an engineer and so on, but your feelings, your thinking is very primitive. So you are still mediocre. Now what will you do about it? Will you break through the pattern? If you don't break through the pattern now, your future is what you are now. Right? Is it clear? You understand what I am saying - that if I don't change now, my future will be exactly what I am now, slightly modified. S: Sir, can one be part of the system of examination, job, etc. and yet not be mediocre?

K: It all depends - you might never pass exams, you might never go through college, universities and a job, yet remain mediocre or you might go through all that process and may not be mediocre - it all depends on the quality of your brain - how you think, how you feel, what your sense of appreciation of the world. Do you understand what I am saying, have I made myself clear?

S: Then there seems to be a contradiction between physical reality and what we aspire to.

K: What is the physical reality?

S: Having a job - after doing examinations.

K: You have to go through examinations. Let us take that. That is actuality - that you have to do. Right? And where is the other?

S: You feel that it is not the most important thing.

K: I personally don't. But your fathers may, your government

may, your society may. I never passed through any examination at all. I am still alive. So what is the contradiction?

S: Where does exactly mediocre stand for us to pass over it. Where do we draw the line?

K: Do you know you are mediocre? Or are you too proud to acknowledge that? If you are honest to yourself - are you honest to yourself, any of you? If you are not honest to yourself, or you ask yourself - are you mediocre? Wanting to follow the same old pattern.

S: Perhaps I want to.

K: Then accept it - you are mediocre. But if you don't want to, that is what the girl asked, if you don't want to, how do you break through this. Right? You tell me. Don't let me tell you. But you tell me how to break, how to go beyond it?

S: This routine of job, then marriage and all that will perhaps give you a security sir.

K: Yes, so, are you seeking security?

S: No one wants to be alone - so that is the ultimate thing? Like no one would like to be in a routine job, marriage, and everything. Everyone wants to have that because no one wants to be alone.

K: Now just a minute - what do you mean by that word alone? Careful, careful. Just think of that word - what it means - alone. You know the word alone means all one - that is the dictionary meaning, the root meaning of that word alone means - all one. You mean isolated.

S: Yes.

K: Each person feels isolated, why?

S: Because, everyone wants company, at least I do.

K: Why?

S: We come back to fear, sir.

K: That's all. Which means what? Because you are afraid, go on, pursue it, sir, don't stop there. Find out.

S: You are afraid, and you want someone to share that feeling with you.

K: Which, you want somebody to support you, encourage you, give you comfort, to say, very well, old girl, and so on and so on. Right? So, you depend on somebody - why? Think it out.

S: Again we come back to fear - because you are scared.

K: So, you are scared, you are frightened therefore you depend. Now when you depend on somebody what happens? Think it out.

S: You don't use your brain.

K: No, think it out. See the consequences of that. You know what I mean by consequences. Now, what does it mean - I am attached to you - you are my friend and what happens? In being attached to you I become...

S: My security lies in you.

K: Which means that I depend on you. Go on, pursue it, go into it.

S: If this attachment breaks there might be sorrow - so again there is fear.

K: So when you are attached the consequences are, fear - right? - pain, jealousy - when I am attached to you and you might look at the other person and I get jealous of you. Right? So I am jealous, I get angry, in all that where is my security? Because you are seeking security through dependence and that very dependence denies your security. Right? Do you see it? Use your brain, don't

stop there. So how do you find security? Every human being, all of you here need security. That means what - when you say security and you agree, what does that mean?

S: It means I want to have no fear.

K: No sir - security.

S: But I want to feel secure.

S: Protected, want to feel, we want protection.

K: What does it mean? Go on? To be secure, right?

S: You hold on to something, not stand by yourself.

K: No, you know - look, you are all secure here - aren't you? Secure, you have a room to sleep in, bed, clothes, water to wash, and good food - is it good food here?

A: Yes

K: All agree - do you all agree you have good food?

S: Mediocre food sir.

K: Would you like to have it improved?

A: Yes sir.

K: You see how quickly you react to that. So food is very important, isn't it?

K: To be secure means, to have food, clothes, shelter and money. If that is assured you are physically secure. Right?

S: I need some company.

K: Yes, yes - company, friends - you call all that security. Now, that woman there, carrying the burden, very poor, she has no security. Right? From day to day - she lives - frightened, hungry, dirty, but she carries on. So, is there security when people are divided into communities? Which means - when a nation is divided against another nation there will always be opposition, there will

always be wars. Therefore the very nationality is denying your security. Do you see that? So, will you be free of nationality? Don't say, yes and go back to nationality.

S: I can't say because, you might feel it but deep inside, you say, OK, I am a Hindu - and I mean you have that feeling.

K: Then wipe it out because that is going to cause war.

S: (Inaudible)

K: I agree - what is next, first you must have physical security. But that physical security is denied to people when there is war.

S: Sir, a small community understands you better than a big community-so nationality is useless.

K: This is a small community, where we live - right? Do we understand each other, help each other, be affectionate to each other?

S: Not to all, to some.

K: So sirs, come back to our question: what is your future? What is the future of each one of you? And if I am your parent, I will be very, very concerned about it. I might try to get you a job, get you to marry and all that stuff in India, but what is your future?

S: Sir, how are we supposed to know our future?

K: You can't. But you can know what you are now. Right?

S: I think it depends on your way of thinking and your parents way of thinking.

K: The parents way of thinking, and the way you think now. If you think in terms of nationality, Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim and so on, then the future will be what you are now. Agreed? Come on sir.

S: You used the word, break down the barrier, once you break down the barrier, where do we go?

K: Once you break down the barrier, where do you go? What is the barrier before you go, what do you call a barrier? Nationality is a barrier?

S: No.

K: Why not, it is causing war. Don't you think it is causing the war? So, that is a barrier. Then if you don't belong to any nationality, what are you? A human being - aren't you? Which is what?

S: Sir, even if there is no nationality here, or suppose the world is one, but even then there is the question of a job, examination, marriage later on.

K: Yes sir, but our whole attitude, our whole way of living would be different, wouldn't it? I may get married, you may get married, get a job, but our whole outlook may not be limited.

S: If only students in Rishi Valley follow this and the whole world goes the other way - we are the ones to suffer.

K: If all of you here followed or thought out, or worked out, and are free of nationality and the rest of the world did not do what you are doing, then what happens to you?

S: What happens to us?

K: Think it out. Either you will be smothered, or you will be smothered, or destroyed by the majority, or the majority might join you, because they might see you have sense. They might see how logical it all is, they might join you.

S: Suppose, they do not realize it.

K: Then you carry on your way.

S: Sir, what happens if the majority thinks that they are making sense?

K: If the majority thinks that they are making sense - is it sense to have wars every year?

S: They think so.

K: I know, I know they think their way of living is very sane, rational, and rather stupid. I have told them that old boy - I have discussed with them. They say, leave me alone. Right? And you come along and say, what a stupid way of living, perpetually at war. Right? And you say, don't be nationalistic; either I say I accept you and begin to put away my nationality. But very few people do this, they talk about it. Do you understand? Very few people actually say, I won't be a Hindu, I won't be a Hindu, I won't be a Catholic or Protestant, nothing.

S: We cannot really dissolve this barrier, because we have to pay taxes, we have to follow certain duties.

K: Of course sir - when you buy a stamp part of it goes to support wars. Right? If you telephone from here to your home, what you pay goes to support war. So what will you do? Not telephone, not write letters, or would you attack the thing much deeper? Attack the thing deeper, which is, nationality, which is the separate religious groups, I am a Hindu, you are a Muslim, I am a communist, you are a Democrat, you follow. This division throughout the world, is destroying the world. You see it, it is happening there - in Beirut - see this. So to think this way is mediocre, to live that way is mediocre.

Now let us come back. You are frightened. Let us talk a little bit about fear. We are going to talk four days together, I hope you don't mind four days. We are going to talk to each other, the day after tomorrow and so on. Now what is fear? You tell me. You

think out carefully and tell me what is fear.

S: Fear is: what happened in the past, something that is going to frighten you.

S: What he says is, that something which has happened in the past and you doesn't want it to be repeated for the fear.

K: Right. You have done something in the past that has caused pain and you want that not to be repeated, and so that causes fear. Right? Now you are afraid also of the future, you might have an accident, you might fall ill, you might be scolded. So just a minute - you are afraid of the future. Are you afraid now sitting here? Careful, think it out. Let us begin again: you are afraid of the past, you are afraid of the future - are you afraid now?

S: You mean at the present?

K: At the present.

S: I am afraid of the future.

K: No darling - you don't mind if I call you darling. You are afraid of the past. I have done something and I am frightened. And also I might be frightened of the future - what might happen - what will happen. So, you are afraid of the past, you are afraid of the future. As the present is now - you are sitting here.

S: We might be afraid of what people might think of us.

K: That is future.

S: Right now, sitting.

K: Are they doing it now? You don't know. So at present - be careful in your thinking, precise - future, past, and there is the present, which is now you are sitting here. So is fear always in the future or in the past? Think it out carefully. Always in the future, always in the past, not in the present.

S: Perhaps we have fear in the present.

K: Are you afraid now, sitting there?

S: Yes.

K: Of what?

S: Afraid of people around me.

K: Careful, careful, you have not thought it out. Think it out sir, before you say anything.

S: It is not actually fear. It is your opinion.

K: You are afraid what might happen. You are afraid what has happened. Right? So, at present sitting here, you might think of the future and get frightened or think of the past and get frightened. So, fear is either in the past or in the future, but never in the present.

What do you say to that. Don't agree. Right? So, what are you frightened of? S: Of what might happen.

K: Or what has happened. Now, which means what?

S: I don't want anything to happen.

K: No darling, sir, think it out. What has happened, what does it mean. The memory, the remembrance of something unpleasant, the remembrance, memory. Right? And the future is what might happen also from the past. The future, which means, it might happen. So, both are the process of thinking. Clear? Be clear - careful. Don't accept a thing anybody says, think it out. I am afraid of the past - that is, something happened two days ago which gave me fear and I think about it. Right? It has happened, it is finished, but I think about it. Right? The thinking about it causes fear, thinking about what has happened. Thinking about what might happen, which is the future, thinking about the past, thinking about the future, causes fear. Clear? I am thinking for you. You are not

thinking. So, thinking about the past, thinking about the future causes fear. So thinking creates fear.

S: So, are you trying to say, why think?

K: No, I am trying to point out to you, the cause of fear, which is thinking about the past, thinking about the future, the thinking itself is the movement of fear. Then what will you do with thinking? You have to think to get from here to there. This is a little too difficult. Do you understand what I am saying? You work it out carefully. Take time. Thinking about the past, thinking about the future, causes fear, pain. Fear is pain.

S: Thinking spontaneously need not cause fear, the present has no fear.

K: Are you thinking spontaneously? She says thinking causes...

S: But all thinking is from the past, you can't think spontaneously.

K: That is right, you have got it. All thinking is from the past, all thinking is not only the past but also the future. Right? This is a little difficult. So what will you do about thinking? You have to think - to put on your clothes, you have to think, when you clean your teeth you have to think, when you comb your hair you have to think, or go to the barber to get it cut short, you have to think. Right? So you have to think. So then what? Thinking causes fear but yet you have to think. Find out. Thinking about the future and the past causes pain, fear, but you also have to think. To put on your dress, put on your trousers, to listen to the educators, who inform you about mathematics, geography, you have to think. So, where do you have to think, which does not cause fear? You understand my question?

S: When you form an opinion about it.

K: Opinion about what?

S: Like, suppose, there is something which you are not certain about. It can happen.

K: No darling, listen, first get the principle that thinking about the past, and the future, causes fear, but yet you have to think.

S: Sir, now we are not feeling afraid, but in the future we might feel afraid of the now - which is the past.

K: Yes. But in the future you might think, by Jove, I am going to fail in the exams, that might frighten you.

S: No sir, we are not afraid now.

K: Sitting there, you are not afraid, of course.

S: Sir, if we are not afraid now, why should we be afraid in the future? Now is the past then.

N: It is a bit complicated. If you are not afraid now, why should you be afraid of the future, which is now.

K: You are a clever boy. Think it out sir, think it out. You are saying, thinking about the future causes fear. But what? Next step - tell me - he said something very good, sir, tell me.

N: Now, I am not afraid, in the future the now will become the past, and you have said, only the future and the past can cause fear, but if now I am not afraid and in the future this will become the past, how can it cause fear, if now does not cause fear?

K: It is very clever, sir. Have you understood this? Listen to him carefully.

S: Sir, now we are not afraid - in the future, this will become the past. So, if now I am not afraid, in the future, this will be the past.

K: Quite right sir. Quite right? The future is the present. He has

said the future is fear, but at present I am not afraid, therefore the present is the future, therefore I have no fear: that is what he said.

S: The present will be the past and future.

K: The present will be the past in the future, therefore in the future there is no fear. He said - please listen to him carefully, it is very interesting - at present I am not afraid, the future is the present, and if I am not afraid now, in the future I won't be afraid. Quite right. That means I am living always in the present.

S: Never in the future.

K: Got it sir? I don't know if you have understood this. That is, listen carefully, use your brains, don't go to sleep, this is not a mathematical class, where you can go on, repeat, repeat. He is saying something very interesting. At the present moment I am not afraid; the present becomes the future, therefore the future has no fear, which means, I am living all the time in the present. Listen carefully, see what it means. Can I live always in the present? That is what he said sir - I am not saying, agree or disagree, listen to what he said. Find out the truth of it, or the falseness of it. If I am not afraid now, the future is what I am now; which means, can I always live now, in the present. Do you understand? Which means - I will explain a little more - which means, the future and the past are contained in the present.

Got it? What? Be careful - don't repeat what I said, find out.

S: (Inaudible).

N: He is saying - I may not be good in Telegu now, so, I might project it to the future and say what am I going to do in the future, if I am not good now at mathematics, or Telegu now, what will I do in the future? He is questioning, whether the present can be a

source of fear.

K: Sir, apart from theories, are you frightened, factually, of the past, future, frightened?

S: Yes, sir.

S: Can you bring the past and the future into the present?

K: No, not bring, I said the present is contained in the past and the future.

S: So, both the past and the future bring fear to the present.

K: Yes. So, you have to eliminate fear now. Got it? You people - you see, you say something true and stop, you don't proceed. You said - go on, repeat what you said. It is very good. Do you realize all of you over there, who are much older, don't talk - why?

S: Because maybe, they are not interested, or maybe they don't want to speak.

K: Why? Or they are cynical - this is all childish stuff, we have gone beyond all this, we will pass our exams and get on with this stuff. Right?

S: Or we are listening.

K: Are you listening?

S: I am.

K: What do you mean by listening?

S: When you say something - I am observing.

K: Do you differentiate between hearing with the ear, and listening?

S: Listening and learning.

K: Forgive me sir, if I may repeat again - do you differentiate between hearing and listening?

S: Yes sir - listening is where you take it in, and analyse, but

hearing is where it goes in one ear and goes out the other.

K: So you are saying, in the process of listening you are analysing, questioning, doubting. Right? Is that listening? You are telling me, the past is fear and the future is fear - I listen to you, I hear what you are saying, there is a difference. I am not interpreting what you are saying. I am listening which means I am observing what you are talking about and wait till I find out the truth of it. I am not analysing, I am listening, take it in and wait till I completely listen, then I can proceed to analyse. But if I listen and analyse, I have not listened to you. Right? Do you see that?

S: I think listening can cause fear.

K: Ah! - you are right. Listening might have awakened the memories of yesterday, or might awaken the future, therefore you listen, find out if you are afraid, but first, you must listen.

S: In the process of listening you might not be afraid, but afterwards.

K: Yes. Of course - but first, you must listen. Have you ever listened to the song of a bird? Have you? Yes. You are listening and seeing that bird on that branch, singing and then afterwards you say, that bird is - whatever the name of the bird - but you are listening. Do you listen to your educator?

S: If it is boring, we don't listen - when it is interesting.

K: The boy says, when he is bored he is not listening. Quite right, quite right. Which means, the educator is boring.

S: Not always sir.

K: He is being polite - not always sir. Now sir - just a minute, come back. Do you want to be free of fear? Or do you like it?

S: Having a fear may help you.

N: He thinks it is a motivation.

K: Yes. When you are afraid, have you listened to your teacher? When you are frightened, do you ever listen? Of course not. I am asking you, all of you, whether you really want to be free of fear.

S: Yes sir, but then you will have some kind of fear.

K: Darling, just listen. Do you want to be free of it, don't say, there might exist afterwards.

S: Yes.

K: Do you really want to be free? What will you do to be free? You know you go to a temple, Tirupati temple, or some temple and say, please God, I'll give you something, you give me something else.

S: It is a business deal.

K: Right. It is a good business deal, it is really a rotten business. But the priests get a lot out of it. So do you want to be free, completely free - not only now, but all through life?

S: Otherwise you will be going through a lot of conflict. Like your parents might say something and you might not accept it or you might. So, there will be a lot of conflict.

K: Yes. But I am saying - do you want to be free in spite of all that.

S: If you do not know something. You have a fear that you do not know - something will happen to you. Because of that fear, you learn those things.

N: You are afraid you don't know something, so because of that you learn.

K: Is learning - I know the game.

N: He is continuing.

K: He has not moved. Are you saying, through fear you learn? That is what you are saying. Through fear, if you don't listen to the teacher, he might beat you up or he might give you less marks, or he might write to your parents. Therefore, being afraid, you listen to him.

S: It is not always so.

K: You are all too clever. I am asking you a very simple question, you don't answer me. Do you want to be free of fear? Do you? Be serious-don't just say, yes and let's get on with it.

S: No, I want to.

K: Then, what price do you pay for it? Not coins, not go to the temples, and pay a fee of ten rupees. But if you say I really want to be free from fear, deeply, then we will work together.

S: Do what you really want to do, not do it for the sake of others.

K: And also, if you want to be free, you, we three will work it out. You understand what I am saying? Work it out, step by step, so that at the end of it you are completely free of fear. Right? If that is what you want to do, what will you pay for it? Not money. What will you do? You know - give a flower - you must do something to show you are serious, your integrity, not just say, I would like to be free from fear, tell me all about it.

S: Be true to yourself, like, not try to put up...

K; I understand. Let us go into it - don't say, I must do this, I must not do that, let us go into the whole question of fear and see if you can step by step, end it. At each step taken, it is ended.

S: (Inaudible.)

K: By learning. Right? What do you mean by learning?

S: Learning...

K: Wait, listen old boy. Don't answer me before I have finished. What do you mean by learning? Is memorizing learning? Right? Answer that. Is memorizing mathematics, repeating day after day, day after day the same thing, till you have memorised it, is that learning? That is what you call learning. But I question, I doubt, if that is learning. Learning is much more active than merely repeating. Now, what is the time?

S: Sir - if you don't have fear, you might cause trouble to others.

K: By being free of fear, you might cause trouble to others. So you will be a doormat. So I am afraid I might hurt him, therefore I keep my fear.

S: Not that sir, if you are free of fear, you might go and burn houses. You are not afraid of anybody.

K: If you are not afraid, you might burn up the school. Try it.

We had better stop, it is now a quarter to eleven, we have done an hour and a quarter. Do you like this kind of meeting?

A: Yes.

K: We will have it. We will meet again the day after tomorrow. So we will go on with this. First of all, I hope you have enjoyed yourselves. Have a good discussion - discuss - you understand, not just listen and say, I agree with you. That is silly. Let us sit quietly for a few minutes, shall we?

RISHI VALLEY 2ND TALK WITH STUDENTS 14TH DECEMBER 1983

Krishnamurti: You don't mind my talking?

Students: No.

K: You are quite sure?

Students: Yes.

K: All right. What do you think is the greatest profession, the greatest vocation, the greatest job? What do you think about that?

S: Having lots of joy, I like moonlight dinner.

K: Moonlight dinner, she likes. But I wasn't asking about your dinner, I was asking, if I may, what do you think is the greatest profession in the world.

S: Teaching.

K: Why do you think that is the greatest profession?

S: It requires a lot of patience.

S: I think agriculture is the best.

K: Sorry I asked this question.

S: There can't be any profession which is the greatest because every man thinks his profession is the greatest.

K: I know. But what do you think is the greatest? I think being a teacher is the greatest profession in the world because they are preparing a new generation, a new generation of people. Not the politicians, not the scientists, not the businessman, nor the gurus - teaching in the sense helping the students throughout the world to be good human beings. Not good at some profession, some career, some job, but to help other human beings, like yourselves, to become extraordinarily good human beings. I mean by that word

`good', not fragmented, not broken up in themselves, contradictory, but whole, unbroken. You understand the word `good'? I am explaining the meaning of that word `good'. Very few of us in the world are good human beings: we say one thing and do another, think one thing and act totally different from what you think, so there is a contradiction in us, a conflict, one desire opposing another desire, so there is always in us this fragmentary activity going on. Are we aware of that? Do you know what I am saying? Don't you say one thing and do another? Right? Think one thing and act totally different from what you think? Haven't you noticed that? That's called fragmentation. That's only part of it: to be fragmented, to be broken up, not to be a whole human being; to use a scientific word, holistic, or a human being that is completely whole, not broken up, not fragmented, deeply integrated, have deep integrity.

And also that word means sane, rational, clear, unconfused. And it is the function of the educator to bring this about with his students, because you are the coming generation, and if you merely follow the old pattern, which is, getting a job, getting married, and settling down, which means for the rest of your life go to an office from nine o'clock in the morning until five o'clock in the evening. You do this, your fathers do this, don't they, from nine o'clock until five o'clock for the rest of their life. Do you realize how terrible this is? You understand this? And this is called living. Of course one has to earn a livelihood, of course one has to get a job, but if one is good in the deep sense of that word, then all the other things take their right place.

Do you understand what I am talking about? Do you? Yes? Do

you? I'm afraid not. Do you understand what I am talking about?
Don't you say one thing and do another?

S: Yes.

K: Why? Either you are afraid, you think one thing and say something else because you are afraid that the other person might get hurt, or might hurt you, or you are not quite telling the truth. All that makes a human being fragmented, broken up, like a vessel, a pot, a terracotta vessel is easily broken. So we human beings throughout the world are in this condition of constantly saying one thing, doing something else. So they are in perpetual conflict. Right? And in their relationship, with the wife, or husband, and so on, they are always in conflict. Haven't you noticed it? So what do you propose to do? If you see all this happening throughout the world, what's your responsibility, and what's the responsibility of the educator? Tell me, don't go to sleep - I hope you had a good sleep last night, did you? Did you have a good sleep last night?

S: Yes.

K: Don't go to sleep now then.

S: To teach them to do something good and not bad.

K: How do you teach them?

S: By being a good person yourself.

K: I daren't ask this question, but are your teachers good?

S: Some of them.

K: Some of them are good - don't tell me who are and who aren't! Are you good? Don't bother about the teachers, are you good? You understand? Please understand what I mean by good.

S: (Inaudible)

K: You are rather fat, aren't you? He is a bit fat - I am too thin

and he is too fat! Go on, sir, what were you saying?

S: I see myself as a good person, but I don't know about others.

K: I asked you. I told you what a good person was, that is, he doesn't contradict himself, say one thing, do another. Right? Think one thing and say something else. And a person who is not in conflict, but who is not asleep - right? - so such a person is a good person. Now are you?

S: Sir, one might think one thing and do another - I might think I am a good person.

K: You may not be, but thinking you are a good person is not a good person. Actually what you are. Now how do you learn to be good?

S: By doing something that is useful.

K: The government says it is very useful to go and kill your Muslim people. Right? War. Do you think that is good?

S: No.

K: Then will you do it?

S: No.

K: But you are a girl, therefore you are quite safe. But if you are a young man, as in Europe and other parts of the world, every boy at the age of eighteen has to join the army, has to spend two years as a soldier, carrying guns, working, training and all that. If the government asks you in this country to go and kill somebody, would you do it?

S: No.

K: Ah, no, don't say, no. It is very easy to say, no. But when you grow up, when you are eighteen, will you go and kill somebody? Tell me.

S: It depends.

K: It depends on what?

S: It depends on the need.

K: What do you mean, need?

S: My need and my want will kill me.

K: I don't understand this.

S: (Inaudible)

K: I see. You will yield to the pressure of a society - is that it? Your society, your government, puts a pressure on you that you must kill. Will you do it?

S: Yes.

K: You may do it, why?

S: Because the country becomes too bad for me.

K: What do you mean by that, the country becoming too bad for you?

S: The conditions for war may become too bad.

K: What are the conditions you would like?

S: (Inaudible)

K: All right, you are living in a society, who created the society?

S: We ourselves.

K: She says, we ourselves, your fathers, grandfathers - no? So your fathers and grandfathers have created this society which says that you must go and kill. Right? Will you go and do it?

S: (Inaudible)

K: What about violence? You may have a great deal of pressure, I might keep on insulting you, and that hurts you, will you then hurt me back?

S: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking - but will you, yes?

S: I would not but the other chap might.

K: So if he is stronger than you what will you do? Look: you haven't really thought about what I am saying.

S: If you are a good person and you help everybody then you will be good.

K: Do you understand what I am saying first? I am saying the greatest profession in the world, in spite of all the societies, everything else, a teacher, an educator, is preparing a new generation of people, and that new generation is not only academically good, but much more important, much more essential is that you as a student under him should become a good human being.

S: (Inaudible)

K: Wait a minute, old boy, I haven't finished yet. Have you understood so far what I said?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir, wait, sir. So I explained carefully what is a good human being. Right? Have you understood that? A good human being is one who is not fragmented, broken up, saying one thing, doing another, thinking one thing and acting in a totally different way - he is broken up. You understand? He is not whole. And we are saying a good person is whole. That is the definition of a human being who is good. You may not agree with that definition, you may say, it is rotten.

S: The teachers want a student to settle down.

K: Then is he a good teacher then?

S: People are like that these days.

K: Do you want to be a good person - forget the teacher for the moment. Do you want to be a good human being?

S: I want to be what I consider good.

K: What do you consider good?

S: (Inaudible)

K: What do you consider good?

S: Study well and get a good job.

K: Is that what you call good?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Yes sir, and lady, but do you say that a human being who is good, study well, get a job?

S: If you study well and get a job that is good for you.

K: Is that all?

S: And lead a happy life.

K: What do you call a happy life? Get a car? What do you call a happy life?

S: Someone to share you happiness with.

K: No, I asked you, what do you call a happy life?

S: When you yourself are happy.

K: What do you mean by happiness?

S: To fulfil all your ambitions.

K: Oh, fulfil all your ambitions is to be happy, is that it? Is that what you are going to do?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Now what is ambition? Think it out, don't just say, ambition.

S: It's a goal.

K: I want to be Prime Minister - god forbid - I want to be a

General - again, god forbid - or a lawyer, or something else, I want to be something. Right? Do you agree to that?

S: Yes.

K: Weren't you here yesterday? Too bad you are not here again. So do you know what ambition does?

S: It makes you unhappy.

K: It makes you unhappy - therefore you are not ambitious?

S: I am but I think when you can't fulfil your ambitions you are unhappy.

K: But can you ever fulfil your ambitions?

S: Not all the time.

K: Then what are those that can be fulfilled? Marriage, of course.

S: If you can't fulfil all of the ambitions you have to feel happy with those you can.

K: What are those things?

S: You can be free of all the things you don't like.

K: First of all, sir, do you know what ambition does? You are ambitious and I am ambitious - suppose I am, so what happens to us?

S: It leads to competition.

K: It leads to competition, you are saying - what does that mean?

S: (Inaudible)

K: You and I are fighting each other. Right?

S: You get satisfaction.

K: You are not thinking, you are just saying something. Do think, please, don't just say something and then not mean what you

say. To be ambitious, what does that mean? The word 'ambition' what does that mean? To become, or be something, isn't it? No? Are you all asleep this morning? Had a good meal?

S: Yes.

K: Then keep awake.

S: But you want us to become a good person.

K: No, I didn't say, become. That's the difference. I did not say become, I said, be, which is entirely different. You understand the two? Becoming is ambitious - wait, wait. I haven't finished yet. Becoming good incites ambition. Do you see that?

S: How can you become good?

K: I did not say, become. I am saying, sir, becoming means having a goal and striving for that. Right? I didn't say that, I said, be. Being doesn't take time, the other does. This is too complex, I won't go into it. So I said, be good, which means be aware that your life is contradiction, that you contradict yourself, and end that conflict, end that contradiction - not that you will end it. Do you see the difference? No.

S: You can see it logically, but doing it is another matter.

K: You can see it logically but doing is another matter - why is it another matter? If you have a toothache, a bad pain, you say, I will take time to get over it, or do you want it ended immediately? No, this is a bit too difficult, or you are not thinking this morning.

S: I want to get over it.

K: Get over what?

S: Toothache.

K: Quite right. You want to get over quickly your toothache so you do something immediately. Right? But when you say, I will be

good - when you say, I will be good, you don't want to do it immediately.

S: If you want to be good you can be.

K: Are you good?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So, sir, please, would you kindly listen. I was saying this morning, I began by saying, the greatest profession in the world is educators, because he is bringing about a new generation of people. Right? Because you are going to be a new generation. And the hope of the world - the world is in such a mess - depends on you. Right? How you grow up, if you merely follow the same old pattern then you are furthering the same misery, confusion of the world.

S: Teaching is not a good profession.

K: Why?

S: Because you hardly get any money.

K: He hardly has enough money. So money is your ambition, is it? To have plenty of money.

S: (Inaudible)

K: You see, for god's sake, you don't listen to what I am saying, sir. Forgive me, you are not listening to what I am saying. You have had thousands of engineers all over the world, thousands and thousands. Right? Great business people, great scientists, and rather unfortunate politicians all over the world - they have not brought about good human beings. Right? So we are saying that the function of an educator, who is really educating, is not only to help them to have good academic brains but also to be good human beings. Right? Because that might change the world.

S: (Inaudible)

K: Have you listened to what I have said, dear?

S: Yes.

K: Then what is your question?

S: How many people do you think will really go after that?

K: Not how many people - will you?

S: I don't think so, sir, it's too difficult.

K: Just a minute, answer my question, will you?

S: I doubt it, sir.

K: Don't say, doubt. Either you want to do something, or you don't want to do something.

S: No, I don't want to do it.

K: That's all very simple. That's very clear. You want to live a mediocre life.

S: I want to live what you call mediocre.

K: Not what I call mediocre - we have agreed. I am not telling you what a mediocre life is. Mediocre means going half way up the hill - the root meaning. And that means, not what I think, don't pass off that kind of game with me, I am very good at this - I am saying, a mediocre life is one who conforms to the pattern, job, marriage, settle down, children, and everlastingly quarrel, fight, struggle. Right? I call all that which produces war a mediocre life. That's all. You may say, that's not mediocrity, then we can discuss it. Right? But if you say, it's your mediocrity, it's not mine, then we can't discuss anything.

S: Sir, just a minute.

K: I'll wait a minute, as long as you like.

S: What you are trying to say, suppose...

K: I am asking you.

S: The next generation...

K: You are the next generation.

S: OK, we also follow the same pattern - how many people do you think will follow the other?

K: I don't care how many. I am asking you, you, do you want to lead a mediocre life? If you agree to the definition, which apparently you seem to do, then do you want to lead a mediocre life, which means creating wars, perpetual conflict for the rest of your life until you die?

S: No.

K: Then what will you do?

S: Well then I would...

K: No, no. Don't escape from it. What will you do? You see you are all too clever, you all want to escape from it, you kind of spin around.

S: It's because we are confused.

K: Are you confused when you said, look mediocrity is this and I don't want to be mediocre like that - that's not confusion. But if you say, I would like not to be mediocre but I am mediocre - and play that kind of game. Right?

S: Why do you call teaching the greatest profession?

K: I have just explained, lady.

S: You are helping the new generation, but what about the other people, the old generation?

K: I explained to you very carefully, if I may repeat it again, I consider, I may be wrong, you have a right to question it, for me the greatest profession in the world is the teaching profession, the

educator, not the ordinary educator who is just turning out, but the educator who is concerned with the world, what is happening with the world, the wars, the conflict, the divisions of people, and seeing all that the educator says, there must be a new generation of people who are not like that. If you and I agree to that...

S: Why do you say that teaching is greatest - why do you use the word greatest?

K: All right, I won't use the word greatest if you don't like it. It is the most important function in the world. Is that all right?

S: If teaching is the greatest profession, then what is the profession for those who have gone through these teachers?

K: They will also teach or bring about a good society.

S: If everyone takes to teaching there will be no students.

K: Nobody is going to. You see, this is just a theory. You see you are all theorizing, I object to that. I say, for god's sake I would like to discuss something else. Wait a minute, wait a minute.

S: (Inaudible)

K: I am your teacher - suppose I am your teacher and you are my student. I say I don't know what goodness is - you understand - I understand what K has been talking about goodness, I have grasped it intellectually but I am not living it. So as I am not living it, and you are not living it, we are on the same level. If you are slow and I am fast, then I stop and help you to be fast.

S: What happens if you are slow?

K: If I am slow you help me. I am your teacher, as I said to you, we are on the same level. I don't know what it is to be really good, I understand it verbally, intellectually, theoretically, but to be good means a tremendous thing; I don't understand it, and you don't

understand it, so let us work at it together. You understand? Not that I am superior, or inferior, or you are superior, we are together in this. It's like being in a boat, a rowing boat, we all have to row. You understand? So it's your responsibility as well as mine in this relationship to help each other to be good. Will you do it?

S: There are many teachers who are not.

K: There are many teacher who are not, all right, don't bother about them, you be good.

Now just a minute, I'd like to talk about something else, leave that for the moment. What makes the brain degenerate? You understand this question? Do you understand this question? Don't go to sleep. You have got a brain, haven't you? The brain is the instrument, is the place where all your reactions, your physical, emotional, your thinking, is all centred there. And as you grow older it begins to deteriorate. Haven't you seen old people?

S: Yes.

K: Including myself. It begins to deteriorate. Now how will you prevent deterioration of the brain? You understand my question? First of all, do you realize what deterioration means, the word deteriorate.

S: Yes.

K: No, no, look. If it seems so clear tell me.

S: What you are trying to say is...

K: Not, `what I am trying to say'. I asked you, the brain deteriorates with age.

S: You mean it stops thinking for itself.

K: No. You can't stop thinking.

S: Like you follow what other people say.

K: Have you noticed here there are the old people, older students and younger students. Will the younger students become like them - hard, grown-up, superior and so on? I am asking what makes the human brain deteriorate. You have to think about it, don't quickly answer.

S: What do you mean by deteriorate?

K: That's quite right. A fruit ripens at one moment and then it begins to deteriorate and gets worse and worse and worse. Right? So the brain has reached a certain point. You probably don't know all this. Watch your own brain, look at your own thinking, it reaches a point and then stops and gradually declines. Right? You have seen this, your grandfathers, grandmothers - I won't insult your fathers - but they reach a height and then decline. Is this what is happening here in this school? I'll explain what I mean, deteriorate.

The scientists who are studying the brain, with whom I have talked, I know some of them, they say there is the left side of the brain and the right side of the brain. Please listen to this, if you are interested. There are the two sides, the left and the right. The left side of the brain is the practical brain, it does everything everyday, you know, think out, drive a car, learn mathematics, that is the function of the left side of the brain, and more. The right side has hardly been touched, therefore that's quicker, more alive. And that influences the other, perhaps. So these two, one is quiet, you understand, the other is active. Now are you following all this?

S: But...

K: Wait, wait. I haven't finished yet. So they have divided the brain into the left and the right. We are saying, I am saying, by this

division you are not employing the whole brain, the complete brain. You understand? If there is no activity of the whole brain there is a deteriorating factor taking place. You understand? You have got it? I am going to show you. The deteriorating factor is repetition. Right? Job, marriage, repeat, go to the office day after day, day after day. A repetition for a long period inevitably deteriorates the brain, like a gramophone record, repeat, repeat, repeat. That's what you are all doing.

S: In the same way, if you have two knives, a sharp knife and a blunt knife, you keep sharpening the blunt knife everyday, and you leave the sharp knife, which do you think would become the sharp knife? In the same way...

K: You haven't understood. The scientists are saying left and right: the left is active, going to the office, writing letters, learning a language and so on, the left is always, but the right is not so active, it is much more watchful, much more aware, and therefore has a greater capacity to deal with the problems. Don't deny it, these are the great scientists, don't play around with them, they will wipe the floor with you. Listen to what I am saying: constant repetition makes the brain dull. Right? And you are doing that all the time. I must have a job, I must get married, and the office, office, office. Right? You understand? Understand what I am saying.

S: But marriage and all that, it's repetition to humanity, but it's not repetition to you.

K: What do you mean, you are humanity.

S: No, everyone gets married, but you are getting married and it is the first time, that is something new to you.

K: Agreed. Agreed. But after the first experience you repeat. Right? You are stuck, old girl.

Now, I'll put it the other way: I have talked about this matter with several computer experts and this is what they are doing. Are you interested in this?

S: Yes.

K: You know what a computer is?

S: Yes.

K: Most of you do, all right. I don't. They are trying to build a computer which is almost equal to the human brain. Japan is putting billions and billions of yen, their money, into inventing a computer which is called an ultra intelligent machine. You understand? An ultra intelligent machine - UIM. Now into that machine they are trying to introduce biological cells, cells which are in the brain. You understand this? And America is doing the same, there is the IBM, which is immensely rich, machinery and so on, others have joined together to outwit the Japanese. So they are trying now to create a machine, a computer that will do almost everything that man does. Now I will tell you, I saw on television in America, was it last year, it doesn't matter, recently, a computer and a robot - you know what a robot is? The computer is telling the robot how to build a car, and the robot is building a car, twisting this way, you follow? And suddenly the whole machinery stops because the computer then says to the robot, 'You didn't turned the screw tight enough'. So the robot goes and turns the screw much tighter. Then the whole machinery starts. And the Honda machines - you know, Honda cars - there they took this television and you see all the workmen in white gowns and white gloves, they are not

doing the work, they are watching, and the computer and the robot are doing the work. Right? You understand this? Right, sir? This is simple, there is nothing complicated.

Now if the computer and the robot take over all the activities of human beings what is going to happen to the human being?

S: He will become dull.

K: Now that is exactly deterioration, which you are becoming. You want to be entertained - I don't know if you have gone into it. The entertainment industry, television, radio, magazines, they are controlling you. Right? You want to be entertained. So they say, all right we will entertain you - football, cricket. So gradually what has happened to your brain?

S: You become dull.

K: No, on the contrary, you are deteriorating.

S: How can one get out of this if one is already entangled in it?

K: That's just it. Do you realize you are caught in it? Do you realize your brains are already deteriorating even though you are young. You understand what I am saying? You are young and already your brains are deteriorating because you keep on repeating. You learn from your educator about mathematics and you memorize it and repeat, repeat, repeat. Do you understand? So your brain is becoming gradually, however young you are, through your education, your brain is beginning to deteriorate. So please listen to all this. Mature slowly, not so fast. You understand what I am saying?

S: What do you mean mature slowly, not fast?

K: American girls and boys, and it is now spreading throughout the world, have sex very early. Don't be shy, this is happening.

They want to have all the experience immediately - swimming, cricket, anything, experience, ski-ing, so as they are young they want to experience everything at once in a short time. So as they grow older, see what has happened to the brain.

S: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, grow slowly. Have you noticed the greatest tree grows very, very slowly. That Banyan tree has taken five hundred years probably, it grows slowly. You understand what I am saying? The speaker is going to be eighty-nine in May - you understand? But you, all of you, you are merely recording, like a gramophone, like a tape, recording, and you keep on recording, so your brain is never fresh. And youth is meant to be fresh.

S: Can you say it is your fault because you are sent to school by your parents who expect something out of you.

K: You, you demand something different. You understand? You demand, all of you demand of your teachers that something different be done. But you say, it's all right, sir, I'll do what you ask me to do, I'll learn mathematics by just listening, by rote, you follow, and gradually your brain becomes shoddy.

S: Excuse me, sir, how can you demand?

K: Ask your teachers.

S: Would they listen to us?

K: Oh, yes, they are going to.

S: I doubt if some of them would.

K: Have you done it?

S: No.

K: There you are, you are contradicting, you are saying something you haven't done. If I say to him, he is my teacher, `Sir,

I heard this morning he was saying, don't let's repeat, teach me a way I can learn without repetition'.

S: They won't tell you.

K: Wait, listen. `I have heard this morning K saying, teach me so that I learn not by memorizing a different way of teaching, so teach me'. You are challenging him. And he has to respond. So he says, `By Jove, these children are much smarter than I am'.

S: Sir, what they would say is...

K: Just a minute.

S: What they will tell you is, we still have to go through this process of memorizing, and all the children have passed out well with that.

K: What have they done well? Got more money. Listen. More money and what happens to their brain? They are just mediocre people, they may have a marvellous job, plenty of cars, women and all the rest of it, but their brain is like mud. If you see that, actually see it, you say, by Jove, I am not going to be like that. When I was younger I was offered - I am just saying this out of humility - ten thousand dollars every week to go into the cinema. How many of you would say, `No, sorry, thanks so much, I don't want to'? You would jump at it, wouldn't you?

S: If you give me ten thousand dollars.

K: That's all I am saying, you are all so mad after money, which means freedom, which means pleasure, that's all you want, and you call that living.

S: Society wants us to do that.

K: Who created the society?

S: We did.

K: Therefore change it. Don't bother, you do the right thing.

S: I'd like to do the right thing but what about all the others?

K: Don't bother about the others, do the right thing.

S: I can't face it.

K: Then you are weak and you will deteriorate, that's all, if you can't face it.

S: If you don't study your parents might get worried.

K: I didn't say, don't study. Just a minute, I did not say, don't study. Don't get away with that. I said, teach me a different way of learning, not just memorizing. You follow?

S: My parents don't want me to learn but they just want me to get good marks.

K: Forget the parents, they have sent you here and find out. What's the matter with you? You have already grown old, all of you? Good god!

S: If you don't listen to their words they might...

K:...disown you. So you listen to them politely, carefully, and say, 'Daddy, this is the way to learn, I am learning something'.

S: But if you try it, what happens if there is conflict? They think in another way, you think in another way.

K: All right. You are younger, so you are more polite and say, sorry, you go your way.

S: No, even if you do it, sir, there will think you are arrogant.

K: No, we have been taught to learn the same subject differently, using our brain, using our capacities, using our senses.

S: How can you your senses and capacities in subjects that you have to memorize?

K: There is no subject...

S: History, the dates, how are you going to remember them?

K: I know, it's silly.

S: Yes, it is silly.

K: Find out. You see you stop there. Find out what is history.

Have you thought about it?

S: Well...

K: Just a minute, lady. What is history?

S: It is the story of man.

K: The story of man. Did you think this out, or somebody told you?

S: I got it from somebody else.

K: Somebody else. I am going to tell you but find out for yourself, don't repeat what somebody says.

S: The tree is the forest.

K: Now just listen, it comes from the Latin, historia, which means story of man. The story of man, that's history. Now, who is man? You, it is the story about you. Do you understand that? It is not about beastly King Edward VIIth or some beastly Indian king. It is the story of humanity, which is you. Listen, listen. You have learned something different, old girl. It is the story of humanity, humanity is you. What are you? So you learn. Learn about yourself. And then when you are learning about yourself you see that King Edward XIVth or whatever, or your own Indian kings, you see what they are like. You are learning.

S: What are you learning? You say a king conquers so many places, and a queen...

K: Yes, yes, murdering each other.

S: You see you are learning from them, and you are also doing

the same thing, sir.

K: Therefore there is no difference between you and him.

S: No.

K: Then in studying yourself you are studying humanity. You are studying humanity. Will you do that? And then that becomes a side issue.

S: But then why is it that we have to remember all those dates, what's the point of it?

K: That's the silly society that is demanding it. Change society, therefore change yourself.

S: If this school is meant to be a place when you change society why should we follow all that, why should we follow all the history?

K: Will you do it? You stop doing it. Don't always blame the others.

S: When you study yourself you study humanity, but...

K: Listen carefully; I said history, historia, means story, the story of mankind, mankind is yourself, in understanding yourself you understand the whole movement of mankind. Right? That's all I am saying. So you get to know yourself, which is tremendously important. Now you don't know yourself, all that you know is your reactions: I like, don't like, I am ambitious, I am this, but you really don't know. And under the present circumstances of society, they say you must learn history, the dates. You learn it. Silly.

S: OK.

K: Not `OK'. It is silly but it is like that. Or you say, sorry, I don't care.

S: But then society...

K: Wait a minute. I don't care, I don't care if I become a gardener, a cook. Right? Because you want to be somebody in the world, money, position, all that, therefore you have to study all that. As I told you, I don't want to become anything. I failed all examinations, they sent me all over the world for exams, all of them I failed. Thank god! Think differently. I have milked cows, looked after chickens, I have looked after vegetable gardens, I have done all kinds of things, helped to build a house. You don't do all that. And I don't care if I am rich or poor, but you all do, old girl, all of you care. That's why you are caught by society. You understand?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Don't do it then. Be different.

S: If you think what is right and society regrets it, you are scared.

K: You are frightened, so be frightened, it doesn't matter.

S: Yes, but they might harm you.

K: If it is what is right they might harm you, don't mind. It doesn't matter. We had better stop now. Shall we sit quietly for a few minutes.

RISHI VALLEY 3RD TALK WITH STUDENTS 16TH DECEMBER 1983

Krishnamurti: As this is the last talk what would you like me to talk about?

Student: About seriousness.

K: Yes. What would you like to know about it?

S: Looking at oneself, looking hard into oneself and not letting it be just an idea, really to come into contact.

K: Contact with what?

S: Contact with whatever you are looking at.

K: Looking at oneself, being in contact with oneself, observing oneself, aware of what you are doing.

S: Not even that.

K: All that. And you call that seriousness?

S: How can one do that?

K: Why do you make it complex? I want to look at myself, not in the mirror, but where do I look to see what I am? Are you interested in all this? I want to know myself; I am a very complex human being and I have inherited so many experiences, so many concepts, opinions, judgements, tradition, vast accumulation of memories both conscious as well as unconscious; I am all that - my beliefs, my faith, guilt, my anxieties, my loneliness, depression, ambition, remorse, guilt, pain, sorrow, affection - I am all that. Now, how do I look at myself? Where do I see myself as I am?

S: How do I feel that I am all that?

K: I am going to point out, sir. Let's talk about it, shall we. As I pointed out the other day, hearing and listening are two different

things. I can hear what you say verbally, understand what you are talking about verbally, intellectually, but actually I am not listening. Do you see the difference between listening and hearing? Hearing with the ear and listening not only with the ear but much more deeply. You were hearing last night some western classical music, you listened and you appreciated it. You listened to it very, very carefully - the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the vitality, the originality, the depth of it - and as you listened you began to see the beauty, movement, running, exploding it. Now how will you do the same in understanding yourself? Do you understand that question?

S: Yes sir.

K: I want to know what I am, let's begin very simply. I can't look at it in my mirror. My mirror tells me what I look like outside. But that mirror can't tell me what is inside, what my thoughts are, what my feelings are. Now is there another mirror in which I can see myself very clearly? You wanted to talk about relationship: don't you see yourself very clearly in your relationship, how you react, what your responses are, in what way you show your prejudices, the weight of your opinion, of like and dislike, of reward and punishment? You begin to observe slowly, bit by bit, in the mirror of relationship. Are you doing that as I am talking to you?

You and I are related because you have seen me several times here; we have walked together, maybe had something of a discussion together. And in that discussion, that walk, in listening to that music - you listened much more than I did - there was a certain relationship. In that relationship, which is a mirror, you can

observe yourself, your reactions, all that. Can you? Will you?

S: Yes, it is out there.

K: It is not out there. Just look at it. You are looking at, in that relationship, your reactions, your opinions, your prejudices, your fears and so on. Are all these reactions different from you?

S: Yes.

K: Examine carefully, if you don't mind my telling you respectfully, don't answer immediately.

S: When I say I am observing my relationship with somebody, it seems as if I am dividing myself into two different entities. I am observing something. It seems to be different. When I say, this is my mind, what does that mean?

K: Is your mind, is your prejudice, is your anger, different from you?

S: I don't understand.

K: I am angry, impatient. Is that impatience, anger, greed, different from me?

S: No.

K: When you say `no', what do you mean by it?

S: It is the same thing.

K: So, you are the anger, you are the prejudice, you are the greed. So there is not something outside of you or inside of you at which you are looking. You are that. Suppose you are this colour, you are that colour. You can describe that colour, but the description is different from the colour. Look, I can describe the Himalayas because I have been up there - the beauty, the grandeur, the enormity of it, the immensity of it, snowcapped, clear blue sky and the marvellous sense of aloofness and the great sense of

solidarity, the glory of a mountain. I can describe all that, but the description is not the mountain, is it?

S: No, it is not.

K: Why do you say that?

S: It is not the same thing.

K: So, I can describe my reactions, but the description is not my reaction. What is the difficulty? I said I can describe my reactions. The verbal description is different from the actuality. The word 'auditorium' is different from the actual fact. Do you see that?

S: Yes.

K: So the word is not the thing. Are you clear? Your name is not you. S: But sir, very often we tend to...

K: Wait, I haven't finished. That means you are not listening, you are so quick with your answer. So you have learned something: that the word is not the thing, the actual thing. See the implications of that: my wife - the word 'wife' is not the actual person. But the word becomes very important, not the person. So, you begin to discover that the brain is full of words, not actuality. Have you found that? Here is my sister, that is the end of it. The word 'sister' is not the person.

S: But she is called by that name. The name is associated with that person.

K: That is right. When you associate the name with that person, the word becomes all-important.

S: When I say 'sister', it is associated and connected with the thing.

K: All right. You know the word 'microphone'. There is a microphone. The word is not the actuality.

S: What can you call it without the word?

K: What would you call that thing without the word? I don't know. What would you call yourself without the word? What would you call yourself if you hadn't your name? Would you invent another name?

S: Yes.

K: You are not thinking, you are just responding. Find out. I say to you, the word 'microphone' is not the actual thing. That's all. I didn't go any further. So you begin to differentiate the word, the word is not actually the thing. So you begin to differentiate between the actual and the idea - the actual and the idea about the actual. The idea about the actual is not real.

So in relationship you begin to discover what you are, whether that relationship be a very intimate one like husband and wife, or friends and so on. Let's look at it the other way. Are you related to nature?

S: Yes sir, you are yourself nature.

K: You are saying you yourself are nature. How do you know?

S: You are on the earth only, on the earth itself.

K: All right, you are part of nature, you are saying. What is your relationship with nature - all those flowers, all the hills, the trees, the monkeys, the dry river?

S: The relationship is life.

K: I am asking you, what is your relationship with nature? Don't just say, life. Look, what is your relationship to a tree? You see that tree, don't you? What do you feel about it?

S: Affection.

K: Affection? Do you love that tree?

S: I admire the tree.

K: Do you? And then what? You are missing something. You are not paying attention to what I am asking.

S: Sir, it is because of the tree that you come into existence.

K: You are just saying any old thing.

S: My relationship with the tree is: I am looking at it, I feel it, and I am related to it for sometime, whatever. And it is separate from me.

K: I hope so. Though you are separate from that tree, what is your reaction to it? You understand my question? Don't go to sleep.

S: When I see a tree, I just look at that. I don't feel happy or anything like that. I just know it is a tree, that's all.

K: The word 'tree' is not the actual. Now, do you look at it? Take time to look at it? Do you listen to it? Do you listen to the sound of it?

S: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you something, you reply so quickly. You don't listen to somebody, do you, you have already made up your mind what so say. I am not scolding you, sir, I am just telling you. I am just telling you, you don't listen. I am saying, do you ever stand still and look at a tree, the whole of it? And do you hear the sound of it? See the beauty of it? The extraordinary capacity of it?

S: Not always; whenever possible.

K: You have not even done it. You have never looked at a tree and seen the beauty of it, the quietness, the dignity, the sound, the extraordinary thing that a tree is. Now, do you look at your sister or your wife or your husband that way? Look at them? Or do you say, this is my sister and get on with it? I am asking you sir, because it

is very important to understand this. We live by relationship. We cannot exist without relationship. Even the hermit, even the sannyasi or the monk is related. He may disappear into a monastery, into a forest, but he is still related to the world. Right? The world of memory, of all his experiences, he still carries with him. So, relationship is life. Relationship is extraordinarily important in life. Where there is conflict in relationship there is no relationship. So you find or discover or see yourself in the mirror of relationship. Is this clear? S: Clear.

K: And the mirror is not different from you. You are that mirror. Penetrate it, go into it, much deeper and deeper every day. Or, you may take twenty years to understand yourself bit by bit by bit. Or you can take it in, in one second the whole thing. Do you understand what I am saying? I can know myself by studying myself, what other people have said about me - philosophers, analysts, Freud and Jung and all the rest of them, I can also read some so-called sacred books, and say, I am that. But books and the words are not me. So, I have to find myself. This has been so from the ancient Greeks and the ancient Hindus: they have said 'know thyself'. Right? And very few people really know themselves. They have not even tried. Now, I say to you, relationship is the most sacred thing in life, one of the most sacred, and in that relationship you can discover everything that you are. It either takes time, or you understand it instantly. This is more difficult because this requires going into the whole question of time, thought, perception, and to see the past does not interfere with your perception of the now. That requires extraordinary attention.

S: We base our relationship on experiences and memory.

K: Your experiences are based on memory. Now, wait. Go into it a little more. Would you have the capacity to think without experience? Do you understand my question? Think it out carefully. Don't answer something you don't know. Don't become like a parrot. I am asking, sir, all of you, 'A' level, 'O' level, all kinds of stuff - without experience is there thinking?

S: No, sir.

K: No? Go step by step. Why do you say 'no'?

S: Because of experience only can we think. Without experience we cannot think.

K: You are saying, without experience there is no thinking. Is that what you are saying?

S: Yes.

N: He said, because of experience we think.

K: Yes. Now, is experience limited? Carefully answer this. Carefully go into it, boys and girls. Is experience limited?

S: No, sir.

K: Look at it carefully. Don't answer. Think it out.

S: Every day one has a new experience.

K: All right. What do you mean by experience?

S: Something interesting happens to us.

K: It can be unpleasant too.

S: It depends on you whether your experience is limited or unlimited.

K: You are not answering my question, old boy.

S: Sir, whether you want it or not, you gain experience.

K: Is that all that you have learnt in this school, just to repeat? I'll go slowly with you. Learn. Don't memorize, but learn, discover

as you go along. I have an experience in a car; I wasn't paying attention and I bumped into another car. Right? And it has destroyed the radiator. So, that incident has been registered in the brain as memory. Right? And I have an experience of going up to the top of the hill and seeing what is on the other side. And there are other hills which are higher. So climbing this little hill is a limited experience. Do you understand? Going to a higher mountain, it is a little more - but that is still limited. All experience is always limited. Carefully, think it out. The scientists, during the last two hundred years, have accumulated tremendous experience, knowledge, bit by bit, theory, and that theory being proved or disproved; and then a new theory, a new hypothesis, proof and disproof, so gradually they build up an enormous amount of knowledge, but that is still limited because there is more to be discovered.

So all knowledge, whether in the past or in the future, is always limited.

S: If experience is limited that implies some sort of division.

K: No, no. Don't bother about division and all that. Just look at the fact that all experience is limited.

S: OK.

K: No, OK. It is so. Is that a fact for you, or are you repeating after me?

S: No, it is a fact.

K: Which means all experience, and therefore from experience you have knowledge, therefore knowledge is always limited. Right? Now proceed a step further. All knowledge is stored in the brain as memory. Right? Agreed? So memory, remembrance of

things past and so on, from that memory thought arises. Right? Clear? So thought is always limited. Once you admit experience is limited, knowledge is limited, then memory is limited and thought invariably is limited. See the importance of this. Are you all paying attention to this, the older boys? Are you bored by all this? The upper classes? I am afraid you are. They don't pay attention. All right, some of you pay attention.

So thought born of memory, memory born of knowledge, knowledge born of experience, right through is limited. Right? The thing that limited thought has done is to divide the people - Indian, Muslim, thought has done this. Agreed? Thought has divided the religions, built big cathedrals, temples and mosques, and so on and all the things that are in it are invented by thought. Do you understand? Really see the truth of this because it will help you tremendously. So all our actions, our feelings, everything that we do, is limited because it is controlled by thought.

S: Our whole life revolves around thought.

K: That's right. So, your whole life is limited. And where there is limitation there must be conflict. Right? Look, when you are thinking about yourself all day long, that is a very limited affair. He thinks about himself and I think about myself and therefore what happens? We are perpetually in conflict; because whatever is limited must induce conflict. I think about myself and you think about yourself, and myself is a very small affair, and your thinking about yourself is a very small affair. And our relationship is a very small affair and therefore what is small, what is limited must induce, must bring about conflict. It is a small affair to belong to a country. 'My nation, I am an Indian', it is very limited. And the

Muslim says, I am Pakistani and all that. So, there is division, there is conflict. Where there is limitation there is division, and therefore there is conflict. This is the law.

S: You say where there is conflict, there is no relationship.

K: That is further. Do you get this?

S: But nothing is coming out of it.

K: Why should anything come out of that? You don't see something, your brains are so atrophied.

Sir, look, there is America and Russia, so-called super powers. This division exists where there is nationality. This division exists by their concepts of what government is, division brought about by ideals: I believe in Marxism and they believe in democracy; my country, my ideals, and they fight, fight. Right? So, ideals are limited, naturally. So there is conflict. Get it? Get is somewhat.

Now we began by saying you can see yourself, what you are, in the mirror of relationship. Now you can go infinitely far in yourself; you can't go very far outwardly. You can go up to the Himalayas - it may take you several days or several months by walking or a couple of hours in an aeroplane, but that is also limited. You can go round the earth - twenty-four thousand miles - twice or three times. That is limited. But when you know through your relationship what you are and penetrate that, then you can go immeasurable distance inwardly. I won't go into that because that is real meditation, and all kinds of things are involved.

The other day when we met, I asked you, 'What is your future'? Not only your future, the future of your educators, the future of mankind. I asked you this: what is going to be your future? Don't go off, as we did the other day, on 'what is time' and all that. Don't

get lost in that. You are young - seven, ten, fifteen, eighteen, twenty, and you are off to university, college, get degrees, get married, if you can you get a job, or some other thing and there you are stuck for life. That is your future. Isn't that future very limited?

S: Yes, sir. It has been brought by thought.

K: It is brought about by thought, and there may be other factors; but it is limited. So your life, being limited, is going to create tremendous trouble for others and for yourself. Do you realize that?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So, what are you going to do? Do you understand? Wars are created through mediocre limitation. We went into all that, what is mediocrity. Mediocrity is, the root meaning, I explained, half way up the hill. You can be very good in a career but yet be thoroughly mediocre - as most people are. And your future life as your parents plan it, as your society plans it, you are going to lead a very limited life, and that very limitation is going to bring about conflict. When I am thinking about myself, you are thinking about yourself, all of us are bound to be in conflict. Right, sir? So, what are you going to do?

S: Why do we live that way?

K: Because you are afraid to let go that way.

S: If we let go, we will get confused.

K: Let go and see what would happens to you. Sir, work it out. Don't be so Utopian and indifferent. See what happens. I don't pass examinations, I am not interested in all this. Then what shall I do? I have to earn a livelihood.

S: I would look at the possibilities.

K: You would look at the possibilities? The possibilities are, you might become a cook, a gardener, a teacher or one of those awful politicians and business people, or a professor - it is all so terribly limited. Follow it, sir.

Now, when you say, thought is limited, what makes you say that? Yes, you see it, and then do you also see that where there is limitation, there is no space. It is limited, and therefore there must be various forms of contradiction, struggle, and all the rest of it. Now, when you say `yes, I see,' is that intelligence operating or are you merely agreeing with the idea? You understand what I am saying? These chaps are getting impatient, I'm sorry.

S: I want to do something, and I do something else.

K: Yes; that's as I said, limitation.

S: How do we break it?

K: You don't break it. You see how idiotic it is and move away from it. If I see that nationality is one of the causes of war, killing people by the million, an appalling idea, brutal, vicious, I no longer belong to any country. Sir, you are missing something really important.

S: Sir, then how do you live? After you realize it, how do you live?

K: How do I live what?

S: If everyone over here sees that it is mediocre to become a cook or a gardener, then I mean they won't become a cook or a gardener, then where do we get food from?

K: If you realize that you are mediocre and you break through that, you are intelligent, then you cease to be mediocre, you are an intelligent human being. Then that intelligence will tell you what to

do. You don't have to bother about it. You see this is the unfortunate part of it. I leave off in the middle of something interesting and you have still not grasped the real thing at all.

Now, look at it the other way. What do you consider religion? What is religion to you? Do you understand? You must answer this question.

S: In which way you want to live.

K: Is that religion - the way you want to live? I am asking you, sir, you see people going to temples in India, and you see the mosques, you see the churches, and inside the churches, inside the mosques, inside the Hindu temples, they worship and all that goes on. Do you call that religion? Go on sir, answer me.

S: An easy way to separate yourself from others.

K: No, when you go to a temple, there are lots of people there too. Do you mean to say you have lived in this country and you haven't enquired into all that. What do you say, sir, what to you is religion?

S: Religion is full of hatred, sir, because we can't understand each other.

K: As we can't understand each other, because we are full of hatred, religion has very little meaning. Is that it?

N. He says religion is full of hatred because we don't understand each other.

K: It is the same thing. You see, sir, how can you go out in the world and not understand all this?

S: What I understand by religion is all this - temples and mosques.

K: Do you consider that religion?

S: It is what I have been told.

K: Why do you accept it? Why don't you investigate it? You are old enough. Why don't you find out what religion is? Is it superstition, belief, tradition, going to the temples, doing puja?

S: It is not religion.

K: Then what is religion? If you say it is not religion and you really mean it, then you must find out what is religion, because man from the most ancient of times, has said, what is all this, there must be something much greater than all this. From the most ancient Sumerians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Israelites, all those people at Hara, Mohenjadaró, they all wanted to find out what god was, if not god, something else. And it has all come down to some kind of superstitious rubbish. Right? But there be something. What is religion, what is all this about?

S: You would be following your own set of ideas.

K: Religion is to follow your own set of ideas? What are your ideas? You know what ideas mean?

S: Religion is love, the true religion.

K: Religion is love? Do you love the trees? The blade of grass? You love the birds, the monkeys that come?

Sir, put your mind to this. Otherwise life has no meaning - going to the office every day, being a cook all day long, or being a big politician, or having a marvellous career. What is the point of all this?

S: One is forced to do something to keep body and soul together.

K: There is no answer to that! Then do something to keep the thing going. Then you become a cog in the machinery. You see,

you are all on the defence, you don't investigate, you don't work it out, go into it. It is the function of the educator to help you in this. If I stayed here - I am not going to, so don't worry - if I stayed here as your educator, I would go with you into all this: what is meditation, is there something beyond all this, something sacred, and if the brain can be quiet, really quiet, and so on. But you see you are all trained, oriented to have a job, that's all we are concerned with. Get married, have a good career and to hell with everything else. Right? Be honest. So you are only concerned about yourself. And yourself is a very small affair. It's like a toad in a little pond, making a lot of noise. The whole world is going through tremendous catastrophe, nuclear wars - if there is a nuclear war, the warfare of germs, ordinary wars, conventional wars, the computer is going to take over your brain. If you go into an American supermarket the girl there doesn't even count, it is done by electronic and laser beams. Our brains are gradually becoming atrophied, as yours are. Unless you actually work, not repeat, repeat, repeat.

Sir, we have talked enough. Let us sit quietly for a while and see. When you sit quietly, watch your thoughts, follow them, whether you can pursue one thought or one thought is interrupted by another thought and so on, just watch it.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1983

It is a lovely morning and I hope you are not too hot! We are going to talk over together many things, serious things and so these gatherings here are not an entertainment, either intellectual, or emotional or romantic. They are serious, and if I may point out throughout the talks that we are exploring, investigating, and enquiring together. The speaker is not merely putting forth some ideas but rather we are going to observe together the facts. The word fact means that which has been done previously and remembered, what has been remembered is not the fact, but what has been done in the past is a fact. And what is happening now is a fact. The word fact is that. The past incident without remembrance and that which is happening now. The future is non-fact, it is a hope, it is an idea, it is a concept but what actually is a fact is that which is happening and that which has happened.

And we are going to deal together only with the facts and not with concepts, with ideas, with speculations, however philosophical, however interesting, but we are going together to consider the fact of what we are, the fact of what is happening around us in the world, and the fact that most of us are concerned with ourselves. And in a world that has no peace whatsoever, there is such chaos, disorder, great danger, terrorism, threats of war - these are all facts. And in this world, living everyday of our lives, with all the turmoil, with all the labour that man has to do, with all the problems we have to face, is it at all possible to live in peace? Because in the world there is no peace. The politicians talk about it, the hierarchy of the Catholic church talk about it, so do the

Hindus and the Buddhists and all the Muslims and so on, but actually there is no peace. And peace is necessary in order to grow, to flower, to understand, to have time to look around, to explore into ourselves and what we can find there. We must have peace - not freedom from something. Freedom between two wars, between two rows, between two problems, or a sense of physical relaxation - that is not peace. Peace is something much more fundamental, much more deep than the superficial freedom that one has, or one thinks one has.

So we are going together, this morning, for part of the morning, to talk over together as two friends whether it is possible to live in peace, both inwardly, psychologically and outwardly. We may want peace and we may see the necessity of having peace but we do not live a peaceful life. And the world is preparing for war, ideologies fighting each other. They do not consider human beings but only the extension of power and so on. So we cannot possibly look for peace from the politicians and governments. That is a fact. They have talked about *pacem in terris*, peace on earth and there has never been peace on earth. On the contrary religions have helped to bring about wars. You know all about it so I won't go into it. They have tortured, condemned, excommunicated, burnt and then the next moment they talk about peace. Probably the Buddhists and the Hindus are the only ancient Buddhists and Hindus, in their religion they have accepted the dictum "Don't kill" - but they do kill. That is just an idea again. And the Islamic world is full of what they are - you know all about it. Those religions that are formed, established on books become bigotry, fundamentalists, and they become terrorists also of the world. And institutions and

foundations, groups, have promised peace. But they too do not give peace.

So where does one find peace? Because one must see very clearly that without peace we are like animals, we are destroying each other. We are destroying the earth, the ocean, the air. And politically and religiously we look to leaders to unify and bring about peace in the world. But they have not succeeded either. Governments, politicians, religious people, those groups that are searching for peace, none of them have given human beings, you and me, the speaker, this peace. So where do we find it? Without that fundamental necessity we cannot possibly understand greater things of life.

So together we are going to go into this, not verbally, not intellectually, but find out for ourselves as human beings, without any guide, without any leadership because they have all failed. Without any priests, without any psychologists, can we have peace in the world, in the world and in us? First, can we have peace in ourselves?

The word 'peace' is a rather complicated word. One can give different meanings to it depending upon our moods, depending on our intellectual concepts, romantically, emotionally, we can give different meanings to it. But can we together not give different meanings but comprehend the word and the significance and the depth of that word? It is not merely the freedom from something: peace of mind, physical peace but the ending of all conflict, that is real peace, not only in ourselves but with our neighbours and with the world. Peace with the environment, the ecology and all that, to have deep rooted peace, unshakable and not superficial, not a

passing thing but timeless depth of peace.

One has sought peace through meditation. All over the world that has been one of the purposes of meditation. But meditation is not the search for peace. Meditation is something far different which we will go into presently.

So what is peace and how can we establish and lay the foundation so that we build on that - psychologically speaking? You understand sirs, we are talking over together. I am not pointing out. The speaker is not the authority but in talking over together things become very clear. If we can talk over together without any bias, without any prejudice, having no conclusions or concepts what peace is, then we can go into it together. But if you have opinions about peace, what peace should be, then your enquiry stops.

Opinions have no value, though the whole world is run on opinions. Opinions are limited. Your opinion, or the speaker's opinion, opinions of the totalitarian governments, or the opinions of the church people, and governments and so on, they are all limited. Your judgement and the opinion which gives values are all limited. I hope we understand the word, what it means to be limited. When you think about yourself from morning until night, as most people do, it is very, very limited. When you say you are Swiss, it is very limited; or when you are proud to be a British as though you are god's chosen people, that too is limited.

So opinions are limited. When one sees that clearly then one does not cling to opinions, or the values that opinions have created. Because then your opinion against another opinion doesn't bring about peace. That is what is happening in the world. One ideology

against another ideology. Communist, socialist, the democrat and so on. So please understand, if I may repeat again, that we are talking over together and if you are adhering to your opinion and I am sticking to mine, then we shall never meet. So there must be freedom from opinion and its values. Is that clear?

Can we go on from there? That you are actually not holding back your opinions and using them as axes to beat each other, to kill each other, but opinions are limited and therefore they must inevitably bring about conflict. If you hold on to your conclusions and your conclusions are also limited, and another holds his conclusions, his experiences, which are always limited, then there must be not only conflict, but wars, destruction and all the rest of it. If you see that very clearly then opinions become very, very superficial, they have no meaning. So please when you are enquiring into what is peace and whether you can live in peace, don't have opinions about it. Be free to enquire, and in that enquiry act. The very enquiry is action. Not that you enquire first and then act. But in the process of enquiry you are acting. I hope again this is clear, that there must be freedom. It is the very basis of peace. There must be freedom from all the values of opinions so that we can together actually, not theoretically, but factually see that you and the speaker have no peace, which is a tremendous demand because we live on opinions. All the newspapers, magazines, books are based on opinions: somebody says that, you agree and that is your opinion too. Another reads another book and forms an opinion. So please to find out the true meaning of peace, the depth of it and the beauty of it, and the quality of it, there must be no bias. Obviously that is the first demand - not that you must have

faith in peace, or make the goal of your life to live peacefully, or search out from books, from others, what is peace, but to enquire very deeply whether your whole being can live in peace.

Action is not separate from perception. When you see something to be true that very perception is action. Not that you perceive or understand and then act. That is an intellectual concept and you put that concept into action. The seeing is the action. The seeing that the world is broken up into tribalism - the British, the German, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Swiss, they are tribes. To see that fact, that they are tribes, glorified as nations, and this tribalism is creating havoc in the world, bringing wars in the world, each tribe thinks its own culture opposed to other cultures. But tribalism is the root, not the culture. So in observing that, the fact of that, is the action which frees the brain from the condition of tribalism. Is that clear? Are we making this clear between ourselves? That when you see actually, not theoretically or ideationally but as a fact that tribalism, which has had certain benefits in it, but the very fact that it exists as glorified nations is one of the causes of war. That is a fact. There are other causes of war, economics and so on - we won't... one of the causes is tribalism. When you see that, perceive that, and that cannot bring about peace, the very perception frees the brain from its conditioning of tribalism. We are together in this? We are talking over together. The speaker is not persuading you. He is not trying to convince you of anything. He is not doing propaganda of any kind. But we are facing things as they are, head on. And one of the factors of contention throughout the world is religion. You are a Catholic, I am an Arab, a Muslim and so on. Based on ideas, propaganda of two thousand years, and the Hindus

and the Buddhists over three to five thousand years, we have been programmed like a computer. Please see the fact that programming has brought about great architecture, great pictures, great chants, music, but it has not brought about peace to mankind. When you see the fact of that you do not belong to any religion - you are neither a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, nothing. Nor when you see that the division takes place when there are half a dozen gurus in the same place - you know what they are doing don't you, they bring about misery, contradiction conflict. Your guru is better than mine. My group is more sanctified than yours. I have been initiated, you have not. You know all that nonsense that goes on. So when you see all this as an actual fact, which is so, round you, then you do not belong to any group, to any guru, to any religion, to any political commitment of ideas. This is very serious if you really want to, and the urgency to live peacefully there must be freedom from all this because they are the causes of dissension, division. truth is not yours or mine. It doesn't belong to any church, to any group, to any religion. The brain must be free to discover it. And peace can only exist when there is freedom from this fallacy. Are we together so far? - even intellectually? You know for most of us to be so drastic about things is very difficult because we have taken security in things of illusion, in things that are not facts. And it is very difficult to let them go. It is not a matter of exercising will, or taking a decision - I will not belong to anything. That is another fallacy. We commit ourselves to something - to a group, to an idea, to a religious quackism, because we think there is some kind of security for us. And in all these things there is no security and therefore there is no peace. The brain must be secure. And the

brain with its thought has sought security in things that are illusory - right?

So freedom from that. Can you do it? Are you serious enough to want, or crave, to demand that one must live in peace? Or only this morning, persuaded perhaps by the speaker, you say, "Yes, I understand all that but..." - but, but, but!

So when we are talking over together as two friends, and that is what is taking place as two friends, though you are many we are friends, you and the speaker. And as two friends who are not persuading, or dissuading, not asking each other to commit to something or other, they are not then friends. As two friends asking each other: is it possible that one lives peacefully for the entire existence of one's life? Not at odd moments, not when you have nothing to do and you are captured by the tube, by the box, by the television - those are all superficial relaxations. But to live without a single conflict, without a single problem. Not that there are not problems, there are. But those problems are not being solved because we are the maker of those problems. I wonder if you understand all this?

First of all the brain, which - the speaker is not a specialist, he has discussed the matter with many scientists, don't accept what the scientists say either. It is far more important to discover for oneself how one's own brain is acting rather than be told by experts, professionals, scientists, what the brain is. The only instrument we have is the brain with its thought. And that brain, with its thought has not brought about peace in the world - in the world or in oneself. That again is a fact. And that instrument, which is thought, has reached its tether, its end - we will go into that presently.

And so where does one explore? And also to explore there - we must be very clear who is the explorer and that which is being explored. Is this clear? If I am exploring into what is peace, then I am separate from the thing that is being explored, and so there is division. Where there is division in the enquiry itself there must be conflict. Are we making it clear? Please this is not an intellectual game but really to find out the depth of peace, and all the great significance of it, the ramifications of it, the expansion of it, it can only be found if we understand from the very beginning that the explorer is the explored. The explorer is not different from that which he is exploring. This is difficult for most of us to accept either intellectually or actually because our conditioning is so strong. From childhood this division exists: the observer and the observed, the examiner and the examined, the investigator, who is - thinks he is separate from that which he is exploring. This is our conditioning. This is so. This is a fact. And so we live in perpetual conflict because where there is division - between Catholic, Protestant, between the Muslim, between the Buddhist, Arab, Jew, and all the rest - wherever there is division inwardly or outwardly there must be conflict. And if you like to live in conflict, that is your affair. Have a good time, enjoy it, the fun of it and the pain of it. But if you want to discover how to live peacefully you must understand this basic fact that the explorer is exploring in himself, not something outside of himself. He is exploring his own structure, his own activities, his own movements of thought, his own memories. He is all that. I wonder - one wonders if you have ever observed that you are a movement of memory. You understand? Memory is the faculty to remember. The faculty of time. That is

the duration of an incident which might have happened fifty years ago, or yesterday, that incident is over but the faculty of remembering that incident is memory. And we live on memory - a movement, changing, reacting, constantly shaping itself. We are that. I wonder if you realize it? And we think progress is the expansion, the continuation, the heightening of the memories, like the computer.

I do not know if you have gone into the question of the computers - some of you may have. It is rather interesting. There have been - the computer is a machine that will memorize. Which is, it is being programmed by experts. I don't know how many millions can be held, memories, on a single side of a nail. They are doing extraordinary things. I have talked to some of them. Do you understand this? And the activities of man, they have built cars, they will invent. Each passing generation is better than the last. They may not write poems, probably they will. They may not write the music of Beethoven, probably they will do jazz very well. So with this machine called the computer what is going to happen to your brain? Please consider this seriously for god's sake. This is not a threat - we have talked about this to some of the great inventors of computers and their advancement, they do not consider what is going to happen to the human brain. They are only concerned with the advancement, the quickness, the rapidity of the computer. We will talk about it some other time and will go into it.

But we said as long as there is memory, which is the faculty of remembering things that have happened before, which are necessary in the technological and the physical world, and when we discover that we are a movement in time, which is the

movement of memory, does peace lie in memories? You understand my question? One can remember the days, or the nights, or the mornings, when one saw the extraordinary depth and the beauty of peace. That perception, that awareness for a minute has gone, but one remembers that, the remembrance is non-fact and so we are living in memories which are dead, gone, finished - right? Please it is not a depressing or absurd thing for you to turn your back against all this, but see what memory does to us.

Memory is my being programmed as a Hindu with all that silly nonsense going on, thinking that my own culture is better than any other culture because it is about three thousand years old, or more, I take great pride. And yours is fairly recent. You are conditioned as the speaker is conditioned - if he is conditioned. Which is, the conditioning is memory - right? Non-fact and so I stick to my memories, which are dead things, and you stick to your memory - as Christian, as Hindu, you know, as an Arab, or a Swiss, or god knows what else.

And also we must have memories - one can't go from here to your house if you have no memory. If you drive a car you must have memory. If you are in the technological world you must be supremely competent in your memories, otherwise you lose your job. But we are talking about the psychological memories of experience, pleasant or unpleasant, painful or delightful. The psychological. So memories are the conditioning factor - right? Please see the fact of it. Not my explanation of the fact. One of our difficulties is that we rather like explanations rather than the fact. Why certain governments are behaving that way - and the journalists and so on explaining it. And we accept the explanations,

the logic, the reason, and so on. The description is not the fact. The painting of a mountain, however beautiful the painting be, is not the mountain. All the pictures in the museums, some of them extraordinarily beautiful, but those pictures are not what they want to represent, something which they have seen. You read a novel and it is good literature - if it is - and all the imaginings, romantic business, sex and so on, written by an excellent, well known author; again that is not your life. Your life is here. So to find out how to live in peace - not the method, not the system. That is a wrong question when you say how.

So we are going to go into it more. What is the cause of conflict? Which all of us have. What is the root of it? What is the root of all problems, whether it is a religious problem, problems of meditation, problems of relationship, political problems, religious - problems. The word problem means - the root meaning of that word is something thrown at you. Probably something hurled at you. Problem is a challenge - right? If you respond to that thing called problem from your memories then your memories will not answer the problem because your memories are not alive, they are dead. You understand the significance of this? That we live with dead things. There is a picture of my son - brother, aunt, uncle or whatever it is - on the mantelpiece. He is dead and gone, he can never come back, physically he is gone, incinerated or buried, or whatever they do. But I have that picture, the constant remembrance of something that has gone. And I keep up that romantic illusory memorial relationship. Please see the importance of all this. So our brain is never clear. It is always functioning within the field of memory. And to live with a sense of great

abundance, flowing peace, there must be freedom from the past, which is memory - right? Memory not how to get to your home, or to speak a language. If I had no memory of English now I couldn't talk to you, you couldn't understand what the poor chap is telling you. (I wonder if you understand what the poor chap is telling you either) And why the brain holds on to dead things as memory.

What is the function of the brain? The scientists are saying several things about it. One side is this kind of activity, the other side is still not awakened, or awakened but influencing the other, and so on. But if you enquire into yourself sanely, not neurotically, not self-centred, if you are self-centred and enquiring into that you will still condition the brain to be self-centred. So what is the function of the brain? One can see one of its major functions is to live in the physical, is to arrange the physical world - right? But that very brain has brought about chaos in the world - right? That is, the activity of the brain which is the root and the beginning of thought, that is the instrument which we operate, thought. That is the major function of the brain. And that function has created such extraordinary havoc in the world, disorder. And also that very brain has brought about health, communication, and all the rest of it, medicine, great surgery. To communicate from India to the other end of the world, to California, if the operators are not too lazy, it takes a few minutes and you are connected. Of course it is not as rapid as thought. So technology is gallopingly advancing at a tremendous speed. And that very technology is creating havoc in the world too, like the computer, like the atom bomb. You understand? Two great powers - I don't know why they are called great powers, they are two idiotic powers - are talking about; you

know - trying to kill each other with the latest bombs - right? That is what thought has done, being one of the faculties of the brain. And also thought has created the marvellous, magnificent cathedrals. And also all those things that are inside them - they are not god given or something mysteriously brought about. All the dressings and the trappings of the priests is the result of thought, copying the Ancient Egyptians and so on. You understand? See what thought is doing in the world. And we, our brains, which have evolved through time, endless generation after generation, that brain is doing all this. Creating and destroying - right? And we accept this way of living. We have never challenged ourselves to find out. We have never asked of ourselves why we live in this chaotic world outside and inwardly, inward chaos. We never realize that to have order in the world outside there must be order in us. Our house is the most important thing to clean up first, not the world around us. Certain things are necessary like an organization not to kill whales, to protect nature, not to destroy the earth, seeking more and more oil - you know what is happening and all that. The rotten governments for which we are all responsible.

So what is the deep fundamental function of the brain? Ask yourself this question. I have got five minute more. If you asked yourself that question, not dependant on what others say, on their answer, on their ideas and suppositions and theories, but when you begin to enquire very, very deeply the fundamental activity which is essential, what is it doing, what does it want? You understand? Is it just survival? Here in this country you do survive very well. Is it just survival? Just to live in this perpetual conflict, division,

quarrels? Is it to act and function within its own conditioning ? Is it to live perpetually in some form of illusion and therefore always slightly neurotic, unbalanced, as most people are? If it is none of these things, obviously it is not, then what is its function? Please we are asking this question of ourselves. The speaker is not putting the question to you and for you to wait his answer. We will go into it. We will go into it very, very, deeply but you cannot wait for him to tell you - then it is like - it is like nothing. It is as good as any other idea. But if you really want to find out what is the deep function of the brain and is the brain different from the mind. Or are they both the same? Or when the brain is unconditioned, thoroughly, completely, then the mind can act upon the brain. Which will we go into, all this. But one has to be very, very clear where its physical necessary activities must exist, the technological physical earning a livelihood and so on, there it must - that is one of its great activities. But if the other activity is contrary to that, then there must be perpetual imbalance.

So the first thing is to find out if the brain can be unconditioned. We were talking the other day to some scientists, doctors and all the rest of it - how many specialists there are in the world, one is thankful one is not, one is just an ordinary person and all the rest of it. We were discussing about this fact in New York two months ago: whether the brain cells which are conditioned, whether those brain cells can bring about a mutation in themselves, not genetically, you know all the rest of it, but in living, daily living, can there be a mutation in the brain cells? If not we are condemned for ever to live in our conditioning and therefore in perpetual conflict, and therefore no peace at all - right? So please we must

stop now and we will go on the day after tomorrow and enquire
what is the deep function of the brain.

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 12TH JULY 1983

May we go on with where we left off on Sunday?

We were talking about peace: why human beings who have lived on this earth for so many thousands and thousands of years have had no peace at all. There have been innumerable wars and probably there will be more wars. And why with all the technological knowledge we have acquired, and all the protestations of religions about peace, *pacem in terris*, why we have not peace at all, either outwardly in the world, or inwardly. The world which we have created, the society in which we live is put together by man, by all of us, by the past generations and probably from the future generations. We live in a world very dangerous, uncertain, insecure and there seems to be no peace on earth - why?

We went into that, talking over together - we mean together - not that the speaker says something with which you either agree or disagree but rather together, you and the speaker, together explore why human beings who apparently are so clever, so intelligent - which I doubt - why they have not created a world where we can all live peacefully. I wonder if you have ever asked that question of yourselves and of the world, the politicians, the religions and so on.

And talking it over together we came to a certain point the day before yesterday: what is the fundamental function of the brain? I think that is where we left off. Why the brain, which has evolved for millenia upon millenia, it has had tremendous experience of every kind, sorrow, pleasure and the uncertainty, death - why such a brain has not solved this problem? And who is going to solve the

problem? The leaders? New leaders? New political statesmen? The new priests? The new ideology? We have tried all that. Man has tried every way to bring about peace in the world and also peace in himself. And the brain, which is a very, very complex affair, capable of extraordinary technological progress and yet that very brain has become very primitive and has not solved any of its problems.

What is the function of the brain? Just to go on living like this? Acquiring great knowledge in every field and using that knowledge to destroy each other, to destroy the earth, nature and all the rest of it? We all know this very well. And one asks, if one is at all serious, and we are here a gathering of people who are serious I hope, not casual visitors but who are taking life seriously, they must inevitably ask: what is the function of the brain? Most of us are only concerned with ourselves, if we are at all frank and honest. We are concerned with ourselves. Self-interest, from the highest category of people, intellectual and so on, down to the most primitive people, the educated and the uneducated, the sophisticated and the religious people, they may identify themselves with something noble but that very identification is part of self-interest. And the brain, our brain, is concerned only with that - personal problems, problems of mathematics, problems of computers and so on. But basically we are concerned with ourselves. That is a fact - right? However much we may try to hide the self-interest in noble work, in meditation, in belonging to various groups, self-interest dominates, consciously or unconsciously. If you are honest, look into ourselves and our activities, political, religious and so on, we are only concerned

basically with ourselves. And we have lived that way from the beginning of time. And we are still living that way. And so the brain only functions in a very, very small limited field.

Is that all the function of the brain - to be concerned with itself, with its problems, with its pleasures and sorrows and pain, ambition, greed and so on? That is the way we have lived. And the result of that in the world is chaos. Each one wanting to fulfil, wanting to achieve, whether illumination, enlightenment, or become a big business man, it is the same thing. So we have reduced our brain, which is an extraordinary instrument, into something so petty. And we have reduced that brain to be very, very limited - right? It may be extraordinarily capable in the technological world, the marvellous instruments that they are creating, instruments of war, instruments of surgery, medicine, communication, computer; there the brain has functioned with an extraordinary vitality, with extraordinary capacity. And that very brain is only concerned with its own self-protective activity. This is all obvious fact. We are only dealing with facts, not with ideals, not with ideas, not with theories, facts. As we explained the other day, facts are something that has been done in the past and remembered, something that is being done now. Those are the facts. From those facts we abstract ideas, conclusions, strong opinions, which have nothing to do with facts.

So the brain lives on memories and not on facts. This is very important to understand if we are going to explore together what is the function of the brain? What is the deep quality of a brain that can penetrate and find out its deep function? We are dealing with facts only, which is that we are a series of movements of memory -

which we talked about the other day. Memory. That is the faculty to remember. To remember things that have happened, and the things that are happening now. So memory has become extraordinarily important, which has nothing to do with facts. My son is dead, he is gone, and I remember, there is only remembrance. And on those remembrances I live. On those memories, on those incidents which we had together, I cherish those memories - right? Please, you are doing this, I am not telling you something which you are not doing.

So we are a series of movements of memory and time. Memory is time. Right? Memory is the reaction of experience, knowledge, and the things that one has remembered. This is what the self is, what we are.

I do not know if you have ever enquired into what is the present, what is now? Is it the cessation of memory? Or we don't know what the now is at all? May I go into it a little bit?

Zero contains all the numbers - mathematically. Zero was invented by the ancient Hindus and in the zero all the numbers are contained. Is the now - please listen - is the now the totality of all time? We will go into this further. You see the brain having cultivated self-interest, which is the accumulation of memories and so the brain has become a very, very small psychological instrument, obviously. When I am thinking about myself all day long it is a very small affair. Or when I think about the whole world it is still a small affair. I don't know if you are understanding? We are moving together? I hope. Right sirs?

So why has the brain got caught in this narrow circle of the self? The self, the me, the ego, and all that is nothing but words and

memories. Right? It is so. And that self has become so terribly important. And when one is concerned with oneself all our actions must be psychologically limited. And where there is limitation there must be conflict. I am a Jew, you are an Arab. That is a limitation, a tribalism which is limited. And I cling to my limitation, and you cling to your limitation and therefore the perpetual conflict. If you are constantly repeating "I am a Russian", and identify with that particular country, tradition, language and all the literature of that country, it is very, very limited. So we have reduced the brain, the brain seeking security in the self has made itself limited, psychologically. So there is a contradiction between the psychological limitation and the extraordinary limitless technological progress. Is this the function of the brain, to live perpetually in conflict? And therefore there is never a liberation, a freedom. Is this the function of the brain - just to limit, live in a small area psychologically? And is it possible when one understands the nature of the self, as we briefly explained, is it possible to break down this limitation? And who is to break it down? You understand? This limitation has been brought about by thought, thought which has created or sought in the limitation, security. And thought itself is limited because thought is the outcome of vast experience, accumulated knowledge, stored in the brain, in the very brain cells. The speaker is not an expert. I have watched very carefully. And thought is the outcome of memory - right? As memory is limited, knowledge will always be limited, and experience is never complete. You understand?

So the brain is functioning with the only instrument - the limited thought. Are we moving together? And so we are perpetually

living in conflict, in struggle, in pain and sorrow, because we seek security in in the limitation, in memories and so on. That is simple. So is it the function of the brain to find security, survival, physical survival - one must survive physically, unless of course one is a little bit dotty, then that is a different matter. But one seeks physical security and also psychological security. Is there psychological security at all? Don't please, don't accept this. Go into it very carefully with the speaker. Together we are examining. We are not imposing a thing on you. We are not trying to convince you of anything. I really mean this. We are not trying to convert you to some philosophy, which is a... please. So we are together walking, perhaps hand in hand, down a lane, shady, full of dappled light, and the beauty of the earth around us. And we are talking about serious things, not petty little things because we are both serious. And we say: is this what we have reduced our life to, just seeking self-security in the limitation? And physically there is no security because of wars, of racial, tribal conflict, ideological conflict, between the Russians, the totalitarians and the so-called democrat, the West and the East. They are preparing for war - you know all that. Of course they won't listen, you can't talk to the politicians because they are concerned to preserve their own position - you know all the rest, I don't have to go into it.

So we are asking: is that the only function of the brain, to seek security in limitation? That is what we are doing. And in the search for security in limitation we are bringing about havoc in the world - right? Such great disorder, confusion. That again is obvious.

Now, what is the function of thought, because that is the only instrument the brain has? We are together in this? What is the

function of thought? What is thought? What is thinking? We all think, whether you are highly educated, sophisticated or the most uneducated person, hungry, very little food and all the rest of it, he also thinks. The sophisticated, the highly educated person who can express things clearly, he thinks. And the person who is not, he also thinks. So thinking is common to all of us - right? It is not your thinking. You may think and express it differently, you may be an artist, you may be a mathematician, biologist and so on, and I may be a layman, but we both think. So thinking is not yours. Thinking is not individual. Please this a fundamental thing to understand. And yet this is what we are doing - "This is what I think", my opinion, my judgement, my values of opinions - right? See what is happening to us. We have reduced the whole vast process of thinking as mine - right?

And also we ought to enquire: if your brain is separate from another? Please don't... we will go into it slowly. Don't get impatient or cling to your own particular point of view. The brain has evolved through time, through thousands and thousands, upon thousands of years of experience, knowledge and all the activities of thought in the world - technologically, personally and all that, thinking. And we say "It is my brain through which I think". Is that so? Is your brain yours? Or is it the result of thousands of years of evolution? So it is not your brain, or my brain. It is brain. I wonder if you see the depth of this? And the brain is the centre for our consciousness - right? What is our consciousness? Not according to the experts, but when you ask yourself that question: your consciousness? What is it? Your beliefs, your conclusions, your opinions, your two thousand years of being programmed, whether

Christian, or five thousand years as a Hindu and so on - right? Your consciousness is the reaction, the reflexes, the fears, the pleasures, the sorrows, the pain, the grief and all the misery of human beings. That is your consciousness. Is your consciousness different from another? Or your consciousness is like the consciousness of all humanity? Because they suffer in Russia, in India, in China, they may have different outward garments, the environment may be different, but psychologically the content of our consciousness is common, it is shared by all human beings. Right? So your brain and your consciousness is shared by all human beings. So you are the rest of mankind. You may be a German, a Swiss and a proud Englishman, but you are the rest of mankind. Right? Sirs, it is not an intellectual concept, it is not an idea, a romantic sentimental something, but it is a fact. And when that is deeply real, when that is the truth and then your whole outlook on a life changes. Then you are responsible for all humanity. It is rather frightening but it is so.

So one has to understand that in this investigation we are not being self-centred, we are not cultivating the self more and more and more. We are not making the self more intelligent. But we are like the rest of mankind. Out of that comes compassion. You understand?

So is the brain an instrument which is merely concerned with security - psychological as well as physical? If it is not then what is the function of the brain? You understand? If I am not concerned with myself everlastingly in my meditation - you know all that kind of silly stuff, then what place has thought and is there a new instrument altogether which is not the activity of thought? Am I

making myself clear? One can see what thought has done in the world. The technological world and the human world. And thought has built the most extraordinary beautiful things - architecture, paintings, marvellous poems, great novels. But also thought has divided people. And thought also, through its division, has created wars. Therefore thought is not the instrument of peace - right? I wonder if this is clear? Right? Are we meeting each other? Are we walking together? So far? That thought, being in itself divisive, limited, it cannot possibly bring about peace in the world. It is shown: the League of Nations, the United Nations - you follow? Napoleon tried to conquer, unify Europe, so did poor Hitler, and so on. So activity of thought, thought cannot possibly resolve human problems - right? If you see that very clearly then what? You understand me?

Suppose I see very clearly what thought has done in the world. I see very clearly what thought has done in the realm of my own psyche. The search for security is the basis of the movement of thought - right? And is there security at all through thought? Do you understand my...? Or there is security only when thought, with its own intelligence, with its own cunningness, realizes its place and does not enter into the area of the psyche. Are we together in this? I will go into a little more.

We cannot live by ourselves. Life is a movement in relationship. In that relationship there are innumerable problems, sexual, psychological, companionship, loneliness, you follow? The whole problem of relationship. So what is relationship? When you are related to your wife, or to your father, husband and so on, what - when you say, "I am related", what does that word mean? Not the

dictionary meaning of it, which we all know, but the depth of it, the significance of that word. I am related to my wife. And in this relationship there is perpetual conflict - which you probably know much more than I do - right? Why? When we ask that question we are trying to find out if this conflict can end - right? End. So to find out whether it can end we must face the actual fact of what is our relationship to another, however intimate it may be. Is our relationship based on thought? I am asking you this question please. You have to answer it yourself. We are two friends talking over... we are two friends talking over things together. One friend asks the other: why is there conflict in our relationship? Is our relationship based on thought, on memory, on incidents that have passed, they have happened pleasant or unpleasant and there is the remembrance of those, the memory of those, and each one of us lives on those memories, which is thought - right? I am ambitious and also she is ambitious. She wants to fulfil in her way, and I want to fulfil my way. She has come to some definite conclusions and so have I. So there is always this division - right? And where there is division there must be conflict. Right sirs? This is simple.

So to understand the nature of conflict, and to see whether it is possible to end conflict in relationship, we have to enquire whether thought dominates relationship. Then is thought love? Don't please, this is much too serious to agree or... go into it for yourselves. Is it thought in relationship that has bound us together through memory, through reactions, through pleasure, sexual and otherwise? And thought is the factor in relationship. She has said something to me which has hurt me and I have hurt her, That hurt is being carried on, which is memory, It is like two parallel lines never meeting.

And this we call relationship, whether it is to your guru, whether it is to a woman or man, whether relationship to your political leader, or to the priest, it is all based on thought and memory. So is remembrance the activity of love? Please ask this question. Then if it is, we are living on dead memories. Memories are not in the future. Memories are in the past, the capacity to remember. Now is there a way of living without conflict in relationship? Is there a way of living in this relationship in which memory doesn't enter? One may ask this question but mere asking questions is not the solution of the problem.

So is it possible to live with another without the accumulation of memory about the other? Which is the ending of thought. You understand? And so is love the activity of thought? Come on sirs.

And as we are trying to find out how to live in this world peacefully one has to understand the depth and the nature of thought and memory. And most of us from the beginning of our childhood until now bear the burden of many hurts - right? Many psychological wounds, and the memory of those wounds, and the continuation of those hurts. Can all that be wiped away? If I am hurt, how can I love another? Right? Please, this is not a sermon in a church or in some place. This is real enquiry so that you begin to see for yourself directly that there is a possibility of ending conflict. And that possibility exists only, the truth of it, when you have really deeply enquired into the whole nature of the self, self-interest, which is based on reward and punishment, then you begin to find out for yourself thought is not the instrument in the solution of problems, human problems. Even in the technological problems you may think a great deal, work out problems, but you come to a

state there too when thought is in abeyance and you discover something new. If you merely continue in the field of knowledge all the time there is nothing new.

So in enquiring whether the brain can live in peace and therefore perhaps it will affect the society, and it may not. We are not seeking an effect. What will, if each one of us finds the activity of thought, the limitation of thought, and all the activities of memory and therefore very divisive, and consequently conflict, if you actually see the truth of it and you live that way, then you say what effect has this on the vast public? None! Does it matter? Are you concerned with society, with changing the society, making it more orderly? You really are not actually if you face the fact. Therefore it is a wrong question to say: what effect has it on the society if there is a fundamental mutation in my brain? You understand? If one may point out that is a wrong question. You are seeking through facts truth. That truth will act, not you will act.

I don't know if you have ever gone into the question of what is intelligence? I have got three minutes left. It is a very complicated question. Now the speaker asks you: what is intelligence? Right? How do you receive that question? How do you approach that question? Our brain is trained to solve problems. Right? It is trained from childhood to solve problems - mathematical, historical, you follow, examinations, all those are indications of solving problems. So our brain is trained to solve problems. The architectural problems, engineering problems, problems of how to put a motor together. So we approach life with a brain that is trying to solve problems. I don't know if you realize that. So you treat life as a problem and then try to find a solution to the problem. So

when the speaker asks you a question like this, what is intelligence, you make that into a problem. Naturally. And then you try to solve that question through a brain that is trained to solve. Now can one, as a friend I am asking, can one look at this question: what is intelligence, not as a problem? Right? Can you do it? If you do that is the beginning of intelligence. That means the brain is already becoming free from its conditioning. But if you approach this question: what is intelligence? and then try to solve it, you are back in the old muddle. But when one realizes that one's brain is conditioned to solve problems and therefore you approach any question with a mind, with a brain that says, "I must solve it." So we never meet a challenge afresh. To meet a problem, any problem, afresh, is the beginning of intelligence.

So we started out by asking whether humanity can live in peace. If you cannot live in peace you cannot flower, you cannot, you know life becomes terribly small and petty. And in that enquiry whether human beings, that is you, me and the rest of the world, can you, being the rest of humanity, you are whether you like it or not, you may stick to your conditioning that you are an individual but you are not. You may have a different body, different name, different colour, you may have long hair, short hair, you may speak German, or Russian, but you are standing on the same ground as the rest of humanity. And we said that the brain has its function. And what is the root of that function? What is the basis of that function? It is not to live in conflict, obviously. Then that question is raised and you say, "I must solve it." Then you ask, "How am I to do it?" Then you read the systems, the methods, the apologies, and all the rest of it, the arguments, the pros and cons. But when

the brain is not approaching a challenge, an issue, with its old trained condition, then you can look at that question, that challenge, totally anew, fresh. Isn't that the capacity of intelligence, to look at something clearly? Not try to solve it.

So we are going to go into it further the day after tomorrow when we meet. Whether there is a possibility of finding something totally new which is not the activity of thought. Right?

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 14TH JULY 1983

Shall we continue with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? I think we ought, if I may point out seriously, that you are not seeking help from the speaker. There is no help outside of ourselves. If that is clearly understood that no political or religious or every type of guru with their systems and theories, trying to help people, or trying to do good. We have had all those things before for the last millenia upon millenia. So there is no help from outside. There is no, if I may use the word, the Christian word, salvation, it is rather an ugly word, outside, through anybody, through any system, through any theological concept, either of the Communist or the Democratic and so on. So one has to completely rely on oneself. Totally be responsible for ourselves - what we do, what we think, and not blame all that we do on others, or the environment, or on heredity, or on genetic processes. We have played with all those things endlessly in different forms. We have pursued every kind of philosophy. And we have great faith in something or other. That is always something outside - a symbol, a person, a conclusion, an idea. And they have all failed because after millenia upon millenia we are what we are now. It is not the past generation that has produced the chaotic world, they have helped, but we are also adding to it.

So if we could together bear that in mind - no book, no theory, no person, no symbol, including the speaker. I am not excluding the speaker because one has to be very careful not to be influenced by him, not to be stimulated by him, not to rely perhaps on his clarification. And of that is absolutely, fundamentally clear that

there is no outside help to discover what we are, what human beings have become after all these centuries of evolution - brutal, violent, you know the whole business. You cannot blame it on anybody, or go back to the past and try to find out the various causes and there are multiple causes, and we can quarrel over those causes endlessly. But the fact remains, we are what we are now after millenia of evolution, thousands of years of evolution. So if that is clear as two friends talking over together, we are two friends, actual friends. That is what the speaker feels about friends. And we can talk about things, neither influencing each other, nor dominating each other, having no faith in each other, but as two friends who have known each other for some time we are discussing, talking over the human problem. For that is far more important than the technological problem. The psychological problems unless they are resolved always overwhelm the technological issues, problems - right? You may have a marvellous technological world, mechanical world, the computer, but the human psyche overcomes the computer. It may bring about a series of good laws - the computer, that you should do this, do that and so on, but the psyche, each one of us, can overwhelm, or transcend and do what it wants in spite of the computer. Right? I think this is very clear.

So please we must begin with doubt, with a certain quality of scepticism so that we question everything in human existence, apart from the physical, you can't question a surgeon if he says you have got cancer. You may question it, you may ask him but several of the doctors will tell you, "Old fellow you have got it". Then you accept it, you can't doubt that. You can try various cures, all the

quacks in the world will join you but eventually you have to accept their statement. But in the psychological world, which is much more complex, needs great sensitivity, there are great intricacies, subtleties, and that demands a mind, a brain, that is very clear, not confused, not self-centred. You cannot examine, look, at the whole complex of self-pursuit unless you are critical about it, unless you are questioning, doubting, asking. But the present religion in the Western world denies any question of doubt, you mustn't have doubt, you must have faith. And so that quality of doubt, which is most vital to human existence is denied. Whereas in the Buddhist and the Hindu world doubt is one of the pillars of enquiry.

So please we are going to talk over together - together, one must keep on repeating this because there is a human tendency to accept, to be led, to be helped, by reading some book or other you think it is going to do you good. So one must be very clear that one cannot rely on anybody, which means one has to be a light to oneself, which does not mean self-assertive attitudes, having tremendous confidence in oneself. It does not mean the pursuit of one's own desires, one's own fulfilment and so on. To be a light to oneself means standing totally alone psychologically. The word 'alone' means all one. From Latin, Greek and so on that word means all one, together, whole, not fragmented. But we translate that aloneness into isolation. We are afraid to be isolated and therefore we don't understand the meaning and the depth of that word to be alone. It includes the whole of time, the past and present which is now, alone. We will go into all that presently. I hope we are together in all this.

Doubt what the speaker is saying. And also doubt very much

more your own reactions to what you hear the speaker saying. Doubt, the seed of doubt, not what you doubt, but the seed. Let it move, let it flower, let it grow until it finds what is truth. And to be alone, to enquire into the nature of that, to find out the truth of that, not the statement of it, the truth of the statement. You understand? Hearing the statement and then accepting the words of that statement but not discovering for oneself the depth of that word. I hope we are all getting together on this. It is very hot here.

As we were saying the other day, we have sought security in the things of thought - right? - in the things that thought has put together, which is in the community, in the family, in the community, in the larger community and so on. Security in isolation, security in the country, in the nation, in belonging to something, belonging to this group or that group, belonging to that church or not - you follow? - belonging. And we have sought security in that.

So one discovers for oneself that there is no security in isolation - right? Now is that a fact? Or just a theory? See the difference? If it is a theory, there are multiple theories but if you examine your own desire to be secure and you will find, if you pursue it, one has sought security in isolation. The isolation may be enormous but it is still isolation. This process of isolation is fragmentation - right? Are we saying something extraordinary? Or are we following each other? Where there is pursuit of security in isolation - in the Arab or Jew - you follow? - outwardly - the pursuit of isolation and seeking security in that isolation is fragmentation. And then the problems arises: how can the fragments be brought together? That is a wrong question altogether - right? Because the search for

security in isolation is the cause. If one is free of that cause there is no fragmentation and therefore there is no search in isolation.

Either the isolation of the family, or the self-centred isolation. I wonder if you get all this? Are we... somebody say yes or no!

See what is actually happening in the world. I am asking my friend to look very closely at what is happening. The family, community, the larger community, the nation - isolating processes. And therefore in that isolation there is the search for supreme power, politically religiously - you follow? The whole sense of gaining power. And so there is more and more confusion, more and more problems, more and more destruction. This is very clear if you go into it, not casually, not reading a lot of books but to see the fact of it in oneself. So one has to enquire much more to find out what it is that we are... why we are seeking security. Not that we should not have security. Physically, as we said, there must be security. For the baby to grow up there must be security. For the man to live at least temporarily happily he must have security, he must have food, clothes, house. But this process of isolation is denying all that to everybody. Each government is concerned with itself, with its own economy, with its own people. Saving through the war its own people, not the other people. I don't know if you heard the other day a general talking about the last war - the war in the little island far South. He said, the general said, "I do not like to kill but we must kill them but primarily we must save our people." And they are trained for that. So if one sees the enormous significance, the fact, the truth, that in isolation there is never security, no security whatsoever. Do we see this before we go any further? It is very difficult to break down the condition of the brain

which has been taught, educated, conditioned to be, to live, to seek its own fulfilment in isolation.

Now what is security, apart from physical security? What is it to be secure? Please ask this, we are together in this, two friends, sitting down in a quiet room, overlooking a nice valley, a lovely morning, being serious at the same time, and asking each other: what is security, to be secure? Is there security in relationship? You ask yourself that question. One wants security in relationship otherwise if there is no security, which implies trust, confidence, love and all that, and yet we want security in each other. And each other, each one is pursuing his own isolation, his own self-centred activity - right? We want security to have a peaceful life - right? Not to have any conflict, not to have any bother, no problems, just to live. And that is not possible either. So we are asking: what is security? Where do we find it? Not in some theory - right? Not in some image that thought has projected and made it holy, not in any symbol which is the activity of thought. I don't know if you are following all this.

So where does one find total, complete security? The brain needs security. But at present the brain is confused. One philosopher says this, the other scientist says that, one guru, one teacher, the hierarchical church says something else and so on. The brain actually after these thousands upon thousands of years is confused. And in that confusion it says, "I must be secure." So it then invents a new illusion. You understand? I have dropped this illusion, I find there, there is no security. Then I find another illusion and I hope to find security in that. This is what we are doing. So where do you find security? Unless the brain is

completely secure, completely certain, unconfused, it must be in a turmoil - right? And if you examine your own life, your own existence, my friend, you will see how confused we are, how uncertain, one cannot rely on anything - right? So where do you find security? Not outwardly obviously. And will you find security in the psyche? You understand? In the me? In the self? No, let's find out, don't say no. Let's find out.

Then we have to ask: what is the self? What is the me, the whole psychological structure? What is the me? Is the me - is it a series of conclusions? It is. I believe, I am convinced, I have faith - right? I am this. And so on. Expand it. So where, if it is not to be found there outside, and is it possible to find out security inwardly? Please ask these questions. I am asking my friend, - both of us are defenceless, we are not defending each other and therefore resisting each other. It is not there, outside, and I hope to find it on the inside, somewhere inwardly - right? Which means I must have more confidence in myself. That is how we translate it. What does confidence in myself mean? In my experiences? In my knowledge? In my prayer? Which is, the me is put together by thought. I have faith in something, I believe in something, I belong to something. All that is the movement of thought - surely? Right? Please let's be very clear on this matter. Thought has created the mess outside, the confusion, the terrible things that are happening in the world; and also thought has created the me - right? We are clear? It is not some kind of divine explosion that created me. From childhood I have been taught, educated, trained, me is the first. Right? So we are examining whether there is security in the me. And the me is put together by thought. We must be very clear on this point. When

I say I believe in god and I have faith in god, my security in god: who has created that god? Please be factual. Don't, I am not attacking. I am not attacking my friend. That would be too silly. And he is not attacking me either. But together we are questioning, doubting, asking - right? My friend says, "You have faith in god." Perhaps I have. And being friends we discuss. We don't say, "I believe. I am going to stick to it." We say, "Look, who created this idea of god?" Then he asks, "But how did all existence come into being" - right? And the scientific answer is more reasonable than all the theories and speculations, belief in god and so on - we came from the ocean - you follow? We have taken millenia upon millenia, four, five, ten million years, to evolve to the present state. That means time has taken to bring about a human being - not within the last four thousand, five hundred years, according to some religious people. Four thousand, five hundred years ago the Egyptians invented the calendar. You understand? That means they must have had tremendous evolution before. You can't invent a calendar just on the spot.

So, he says to me, look carefully, the thing that you have created, thought has created, seeking security, being frightened of death and so on, you have created that, thought has created that. And thought then worships that, tries to find security in that, contrary to what you are doing, contrary to your life. I don't know if you are following all this? I may believe in the most extraordinary things, like god and all the supreme intelligence - you know - highest principle, but it has to be a reality in my life, otherwise it is of no value. Please I am not preaching, advocating atheism. I am questioning. We are questioning each other the

fundamental issue, which is: the urge and the demand, the necessity for security. And we find we have sought security in illusions - right? Now what happens? Please look at it carefully. If you see something false, to be actually factually false and you hold on to that false - right? - you are not intelligent. I don't know if I am making it clear. If I tell my friend, look, this is not actual, this is just an invention. And in that kind of invention, illusion, some romantic, sentimental nonsense, there is no security in that.

So please to see the false - right? Which means you have already discovered what is true. Is this clear? If I see something false, some illusion as illusion. The word illusion means, in English, to play with something, ludere. Something which is not real. So I tell my friend, look, you live with false things. And when he sees the false things as false what has happened to his brain? You understand my question? The brain has accepted for centuries something which is not actual, which is the vast majority of mankind believes in god because god is their security. But god is the invention - and all the rest of it. When my friend sees that and I see that the conditioning of the brain has broken - you see? I have been going North all my life and you come along and point out to me that the North is an illusion. There is North, I am talking... is an illusion, he shows it to me and as we are friends we talk it over and I say, by Jove, that is right and I turn and go East. Which means what? I have broken the system, the habit, the condition of the brain, which has been going in one direction, suddenly it breaks away from it and goes in another direction. Therefore there is the breaking of a conditioning. I wonder if you understand? Right?

Not... we are going to go into the whole conditioning, we will

go into that a little later but I have broken the habit of pursuing an illusion. Therefore the cells themselves have changed. You understand? The brain cells in themselves have changed because it hasn't fallen, it has pursued a habit and has broken the habit. Not through enforcement, through will, through any action, but pure logical sane, seeing the fact - right? I am working very hard for you, aren't I?

So where is security? Surely not in experience - right? Be quite clear on all this. Not in knowledge because knowledge is never complete - right? Knowledge is based on experience, scientific experience, hypothesis, theories, then proving that theory, hypothesis to be true or false, in the scientific world - right? So where is there security? Please go into it with me. Sorry. I hope you are not bored. If you are, it is your affair. It is really a very serious question we are asking, not a casual something or other. It is a demand of the brain to be secure. It hasn't found it there, outside, in an outside agency, outside gods, or it can invent there is a god in me. Lots of people do, millions do.

Audience: I do.

K: A gentleman says he does. And he is going to hold to it. It is not a discussion. We will do that when all the talks are over.

But we have to find out whether there is complete security or not. We have to be very, very clear of the process of thought. Thought - I will go into it again - thought is a limited process, a materialistic process because thought is based on experience, experience is sensory - right? - reaction, reflection, and from that arises experience and that experience is limited and from that limitation, knowledge, so knowledge is always limited, whether in

the scientific world or in the psychological world - right? It is so. It is so simple. And so memory is limited, because it is based on time, the duration of time. I will go into the question of time presently. And thought is limited. There is no thought without memory - right? And your memory, remembrance is small, limited. You may remember all the things from your childhood - I hope you don't. Then your brain is nothing but memories and as those memories are limited so thought is invariably limited. And so whatever it does is limited. Your prayers, they are limited. All the things in the church and all that is limited, put together by thought. Right? It is so obvious. What are you all resisting this for? I know why you are resisting. You listen. You are frightened. It's very simple. That's why. You might lose your job. We were talking the other day to some priest, we were having a good discussion, we were friendly. And he said, "All right, I agree with you but how am I to live?" (Laughter) Please don't laugh at it, that is for most of us too. Please understand this very simple thing: when you see something false, when you see the limited activities of thought, and what it does in the world - because where there is limitation there must be conflict - right? If I keep on repeating, "I am a Christian", "I am a Buddhist", I am this or that, it is very limited. And that very limitation must bring about conflict. And in conflict obviously there is no security. Unless you love conflict and say that is part of your being, all right, then that means something, there is a hole in your head.

So we must come back to this point: when you see the false as the false and abandon the false, not just say, yes I see the false as the false and just remain. But you see... when you see that which is

not true, which is not actual, which is false, illusory, when you see it, it is the ending of that illusion. Not that you will conclude to end it, the very seeing of the fact, that very seeing of the fact is the ending of that illusion. So what has happened to the brain which has been conditioned to the false, then when it breaks there is a mutation in the brain cells themselves. I wonder if you see this? You understand? Suppose I have a very strong habit. Habits of different kinds. Habit - 'I believe' is a habit. A conclusion to which I stick to is a habit. We won't go into the question of habit. When I break a habit, when there is the seeing of the futility of a habit, there is the breaking of it and there is a change in the very structure of the brain. So what has taken place when I see that which is false as false, the very ending of that, what has happened? You are not doing it as we are going along. If you do it as we go along my friend then what has taken place? Please don't discuss with me, please just find out. Hasn't the brain become clear? It has put away the burdens which are false. Seeing that which is false, seeing is acting. When you see something dangerous you act. So the seeing is the action. Now what has happened to the brain that sees?

We will approach it differently. Most of us want to become something - right? In the physical world we want to be something, to become something. I am just a clerk in a big office, in a corporation and gradually I work up. If I am good, capable, I become the manager. From the manager I step up more and more until I become the executive and the president. I have become through time to be the president. This is the physical process. Now we extend the same movement into the psychological realm. I am this but I will become that. It is the same movement. It is not

different. Both require time. Time to become - right? What is becoming? I can understand in the physical world. I can earn more money, better car, better house, more pictures. If I have the money I buy a Rembrandt or - you follow? I drink more. You know, the whole business of it. The modern culture. We mustn't go into the question of culture now, we will do it another time. I become there something. And I extend the same movement, that same movement into becoming something. One day I will be enlightened - right? Enlightened, become, reach the highest principle, god, whatever you call it, by righteous behaviour, step by step, by step, by step I become something - right? That is the whole system of religious thought - right? I go to the guru and the silly guru teaches me. I will one day become like him, which means power, I will have disciples.

So follow all this very carefully, I am telling my friend. So what is it that is becoming? When I say psychologically I will gradually experience enlightenment, gradually build it up, what does that mean? Is there a becoming? Question that. Not that I should become something psychologically but we must question is there anything to become? Myself, my experience, my memories, my projections of what I should be? - which means I must have time for all this. So man has said that to become wise, enlightened, become, you know, all that, you must have... it is a process - right? And we are saying quite the contrary. I am saying to my friend, it sounds nonsense - you know the whole Buddhist concept, you wouldn't know Buddhism, it doesn't matter. The Buddha went through a series until he ultimately reached enlightenment - which I question. Is enlightenment, understanding, perception, a matter of

time? What is time? Time is a movement - right? Time to go from here to your house, to your chalet, to your flat, to go to Montreux or Lausanne, or wherever it is. It is a movement in time, to cover the distance - right? You need to have physical time to go from here to your house. That is time. And to become something requires time. You have set a goal for yourself, in the physical world you have set a goal for yourself to become the manager and that requires time. And also you have set a goal to become something - right? To become non-violent. Let's take that. Right? You are violent, my friend and I, we are saying, you are perhaps not but I may be, we are violent. And to be free from violence needs time. To become non-violent needs times - right? We are questioning that, doubting that. You follow? You have to doubt this whole idea of becoming non-violent, which they are preaching a great deal in India. The fact is violence - right? I am angry, I am jealous, I am furious, I hate somebody, I want to be somebody more powerful. That is a fact. But non-violence is non-fact. So what am I doing pursuing, cultivating a non-fact? And to achieve non-fact requires time. See the absurdity of it! And millions upon millions are doing this. And because they are so powerful, the millions, also all the politicians.

So come back: so the fact is I am violent. But to achieve non-fact requires time. So to stay with violence needs no time. To understand, to observe, to perceive the nature and the structure and the causation of violence needs no time. Because it is a fact. If I look at it carefully it will reveal the whole thing. But if I am pursuing non-violence I am not observing. Right? So please understand something: perception does not require time. I am

violent, I say to myself, suppose I am really violent, I say what do you mean by that word? You are not physically violent, I haven't seen you in all these years hit somebody, I haven't seen you angry but you are a violent man. And you say tell me what that means to be violent. Violence can exist only when there is contradiction in me. Please understand all this. When there are two separate activities in contradiction with each other. I say one thing and do another, think one thing and act totally differently from the fact, that is a contradiction. That creates the opposites. So you can say, look, you have discovered something: where there is contradiction, opposites, there must be conflict. That conflict indicates violence. Violence - I won't go into more details of violence, which is imitation, conformity. Comparison is essentially violence, right? When I compare myself with you who are much brighter, much more this, much more that, I am envious of you, I am antagonistic, I am jealous of you. Jealousy, conformity, antagonism, is violence because it is clear when I have put away the non real, non-violence, I can see this very clearly, all the intimations, the complexity of violence. And when there is a perception of this there is the ending of that. That violence is not separate from me. You understand? Must I go into this?

When you are angry, is anger different from you? When you are sexually excited, is that excitement different from you? Right? So is violence, comparison, different from you? Or you are all that? My friend has been trained from childhood to compare. He goes to his school, there he is given marks, compares right through that process until the university, if he is lucky enough, or unlucky enough. Then when he comes to a job he is still comparing,

fighting, struggling, right? And we say all that is a form of violence, aggression, and so on. Now seeing the fact of that, not the non-fact of violence, which is non-violence, but the fact that I am violent, seeing the entirety of violence. I can only see that... there is a perception of that only when the non-fact is completely put aside. When there is no pursuit of non-violence of any kind, then my whole attention - the whole attention, not my, the whole attention is on the fact. Then the fact moves, reveals, shows what it is. And that very perception is the ending of it because there is no conflict as violence being separate from me. Violence is me, as anger, as your reaction, as when you have pain in your tummy, or in toothache, or headache, that is you. You are not separate from all that. Where there is separation there must be conflict, as the Arab, Jew, Hindu, Buddhist.

So there is security only in intelligence. We won't go into the question of what is intelligence as our time is up. It is intelligence that says that is false - right? Because you have examined it, you have looked at it, you have doubted it, you have questioned, but if you say, "I accept the false as the truth", then you are unintelligent. But the moment when you look at the falseness of things and see clearly the false as the false, that perception is the beginning of intelligence. Right? Now to go into that intelligence profoundly, which we shall as we go along, that is security. Intelligence of that kind is supreme security.

I hope we still remain friends!

SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1983

I hope you are not too hot. May we continue with what we were talking about on Thursday? We were saying, last Thursday, that human beings throughout the world have sought security, and they must have security, not only biologically, physically, but also human beings have sought psychological security. They have invented all kinds of images, theories, hypothesis and so on. In all those man has sought psychological security. And physically it is necessary obviously that all of us throughout the world should have food, clothes and shelter. And that is denied by various forms of division - racial, national, which is tribalism, and ideological differences, which have produced a great many wars, thousands of wars. Throughout history wars have existed. So man has hardly any security physically except those who are well established, plenty of money, following the tradition, conservative and so on. But psychologically, inwardly, security we have sought in various illusions - in god, in ideas, in relationship, in concepts and prejudices, conclusions, convictions. And all those have not given man inward security, which we went into pretty thoroughly last time that we met here.

And we said: is there security at all for human beings? Those of you who have come here for the first time, please if you will kindly bear in mind that this is not a lecture: a lecture being a talking about, a discourse, on a particular subject, to be instructed, informed. So this is not a lecture, this is not something ideological, philosophical, exotic from the East. But as we said, we are talking over together as two friends about human existence, why human

beings after so many millenia upon millenia are still primitive psychologically, though technologically highly advanced. They have been to the moon, they have invented a great many things, rapid communication, great surgery, medicine - if you believe in all that - and also computers, which perhaps may take over the whole activity of our brain, not quite, but most of it. So we were talking over together at the last few meetings that we had here, why human beings are what they are now, after a long period of time which is called evolution. They are still violent, brutal, primitive, have tribal wars, which are national wars, economic wars and so on. And apparently there is no peace in the world. The government cannot possibly, of whatever country, cannot bring about peace. We have talked about that a great deal, we are not going to go into all that again because we have another two meetings only - next Tuesday and Thursday - so we must not go back to what we have said over and over again.

And we are talking over as two friends, not the speaker is laying down certain dicta, certain ideas. He has no authority, he is just a friend talking over together the whole question of human misery, human suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair, depression, uncertainty and all the turmoil of life. So we were talking the other day about whether there is any security at all, psychologically. And we have tried to find psychological security in every form of illusion, attachments, ties and so on. In all those activities there has been no security. Security means being stable, firm, unchangeable, not fluctuating, not changing but a stability, a steadiness, a sense of great strength and vitality. And we said it is only in intelligence that there is total security.

Now we are going to enquire together, together, you and the speaker, investigate what is intelligence. According to the dictionary common usage of that word it means to understand, to discern, to grasp quickly, a statement, an idea, a something put forward, to understand rapidly. And to have sagacity, which is to be able to have the capacity to discern instantly. Each one of us when we hear that word intelligence, we will translate it according to our conditioning, to our prejudices. We say, "That is an intelligent book", "That is an intelligent man". That is, a man who has capacity to investigate, to observe, to think out. That word intelligence, radically the root of that word, is not only to discern, to be able to capture something that is put forward instantly that may be new, but also it means to understand, to have glimpses between the lines, between the two thoughts, between the lines on a page which are not printed. And intelligence, that very word, has an extraordinary sound. When you hear that word, what does it mean to each one of us? First we hear the word, the sound of the word? Because the word is not the intelligence. The word is not the thing. This tent, the word tent is not the actuality. So the word has its own significance verbally, but also behind the word is the sound of that word. The sound contains the deeper significance of that word. Are we meeting each other? Because sound is very important. Music is sound. That river flowing down rapidly makes a sound. We hardly listen to sound. We have our prejudices which prevent the hearing of not only the word to communicate but also to capture the sound of that word. That means one has to listen very, very carefully so that the word itself unfolds the full significance of that word. And you can only listen when there is

the sound that word brings about. A sound is not noise. Sound is not an interval between two notes. Sound has great depth. That is, when one listens very clearly, without any bias, without any prejudice, opinion, or any form of conclusion, then you capture the enormous significance of a word like intelligence with its sound. I hope we are doing this together. We are going to talk over many things this morning and one has not only to communicate with words, because we are speaking unfortunately, or fortunately, in English, and English has certain definite meanings to certain definite words. And those words must be used to communicate. That is a nice day. It is a beautiful morning. But the words are not the beautiful morning. The words are not the mountain. But if you listen to the sound of that word - a beautiful morning - you capture the whole significance of that morning, with all its extraordinary beauty, the shadows, the clear air, the mountains. In that sound all things exist.

So we are going to talk over together: what is intelligence? How does one approach a question like this? Each one of us will give a different meaning to it according to our capacity, if you have read a great deal, a great many books, talk a great many languages, gifted in various directions, you would call that intelligence. And someone else might say you must have the capacity to discern without choice, action. Someone might say, to put together the whole complicated machinery of computers is intelligence. So each one according to his predilection, according to his prejudice, bias, conclusion, will say, "This is intelligence". But to investigate what is really intelligence we must negate what is not intelligence - right? We must investigate that which is not intelligence to find out

what is intelligence. But to investigate what is intelligence you must first understand what it is not - right? I hope this is somewhat clear, that we are investigating what is not intelligence. Through negation you come to the positive. But if you start with the positive you end up with negation. If you start from childhood believing, having faith in some form of illusion and so on, as you grow up you will invariably end up with not believing in anything.

So we are starting now to find out what is not intelligence - right? That is we are thinking together, not the speaker is telling you what is not intelligence, but together, you and the speaker, as two friends, investigating this enormous problem, a very complex problem, to find out for themselves what is intelligence. And to do that there must be negation of what is not intelligence - right? Are we clear on this matter? If we are we can then proceed.

What is not intelligence? Is war intelligence? All the bestiality, the nastiness, the ugliness, the noise, the brutality, the shedding blood of killing others, is that intelligence? Killing all the things on the earth, the animals, the whales under the sea. We are perpetually killing, not only nature but ourselves. Our brains are degenerating. I do not know if you have gone into this question at all. We see war is not intelligence but yet we are pursuing it. Each one of us responsible for it - right? I do not know if you would acknowledge that as such responsibility. There is a war going on in Beirut, I believe there are forty wars going on in the world at the present time. Killing each other for ideas, ideals, to assert one's own position, power, as a nation, and not to be encroached, surrounded. You know, all that is going on. Is that an act of intelligence? Human beings who have evolved through a long passage of time,

have had two appalling wars recently, and yet they are preparing for wars. That is an act of great stupidity - right? Obviously. The cause of it - one of the causes of it is nationalism, which is glorified tribalism - right? My country, my space, my people, my tradition, my god: all such activity is an act of stupidity. It is not intelligence. I think you all agree to that. But do we see the fact of it, not just the verbal assertion that it is stupid?

So what is our responsibility - we will come very near home - what is our responsibility when you see this thing going on? If I belong to a certain tribe called nationalism, certain religious sect, which brings about division, and therefore conflict, I either accept that conflict and follow the usual traditional path, or I no longer belong to any country, actually not belong to any country, to any tribe, to any group, to any sect - right? Or to any religion. Because they are the factors of division, and therefore conflict. And the deterioration of the brain, which has happened to all of us; when we are born very young it is already deteriorating because conflict is one of the factors, or major factor, of deterioration in the brain. Conflict. When human beings from childhood until they die are in perpetual conflict about one thing or another, and that conflict comes into being when there is contradiction, when you say something and do totally a different thing. That is hypocrisy. Will you listen? As a friend are we listening to each other? Or do you say, "Yes, quite right, I agree with you" and carry on?

As we said the other day, this is a serious meeting, not an entertainment, not an intellectual stimulation, or something romantic, sentimental, and all that nonsense. This is a very serious gathering. And life has become most dangerous for most people.

And life has apparently no meaning whatsoever. And if we are to take life seriously, which we must if we are intelligent, we must be concerned with all this, not just one aspect of it. We are concerned with the whole human existence from the moment we are born until we die. Not go off into some kind of absurd meditation, or follow some guru, or accept and be tied to a theory, or an ideal. This is a serious matter to consider. That means exercising one's brain to find out for oneself what is true, and what is illusory, things that are illusory. And nationalism of any kind, bringing about wars, division, is obviously not an act of intelligence. So when you see something to be true the false drops away. There is no longer conflict, or determination not to be a nationalist. You may have a passport, but passport is not... unfortunately it is necessary to travel. So nationalism is one of the factors of conflict.

And also holding on to a prejudice. The word prejudice means preconceived opinion - right? And we are full of prejudices. Your opinion against another person's opinion - right? And there is the political opinion, and dividing people all over the world. Our opinions - opinion means suggestions, lacking proof, based on some emotional reaction, strong adherence to a conclusion, this is also dividing people, and therefore there is conflict. And can we live - please listen my friend - can we live without opinions? Without prejudice? After all it is a prejudice when you believe in some kind of god. When you as Christians and someone else as a Hindu or a Buddhist doesn't believe in a saviour but you very strongly believe in a saviour, and the other chap doesn't. It is just a matter of belief, faith, without any proof, and your belief in a person has not brought about peace in the world. When you see all

this: how belief, prejudice, conclusions, ideals, divide people and therefore breed conflict, such activity is obviously not intelligence. So when you hear that will you drop all your prejudices? All your opinions about what one is, what one is not, what should be, and so on. Will you drop all those so that you have a free mind, uncluttered mind? If you say, "That is not possible", then you will never find out for yourself - we are talking as a friend - you will never find out what it is to be intelligent. And therefore you will always search for security in an illusion and never finding security, therefore in great turmoil, confusion, neurotic activity, and escape into sentimentalism and romanticism, or into sensuality. This is what is happening - right?

So as we said, one of the major factors of the deterioration of the brain is this constant division which breeds conflict. Right? Why is there division in us, fragmentation? I hope we are asking each other this question. The speaker is not asking the question. We are asking each other this question. You are asking that question. Why is there in all human beings throughout the world this contradiction, this fragmentation, and therefore the urge to bring all the fragments together and to fulfil? So we are going to examine because we want to see really what is intelligence, supreme intelligence, not the intelligence of thought, not the intelligence of knowledge, not the intelligence of experience, because that intelligence is limited, because experience is limited, knowledge is limited and therefore anything that is limited is not intelligence. I hope we are meeting each other as two friends walking down a lane, quietly sitting on a bench, listening to the birds, listening to the stream as it goes by and seeing the beautiful

mountains, quiet, still, and exchanging their investigation into understanding and establishing, not merely intellectually verbally understanding, but establishing in their life this quality of intelligence.

Why is there in us this duality, these opposites? Wanting, not wanting, 'what is' and 'what should not be', or 'what is' and 'what should be' - you are following all this? Greedy, one is greedy, one should not be greedy. One is violent and one should not be violent. One is dull, stupid and conforms or imitates, compares oneself, one's own stupidity with someone who is not stupid. So we have this constant struggle. That is an obvious fact. Are you interested in all this? (Yes) Are you quite sure? (Yes) I hope you won't go to sleep. If you are really interested in it and pursue it to the end and drop it, not just say, "I am interested casually". You are not interested casually about making money. You are not interested casually about having sex. You are not casually interested in having a job, you have to have a job, you have to have money. So this is far more important than the job, sex or any other thing because when there is that intelligence that will operate in all the fields of our life, in all the areas of our existence. But we never go to the very end unfortunately. That is why we are all mediocre. Forgive me for saying that. The word mediocre means going half way up the hill, never going to the very top of the hill. And we are trying to understand and live a life of intelligence. And to do that one has to see not only what are the causes of conflict but also end the cause.

What is a fact? And what is not a fact? When only there is fact, fact has no duality. You understand? Fact has no opposite. Love

has no opposite as hate. So the fact is that which has happened before, that is a fact. Or that which is happening now, that is a fact. But we draw a conclusion from what has happened before and hold on to that conclusion. That conclusion is not a fact - right? Or what is happening now, it is a fact, but we never look at the fact but always make an abstraction of the fact as an idea, and then pursue the idea which is non fact - right? Is this clear? Or am I talking to myself? So can we stay only with the fact? I am envious. That is a fact. Not I personally, I am not envious, I don't care - you follow? Suppose one is envious and that is a fact, that is what is taking place, a reaction which we call envy. And out of that fact we draw a conclusion that we must not be envious so we pursue the non-fact, and so create an opposite to 'what is' - clear? So if you don't pursue the non-fact and remain with the fact, and the fact is you, you are not separate from the fact - right? This is difficult for you to see this because most of us say, "The me is different from the action, me is different from the reaction, me is different from my anger, from my envy" and so on. That is what we have been conditioned to. Which means we have been conditioned to conflict. Now somebody comes along and says, "Look, to end the deterioration of the brain, only then the brain can be intelligent." To end that deteriorating factor is to hold on to the fact and put away all non-fact. No idealism, no conclusion, no prejudice - you understand? - only the fact. The fact is one is envy, envious. Now if you hold on to the fact, what is implied in that? The other, when you pursue non-fact, time is involved. I wonder if you understand this? Am I making this difficult? When I pursue non-violence when I am violent, the pursuit of achieving non-violence requires

time - right? To become non-violent requires time. But whereas if you remain with the fact there is no time involved in it. I wonder if you see this? This is important, please. So one has to enquire now: what is time?

Are you willing to go into all this? Well, it is up to you; but I am going to go on. Please bear in mind that we are friends talking over together. You are not merely listening to what is being said but you are sharing in what is being said. That is the activity of a friend. You don't talk to a stranger, probably he is not interested. But as a friend we are talking over this matter: what is time? Because all our life is based on time. The evolution of the passage of millenia years is time. What we have become requires time, not only the time that is required to go from here to your house, not only time to become something, become from the clerk to the chief executive, that requires time. If you have got the skill, the capacity, the crookedness and all the rest of it, then you reach the top, if you want to. All that requires time. To learn a language requires time. So time in a certain area is necessary. If you want to catch a train you must be there at a certain time. And is there psychological time at all - the tomorrow? Please understand this carefully otherwise we will create all kinds of mischievous ideas. Time. Time is hope, psychologically. Time is required to become something psychologically. one is envious, to become non-envious requires time. So our brain is conditioned to time, and by time - right? Clear? We have had a thousand years of experience, to accumulate all that experience requires time. To acquire a great deal of knowledge, psychological knowledge requires time. The passage of memory - right? - is time. So memory is the... thought is the

response of memory, which is time. So thought is time. Is this all - no? Oh, my lord!

Now this is what I meant: having the capacity to capture this instantly, see the truth of it. That is, experience is always limited - right? You can't have complete experience about anything. So experience is limited and therefore knowledge is limited. That is a fact whether you like it or not. And so memory is based on knowledge, and therefore memory is limited. You may remember from your youth all the things, long passage of time, the remembrance of things past - all that is limited. And so thought is invariably, under whatever circumstances it is limited. Right? So all the things that thought has created are limited. All the religious structures of the world put together by thought are limited. I wonder if you understand this? You are born in India - I won't talk about your Christian world because you might get upset - if you are born in India, or in the Buddhist countries, what the Buddha or somebody in Hinduism has said is complete, finished. They worship an image, thinking that it is the absolute, permanent, everlasting truth, as you do here in your own way, if you don't mind my pointing it out to you. And all that is the activity of thought. They all say he is the direct revelation of the truth - right? Every religion, all says he is the revelation of the truth. But truth cannot be revealed through a book, through a person, through an idea, through a ceremony, or having faith. Truth has to be found, not to be told about it. Therefore there must be complete freedom. And only when there is complete freedom there is no conflict. It is only when the brain with its only instrument, which is thought, and that thought is the only instrument of our life, one must realize that

all thinking is limited and must invariably bring about conflict. When I am thinking about my beastly little self all day long, as most people do, it is a very limited occupation - surely, no?

So time is a movement of thought, psychologically as well as physically. Time is not only the past and the future and the present - right? This whole movement from the past through the present, modifying itself and proceeding further. That whole movement is thought and time - right? Are you following this?

So then one asks: if that is the process of time, and that is limited - I hope you are following all this - and when it is limited it must create conflict, and therefore one of the factors of deterioration of the brain. Then to enquire whether the brain can not deteriorate at all one must understand what is the now. Do you understand all this? What to you is the now? Is the now where you are sitting there and listening, partaking, sharing, is that the now? Look carefully. Go into it sirs, don't say, "Yes, that is part of it." The now is not only the past, but the present - right? - the past being you have made a conclusion to come here and therefore you are sitting here. And the future is when you leave the tent and go away - right? So the now contains the past, the present and the future. The past being you have decided to come here and listen to this poor chap, and you are sitting there, and also the now is when you have finished here and go. So the now contains the past, the present and future. That is the now which has no time.

So when you remain in the now, you understand the past with all the human experience of which you are - right? Your consciousness, with its content, is the past, the present and the future - right? Your consciousness is that - what you believe, what

you believe you have been told, you have been programmed by the experts in politics, in religion, in education and so on, which is the past - right? Are you following all this? And the past is there now, and the future is the outcome of that past - right? - which is already here. So the now contains all time as past, present and the future. And to understand this in depth so that the now contains the whole thing, all existence is now. Therefore there is no movement away from the now. There is no movement away from the fact and the non-fact. A movement away from the fact to non-fact, that has ended. Therefore there is no conflict. I wonder if you understand all this? Not verbally, please don't take it verbally. See the truth of it. So that the brain, which has lived for thousands of years, which is not your brain, it is not your thought, it is the thought of the whole of humanity, which we went into very carefully the last few days.

So the fact is now. And the fact contains all the past, present and the future. But to listen to that fact is for the fact to reveal the content. Not you tell the fact what its content is. I wonder if you understand all this? Are we thinking together? Or are you merely listening to some words of the speaker and therefore confused? Are we thinking together? That we are now not only the past, all the memories, all the activities, the pain, the anxiety, the hurts, the loneliness, the suffering, the pain, the fears. You are all that now - right? And the future is what is now - right? Obviously sirs. So the future and the past exist now because of what you are - right? This seems so incredible - what is the difficulty? Would you kindly express your difficulty. Very simply please, don't complicate it. Aren't you the past? Right? Your education, your being

programmed as a Swiss, as a British, as a German, a Hindu, an American, Russian and so on, you have been programmed. That programme is the past - right? So the past is your accumulated memories - right? Those memories are stored in the brain. So the past is now - right? And the now also contains the future, unless there is a fundamental mutation - you understand? That is, there is complete mutation in the very brain cells of the brain, you are the past memories and continuing in the future as memory. The future is now therefore, and the past is now. Is that clear? Unless there is fundamental psychological change. That is, when there is this conditioning of the human brain - right? That conditioning is memory - right? I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a Hindu, I am a Buddhist, I don't believe in gods, but I believe in Marx, Lenin - which is the same thing in different words. My guru is better than your guru, and all the rest of that business. So the brain of each one of us is conditioned, programmed, which is the vast accumulation of the past. That is simple enough. So we are memories - right? You may think that you are something more superior than memories but you are not, even when you think you are superior, that very thought is memory - right?

So memory is a movement of time, time as the future in the present. So if you remain with that fact and not move away from it, that you are now. You are the rest of all time. Right? Then when you realize, when the fact is revealed that you are that, and if you give your complete attention, not escape from that - you follow? - that memory is you. You are not different from that memory - right? So there is no division between you and that memory. When there is division there is conflict. So the observer is the observed.

The experiencer is the experience. The analyser is the analysed. And so on. Then conflict ends. Conflict exists only when there is division and therefore the brain then has no conflict, and therefore there is no deterioration of the brain. But most of our brains have deteriorated, or are deteriorating. That is a fact. And so one has to discover why, what are the causes of deterioration. Essentially conflict. A mind that is frightened, a brain that lives in fear - which we will discuss next time, fear and all the rest of it - such a brain must deteriorate. The brain that is seeking constant sensuality, sexuality, must deteriorate. These are facts.

So to find out a way of living, and that is quite... is it possible to find a way of living where is no shadow of conflict? Then your brain is extraordinarily alive. Its activity then is whole because it is free. And the word free means also love. Love has no opposite. Love has no... is love desire? Is love the activity of thought? If it is, as with most of us, it is not love. If thought in relationship, in intimate relationship, if there is the activity of thought then there is no love. Go into it. We shall go into it another time. May I get up?

SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1983

May we go on where we left off on Sunday? We were talking about intelligence and security, and we came to the point where the past, the present and the future were contained in the now. That is, all time is now. And in the now there is no time at all. I don't know if we have understood that, if we have gone into it fairly sufficiently. And as we have got only today and Thursday we have got a lot of ground to cover so we will not go back and repeat what we have already talked about.

We ought to consider what is the future of mankind? Through various successions of events, vast experience and collective memories, through evolution, that is the whole process of time from the past, infinite past, to the present is called evolution. The successive events, memories, experiences, and so on. And we have arrived at this present stage of human evolution. And what is our future? Not only the future of each one, which I question whether each one is separate from mankind, but what lies ahead of us? Do we proceed along the same path as we have been going for the last million years, or more or less, slowly developing, slowly accumulating vast memories, not only in the technological world but also in the psychological area, in the inward area - if we can so put it that way. And considering what evolution has brought us to now, and what are the successive events, experiences, that lie ahead of us? We have evolved and we are almost primitive psychologically, angry, violent, innumerable illusions, dogmas, beliefs, faiths of various religions and various groups and societies and cultures, all that is inherited by us. We are all that. And there is

no question about that. Nobody can argue or theoretically oppose all that. We are the result of vast successive experiences, incidents and so on. That is our consciousness. That is what we are. And from the beginning of time we have not changed very much. Biologically we have reached a certain point and I don't think we can develop a third arm or two heads or something of that kind. And when we look at ourselves, and our society - the society which we have created, the divisions which we have brought about, religious, national, tribal and all the rest of it, one wonders what is the future of all human beings?

This is a very serious question, we ought to consider, investigate together. Not that the speaker is exploring or pointing out, but you and the speaker together are walking along the same road, at the same speed, with the same intention, with the same commitment to find out what is the future of man. Not only the future of our grandchildren, and their grandchildren and so on, but the whole of human kind, not one's own particular future. And our consciousness, which is what we are - our reactions, our responses psychologically and physically, all the beliefs of various cultures, of various people, all the faiths, the dogmas, the environmental conditioning, our fears, our anxieties, loneliness, depression, sorrow, and the constant pain of conflict. This is the common ground on which all human beings stand. That is a fact. When you suffer, when you are lonely, depressed, anxious, in conflict with your own friend, with your wife or husband, this is the lot of all human beings throughout the world, whether they live in Russia, China, India, Asia and so on, in America or Europe, every human being goes through this, may express it differently, may put it into

words that are not familiar to you but the feeling, the pain, the anxiety, the sorrow, the uncertainty, the insecurity, faith in something that has no reality but in an illusion, vast network of superstition. This is the common lot of all human beings. That is our consciousness.

Our consciousness, your consciousness is not something private, personal, exclusively one's own. It is shared by all human beings. Whether you go to the most primitive part of Africa or the most sophisticated people in New York or Tokyo, or even in Moscow, they all share this. So it is not our personal consciousness. It is not your private, individual belief in something or other. This belief is shared by everybody. They may believe in something and you may believe in something else, but belief is common to all of us. Pain, tears, laughter, humour, the sense of desperate loneliness, anxiety is shared by every human being on this beautiful earth. So it is not yours. And this consciousness is the self, the me, the person, the ego. And this ego is the common ego of mankind. This is very difficult for most people to accept and see the truth of it because all of us are conditioned to believe that we are separate human beings, separate souls, which religions have encouraged, separate. When we think, we think as though we were separate from all other people who think. Thinking is common to all of us, whether the highly educated, sophisticated thinker, philosopher, or the person, the most primitive person in a small, little withered hamlet or a village, or a hut, he also thinks. Thinking is common to all of us and therefore it is not your individual private thinking. This is very difficult for people who have been brought up from childhood to think that they are separate. That is a

marvellous illusion, cultivated sedulously, through literature, through talent, through religions, through national worship and all the rest of it. And this common consciousness, the common self, not your self, the self which everybody clings to, that is the common self, collective self. And what is the future of mankind? That mankind has evolved collectively through millenia upon millenia.

Please we are thinking together, unemotionally, non-romantically, but without any bias or prejudice, if that is possible. We have to investigate this question.

We were talking yesterday with a person who has excellent credentials about computers. He is building one of them, meeting all the top computer people, and their extraordinary activity. In our discussion yesterday the big organizations in America and Japan especially are pouring billions of dollars or yen, not only to cure cancer but also to create a computer, the fifth generation, the ultra intelligent mechanical mind - brain that will, with the robot (Noise of aeroplane) - this is modern civilization, noise, including that of the speaker - they are creating or working to bring about, the top people, not the local inventors, they act too, to bring about a computer with a robot that will outstrip man. You understand all this. The machine can think faster, create more, almost everything that the human brain has done and can do. This is a fact. They are working at it twenty four hours a day, competing with each other, America and Japan. They are producing machines which will control us human beings - which is actually going on now. Machines, computers and other mechanical devices that will control our human activity. We will be shaped by the machines.

You understand? We are being shaped now but that is very slow, casual. But the big industries are producing machines that will control us. In the factories the robot and the computers will build the car and so on and so on and so on. They do operations. That is one side of it. The other side is also they are trying to - genetic engineering to change the genes of the human beings.

And also a certain country is more interested - Russia - in understanding the activity of the brain. That is, thought transference. You understand. To read other people's thoughts. To find out what Mr. Reagan is thinking and Mr. Reagan is trying to find out what Andropov is thinking. And presently, if that succeeds, probably they will because they are putting all their best science and thousands and millions of dollars in all this, governments as well as big companies, to find out what makes the brain function in a certain way and whether it is possible to change that, and to read other people's thoughts. They are working on all this. Perhaps some of you already know that Duke University in America, at one time extra sensory perception, reading people's thought, thought controlling matter - they just touched the peripheral E.S.P. - extra sensory perception. But now they are spending all the scientists, and the top people are working at this. Please these are facts. I am not exaggerating.

So what is the future of mankind? What is going to happen to our brain when the computer and robot take over, and when the great industries invent all these machineries of ultra intelligent machines, and you, what is your future as a human being? You understand my question? This is happening. It is not something in the future. It may take ten years. And they say, "We will do it in

ten years" - right? And they are going to do it in ten years, for commercial reasons. So they are acting from the outside on the human brain - you understand? Through bio-chemistry, through electric currents and so on. From the outside. And they may change our conditioning - from the outside. And probably they will. They will invent better gurus than any other guru in the world.

(Laughter) Don't laugh please. This is very, very serious. It sounds funny, humourous but it is a fact. The computer will invent the best god on earth, will bring about a society that will function mechanically - you understand? Face all this.

And what is the future of man if we as human beings don't change from the inner, from the inside - you understand? They are going to change you from the outside. This is inevitable. It is in the cards. We laymen know nothing about all this, what they are doing. And perhaps we don't want to know. And what is going to happen to our brain, human brain, not the mechanical brain invented by top computer experts and the bio-chemists and the genetic engineers, acting from the outside to control the brain - you understand all this? We are not painting a dark picture, it is a fact, it is happening. And what is going to happen to the human brain when we have vast leisure, because the computer, the robot will do all the dirty work? They will build cars, they will sweep the roads, perhaps establish a better relationship between you and your wife. Please this is serious what we are saying. It may give you all the sexual experience through computers - yes sir, swallow that also.

So what is the future of man? Your theories, your particular guru, your doctrines, your churches, will have no place at all because the computer brain is much more active, much clearer, in a

millionth of a second it will answer a question. Taking all this in, not being frightened, not being depressed by it, but seeing the actual fact of what is going on. And this friend of ours, who is building a computer, meeting all the top people, in discussing we saw what is the future of man.

Our brain is now conditioned by experience, successive incidents which bring about experiences, the fears, the pleasures, the aches and the anxieties and the pain of sorrow, the death; we are conditioned linguistically, climatically. That is our conditioning. And if we admit that during the successive years or periods of evolution we will gradually inwardly change - which means continue what we are almost indefinitely, which is evolution. Or sudden jump - which is psychologically impossible.

So what we are asking is - as two friends we are talking together, just as two friends we talked yesterday with this person, we have known him for years, and also some of you we have known each other for years - and we were talking over together amicably, in friendly spirit. These are facts. Irrefutable facts. And can we, even a few, change, bring about a mutation in the very brain cells of the brain? Does it take time? You understand my question? Does it take a series of incidents, successive memories to bring about a mutation in the conditioning? Are you following all this? Realizing that in investigating the conditioning we are not investigating personal conditioning, it is the conditioning of the human brain. And that brain has evolved through time, it is not your brain. So we are not talking about your individual transformation, or individual mutation that you become more enlightened, more happy, more some kind of nonsense. We are talking about the human brain

because you, as a human being, represent all humanity. You are all humanity because you suffer, they suffer - you understand? You are humanity, not just one person isolated, individual, secretive, concerned with your own beastly little self. Right?

Now we are going to find out, if we don't radically bring about psychological revolution in the sense of bringing about a mutation, our brains will wither because the computer and the robot, and other things they are inventing, will make our brains inactive. I wonder if you understand all this. Now you have to think, you have to investigate, you have to work. That means your brain has to be active. But when the computer and the robot takes the things over, what is going to happen to your brain? Either it is going to wither, or go off into some kind of vast entertainment, which is also taking place - right? I do not know if you have not noticed what great importance they are giving to sports - the Olympics and all that business. So it will be caught in that. You are following? This is happening sirs. Or then you have to investigate whether you can, as a human being who is the rest of humanity, if there is a radical mutation you affect the whole of consciousness of mankind? I do not know if you have not noticed if in America, or in Russia, or in some remote part of Japan, they invent something, the rest of the world picks it up much... it is there. You understand? It is happening. So if when one or two, or a dozen, or a hundred bring about a fundamental freedom of conditioning, they affect the whole consciousness of humanity - right? This is so. As Hitler has affected the whole consciousness of mankind, Napoleon, your religious leader, or the other religious leaders, they have affected humanity. So can we, after stating all this, can we bring about, not

through gradual process of evolution, that is out, finished, can we bring about a mutation in our whole being, in our whole behaviour, in our way of looking at life?

So we have to investigate together the content of our consciousness, - you understand? - of which you are, because the content makes up consciousness, without the content, consciousness - as we know - it doesn't exist - right? Are we clear on this matter? If I am a Hindu, with all that business, with all the superstitions, with their gods, with their rituals, with their... you know, with their circus as you as Christians with your circus, and our faith, our belief, our habits, you follow? - all that - can all that radically bring about a change, total change? Right? Have you understood? Can we go on from there?

Please, this is very serious. This is not something to play at. See the danger on one side: what they are outwardly going to do to our brains; and also see actually what our brains are: conditioned, nationally, linguistically, fear, pleasure, sorrow and all that, faith, I believe, I don't believe, my prejudice is better than your prejudice, and so on. That is what we are. Now one of the contents of our consciousness is fear, which is shared by all human beings, it is not your fear, only it is fear. What is fear? How does it arise? Please you are sharing this, thinking together, I am not exploring and you just listen and play with words. You are afraid. That is a fact.

Afraid to die, afraid to lose, afraid not to become something, afraid of your wife or your husband, or somebody or other. Afraid of nature - you follow? - fear. Can that fear, which has conditioned our mind - our brain, can that fear completely end? Not through time, that means evolution, gradually - you follow? I wonder if you

are following all this? Please, it is your life, it is not my life, not somebody else's life. It is the life of every human being.

Fear does terrible things. Fear makes you lie, fear makes you kill, fear makes you violent, fear makes one curl in oneself. All of us know what fear is. Is fear one of the causes... one of the causes of fear, is it to become something - you understand?

Psychologically to become something. That is, I am this, I must be that. The 'that' is the projection through comparison. Right? I compare myself with you - right? And I want to be like you, or I don't want to be like you but like somebody else. To become. You understand? The comparison is to become.

So can we now, not tomorrow, end all comparison? Of course you have to compare between two cars. If you have the money you buy the better. When you are comparing one house, one architect, you know, there it is necessary to compare; to get the best of cloth, best of houses, if you have the money, and so on. But we are talking about psychological comparison. To see the consequences of comparison, which is to become - right? And one of the causes of fear is this - right? And seeing the truth of it end instantly all comparison. Are you doing it? Even a few of you for god's sake. So that your mind - your brain is free of this burden, which means you are unconditioning the brain cells themselves. Those cells have been accustomed, trained, educated to compare. You understand? One day you will sit next to god - you know all that stuff. Or you compare what you are with what you should be. So that all sense of ideals, the future, completely ends. And so one of the causes of fear ends instantly.

There are other multiple causes of fear - fear of public opinion,

fear what your friends might say about you - you know, a thousand fears. Fear of the dark, fear of your wife, or your husband, fear of this and fear of that. Fear of your guru because you want to be like him - right? He tells you how to meditate - you know all that stupid stuff. So you are always trying to become something. And what is it that is becoming? An idea, a memory, a thought - you understand? You follow? Is that what is becoming? And therefore it is an empty becoming, there is nothing in it but yet we cling to that. So what are the other causes of fear? Please we are investigating together. Is it time? Fear of the future? Or fear of the past? Fear of having done - you know all the rest of it? Both biological fears and psychological fears based on the past, which is time? Fear of future as death? So time and thought are the root of fear - right? Of course. It is so obvious. Can we go on from there.

Do you and I see the fact: comparison, which is also part of time, the becoming, and the thought that says, "I must become", "I must be", both thought, time, are the basic factors of fear? If you say, "How am I to stop thinking?", that is a wrong question. But if you see the fact - you understand? - if you see a dangerous snake in front of you, you act. You don't say, "What am I to do with it? Please tell me how to run from it." You don't ask somebody and say, "What am I to do?" When there is danger there is instant response. And time and thought in relation to fear is a fact, is a tremendous danger - right? And do you actually see the danger? Or the idea of danger? You understand? The idea is stronger than the fact and so we play with it. The idea of a snake is different from the actual snake - right? The actual precipice. You can imagine that you are standing on a precipice and try to fall and play all around,

but when you are in front of a deep chasm at your feet, you respond instantly. So if one is aware of the nature of fear and the danger of fear, how it corrupts the mind, the brain - the mind is different, sorry I won't use that word mind. I will keep that word away from the brain. And so does one see the danger and therefore act?

And also one has to consider the whole pursuit of pleasure - sexual, the becoming, the achievement, being tied to something, attached to something, possessing something - you follow? Various forms of pleasure. When you are attached, when you are tied to something, then corruption begins. Right? I wonder if you see all this? When I am tied to my wife, or to my husband, or a to an ideal, or a series of logical deductive conclusions, and I hold on to that, then corruption is inevitable. When I hold on, attached to my wife - you are following all this? - or to my girl friend because I get comfort, sex and all the rest of that, in that attachment, in that tie, there is the beginning of the seed of corruption. When you see the truth that wherever there is any kind of attachment to anything - to your furniture, to a person, to an ideal, to a system, whether it is the democratic, or social, or any attachment, tie, you have already the seed flowering into corruption. Yes sirs. And pleasure is that corruption, if you are pursuing it. If pleasure happens, all right. But if you pursue it, as most human beings do, and are attached to pleasure, then you have all the corruptive process taking place which brings about deterioration of the brain. Corruption is the deterioration.

And also we ought to talk over together a much more complex problem: that of suffering. Mankind wherever they live have

suffered enormously. Go to the poor countries where they have one meal a day and not enough to eat, they suffer infinitely. And all the wars of many centuries, how many people have been killed, how many tears. Aren't you aware of all these blasted things? The sorrow of not achieving, the sorrow of ignorance, not of books, not of accumulated professorial knowledge, that is part of ignorance, we are talking of ignorance of the truth of reality, of what is going on inwardly. The sorrow of losing somebody whom you think you love. The sorrow of disease, the sorrow of a thousand things. And mankind throughout the world has borne this sorrow. And we are still going on with it. So what is wrong with us? We know the wars that are going on now - maimed - you follow sir? - those terrible tanks, the aeroplanes from thirty thousand feet dropping a bomb, not seeing the devastation it makes and saying at the end of it that god was with me when they dropped the atomic bomb in Nagasaki or Hiroshima.

So is it possible to end sorrow? Which is to face loneliness and end it - not take time, the causes of sorrow, seeking comfort. There is always a comforter, the priest, the psychoanalyst, the friend, the guru, someone will cry with you, hold your hand. That doesn't end sorrow. It is like having a deep wound: you may cover it up, you may escape from it, but it is always there, deep down in the dark recesses of one's own brain. And to end it, because where there is suffering there is no love. And without love and compassion there is no intelligence. And if we pursue our life, our daily life, as we are living now, year after year until we die, as vast millions and billions of people are doing, they are not contributing anything to the whole collective consciousness of man. But if you and a few of

us basically, fundamentally bring about a mutation in the conditioning of the brain, which means in the very brain cells themselves and that is possible only when we are aware of our conditioning, meet it head on, fear, all the faiths and the dogmas, the stupid rituals, fears, pleasures, sorrow, of which we are. If there is no mutation we will be contributing to the ugliness of mankind.

So there is only one choice for us, only one direction for us: either we enter into the world of entertainment - you understand? - the football, the literature, the painting, the talk about pictures and the cinemas, you understand? - the whole world of entertainment, that vast industry which is gradually taking us over. And that industry includes all the rituals of the religious people, it is a form of entertainment. They don't change by going day after day, to mass, or to the Indian rituals. There is a temple in India near the school where we live, it is one of the most famous temples in India. They take vows to that image inside and they pour thousands of dollars a day. It has become a tremendous business affair, like all religions. You understand? The churches of the world. So when one actually sees all this spread out in front of you like a clear map: the computer, the robot, bio-chemistry, genetic engineering and the search into the activities of the brain to read other peoples' thoughts on one side. The other side, vast entertainment. Unless one is extraordinarily aware you are going to be caught in all this. Probably you are already caught. And when there is a change, a radical mutation in the conditioning, which means freedom from all conditioning, and that freedom is love, it is not self interest. That freedom is compassion, in which there is sympathy and all that, but compassion is not attached to any religion. It isn't because

I love Jesus or Krishna or somebody that I am compassionate. I go and help the poor country. Compassion is born only out of total freedom. I've finished. May I get up please?

SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST JULY 1983

I think it is cooler this morning, isn't it? This is the last talk. There will be questions and answer meetings on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday.

I think one can ask what is religion only when we have established order in our lives. We live in disorder, confused, uncertain, driven by various desires. And we generally muddle along in our disorder. And that disorder has its own order - railways run more or less in the West on time, aeroplanes leave on time, telephones can get to the other side of the world directly, but not in the Asiatic countries - trains are about seven or eight hours late or a whole day late, nobody pays attention, it is part of the daily life. So there is order in disorder in this world, but unless there is total order, not out of disorder, and that can only come about when there is freedom from fear, from all the hurts that one receives from childhood, the wounds, psychological as well as physical wounds, and the understanding and the meaning and the pursuit of pleasure, the becoming and the ending of sorrow, then only where there is freedom and order then one can really ask: what is religion?

If one asks, what is religion when we live a disorderly, scatter-brain life, then we will invent, as we have done, various religions, various established religions of orthodoxy, religions based on books, like the Christian and the Islamic world, and whereas in India there are about three thousand or more... three hundred thousand, I beg your pardon, gods there. That's much more fun than having one god, then you can play with them all. One day you

can choose one god that pleases you, next week another and so on, you can go the whole round for two or three years choosing your own gods. All that is called religion, established, orthodox, based on faith, and those religions, whether it is Christian, Hindu, Buddhist or the Islamic world have nothing to do with our daily life. They are a make-believe world, a romantic world, a sentimental, imaginative, superficially comforting world - which we all know. And out of that chaotic disorder we somehow create, or bring about, a religion that is very comforting which has no validity in daily life, which has no fundamental meaning but one goes to it like you go to some kind of entertainment and sensation, and the repetition of constant rituals, incense, you know all that.

So the speaker generally puts at the end of the talks religion and meditation because, after all these five talks that we have had here together, we have understood the whole structure and the business of life, and perhaps some of us are deeply free of fear and no longer carrying with us the various psychological wounds. And also have understood the futility of pursuing pleasure. And perhaps some have grasped the significance of suffering and the ending of suffering, and thereby have that extraordinary thing called love and compassion. Then when there is order in our life, not induced by thought - thought can never bring about order - but only perception of the fact and nothing else. And out of that order, which means having a clear, unprejudiced, unbiased mind - brain, then only, it seems, that we can ask: what is religion? You understand? I hope one has made this clear.

Because if one is afraid, and to escape from that fear, however deep, however superficial, if one is aware of it, if there is fear you

can invent anything you like, most comforting, satisfying and so on, which most of us do. And that invention, that imaginative structure of something superior is born out of fear and therefore is nothing whatsoever to do with religion, a religious brain.

So we are together this morning going to investigate what is religion? And also in that investigation we are going to discover what is meditation, not meditation as something outside of our daily life. That again becomes extraordinarily superficial. Or you may think that by having the right kind of meditation, then that meditation will affect our daily life. You understand? But whereas meditation is something extraordinarily important if one understands the significance of meditation, not the practice and all the silly nonsense that goes on, but the deep significance of it, which we are going to talk over together this morning. All right? Is this clear so far? - so that we can go on together. Not that the speaker goes on talking, you just sleepily follow him, but together, take the responsibility together to find out what is religion, what place it has in daily life, and in the process of that, discovering for ourselves what is the depth and the beauty of meditation, for ourselves, not be told. Because you have now various gurus bringing their latest systems of meditation and for a certain coin you pay and then you learn. It seems so absurd, it becomes a business affair.

Before we go into this question of religion and meditation we ought to understand, if one may point out, what is listening. Do we each one of us listen, hear what we say to each other? Or you are talking, you want to tell me something and I want to tell you something. What you want to tell me becomes much more

important than what I want to tell you, so there is this battle going on - you understand? You want to say - you are talking to yourself most of the time - and another comes along and wants to tell you something. You haven't the time or the inclination or the intention to listen and so you never listen to the other chap. And so there is this constant deafness, a sense of space in deafness, so that we never listen to each other. There is not only the hearing with the ear but also listening to the meaning of the word, the significance of the word, and also to the sound of the word - the sound, which is very important. When there is sound there is space. Otherwise there is no sound. Unless you have space then only in that space sound can take place. So the art of listening, if one may point out most respectfully, is not only hearing with the ear but also listening to the sound of the word. The word has a sound and to listen to that sound there must be space. But whereas if you listen all the time translating what is being said into your own prejudices and your own pleasurable or unpleasurable process, then you are not listening at all. Is this clear? Can we this morning attempt to listen not only to what the speaker is saying but also listen to your own reaction to what is being said, not correct your reaction to conform to what is being said? So there is this process going on: the speaker is saying something which you are listening to, and also you are listening to your reactions to what is being said, and give space to the sound that your own reactions are and also to what is being said. You understand? It means a tremendous attention, not just getting into a kind of trance and go off, and say, "That's a marvellous speech" and you know, "It was very nice that morning, it was a very good speech, and it is this, it is that, I was glad I was

there, he told me a lot of things which I had not thought about", and all that nonsense. But whereas if you listen, and in that listening there is a miracle. The miracle is that you are so completely with the fact of what is being said and listening to that, and listening also to your own responses. It is a simultaneous process - you understand? You listen to what is being said and you react to what is being said, which is instantaneous and then listen to the whole sound of it, which means having space. You understand? So you are giving your whole attention to listening. Am I making this clear? This is an art, not to be learnt by going to a college, passing some degrees that you have learnt listening but to listen to everything - to that river going by, to the birds, to the aeroplane, to your wife or to your husband - which is much more difficult because you have got used to each other, you know almost what she is going say. And she knows very well what you are going to say, after ten days, after ten years. So you have shut your hearing altogether - you understand?

Here we are asking something entirely different, to learn not tomorrow, now as we are sitting there to learn the art of listening. That is, to listen, to be aware of your own responses and allowing space to the sound of your own beat, and to listen. It is a total process, not separate, but a unitary movement of listening. Have you got this? This is art. This is an art that demands your highest attention. Because when you so attend there is no listener, there is only this fact, or the reality of the fact, or the falseness of the fact, is seen - right? I hope we are doing this, this morning, because we are going to go into something very, very complex, And unless of course you want to go off into some romantic trance, it is all right,

but if you really want to probe into the nature of a brain that is religious and a meditative brain, you have to listen very, very attentively to everything (Noise of aeroplane)... to that aeroplane so that there is no difference between that noise and the noise the speaker is making and the noise you are making. You understand? It is like a tremendous river moving. So please don't go to sleep this morning, or go off into a kind of imaginative, romantic trance.

We are investigating what is religion. Is it the structure of thought? Or is it beyond thought? You understand? As we have been saying throughout these talks, which both of us have understood, that thought which is always based on experience and knowledge and memory is very limited. That is clear. And anything that is projected, put together by thought, is always limited. The various religions of the world have been put together by thought. One can say it is a divine revelation straight from the horse's mouth - I hope you understand that phrase. An English phrase which means you have got it directly from the highest. And that to be conveyed is put into thought and you put it down on paper, whether that paper be two thousand years old or five thousand years old, it is still the activity of thought - right? And all the rigmarole, all the words, the rituals - you follow? - the whole structure of religious movement, is based on thought. You can sanctify what thought has created and then worship that, as most of us do, calling it religious, which only shows how the brain is caught in the process of illusions. If we are clear on that point and we are trying to find out what is religion which is not put together by the limited thought - right? When you accept your guru and do all the things he says, it is very, very limited - right? He may talk

about illumination, and leading you to truth and all that, it is still the activity of thought. And we thinking about it, we say, "That is quite right, let's all follow that." You have seen all this. I wonder if you do?

So one cannot belong to any guru, to any system, to any method - right? Because they are all the product of thought. I wonder - right? You agree? No. You are too committed and therefore you will never understand that thing which is really a tremendous activity of the religious brain. Now to examine that which is beyond thought - you understand? - not thought examining, that is the difficulty. I see personally that the activity of thought is limited, entirely, in any direction, whether it is in the technological world, in the world of the computer and so on, or psychologically it is thought, with all its activity, is limited, and therefore there must be conflict. That is understood. And when that is understood what is the instrument that can probe into something that is not the activity of thought? Is that possible? You understand the question? Carefully please, we are working together, put all your brains into this. Thought can investigate its own activity, its own limitation, its own process of putting things together, destroying that and creating something else. Thought in its own confusion can bring about a certain order, but that order too is limited order - right? Therefore it is not supreme order. Order means the whole business of existence.

So the word perhaps 'to probe' is wrong, to investigate is wrong - right? Because you cannot investigate into something which is beyond thought. You understand? You can write books about it and get a lot of kicks out of it. But you can play that kind of game everlastingly. Theologians and the excited people do all this kind

of stuff. But to understand whether it is possible to observe without any movement of thought, to observe. Observe that tree, to listen to that stream, which is part of observation naturally, without any interference of the word - the tree, the river - to observe without any movement of the past remembrance entering into your observation, which requires complete freedom from the past as the observer, and just to observe. You understand this? Are we understanding generally? Let's go into it a little more.

When we look - at your wife, or your husband, your friend or a train passing by - the train, the wife, the husband, the tree have all a particular name. The name is associated with memory, which is time - right? Memory can only take place during the interval of the incident and the remembrance, which is time. Right? So can you look, listen, observe, without the whole movement of thought, which is time? Right? Can you do it? Please listen to this. Don't say it is not possible. Or say, yes, let's get it. One has to observe. One has to see actually how you look at a tree, at that cloud in the morning lit by the morning sun, full of depth and beauty and light, and tremendous activity, to look at that without the word 'cloud'. That is fairly easy because it is nothing to do with us - right? You can look at the tree without the word - or the train, or the river. But the word 'river' is not that river, it is river. All the rivers in the world. Right? But if you associate river with one particular river you never then can understand the whole movement of rivers. Right? Oh, you are missing an awful lot.

So can you observe without the word? Which means to observe without all the remembrances and associations that word implies, contains? Can you look at your wife, or your girl-friend, or your

husband without the word 'wife', without all the remembrances that word contains, see the - you understand? - the importance of this so that you look at her or him, or the river as though for the first time? You know when you wake up in the morning and you look out of your window and see these mountains and the valleys and the trees, and the green fields, and the chalets spotted all over the valley, it is an astonishing sight when you look at it as though you were just born. Which means to observe without any bias - right? To observe without any conclusion, prejudice. Will you do that as we are talking? And you cannot do this if you are half awake. This demands again not attention, see what is implied and therefore you do it easily. If I look at my wife from all the images, incidents, memories and hurts and all that, I never look at her. I am always looking at her from the images, past memories, through that I look. You are all... some of you are married, or have girlfriends, haven't you? Look at it. Look at your wife or your husband - careful, careful, not in front of me please! - can you look as though for the first time without all the images, memories and all that nonsense?

So we are going to observe the nature of a religious brain, which is not contaminated by thought. This demands your greatest attention - right? Which means you are totally free, completely free from any commitment - right? To your guru, to your church, to your ideas, to your past tradition. Completely free of that to observe. Right? When you so observe, what has taken place in the very nature of the brain? You understand my question? Please understand the question first before we go into it. I have always looked at the tree, at the river, at the sky, at the beauty of a cloud, my wife, my children, my husband, my daughter and so on and so

on, always with a remembrance, with an image. That is my conditioning. And you come along and tell me: look without the word, without the image - right? - without all the past remembrances. And I say I can't do it. First immediate response is, I can't do it. Which means you are not actually listening to what the man is saying - right? Your response is so instantaneous and you say, "I can't do it". Now, to be aware, to be attentive to say, "I can't do it, is a form of resistance because you are committed to your particular rubbish of a guru, or to some form of religious doctrine so you are afraid to let go, therefore your immediate response is "I can't do it". So pay attention to that, right? "I can't do it" and also listen to what the other man is saying - right? That to observe there must be complete freedom of the word, the content of the word, and listen to both. So, this movement - you follow? - the resistance and the listening, wanting to listen, and you cannot listen if you are resisting, and be aware, don't move from that, don't say, "I must understand" - just watch it, so that you bring about total attention - right? Are you doing this, some of you? I hope you are sitting comfortably and paying attention to what is being said so that you can observe, there can be observation without the movement of thought - right? Are you doing it? Or is it just another theory, another wanting to do something like meditation and say "Tell me how to do it", "What is the method, what is the system?". That is all rather childish. Right? Can we go on from there.

That is, pure observation without the movement of the self - right? The word is the self - right? The word, the remembrances, the accumulated hurts, fears, anxieties, pain, sorrow, and all the travail of human existence is the self, which is my consciousness -

right? And when you observe, all that is gone. All that doesn't enter in that observation. There is no me observing. Right? Then in that observation in daily life there is perfect order. There is no contradiction. Contradiction is disorder, and that very contradiction with its disorder has its own peculiar limited order. Clear? We are not going off into a trance, are we?

So let's proceed. Then we can ask: what is meditation? The word, the etymological meaning of religion, they have not made it very clear. Look up various dictionaries, they haven't been able to trace the beginning of that word. They have given various meanings at different times, but generally it means to gather. Gather all your energy. I am putting this, not the dictionary says that. So what is meditation? Not how to meditate. When you ask 'how' there is somebody to tell you what to do. Right? If you don't ask 'how' and say what is meditation, then you have to exert your own capacity, your own experience, however limited, you have to think - right? And you say, "Tell me what is meditation, I'll go off into some kind of silly dream." The word 'meditation' means to ponder over, to think over, to be concerned with. And also it means, the root meaning, to measure, both in Sanskrit, Latin, Greek and so on, and in English, to measure. Not only to ponder over, think over, to be concerned, to be dedicated - not to something, but the spirit of dedication - you understand? And to understand the meaning of that word 'measure'. We live by measure. Measure is time, isn't it? I measure myself, what I am now, and what I should be. That is a measurement. I hope you are listening. Not trying to go off into some kind of meditation. I hope you are listening to find out for yourself, for nobody, nobody can

teach you what meditation is, however long bearded the gentleman is, or whatever strange garments he may wear. But to find out for yourself and stand by what you find out for yourself and not depend on anybody.

So for that one must understand very carefully the meaning of that word, which means to measure, basically. What does that imply? From the ancient Greeks to modern times, measurement in engineering is essential - right? The whole technological world of the West, Northern West rather, is based on measurement - right? You cannot possibly put together a bridge without measurement, or build a marvellous hundred story high building without measurement. And also inwardly we are always measuring: I have been, I will be - right? I am this, I have been this, I must be that - right? Which is not only measurement but comparison. Measurement is comparison. You are tall, I am short. Or, I am tall, you are short. I am light and you are brown - you follow? - measurement. So to understand the meaning of measurement and the two words 'better' and 'more' - to understand those two words and never use those two words, 'better' and 'more' inwardly - you understand all this? Are you doing it now as we are talking together? You have understood the meaning of that word meditation. To consider together - I won't go into more of it - to consider together, not I consider and I'm right, but together consider. That means you and I are willing to let go our own prejudices, and consider. And also it means to think over together. And to see the depth of the word measure - right? We have touched it briefly. We can go into it much more, I don't want to go into it in detail. But to see the meaning of that.

So when the mind is... when the brain is free of measurement - you understand? Becoming is a measurement. So for the brain to be free of measurement - you understand what has happened when you are free, when the brain is free of measurement, the very brain cells which have been used to measurement, conditioned by measurement, has suddenly awakened to the truth, to the fact that measurement is destructive psychologically, therefore the very brain cells have undergone a mutation. Get it? I wonder if you understand this?

May I repeat that if you are not clear? One's brain has been accustomed to go in a certain direction - right? Let us say our brains have been accustomed to going North, North East, and you think that is the only way to whatever there is at the end of it. What is at the end of it is what you invent naturally. But you come along and tell me that direction, North East, will lead you nowhere. I resist. I say, "No you are wrong. All the tradition, all the great writers, all the great saints, and bla, bla, bla, say you are wrong." Which means you really haven't investigated but you are quoting somebody else. Right? Which means you are resisting. So the man says to me, "Don't resist, listen to what I am saying, listen to what you are thinking, what your reaction is, and also to what I am saying." So listen to both. And to listen to both you must give attention, which means space. Right?

So to find out whether you can live, a daily life, not at moments of peculiar meditation, but to find out if you can live a daily life without measurement. You understand what the implication of that is? Never to use the word better, the more, I am the more, I am better than I was yesterday. Silly nonsense! I am less angry. I have

disciplined myself a little more today. You understand? This is what we are all doing in various categories. So to live a life without any sense of measurement, that is meditation. To think together - right? To ponder together. To be concerned together. Together to have no measurement - you understand sir? - except of course when you buy a suit or when you buy a car you have the better, you have to look at various models and so on.

So meditation implies a sense of deep understanding of that very word, and the very understanding, the perception, the insight into that word is the action which is to end measurement, psychological measurement. You understand? Are we doing this? Or are you just playing with this? First of all, don't we measure? - if we are honest with ourselves aren't we measuring always? Obviously. I was poor, now I am rich. I have understood now, I have not understood before. Right? Which is such nonsense. Because you didn't pay attention at the beginning, now you are being forced to pay attention. Do you follow ? And so on. To live a daily life without comparison, psychologically without measurement. Right? Which means the brain cells, which have been accustomed to all their life to measure, have suddenly ended measurement, therefore there is a mutation in the brain cells - right? You may not do it but see the fact. The logical, intellectual fact. It is like your brain is mechanical, obviously, there is no question about it. Responding to various programmes, various propaganda and so on, one's brain has become mechanical, routine, go to the office from 9.30 until 5.0 or 9.0 to 5.0 and so on and so on. So your brain, its cells, have been conditioned. And to break that conditioning instantly, not through evolution, time, is to listen

to something that is totally new. That is, no measurement, psychologically. Therefore when you see without any resistance to the fact then that very perception brings about a radical change in the very structure of the cells - you understand?

So, now let's move from there. What further is meditation? We have understood the meaning of that word together: concern, ponder, think over, look together - right? And to understand the meaning of that word measure, never to say "I am short", "I am tall", "I am dull", "You are more clever" and so on. And when you do that, you are what you are, from there you can move - right? If I am constantly imitating you because you are clever, I am imitating, that is not cleverness, because I am dull in comparison. If I don't compare at all with you, who are clever, I am what I am. I don't call myself then dull. I am what I am. From there I can begin. But if I am always pursuing you I have nowhere to begin. I am pursuing you. You understand?

So what is next in meditation? We have understood the nature of attention, complete listening - right? To listen there must be space and there must be sound in that space. And we are saying is there something sacred, something holy, something... is there, we are not saying there is, or there is not... is there something never touched by thought? Not that I have reached something beyond thought, that is silly nonsense. Is there something that is beyond thought? Which is not matter. You understand? Thought is a material process. I don't have to go into all that, we have gone into it. So anything that is put together by thought is limited and therefore it isn't complete, it isn't the whole. Right? So is there something that is so completely out of this world of thought? You

understand the question? We are enquiring together. The speaker is not saying that there is, or that there is not. We are enquiring, giving your attention, listening, which means what? All the activity of thought has ended - right? Except in the world, physical world, I have to do certain things - right? I have to go from here to there, I have to write a letter, I have to drive a car, I have to eat, I have to cook, I have to wash dishes, all kinds of things. There I have to use thought, however limited thought, however thought be routine there. But inwardly, that is psychologically, there can be no further activity unless thought has completely come to an end. Right? Obviously. You understand the question? To observe anything beyond thought, thought must come to an end. Not how to end thought, what is the method to end thought, which is concentration, control, who is the controller - you follow? The conflict of control. All that childish, immature stuff.

So to enquire, to have further insight, to observe if there is something beyond, not put together by thought, thought must completely end; the very necessity to find out ends thought. You have understood? I want to climb a certain mountain, the Jungfrau - I can't, but suppose I can - I have to train, I have to work, day after day climbing more and more and more - right? I have to put all my energy into that - right? So the necessity to find out if there is something more than thought, that very necessity creates the energy which then ends thought. You have understood this?

The importance of ending thought to observe further, that very importance brings about the ending of thought. It is as simple as that. Don't complicate it. You understand? Are we clear on this matter? If I have to swim I have to learn. The intention to swim is

stronger than the fear of swimming.

So this is important because thought, which is limited, the limitation there has its own space. Right? You understand? Its own order. When there is the cessation of the activity of the limited thought then there is space - right? Space not only in the brain, space. Not the space that the self creates round itself but the space that has no limit. You understand? When thought discovers for itself its limitation and sees that its limitation is creating havoc in the world then that very observation brings thought to an end because you want - you follow? - to discover something new. That is sir, a man who has been accustomed, trained to engineering and the understanding of internal combustion machine, which is the piston, he has worked at it for years. And he says, "I want to discover something more than that." So he has to put all that aside to see something new - right? If he carries all that with him all the time he can't see anything new. You understand? That is how the jet engine was discovered. The man who discovered understood completely the internal combustion machinery, that is the piston and all the rest of it, the propeller, and he said there must be something more. He was watching, waiting, listening. And he came upon something new. You understand? Similarly - it doesn't matter if we have five minutes longer, does it? Similarly I see - one sees thought is limited. And whatever it does will always be limited. Obviously. Because in its very nature it is conditioned, therefore limited. And it cannot go further through using that machinery. Therefore it says, "I have the urge to go further, the machinery must come to an end". Obviously. Then the ending of thought begins. You understand? Then there is space, and silence.

That is, meditation is the understanding of the word, the meaning of measurement, and the ending of measurement psychologically, which is to become. The ending of that. And the seeing the limited thought, thought is everlastingly limited. It may think of the limitless but it is still born of the limit. So it comes to an end. So the brain, which has been chattering along, muddled, limited, has suddenly become silent, without any compulsion, without any discipline, because it sees the fact, the truth of it. And the fact and the truth, as we pointed out the other day, is beyond time. And so thought comes to an end.

Then there is that sense of absolute silence in the brain. All the movement of thought has ended. It has ended but can be brought into activity when there is necessity in the physical world - you understand? It is quiet. It is silent. And where there is silence there must be space, immense space because there is no self from which - you understand? - the self has its own limited space, you when you are thinking about yourself, it is limited and it creates its own little space - right? But when the self is not, which is the activity of thought is not, then there is vast silence in the brain because it is now free from all its conditioning. And where there is space and silence it is only then something new, which is untouched by time, thought, can be. That may be the most holy, the most sacred - may be. You cannot give it a name. It is perhaps the unnameable. And when there is that then there is intelligence and compassion and love.

So life is not fragmented. It is a whole unitary process moving, living.

And we never talked about death. We haven't time. We are not

going to begin with that now. We have talked about it sufficiently at other times. But death is as important as life, as living. They go together. Living means dying, which means living means all the trouble - right? Pain, anxiety, to end that is dying. So it is like two rivers moving together, tremendous volume behind it of water.

And all this from the very beginning of these talks until now is part of meditation because we have gone into the human nature, and to bring about a radical mutation in that. And nobody can do it except you yourself. Finished. May I get up.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 24TH JULY 1983

This is a question and answer meeting. There are several hundred questions been sent in and we cannot possibly answer all those. It would perhaps take a couple of months, so we won't be here for a couple of months!

When we ask questions do we expect a reply from somebody else? Here are seven questions this morning. We shall answer them, or rather we shall together investigate the question, not the answer but rather in finding out the meaning of that question we shall then come upon the answer. The question is much more important it seems to me rather than the answer. Why one puts the question, what is the motive behind that question and do we expect a reply categorically, yes or no, or do we try to find an answer from somebody else rather than dig into the question, go into the question much more deeply and in the unfolding of the question perhaps we shall find the answer. The answer is not outside the question, it is in the question itself. I hope we are listening to all this.

It is a nice fresh morning. There was thunder last night and the air is fresh and I hope you are not going off to sleep.

1st QUESTION: I understand that in order to have a deep insight thinking must stop; for thinking to stop there must already be a deep insight. Where does one start? In this isn't the brain working to achieve something and thus preventing insight?

I don't know what the question means but we are going to go into it. I don't know what it all means. Let's go into it.

Do we clearly see, each of us, that our brain has become mechanical? We repeat, we live in the past and the reactions we have are obvious. And the question really is: where does one start? Where does one start to understand the whole problem of existence? Not insight, or thinking, how to stop thinking, but rather what is the meaning of all this? If we could start from there and then investigate more and more, deeper and deeper, then we will come upon something which may be not mechanical. That is, if we can realize that our brains have become mechanical. That is, when you insult another, the other insults you. Action, reaction. Right? A reward and punishment. On this basis, action, reaction, from that reaction, action, and so on, like a tide going in and out. And that is a mechanical process - right? Our memories are mechanical. We live in the past. If I have an experience and it is an exciting experience, it has brought about several rewards and I cling to that, which then becomes mechanical. If I am attached to a person, or to an idea, or to some kind of experience then that being attached becomes mechanical, you repeat over and over again the same thing. Sexual and every other form of repetitive action is mechanical. I hope this is clear.

Then the question is: can this mechanical habit, mechanical brain, which has been programmed to be mechanical because it is seeking security in the mechanical, constant repetition, repeating your own prejudices, is a mechanical process. I think that is fairly clear. And so the question is whether this mechanical process can stop.

Suppose one has a habit, either smoking, drugs, alcohol, sexual and habit of belonging to something, belonging to a group,

belonging to some kind of orthodox religion and so on, there you feel safe. There you feel you are among people who also think alike. And this mechanical process gives one a sense of security. This is again fairly clear. I hope you are listening. Are you listening, if I may ask? Because I don't see the point of coming here, going through all the heat, and the troubles one goes through, and sitting here and going off and dreaming something else, why you have come to listen to each other. So please let us listen to each other. Which doesn't mean you must accept what the speaker is saying or cling to your own prejudices, conclusions and so on but both of us are understanding a very, very complex problem. The problem is living, existence. And in that existence of our daily life and so on, one finds the brain keeps on repeating the same thing over and over again. You may put a different disc but it will be the same thing, repeated. And so on. So our brains have become mechanical through long evolution, through innumerable experiences, and the brain has accumulated a great many memories and keeps on repeating the memories. You know, we know all this. And therefore the brain has become mechanical. And in this mechanical process it seeks security. That is all we want. We all want security, both biological, physical, as well as psychological. And when a brain becomes mechanical one thinks there is security. As long as I repeat that I am British, that I am French, that I am - there is security. But that divisive process brings about insecurity. Right? That is clear. Are we?

Now the question is, before we go into the problem of insight, the question is: whether this mechanical process can come to an end? This mechanical process brings about a deterioration in the

brain - right? Do we see this? The brain needs stimulation. The brain needs challenging, questioning, doubting, asking, demanding. But if it is routine it stops demanding. It stops being sharp, clear and so gradually it deteriorates. You can see it all round - perhaps not here! But you can see it almost from teenagers to old age. I wonder if one is aware of one's own brain deteriorating by constant repetition. You may revolt against the old and fall into another pattern and then repeat that. "I am no longer a Christian, but I am a Buddhist". "I am no longer a Buddhist but Tibetan" - you know the game one plays all over the world.

So the question is: whether the brain can stop deteriorating? That is really a very, very serious question. As long as we are living in the past, which we are, because we live in memory, we are memories, and that is the past. There is no future memory; future memory may be projected from the past, meeting the present and modifying itself and going on - right? This is the process we all do. The past meeting the present, modifying itself and then proceeding further. But it is still the past in movement, isn't it?

So is there a way of looking at life, living, which is not merely the continuation of the past? Have I put the question? I find my brain - suppose I find - my brain becoming repetitive. The language is repetitive, the symbols that thought has created become repetitive, language which is - language is not limited - but the limitation of the language creates the symbols and so on. I won't go into all that for the moment. So language, the past memories, being attached to, tied to an experience, to a series of memories, all those, because they are mechanical, bring about deterioration of the brain. Is this clear? Can we go on from there? Don't please nod your head

and say yes, but watch your own brain, watch your own life, because your life is the activity of action, reaction, memories and all the turmoil, the depths, the pleasures, the anxieties, the loneliness and so on, that is our life. We have lived that way for a million years, or more or less, and that is repetitive. War after war - right? War after war in different parts of the world. There have been two terrific wars within the last few years. So that has been repeating, repeating, repeating. So we have come to that point. I hope you have listened to this.

When you have come to that point, one asks: why does the brain depend so much on the past, on being programmed? You understand? Is that clear? Why does the brain depend, or live with this repetitive action? We are saying this repetitive action gives great security. Freedom doesn't give security - right? We will come to that a little later. So security is the basis of holding on to the past. Tradition is the past. Those soldiers in London going every morning up and down - you have seen all this. Poor devils!

So now we are asking whether the brain can perceive its own mechanical process and that very perception brings about a challenge to move away from it. You have understood? I perceive that my brain is mechanical and I perceive it, not as an idea but actually - right? I perceive it. There is the perception that it is mechanical. That very perception is a challenge - right? Are we meeting this? I perceive a dangerous snake. That is a challenge - right? I have to do something about it otherwise that poisonous snake will kill me, so I have to act - right? There action takes place when there is perception - right? Are we meeting this?

Look, when I - when one is climbing a mountain and you see a

precipice, the precipice is a challenge, isn't it? Either you are very capable and so go on, or you get dizzy and hold on to a rock and crawl back. So in the same way when you perceive, when there is perception that the brain is mechanical, being programmed, and in that programme there is no security, though one may want security there is no security because the brain is becoming dull, deteriorating, therefore in that there is no security - right? Right? Clear? So when there is perception of a danger there is action right? When there is perception that the brain is becoming, or has become mechanical, that very perception brings about the energy to end that repetitive action - right? I wonder if you get this? Are we at all together in this? No, no. What am I to talk about it? You tell me what to do.

First of all, let's begin. Does one, each one of us realize that our brains have become mechanical? Do you realize that? Then whether you are a philosopher, whether you are a scientist, whether you are a businessman, whether you are following some guru, whether you belong to some religion or not, the whole mechanical process is going on - right? As long as that mechanical process is going on the brain must deteriorate because the brain needs to be tremendously active. It is active in mechanical processes - right? But it is not active in freedom. Therefore only in freedom the brain doesn't deteriorate. Is this clear, at least somewhat? Can we move from there?

As long as the brain is being programmed, repetitive, there is no freedom, and therefore it must deteriorate. It is like a human being in a prison. And there is no freedom there, therefore, not only biologically, organically, and also mentally, the brain deteriorates

gradually. Now let's move from there.

(Noise of heavy rain) It is nice after this fortnight of hot weather it is nice rain, cool.

It is not how to stop thinking, how to break the routine but if you see the fact that repetitive action, clinging to something of an experience which you have had and so on, are one of the major factors of deterioration. If you see that then you have brought altogether a different action - is this clear? Like when there is a perception of danger, physical danger, you act. But when we see that the brain is deteriorating because of various reasons which I have explained, you go on because you don't see the fact that routine is deteriorating the brain. If you saw it you would act. You saw fit to come here - right? You have taken the trouble to come here. You took steps, you saved money, or you had a lot of money and so on, but you decided to come here. Similarly when you see something clearly, the factors of deterioration, you go on. You don't say there must be action - right?

Now from that let's go into it further. What is the process of thinking? You understand? What is the cause, or causations of thinking? We all think, fortunately or unfortunately, some more, some less, some with an extraordinary clarity, logic, others live in a slip shod way. But we all think. And we have never asked: what is the cause, what is the root of thinking? You understand? Do please find out for yourselves what is thinking. When you are asked a familiar question your response is immediate. What is your name? Where do you live? And you immediately answer. Why? Because you are familiar with your name, you are familiar with the road and the house that you live in. And so familiarity and constant

repetition, you reply instantly. Right? Suppose one asks a little more complex question, there is an interval between the question and the answer. In that interval you are searching your memory, you are looking. You are saying, "I wonder if this is right", "This is wrong" - you follow? The interval between the question and the answer is time interval. In that time interval you are searching for an answer, whether in the encyclopaedia or in your own memory, or asking somebody - right? So there is an interval between question and answer, which is the time interval. Suppose one asks some very complex question and you say, "I don't know" - right? What is the distance from here to Mars? You don't know. And you say, "I don't know" - right? So familiarity, an interval of time between question and answer and saying "I don't know". So this whole process is thinking - right? Right sirs? Are we together in this? This whole process of the question which you are familiar with, the question which demands time, and you say "I don't know", all that is a process of thinking. Thinking along a particular line, if you are attached to a particular experience and you hold on to that experience, thinking then is round that experience - right? (Noise of heavy rain) Shall we wait a minute? Or shall I go on? I will go on in spite of the rain.

And thinking is based on memory. If you have no memory you can't think. And memory is gathered in the brain as knowledge. Knowledge comes from experience - right? Experience, knowledge, memory, thought. One must be absolutely clear on this - right? Experience is always limited, whether you are experiencing pleasure, pain, sorrow, loneliness, depression, anxiety, all that is limited. Right? A man who says, "I am enlightened" - right? You

understand? - when a person is asked, "Are you enlightened?", and the other person says, "I am", that very experience that he has illumined is limited. No sane, rational, really enlightened man says, "I am enlightened" - right?

So all experience is limited and therefore all knowledge in the future or in the past is limited. So thought, which is the child of memory, and memory is limited. So the whole thinking process is limited. Is this clear? Can we go on from that?

Now what happens when thought, which is limited, when there is limitation what takes place? You understand my question? Are you listening to this or the rain? (Pause for heavy rain) Shall we go on? Can you all hear?

When one is thinking about oneself, which most of us do, the thinking about oneself is very limited. You may expand that thinking about oneself as illumined, as a great writer, or... (Rain stops, laughter)... May we go on now? As we were saying that if we are concerned with ourselves, as most of us are, even those people who say, "I have reached the heights", they are thinking about themselves. And consequences of that thinking about oneself is very divisive. Right? If you are thinking about yourself and I am thinking about myself in various ways, it brings about a division, therefore in that division there is conflict - right? So whatever is limited must bring about conflict. I am an Arab and you are a Jew - or if you don't like that - I am a Jew, you are an Arab and so on. So wherever there is limitation there must be conflict. This is very important to understand because all our lives are based on limitation - right? And therefore we are in perpetual conflict. I wonder if we realize this, not verbally as a mere statement, that

wherever there is division in our relationship, however intimate, national division, economic division, social division, religious divisions, there must be conflict, struggle, war. This is a law. The law of Moses.

So when one realizes that and that self concern nationally and so on, is brought about by thought, and therefore thought being limited must inevitably create conflict - right? Is this clear? This is logical - right? - rational, sane. That wherever there is division, thinking about myself, my ambition and the other person thinking about his ambition, his fulfilment, this division must breed conflict.

So the question then is: is it possible, seeing the truth of this, that as long as I am an Indian, as long as I am concerned with my piano, with my enlightenment, or with my writing a book, and so on, it must invariably create disturbance, turmoil, conflict. If one sees, if there is perception of that, what is the action? Not how to stop thinking. I wonder if you see that. There is the perception that thought has created this division. Religiously you can see it very well: as long as I am a Catholic, as long as you are something else, we are going to be in turmoil with each other. And that is the product of thought. So what is one to do? You perceive the fact. Does the very fact free you? You understand? Or does the fact merely remain as an idea? You understand? You are not going to sleep? Are we still? The rain has gone, so we can begin again.

When one makes a statement like this: that wherever there is division there must be conflict, in relationship and so on. Is that a fact to you? That is, you see the reality of it? Or you merely see the idea of it? Is this clear? A fact, like a serpent is a fact. But you can draw an idea about a serpent and live in that idea. Therefore you

are living with a non-reality away from fact. Is this clear? Can we go on from there? Which is it we are doing now? Not tomorrow, now, as you are sitting there and we are discussing and we discover that where there is division there must be conflict. Is that a fact to you? Truth to you? Or is it just an idea? You understand? Which is it? Is it a fact, like you are hungry? Or is it an idea that you are hungry? You understand? Which is it? If it is a fact, it is so, that where there is division there must be conflict. Or you hear only a statement of it, therefore that is nothing to do with the fact? So which is it for you? If it is a fact it is so, that you will fall down a precipice, that is a fact. So you move away from it. So the fact is the challenge which you must answer - right? Are you answering? Or, you say, "That is too much, I don't know what the danger will be" and so on and so on? So it is up to you.

So it is not a question of thought stopping, but seeing the fact and the perception of the fact in itself brings about a movement which is not thought. I can't go on repeating this umpteen times.

And the questioner asks: what is insight? What is it, how does this perception and action instantaneously take place? That is what he means. You understand? Is the question clear? The question, that is, is there an action which is not based on memory - of course - if it is based on memory it is repetitive - is there an action, please ask this question of yourself, is there an action which is not based on past memories, past experiences and therefore on thought, and if there is action of such kind, that action is limited and therefore must breed conflict. So is there an action which is not based on past memories, experience and so on? Right? That is the question. And he asks, he says, that is insight. You understand? Seeing

something clearly, acting - right? For us we don't see something clearly, we take time, during that interval other changes take place, so our actions are always confused. Whereas is there an action - please ask this question of yourself, I am putting forward to you this question, please listen to the question and find out if the question is logical, rational. It is rational, logical because our actions are based on memories, on the past experiences, therefore our actions are mechanical. And the questioner says: is there a movement, an action in which the past, thought, doesn't enter at all. Is the question clear?

Now we are going to find out. Right? Thought as an instrument of action apart from the technological field, has created havoc in the world. Right? Are you clear on this? Oh my god, must I repeat all that over again? Thought has built marvellous cathedrals and thought has put all the things in the cathedral, the ceremonies, the rituals, the mass, all the dresses they wear, all that is the product of thought, and not divine revelation. One might like to think that but it is the movement of thought - right? And that movement is limited, therefore must create conflict. So do we see that the activity of thought, necessary in certain area - right? - but may not be necessary in other areas. Like in one's relationship to one's wife, husband, girl friend and so on, in that relationship, if that relationship is based on thought, therefore divisive, therefore conflict. That is clear, you all see that. Therefore where there is conflict there is no love. Jealousy is not love. Ambition is not love. But when the wife and the husband are both ambitious - right? - therefore there is perpetual conflict. So thought has its place, technologically, from here to there, and thought may not have a

place at all psychologically. Do you understand? So find out for yourself whether there is an action which is not based on thought. And the speaker says there is. Don't accept his word, doubt what he is saying, question what he is saying, he is no authority. He says, and he will give you a reason for it presently, that there is an action, that there is an action which is not based on thought. Right?

We are going to find out. Be sceptical please, doubt, question, what he is talking about. Hasn't it ever happened to you in your life, seeing something true and acting? Right? Without the process of thought, without the process of rationalization, without remembering, it must have happened - right? Every person has moments of this. Clear perception without any movement of thought, action taking place at the same time - no? Aren't you all human? Is this very strange? Some call it intuition, but the word intuition is rather a dangerous word. you can intuit your own desires, say "I want that" - you follow? So there is a movement, movement is action, there is a movement in which thought doesn't interfere at all. I will show it to you. Love is not thought - right? Agree to that? Love is not desire - right? Do you see that? Love is not pleasure. Love is not ambition, jealousy and so on, hate. So through negation of what love is not, the positive is. Are we doing this? Can you put aside jealousy, hate, ambition, aggression, violence, all that is not love. So love is an action in which desire is not, pleasure is not, therefore love, if there is such a thing as that, from that any action taking place is not the movement of thought. Are we together in this? Or is it all just a lot of verbiage?

Now put it round the other way. We operate from the background of memory. All our actions are based upon the past,

knowledge and so on. Now can you, can the brain see the fact that it is operating from the past, perceive that, and see the consequences of that, and seeing the consequences of it doesn't depend on the past - right? And therefore there is an action which is not of memory. I can't keep on repeating this. Are we getting anywhere near? There is an insight which is not born of remembrance. Insight is not of time - right? Time is thought, time is memory, time is experience, knowledge, and as long as we depend on time, which is divisive, therefore conflict, and to see this, to perceive the actuality of this, then only is there an insight into it.

I am allowed another quarter of an hour. We have talked an hour over one question.

2nd QUESTION: I long to be loved. And it is a constant anguish. What am I to do?

Is the question all right?

Aren't most of us in this position? We all want to be loved, specially by one. Now let's go into this. I have got quarter of an hour. It is a very complex question.

Why do we want to be loved? And why has it become anguish, an anguish? What is the cause, the root, or the motive, wanting to be loved? Do you understand my question? I want to be loved by you - god forbid - but I want to be loved by you. Why? Is it I am lonely? Is it that I feel if I am not loved I have no raison d'etre to live? Is it that if I am loved I feel I can flower, grow, be happy and all that? Right? Is it that in myself I am nothing but when you love me I become something? You are following all this? Please this is your life, not my life. So please listen to this. So there is a cause

which makes me say, "I want your love" - right? There is a cause, there is a motive, there is a background which says, "I must have that" - right? So we have seen some of the causes. I am desperately lonely. You all know that, don't you? Married, unmarried, whether you are amongst a group and so on, human beings through their self-centred activity bring about loneliness. Right? Is that one of the causes of the desire to be loved? As long as there is a cause the effect is to demand that you should love me - right? So can I understand the cause and be free of the cause? You have understood what I have been saying? Please sir, this is your life.

I am lonely, depressed, isolated and feel desperately unhappy, and if you love me I will say, "By Jove, everything is so beautiful". So my demand, my desire, my longing, is based on loneliness, demand for companionship, with whom I can talk, unfold and all the rest of it. So there is a cause - right? Now do I see the cause, actually? The cause is I am lonely. I am taking that one instance. I am lonely. And I want you to love me for god's sake. And you don't. You turn away from me. Either I commit suicide - right? Or I become full of anxiety - right? Depressed, more depressed than ever. I then escape from myself - football, church, new guru, or the latest literature, or the latest picture, talk about it - right? So is the cause of loneliness seen? Loneliness is a sense of isolation - right? The isolation comes into being as long as I am self-centred, thinking about myself, I am unhappy, I want you to love me - you follow? I have reduced all my life, which is such an extraordinary thing, to a small affair, that you love me. You understand? Such a petty little affair I have reduced it to. And being isolated I am unhappy and I wish you, I crave for you to love me. (Fly settles on

K's face) This particular fly is fond of me! (Laughter)

You understand? See the tremendous complexity of a very simple question. I want to be loved and I am not loved therefore I am full of anxiety. And the questioner says, "What am I to do?". When the brain is caught in such anxiety, such anguish, it can't think clearly, can it? Right? It can't even listen it is so full of its own anxiety, its own sense of desperation. Now can there be an interval in which you listen? You understand? A short period in which you say, "Tell me about it" and then will you listen? Or will you say, "No, I don't want to listen because I still love being in a tremendous state of anxiety" - you understand what I am saying? Most people do. Without that sense of anguish you are nothing. That sense of anguish keeps you alive - no? Oh come on sirs, this is all ordinary psychology, childish psychology. So will you, if you are in such anguish, for a few minutes, listen to what is being said? Or you love your anguish so much you don't want to listen?

So as we were saying the other day, if you really listen, with your heart, with your mind, with all your being, then you have a space, your brain becomes quiet, then you listen. Then that very listening is like a seed that is being sown, then you don't have to do a thing, it then grows, multiplies. And when you understand love is not something to be asked for you don't stretch out your hand to be loved. That means that you are dependent on somebody. That means you really don't love at all. If you are asking another to be loved, if you are asking to be loved by another, it means you have no love in yourself. It is so obvious. If you have love, you don't ask anybody that you be loved. You see we are making ourselves into beggars. That is what is happening. When you go to church, pray,

we are beggars. When we want somebody to help us, we are beggars. Or when we depend on books we are beggars. It may be all right to be a beggar but see the consequences of it: you are always depending on somebody else. And there are all those people who will help you fill your bowl full of their rubbish.

So see what has taken place when we hear this question: I want to be loved, and I am not, I live in great anguish, what am I to do? That means one has no love in oneself. Then how can another love you - you understand? If you have no love and you are incapable then of receiving love - you understand? Love is not a vacuum, like a sense of emptiness. On the contrary. If you have that tremendous feeling - not feeling - a quality, a depth, a beauty, then you don't ask anybody for love. It is like a cup being full. Right? If you have listened to this very carefully, then the problem is gone.

Finished for this morning. We will meet again tomorrow morning, if you want to. May I get up please?

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 25TH JULY 1983

There have been a lot of questions. "You say this and you say that." "I read your biography, and why do you say that?" "What is this?" And so on. Innumerable questions about all that kind of stuff. But we never apparently ask a direct question about ourselves. You are always quoting somebody or other. Or who is the greatest mahatma, avatar and all that kind of, you know, immature, thoughtless stuff. And also apparently we don't seem to be concerned really with ourselves, with our problems, with our jealousies, with our hatreds and calumny, and all the travail that goes on in our daily life. I wonder why? Personally I am not interested in what the Buddha or anybody said but I want to know the way I am living, why I am living this way, what are my peculiarities, prejudices, opinions and so on. We never seem to ask such questions. Why we cling to our prejudices, our conclusions and why we follow somebody or other. We never seem to, if we can most respectfully point out, we never seem to be aware of our own deeper anxieties, why our brains have become so shoddy, not clear, bright, alive, active, but always "Why do you say that" and "Why do you say the other thing". That is how we live.

So I would like, if one may, to ask you a question. Not you ask the speaker a question. I would like to ask you a question: What will make you change? What will make your mind, brain rather, extraordinarily active, alive, free so that you have an extraordinary view of life, the great complexity of life, not one's own life, the life of nature, the life of the earth, the trees, the ocean, the immense

skies, the beauty of the world. And if one were to ask you that question, what would you say? Why are we all so - forgive me if I use that word - dull? Going along a particular line and never varying, moving away, never seeking real freedom - why? Is it fear? If it is fear then let us deal with it and be out, finished. But if you keep on asking, if one may point out, "Why do you say this?" "What do you mean by that?" - you know, then you are depending on somebody. So please, today and tomorrow, we have only two question meetings left, and could we ask ourselves, if you are listening, ask ourselves: Why we are what we are, after this millenia upon millenia of evolution, why are we violent, so disorderly in our life, why do we have this antagonism for another, why do we get hurt? You understand? The deeper issues of life. But apparently one is not interested in those things. So I will go on with the usual questions if I may.

1st QUESTION: Is there such a thing as right education?

If you have children, this is the question, is there such a thing as right education? Either a parent has put this question because he has many children and knowing what the world is, the extraordinary brutality and vulgarity and all the terrible things that are happening, what is their future? A parent would be tremendously concerned if he loved his children, which I doubt very much, if he really loved their children, if he asked such a question: what is right education? - and what is one to do with children who are already contaminated, if I can use that word, by other children, by society, by the friends they have, the terrible language children use already? You follow? All this and naturally a parent concerned not only with his own children, but with the

children of the world, because those children are going to contaminate my son, my daughter. So this a question which we must very carefully enquire into. Why are we being educated? What does education mean? The ordinary meaning is to draw out - educate. To draw out. But that is just the dictionary meaning. Linguistically it means to help the child to grow, to understand, to comprehend the whole process of living. And he goes to school, there he is taught, he learns to memorize really. So he gradually builds up a whole structure of memories along a particular line, doctor, engineering, philosophy, psychology, physicist and so on. And the computers are taking the place of teachers. A computer can teach far better than an ordinary local teacher. On the computer you can have the top teachers in their special subject. So they can learn from the computers. And the computer is becoming more and more superior to the human brain. Perhaps you know something of it. I have already talked about it so we won't go into that.

And why should he, please just listen first, why should he carry all the encyclopaedic knowledge about one subject or the other and retain all that in his brain? Is that education? You understand, I am questioning. We can look up a book, an encyclopaedia and work from that. You follow? If one is a surgeon you have to naturally know a great deal of the human anatomy, you have to study and go into all that, it may take ten to fifteen years. And technologically to have extraordinary understanding of the whole world of the technique. And that is what we are cultivating more and more and more.

And also we are neglecting totally the whole psychological world, the whole world of the psyche - right? This is what is

happening. One side you have an extraordinary development in technology - whether it is science, biochemistry or genetic engineering, or a top surgeon - right? You have that extraordinary field, highly cultivated more and more. And the other side of the human being, which is far more important - you understand? - this is far more important, that is neglected, denied, you say it is not important. You understand? The Communist world, the ideological Communist, not that I have read Lenin, Marx or any of that, but we have talked to a great many Communists - are you frightened of that? There are some friends of mine - you don't mind? They say what matters is not the psyche but the environment. Change the environment fundamentally and then you will change man, which can never take place. But they stick to that theory because Lenin had talked about it, Marx, you follow? So they hold to that.

So both in the Democratic world and the so-called Totalitarian world, and the religious world obviously, education means academic training, academic excellence. To be able to argue, to learn a job, to become a professor, and live in a world of your own in that particular discipline and so on. And the psyche, which always overcomes the outer, you understand? - you may have a marvellous government, rules, laws and so on, but ambition, the drive for power, position, all that overcomes the other - right? You have seen this happening right in front of our eyes in the Communist world. So what is it to be educated? You understand? As a parent - I am not a parent - but if I was a parent that would be my tremendous concern; conscription on the one side, two years or four years in the army - in America there is no conscription, or in England, nor in India because there are so many poor people who

can join the army and go on with it. But what is one to do in a world like this? You understand my question?

So what is right education? Is it not both the cultivation of a brain that can function excellently in the world and also psychologically understand the whole meaning of existence, the self, the I, the psyche? You understand? Couldn't these two go together - like two well trained horses trotting along harmoniously together - you understand my question? And apparently one horse is highly developed, the other is still a baby, a foal. And right education seems to be not only academic training, because we have to have a job - you may have a job and work only for two hours if the computers become more and more important you will have more and more leisure. That is taking place already. And that leisure is going to be used, exploited by the entertaining structure, industry. More and more that is going to happen. Obviously you can see it is happening now. So how does one, apart from the academic affairs, how does one become a good human being - right? You are asking this question, I am not asking this question. I have no children but I meet hundreds of children all over the world. I go to various schools and so on. It is your children, not mine. You have to listen to this, find out, not just say some doctor tells me what to do, some psychologist says that I must treat my children this way and that way and so on - you know.

So how am I, having a few children, knowing they are going to be conditioned by other children, knowing that in a school they are going to be conditioned, the newspapers, the magazines, the books, the history books, my country opposed to your country, my kings are better than your kings - you know all that nonsense that goes

on. And how am I, as a parent, to bring about a good mind, a good brain, a good human being? The word good has several meanings. It is an old fashioned word, even though it is old fashioned I think it is a good word. How is one to bring about a good human being? My children, I would like them to be good, not sentimental, not romantic, not just having a sloppy brain, what am I to do? You understand my question? You have children, haven't you? No? You mean to say you have no children? (Laughter) And isn't this your problem? First of all good means not only in action, correct action, not righteous action, correct action. See the difference between righteous action and correct? Precise action, talking precisely, clearly, communicating to another what he wants to say, not mumble, you follow, all the rest of it. And also good means whole. If I may use that well worn out word, holistic. I would like my children, daughter and son to have a view of the world as a whole. The view of humanity not from his narrow point of view but humanity. You understand? The whole of the human world. And also to have a good relationship with nature, not to destroy things, the birds, the animals, the whales - you understand? Not to destroy. And to have a great sense of beauty, not the appreciation of art but to have the feeling of beauty. And to have that great sense of affection, love, compassion. These are all just words. Now how am I as a parent and therefore a teacher - teacher is not merely in the school but also being a parent I am a teacher also - so how am I to help him to have this? You understand my question? Please answer this question: how are you, if you see this is the way to live, this is the way to act in relationship and so on, how are you going to bring this about in a student, in your child? If you are an example as a

parent, an example, he will turn his back onto you - right? You understand? He won't listen to you. So not to be an example, that is if you smoke don't tell the child not to smoke because he will say, "Well you smoke, why shouldn't I?" And then the whole argument goes on. If you are an example at all - see the implications of being an example. You want him to conform, you want him to copy what you are and so you deny him freedom to work, think, act. Right? You understand all this? Is this getting too complicated?

And he is conditioned, not only by you, by the language you have used, the climate, the food, the social environment, the other boys, his grandmother says, "Look, believe in god", or "Don't believe in this new guru" - or whatever the nonsense the parents tell the child. So the child is being gradually conditioned, narrowed down. How am I as a parent to prevent that? You understand? Is it possible? Is it possible for me in talking with my son to realize I am conditioned, I realize also that he has been conditioned. So I tell him "Look, I am conditioned and you are being conditioned. Let us talk about it. Let us see if we can be free of it." - you understand? It is not "I am the parent, I know far more than you do", but rather in this relationship there is no superior and inferior - right? In this relationship I talk to him. I say, "I also am conditioned. I have been brought up by the Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, whatever the nonsense is, and you are being conditioned. Let's see what it does in the world." I will go into it with him. I keep on at it, day after day, in different ways, not to bore him. But the pressure from the outside is much stronger - you understand all this? Tremendously strong and probably he will succumb to it, as most children do. There are very, very few exceptions. And I hope

my son will be an exception, but I jolly well also know that he is not going to be.

So it is a constant observation, constant helping, guiding, not guiding - you follow? That can only happen if there is love between us. If he respects me and I respect him. Respect. So I am asking you: do you respect anybody? And if you don't what is the good of talking to a child, your son, to have respect? What does that word mean? The meaning is to look back. I won't go into the meaning of that word for the moment. Is respect part of love? Or if there is love nothing else matters? You understand? In love there is generosity, there is sympathy, pity, but pity is not love, sympathy is not love - right? So have I love in my being when I talk of love to him? Or is it just a word? You understand what I am saying? Are you interested in this? Or you want to reach Nirvana? (Laughter) Don't you see, please, unless we lay the foundation in our life you can't go very far. You may sit endlessly in a certain posture, meditate. There used to be a man in India who meditated for twenty five years, day after day, day after day. He came to see us one day and you couldn't talk to him sanely about anything because he was still meditating. So do we love anything at all? Do you love your wife, and husband, or your girl-friend, or whatever it is? Please, do we? If you loved your children you would stop all wars - right? If every parent in the world loved their children, do you know what would happen naturally? You wouldn't allow anybody to kill him or him to kill others. You understand? But our governments all over the world are based on power, position, status, and therefore to protect all that, guns. You know all the rest, I don't have to go into that.

So right education seems to be - I am not saying this, it is for you to find out - right education seems to be not only to have an academic training so it will be excellent in that direction, but also to be a good whole human being, unfragmented, not broken up and contradictory, living in a battle with himself and with others. That requires a great deal of enquiry into the psyche, not according to Jung or Freud, or somebody including that of the speaker, but to watch one's own responses, one's own actions, one's own behaviour. And out of that comes an extraordinary sense of freedom. And freedom, that word has the root meaning in love. That is enough for that. Gosh one question takes a longtime doesn't it?

2nd QUESTION: Could we speak about the brain and the mind?

There is a lot of it. I will read it briefly twice and I hope you will understand a rather long question. I haven't read it before.

Could we speak about the brain and the mind? Thinking takes place materially in the brain cells. If thinking stops and there is perception without thought what happens in the material brain? You seem to say - (again, you seem to say) - that mind has its place outside the brain but where does the movement of pure perception take place if not somewhere in the brain? And how is it possible for mutation to take place in the brain cells if pure perception has no connection in the brain?

Have you understood the question? May I read it once more? It is a good question, so please listen to it. I am listening to it too.

Could we speak about the brain and the mind? Thinking takes place materially in the brain cells. That is, thinking is a material

process. If thinking stops and there is perception without thought, what happens to the material brain? You seem to say that mind has its place outside the brain but where does the movement of pure perception take place if not somewhere in the brain? And how is it possible for mutation to take place in the brain cells if pure perception has no connection in the brain?

Right. Have you got the question? So first he wants, the questioner says, to differentiate, separate, distinguish and so on, between the mind and the brain. And then he asks if perception is purely outside the brain, which means thought is not the movement of perception. And he asks, if the perception takes place outside the brain, which is the thinking process, remembering process, then what happens to the brain cells themselves which are conditioned by the past? You follow? And will there be a mutation in the brain cells if perception is outside? Is this clear? Are you sure it is clear?

So let's begin with the brain and the mind. The brain is a material function. It is a muscle - right? Like the heart. And the brain cells contain all the memories. Please I am not a brain specialist. Nor have I studied the experts. But I have lived a long time now and I have watched a great deal, not only the reaction of others - what they say, what they think, what they want to tell me, but also I have watched how the brain reacts - you follow? And so on. I won't go into what my brain is, that is unimportant. I know you would like that (Laughter). So the brain has evolved through time - right? From the most single cell, taking years, millions and millions of years, until it reached the ape and go on another million years until it could stand and so ultimately the human brain. The human brain is contained within the shell, within the skull - right?

It is there. But it can go beyond itself - right? You can sit here and think of your country, or your home, you are instantly there - right? In thought, not physically, you are here, but instantly you are in your home, or in a far away country. The brain has extraordinary capacity - right? Technologically, see what it has done, the most extraordinary things they are doing. If you have asked some of them, and fortunately or unfortunately I meet them very often, they tell me all about it.

So the brain has extraordinary capacity. That brain has been conditioned - right? - that is so - by the limitation of language, not the language itself but the limitation of language, you understand the difference? I won't go into that. It has been conditioned by the climate it lives in, by the food it eats, by the food, by the social environment, the society in which it lives, and that society has been created by the brain - you understand? So that society is not different from the activities of the brain. I hope you are following all this. And a thousand million years of experience - right? Millions of years of accumulated knowledge based on that experience, which is tradition. I am British, you are German. He is a Hindu, he is a black man, he is this, he is that - all the nationalistic division, which is tribal division - right? - and the religious conditioning - so the brain is conditioned. Right? And being conditioned it is limited. The brain has extraordinary capacity but it has been conditioned and therefore limited - right? It is not limited in the technological world, like computers and so on, but it is very, very limited with regard to the psyche. People have said, "Know yourself" - from the Greeks, from the ancient Hindus and so on. They study the psyche in another - you understand? But

they never study the psyche of themselves. The psychologists, the philosophers, the experts, they never study themselves. They study the rats, the rabbits, the pigeons, the monkeys and so on and so on and so on, but they never say, "I am going to look at myself. I am ambitious, I am greedy, I am envious, I compete with my neighbour, with my other scientists, I want better... " - you follow? It is the same psyche that has existed for thousands of years, though technologically you are marvellous outside person. You understand? So inwardly we are very primitive - right?

So the brain is limited, primitive, in the world of the psyche. Now can that limitation be broken down? You understand my question? Can that limitation, which is the self, the ego, the me, the self-centred concern, can all that be wiped away? Which means the brain then is unconditioned - you understand what I am saying? Then it has no fear. Now most of us live in fear. Most of us are anxious, frightened of what is going to happen, frightened of death, you know, all the rest of it, a dozen things, anxious. Can all that be completely be wiped away and be fresh? You understand? So that the brain is free. Then its relationship to the mind is entirely different. The mind - I must here say that we have discussed this matter, not that you must accept it, the speaker has discussed this matter with several scientists, the top ones, not the local chaps who are government servants, and they won't go as far as the speaker has gone, they go theoretically - you understand? But actually. See the difference. That is, to see that one has no shadow of the self. And that is extraordinarily arduous, to see the me doesn't enter into any field. You understand what I am saying? No? No, sir, not you. The self hides in many ways, under every stone. The self can hide

in compassion, going to India and looking after the poor people, because the self then is attached to some idea, some faith, to some conclusion, some belief, you understand? - which makes me compassionate because I love Jesus or Krishna, and I go up to heaven. The self has many, many masks - you understand? The mask of meditation, the mask of achieving the highest, the mask that I am enlightened. I know of which I speak of - you know. All this concern about humanity. that is another mask. So one has to be extraordinary, have a subtle mind - quick brain rather, not mind, to see where it is hiding. You understand this? It requires great attention, watching, watching, watching. You won't do all this. Probably you are all too lazy, or too old and say, "For god's sake, all this isn't worth it. Let me alone." But if one really wants to go into this very deeply one has to watch like a hawk every movement of thought, every movement of reaction, so the brain can be free from its conditioning. I am speaking, the speaker is speaking for himself, not for anybody else. He may be deceiving himself - right? He may be trying to pretend to be something or other - you understand? He may be, you don't know. So have a great deal of scepticism, doubt, question, not what others say, yourself.

So when there is no conditioning of the brain it no longer degenerates - right? As you get older and older - perhaps not you - but people generally they get older and older, their brain begins to wear out, they lose their memories, they behave in a most peculiar way, you know all that. Degeneration is not merely in America, jazz and vulgarity, degeneration takes place in the brain first. And when the brain is completely free of the self and therefore no longer conditioned, then we can ask - we are now going to ask, not

the brain, then what is the mind?

The ancient Hindus, we have talked to some of the so-called learned people in India, they are learned but not the actual reality. They are learned about what other people have said. They have enquired into the mind - right? And they have posited various statements. But wiping all that out, not depending on somebody however ancient, however traditional, what is the mind? There is according to the Christian theory, Genesis, that man suddenly came into being at 4,500 BC - you know - which seems rather absurd because at 4,500 BC the ancient Egyptians invented the calendar. You can look it up if you want to and see what I am saying is correct. But that invention must have come after tremendous search, enquiry of generation after generation, so there was a connection between India, Jerusalem, Israel and Egypt at that time. I won't go into all that, I am not a historian.

So what is the mind? I say Genesis is disorder out of chaos, out of that came order - right? You know. You understand there are two things involved in it: disorder has its own order - right? Are we clear on this? Trains don't run punctually, - right? A day late, two hours late, if you are in the East perhaps the next day it will come, the engineer has gone to see his wife on the way, and talk to some friends - you know. Take it leisurely. But that very leisurely, slack way, has its order, it arrives tomorrow instead of today. But at least it arrives, that is an order - right? I don't know if you have ever watched, a cigarette smoke goes straight up - right? In a room where there is no draught, it goes straight up and after reaching a certain point it goes off. In that going off there is order. They are enquiring into this. It is not my business now. So we live in

disorder - right? Our brain functions in disorder. Our brain is constantly in conflict therefore it is disorder. Such a brain cannot understand what the mind is? The mind can only be seen, not my mind, or your brain, or my brain, the mind, the mind that has created the universe, the mind that has created the cell, so that mind is pure energy and intelligence. You don't have to believe all this. So that mind, when the brain is free, that mind can have a relationship to the brain, but if the brain is conditioned it has no relationship. So intelligence is the essence of that mind, not the intelligence of thought, not the intelligence of disorder. But it is pure order, pure intelligence and therefore it is pure compassion. And that mind has a relationship with the brain when it is free. Right?

Now I must go on. I could go lots more into this but I won't. Are you getting tired or are you listening? Are you listening to yourself, or are you just listening to me? Are you doing both? Then are you watching your own reactions, how your brain works? That is, action, reaction, back and forth, back and forth, which means you are not listening. You are only listening when this action, reaction stops, just pure listening. You understand? Are you following this? Oh come on sirs, don't... Look sir, the sea is in constant movement - right? The tide is coming in, the tide going out. This is its action. And the human beings are also in this action - action, reaction, that reaction produces another reaction, that reaction in me produces another reaction and so back and forth. Therefore when there is that movement back and forth there is no quietness naturally. In that quietness you can hear - right? The truth or the falseness - not when you are back and forth, back and forth - right? At least see it

intellectually, logically if there is constant movement you are not listening, how can you listen? But only when there is absolute silence you can listen - right? See the logic of it. And is it possible to stop this movement back and forth? I say it is possible, the speaker says it is possible when you have studied yourself, when you have gone into yourself very, very deeply. Understand yourself then you can say the movement has really stopped.

And the questioner asks: as the mind is outside the brain, the mind is not contained in the brain, but outside - we have discussed this with some scientists and they say yes, perhaps casually to please me, or theoretically they see but we are talking - the speaker is talking factually for himself. Right? He may have a hole in his head but... So, he says how can this perception, which takes place only when there is no activity of thought, then how does the brain cells, which are a material process, bring about a mutation? That is the question - right? You have heard the question? May I repeat it? No, I don't have to repeat the whole question.

Sir, look: keep it very simple. That is one of our difficulties: we never look at a complex thing very simply. Right? This is a very, very complex question but we must begin very simply to understand something very vast. So let's begin simply. Traditionally you have pursued a certain path - right? Religiously, economically, socially, morally and so on, a certain direction all your life. I have - suppose I have. You come along and say, look that way, the way you are going leads nowhere. It will bring you much more trouble, you will keep everlastingly killing each other, you will have tremendous economic difficulty - right? - and he gives you logical reasons, examples and so on. But you say, no

sorry this is my way of doing things. And you keep going that way. Most people do - right? Most people, ninety nine per cent of the people keep going that way, including the gurus, including the philosophers, including the newly achieved enlightened people. And you come along and say, "Look, that is a dangerous path, don't go there. Turn and go in another direction entirely" - right? And you convince me, you show me the logic, the reason, the sanity of it and I turn and go in a totally different direction. What has taken place? You understand my question? I have been going in one direction all my life, you come along and say, "Don't go there, it is dangerous, it leads nowhere. You will have more troubles, more aches, more problems. Go in another direction, things will be entirely different." Right? And I accept your logic, your statements sanely, logically, you follow?, all that, and I move in another direction. What has happened to the brain? You understand? Keep it simple. Going in that direction, suddenly move in the other direction, the brain cells have themselves changed. You understand? I have broken the tradition. You follow this? You understand? It is as simple as that. But the tradition is so strong, it has all its roots in my present existence and you are asking me to do something which I rebel against, therefore I am not listening - you understand? But whereas I listen to find out what you are saying if it is true or false. I want to know the truth of the matter, not my wishes, my pleasures, but I want to know the truth of it, therefore being serious I listen with all my being and I see you are quite right. I have moved - right? In that movement there is a change in the brain cells. It is as simple as that. Have you got this? Oh, no, don't look so...!

Look sir, if I am a Catholic, or a devout Hindu, practising Catholic and so on, you come and tell me, "Look, don't be silly, all that is nonsense. They are just traditions, words, words, without much meaning, though the words have accumulated meaning." You understand? So you say, "Point out" and I see what you say is the truth, I move, I am free from that conditioning, therefore there is a change, a mutation in the brain. Look I have been brought up, we have all been brought up to live with fear - right? We are all brought up, not only fear of something, but fear - I won't go into it now what is the nature of fear. And you tell me it can end and instinctively I say, "Show it, let's go together, find out" Right? I want to find out if what you are saying is true or false, whether fear can really end. So I spend time, I discuss with you, I want to find out, learn, so my brain is active to find out, not to be told what to do. So the moment I begin to enquire, work, look, watch the whole movement of fear, then I accept it and say well, I like to live in fear, or move away from it. When you see that there is a change in the brains cells. It is so simple if you could only look at this thing very simply. There is a mutation - to make it a little more complex - in the very brain cells, not through any effort, not through the will, or through any motive, when there is perception. Perception is when there is observation without a movement of thought - right? When there is absolute silence of memory, which is time, which is thought. To look at something without the past. Do it sir. Look at the speaker without all the remembrance that you have accumulated about him, not his gestures, but watch him; or watch your father, your mother, your husband, wife, girl and so on, it doesn't matter what - watch without any past remembrances and

hurts and guilt and all that coming into being. Just to watch. Then when you so watch without any prejudices, then there is freedom from that which has been.

I have got five more minutes. Shall I go on with the next question? I am sure you want me to go on. But you are not active in your... you should be tired.

3rd QUESTION: I once hurt someone very much. Why is the feeling of guilt such a deep tenuous one that endures in spite of every effort to be free of it?

Right? You have understood the question? Do you feel guilt? Don't most of you here have guilty consciences about something or other - no? Or are you all pure human beings? So there is guilt. What does that word mean to each one of us? Having, doing something one feels one shouldn't. A very simple level. Psychologically hurting another, and the other commits suicide and you feel my god, what a terrible thing I have done. Right? Or you have remorse, which is the same thing - right? You understand? We are talking about guilt - culpa, mea culpa.

People make you feel guilty, that is one of their tricks. Because then they can do what they like with you. We have been in that position very well, all of us. The father, the mother, the big bully or somebody, bullies you and you feel you have done something terrible and then they have you by the neck, blackmailing you. You understand all this? Don't you know all this? And why does one feel guilty? I understand why you make me feel guilty because you want power over me. Then you have me by the tail - right? So that is quite a different matter. But you have been unkind, you have done something to another, physically or psychologically, and he

jumps over the bridge. And you feel my god, what have I done? What a terrible - I wish I hadn't done that - right? And you feel guilt. You understand that word, all of us? So I don't have to go into the word, the meaning of that word. Why? I have done everything I can. You want me to love you more and out of my heart, I will do everything, out of myself, not because you want me more - you understand? Are you following all this? It is your life sir not mine. I am your mother, father, whatever it is, I have done everything, I have loved you, taken care of you, all that on my part, but you want me to do more, exclusive. And I can't. I have given you my heart but you want the entire heart, but I would like a little bit of it for somebody else! And you get hurt - right? Then you jump, or commit suicide, do every kind of horror to hurt me. Then I feel guilty. These are cases. I am taking an example which is common. You do it very little or a great deal, but this blackmailing goes on.

So nationally they do it - you understand? You have hold of the whole government because you are going to fast - you know all the tricks they are playing. So why does one feel guilty, with all its anxieties, with its fears, with its kind of shrinking feeling - you understand? - Right? The feeling of my god, I wish I hadn't done that, I wish I had given more. But I have given the best of everything I have but you want something more but I can't. But you want me to feel guilty because I can't give more, and you make me feel more guilty by jumping in the lake, or taking a pill and committing suicide. So I am not going to be blackmailed - you understand? I have given everything possible. Or I don't want to give it - you understand? I don't want to feel guilty, not by your

action. But you want me to feel guilty, then you have me. And I refuse to be put in that position - you understand? I won't be guilty. I mean I see the absurdity of it. Unless there has been a trick played on me, that is a different matter. I see very clearly that I have done everything a human being possibly can and you want more and I can't give more. And it is your affair if you want to kill yourself, I haven't done anything. You understand? Why can't we be sensible about all this?

I know - we know many, many people who have carried guilt all their life. It is like a wound never healing because they always remembering and that destroys their life. One has done everything possible, yielded, lied, given but the bully wants more. The responsibility is not yours but that of the bully - right? Finished. May I get up please?

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 26TH JULY 1983

We have had marvellous weather but a bit hot, except for yesterday's rain it has been marvellous weather. We have been here for twenty two years and this is the first four or three weeks it hasn't pelted with rain. I hope you have all had a nice holiday. This is the last talk. Perhaps we shall meet again next year.

There are several questions here and one wonders, one asks, how you approach a problem. Life has many problems, economic, social, religious and so on, technological. How do you approach a problem? The word approach means draw near, come close to. And the word problem means something thrown at you, the root meaning of the word, something thrown at you, a challenge. And how do you receive that challenge? If we approach a problem with a trance of tradition - that is a good phrase, a trance of tradition - then you will never solve the problem. On the contrary the problem remains and you introduce into it more problems, which is what is happening in the political world and so on. Or if you approach a problem, come near, draw near, with a conclusion already made, then obviously one doesn't answer the challenge, or the problem. Or if one has some ideological conclusion, belief, then if you approach a problem with that, again the same thing continues - right? Are we clear on this? That any problem, whether it be a technological problem, or social problem or personal problem and so on, religious, unless one approaches it without any motive, if that is possible, then the problem has very little significance: what matters is how one approaches it, because the approach is going to

dictate the issue. Right? Are we together in this? We are not telling you what to do. We are not your guru and don't you follow the speaker. The speaker is not important, but what he says is important and for you to find out whether it is false or true. So one must have a great capacity to be sceptical, doubt, to question - right? - so that your mind is sharp, clear.

And we are going to answer some of these questions. There are problems and we are going to approach it without any motive, personal, without the deadening weight of tradition, or having a particular bias, prejudice - right? So that your mind, your brain is free to look at the problem. I hope it is clear. That to understand the problem the brain must be free to look at it afresh, otherwise you just repeat, repeat, repeat and that becomes rather tiresome, boring and useless. With that, when that is clear, let's examine these questions together. It is not that the speaker is going to examine them, it is not a problem for him, but as it is a problem for the questioner and for most people, we are going together, so there is no leader and the lead - right? Clear? There is no guru sitting on a platform. Fortunately I have no beard, or strange robes and all that kind of nonsense. So we are together going to examine without any bias, without any tradition, prejudice, to enquire into this problem. It is so hot already.

1st QUESTION: What is desire? And is desire awakened by external objects?

This is a very good question. It requires a great deal of enquiry into this. Are you prepared? I hope you are not going off in a trance in the heat, and all that. I hope your minds are fresh and you are capable of listening not only to the speaker but also to your

own reactions, to your own attitudes.

The questioner asks: what is desire? And is desire awakened by an external object? So first let's look together: what is desire.

Desire in our life has become extraordinarily potent. We desire so many things. We desire heaven and if you are a Hindu you desire Moksha, another kind of heaven, liberation; or you desire a car, a woman or a man, or you desire a lovely garden, you have plenty of money and so and so on and so on. What is desire? How does it awaken? What is the purpose, the intent, the drive behind desire - right? You understand what desire is, the word, desirer and so on. Please this is going to be a very complex question and we are going to go into it together and if you will listen to it all, the whole of it, not just little bits of it.

First of all you see an object which attracts you, a car, one of the latest models, beautifully polished, with large tyres, good lines, powerful. And if you have the money to run the car you look at it. You understand? You look at the object and then the object awakens the desire to have it-right? You are following so far? That is, you see something beautiful, a picture, a house, a garden, a car, man or woman, and you are attracted. And the people who manufacture the car want you to buy it, and your own desire is to own it. So the object which is outside, awakens the desire to possess it - right? And if you have the money and so on, borrow, you know. So we are asking the question: is there desire without the object? You understand my question? If there was no car, no woman, no man, no house, attractive position as a saint, or a guru - I hope you haven't any of that - or the desire for power - it is all the outside which then awakens the desire and then you fulfil that

desire and you are satisfied, until the next desire, which is another object, not a car but something else. So we are asking, please find out carefully if you are willing to listen, the object creates, awakens the desire - right? Is there desire without the external object? That is one question.

Second is: you may create for yourself an image which is externalized and you want that image to fulfil that image, therefore there is a desire to achieve that which the thought has created - right? You are violent and you create non-violence which is non-fact, and then you desire to become non-violent. So there is not only an outside object which awakens desire but also inward ideologies, inward symbols, psychological pictures, images; having created it then you desire. So external objects or internal objects are both the same because they both awaken desire.

Now we are asking a very serious question, seeing this, is there a desire which is so extraordinarily strong, without an external object or an object created by the psychological process of thought? Right? We are going to find out. And is there desire without either of these? Clear?

So we are going to enquire together, not me enquire and you just listen, together because it is your life: what is desire? Why has it become such an extraordinary potent power in our life? We desire so many things, from the most trivial to the sublime - right? That is our life. So one has to enquire, explore together, what is desire? How does it come into being and whether it can be controlled? Then if you are controlling it, who is the controller? You follow? If you are controlling your desire - right? - the controller is another form of desire - right? We are together there? I

desire to achieve some kind of so-called spiritual experience - I don't know why, I must be cuckoo! And the controller, who says, "I must control my desire", the controller wants to achieve that, that kind of funny, romantic nonsense. And then the controller is another form of desire. You see this? So the controller and the controlled are the activities of desire. Clear? Is this clear? We are together in this, are we? Because this is a serious question. One has to go into it very, very carefully.

And we are not advocating or stating you must control, suppress, etc, desire. We are trying to understand the extraordinary movement of desire, look into it. When one understands the whole movement of desire then you will see something else take place, if you are going to go into it step by step, untraditionally - right? If you say, "I must control my desires" then you are off. Then you haven't examined who is the controller and then you are back into your traditional chants, which obviously does nothing. You can say your country is the most marvellous country and keep on repeating it and you mesmerize yourself - right?

So what is desire? How does it come into being? There must be a cause. And we are going to discover for ourselves what the cause is. There is, you see, and if I may go on with this simile, you see a car, the latest Mercedes, and the seeing, the sensation, contact, sensation - right? That is the process: seeing, contact, sensation. Right? That is clear? This is what takes place. Then thought creates the image of you sitting in the car and driving it. You understand? Thought creates the image of you owning it, driving it. Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought takes over, you, the image created of you sitting in the car and then driving it. So there is an interval,

or a gap, a hiatus, between sensation - right? - contact, seeing, contact, sensation, instantly thought creates the image, you in the car and driving it. The instant that thought creates the image, that is the beginning of desire. Have you understood this? Please exercise your brains, don't just accept or reject what the speaker is saying, look at it carefully. Right? You see there is perception of a car, then touch it, contact, from that touching, contact, there is sensation which is natural, healthy because you are not paralysed. Then thought creates the image, at that second desire is born. Is this clear? Right? Are we clear on this? Oh, for goodness sake. May we explore more into it? Yes, you want to explore more into it. What is the matter with your brains? You have something put forward to you, very simple, and you...

I see this blue shirt in the window of a shop. I go inside, touch it, see if it is a good material, and if it suits me. I have a sensation, it is a nice blue shirt. Then I say how would it look on me? So I go to the mirror - I don't do all these things, but it doesn't matter - I go to the mirror, put it on and look at myself. Then the image is created at that moment desire to own it. Bien? This is what you all do. Only the thing is so rapid, so quick, but if you slowed it down and watched it, watched the movement, the movement of contact, sensation, slowing down. Then the image created by thought, at that second desire is born. Right?

So the question is not of control, but watching the process slow down. The process of seeing, contact, sensation, thought creating the image, at that moment desire and so on, fulfilling it or being frustrated - right? Now to watch all this process slowly, carefully, step by step - right? So then the question arises, not of control, not

of suppression, not of escaping from desire as monks have done throughout the world, they have controlled it, they have suppressed it, but they are burning with it. Therefore they pick up the bible or the Gita, or some other book and keep on reading it, never looking at marvellous heaven. Right, you are following all this?

So can you, can we, slow down this whole process so to watch every step very carefully? When you so watch it, then you find there can be a gap between sensation and the moment when thought takes it over - right? An interval. You are following all this? Is this clear? No? Isn't this clear? At last some young person agrees. So to extend that gap. That is, I see the blue shirt in the window, go inside, touch it, see the quality of it and wait, so that the thought doesn't immediately enter and take over. You understand? That requires very careful attention, watching, all your reactions so that there is an interval between sensation and the activity of thought with its image. Extend that gap then you will see desire has very little potency. You have understood? Right? So that desire then becomes not the master but the slowing down of the sensation and the thought. Got it? So that you are extraordinarily alert. It is the inattentive that are a slave to desire - right? Is the question clear now? The object, the car, seeing, contact, sensation, awakens the desire to own it and then the battle - shall I have it, shall I not have it, have I the money, etc., the desire to fulfil and the frustration not to have it and so on. But when you understand desire is not only for the object outside but also from the psychological projection of an image, Bada, Nirvana, Heaven, reaching some height of some ridiculous nonsense, that is also from the inside but it is projected outside. So if we can

observe this whole process totally, that requires your attention, your care, your watching, then desire, you can look at a car and you will have no reaction, unless you want it - you understand? Right?

The speaker is allowed an hour, an hour and a half to go on this morning and I hope you can stand it.

2nd QUESTION: You said it is necessary to have no opinion (you see again you are referring to me, you say - right? Why haven't you found out for yourself? I will read the question) You said it is necessary to have no opinions about anything. I feel it is necessary to have opinions about such serious things as Nazism, Communism, the spread of armaments, the use of torture by governments. One can't just sit and observe these things taking place. Mustn't one say something, or perhaps do something?

You are not going to catch me! I am not going to catch you either! This is not a game we are playing. Why do we have opinions - I am not saying it is necessary or not necessary. Why do we have opinions? Opinions are something that has not been proved - prejudice is another form of opinion - right? So why do we have them? Not that they are not the spreading of Nazism, the spreading of armaments and the use of torture by governments. That is going on, every government is indulging in all this in the name of peace, in the name of law, in the name of patriotism, in the name of god - right? Every religion has tortured people, except Buddhism and Hinduism. Now these are facts. Britain is selling armaments to Argentina. See the ridiculousness of it. It is a fact. France and other countries. And you may have strong opinions that this should not happen. And what are you going to do? Join a

group, demonstrate, shout, be beaten up by the police, tear gas? You have seen all that happening on the television, or if you are part of the circus, part of the show. Now what has your opinion brought about, a change? The armaments thing has been going on for centuries - right? They all say we must not and yet big business, great industry says we can't exist if we don't sell armaments. So will you stop paying taxes? If you do you are sent to prison - right? First of all see the logic of all this. What will you do about all these things? They are all wrong, cruel, they bring about a great deal of violence - right? That is a fact. Chile is now torturing people, in Belfast and so on and so on, and so on. No government is free of it, whether it is more subtly, more obviously, but it is going on. Now what is one to do? You may be strongly opposed to Nazism. They have done terrible things in the world - Hitler and company. Watch it all sir. Germany was a most civilized country in Europe, studied philosophy, you know, inventions, they were great at one time. Those very great cultured people were taken over by a lunatic. You know all this.

Now what is an opinion? An opinion that I am against all this. And what value has that opinion? What can I do with my opinion? Will it affect selling up armaments, will it prevent Nazism, will it prevent torture? Or the whole thing is much more deep than mere having opinions? You understand? Are we meeting each other? I am not laying down a law, or I am not offering any opinions about this. But the problem is much deeper than opinions. A more serious, deeper question: why is man against another man? right? Ask that question, not whether my opinion is justified or not. But why, after all these centuries of civilization and so-called culture,

man is against man? Why? If we could go into that, which requires much more serious enquiry than holding on to opinions or no opinions, then we will enter into an area where we might do something.

Why are you, as a human being, against another man? Against another ideology? You have your own ideology but you are against another ideology. Democratic ideology and the totalitarian ideology, they are at war. Why do men live by ideologies? Ideologies are not real, are something which thought has invented, or thought, after a great deal of study, historical materialistic philosophy, comes to a certain conclusion and that becomes a law for them and they want all the others to accept that. And the opposite side does exactly the same thing in a different way - right? There, in the democratic world, so-called free world doesn't put you in prison because we can sit and talk, in a totalitarian state probably it would not be possible - right? This is happening sir.

So we are asking a much more fundamental question, deeper issue: why is man against man? Go on sirs. Aren't you against somebody? Aren't you violent? And you are the whole of humanity. I know we like to think we are separate individuals, separate private souls - which we have gone into previously, I won't go into all that - because you are not. You are the rest of mankind because you suffer, you are in agony, you are lonely, you are depressed like all the rest. So you are basically, fundamentally the rest of mankind. You are humanity - right? And if you are humanity, and you are whether you like it or not, in the global sense and if you are antagonistic, violent, aggressive, patriotic, my country is better than your country, my culture is the highest

culture and all that nonsense, then you are selling armaments, you are torturing people because they are doing it there of which you are, you have helped to torture people because you are a Catholic, you are a Protestant, you are a Hindu - right? So where there is division there must be conflict and all the rest of it. So are you acting wholly - you understand? - or small little me acting? You understand? Then you are against - man against man. Is that understood that question?

3rd QUESTION: From what we read you have had strange and mysterious experiences? Is this Kundalini or something greater? And we read that you consider the so-called process that you have undergone to be some sort of expansion of consciousness. Could it be instead self-induced, psychosomatic thing, caused by tension? Is not K's consciousness put together by thought and words?

Somebody is interested in this so I must answer it. (Laughter)

You are interested in this? Of course. This is much more exciting than desire. (Laughter) I wish you would be simple about all this. K apparently has had various experiences. They may be psychosomatic, induced by tension, or pleasurable projection of his own desires, and so on. In India the word Kundalini has a great meaning. They have written books about it and several claim they have awakened it. I won't go into it all. Don't be mesmerized by this word. A kind of release of energy so that that energy is inexhaustible, that is the meaning of that word. It has other meanings and different types. The fact is to awaken the energy and to let it function completely. And so-called process may also be imagination and so on. Do all these things matter? One is able to read other people's thoughts. They are experimenting with that in

Russia - you understand? Andropov can read Mr Reagan's thought, or Mr Reagan can read Mr Andropov's thought, then the game is over! And if you can read my thoughts and I can read your thoughts then life becomes terribly complex and rather tiresome. They have experimented with this in Duke University in America, they have proved telepathy exists, that thought can control matter and so on. This is the old Indian tradition. Perhaps K has done some of these things but is this all important? It is like having a good bath - right? After a hot day having a good clean healthy bath with clean towel and good soap, but at the end of it you are clean. What matters is that you are clean - right? Put all this at that level. You understand? Don't give this all importance, it is not important. K has been through all this. He knows a great deal about all this. Don't wake up suddenly! (Laughter) But he treats all this as not necessary. There is the energy which has been misused by us, in fights, in quarrels, in pretensions, trying to say mine is better than yours, I have reached this platform and so on. It is far more important to enquire why human beings behave as they do now, not all this triviality. This is triviality. We have discussed this matter with some of the people who claim all this awakening. You know you have a little experience and then you set up shop. You understand? You know what that means, setting up shop? I have a little experience of this kind and then I become a guru, I am in business then. I have disciples, I tell them what to do, I have money, I sit in a posture, and I am very... you follow? All that tommy rot!

So one has to be terribly careful of one's own little experiences. Right? But what is important, really important, is to find out

sanelly, rationally, logically, how you waste your energy by conflict, by quarrels - you follow? - fear and pretension. When all that energy which is being wasted is not wasted, you have all the energy in the world. As long as your brain is not deteriorating through conflict, through ambition, through strife, fighting, loneliness, depression and all the rest of it, which we have gone into, when the brain is free of all that, you have abundance of energy. But if you release some kind of little energy then you do an infinite harm to others - right? Is this question answered? Can we go on to the next?

So please don't fall into the trap of those gurus who say, "I know. You don't know, I will tell you," There are various centres in America and probably in Europe and India, where one or two people are saying, "I have awakened this peculiar stuff, and I will tell you all about it. I will teach you." You know, the good old game! It all becomes so trivial when man is fighting man, the world is degenerating, disintegrating, you are talking about fooling little experiences.

And also the questioner says: is not K's consciousness put together by thought? As every consciousness with its content is the result of the movement of thought - right? Your consciousness with its content of fear, belief, loneliness, anxieties, sorrow, following somebody, having faith, saying my country is more, the highest culture and all that business, it is part of your consciousness. It is what you are - right? If you are free of that then you are in a totally different dimension. It is not expansion of consciousness. It is the denying of the content of consciousness - right? Not expanding, becoming more and more self-centred - right? Let's go to the next

question.

4th QUESTION: What does death mean to you?

Why to me? What does it mean to you? Much more important. You understand? What does life, the living and coming to the end of it, what does it mean to you? If you believe in reincarnation - you know what that means? - if you believe in reincarnation, that is you are born next life, and if you have lived rightly, correctly, happily, your next life you will have a better chance to reach the higher ladder - right? You understand? But those people who believe in reincarnation live like ordinary other people, fighting, quarrelling, aggressive, mean, right? Vicious, violent. But that belief in reincarnation has very little meaning. But it is very comforting. Now enquire into it. What is it that is going to be reborn? You understand? Suppose you believe in reincarnation, as some of you may do, I don't know why. It may be comforting but when you begin to examine that which is to be reborn, what is that? Is it permanent soul? Permanent something that is beyond time? If it is of time that is not permanent - right? So what is it that is going to be reborn? Your tendencies, your idiosyncrasies, your experiences? That K dies and next life he is born again, poor chap. And what is that K? What is it, who are you, what are you? (Noise of dog barking) - could we ask that dog to be quiet for a while? Who are you? Actually, not theoretically play around with a lot of ideas that you are Atman, that there is god in you, that is all the activity of thought - right? So what are you? You are your experiences - right? You are what you have acquired as knowledge, you are the whole movement of memories, aren't you? Or you don't like that. You like to think that there is something

marvellous in you. All that is absurd. I won't go into it, even discuss it. The fact is you are nothing but - I mustn't use 'nothing but' that's wrong - you are a whole series of movements of memories - right? Examine it, please don't agree, look at it. You are not if you have no memories - right? If a certain operation takes place in the brain and then you lose your memories then you become a vegetable. You know - right? The speaker has been in a hospital in California, in America, where they have done all this, I have watched it. It is horrible.

So you are the tradition, the connected memories, the communal family tradition, the tradition of the country, all the memories - right? You are all that. And if you die you want all those memories to go on? What are memories? Things that have gone, remembered something that has been happy, pleasurable, or something you are longing for - right? It is all a movement of the past as memory, modified and going on - right? So what does death mean? You, as an individual, coming to an end - right? Physically coming to an end, but psychologically you say, "No, that is not quite so. I am more than my body. I am more than my thoughts, I am more than any reaction." - right? Are you? I know tradition says you are and you like the idea that also you are more than all this business, so you cling to that and you hope the 'more' will be born next life in a better house, greater power, greater position, nearer god. You understand? All this is a matter of belief and thought - right? Thought has also invented belief because in believing in something it gives you great comfort - right? So if you like that kind of stuff, carry on. And millions do - right? And those others say, "Well, life has been jolly good", if you are successful, or "Life has been

terrible, miserable, unhappy and I am glad to die." Right? And before dying all the agony of illness - right? Long, prolonged years of illness, sustained by the doctors to keep the thing going - right? This is our life. This is the way we all live. And we are frightened of death, coming to an end. Though you believe in reincarnation but you are jolly well frightened of death. You can't carry everything with you but you like to have it at the last minute. You understand? If you have a lot of money you like to have it until the last minute, though you know you can't carry it with you.

So this is what we call living and dying - right? Why do we give so much importance to the after? What happens after death? Why? Is it not far more important what is happening before death? You understand? You understand what I am saying? Not what happens after but what is happening during the long years of living, struggling, pain, anxiety, depression, suffering, loneliness, that you all go through - right? Isn't that more important to consider, whether all that can be changed, all that can be ended rather than go on talking about what happens after death? You understand?

Suppose I am attached to my family - suppose, I have no family, thank god - but suppose I am attached to my family, my wife, my children, my house, my furniture, death comes along through accident, disease, or natural weariness, death comes along and says you can't take it with you - right? You have understood? I am attached to an idea, to a belief, to a concept, to an ideal, or I am attached to furniture, to a house to a family and so on. Death means the ending of all that, though I may believe all that I will have next life with my brother, with my sister - you follow? Is it possible to end all that while living? You have understood? While I am living

is it possible not to be attached to a single thing? To my furniture, to my house, to my experience, to my books, to my reputation, to my nonsense - you follow? All that? End all that instantly. That is death. Right? Comment?

Audience: That is wonderful.

K: What is wonderful? It is wonderful if you do it. If you don't do it, it is just a lot of words.

So what we are saying is this: death of the body, with all the accumulated memories, brings to an end; unless you believe of course in the other, reincarnation, you are something which is permanent that is going to reincarnate and so on, all that is an invention of thought. So is it possible to end while I am living, while one is living, to be free entirely of all attachment?

Attachment to your guru, attachment to your idea, experience - right? Because that is what death is going to do. So while living, the ending means living with death. You understand what I am saying? No, no you don't, don't nod your head, no sir you don't. Ending, if you end smoking - right? - if you have a habit of smoking, suppose, and you end it, though the body demands nicotine and all that kind of stuff, end it. Because that is what is going to happen when you die. End your clinging to some experience, to some memory so that your brain is new, fresh, clear, not burdened with all this rubbish, garbage. Memories are garbage. I know. So to live is to live with death all the time. You understand? Do it sir. Do one thing that you hold most precious, end that. Not I must end it, how an I to end it, tell me the way to end it, or take a drug to end it, end it because you see death means that. So it is possible to live a life which means a life of freedom,

and therefore a life of love, because love is not attachment. Love is not jealousy. A mind that is burdened with all kinds of stuff, a brain that has all kind of problems is not capable of affection, love.

So understand sir the beauty of it: living and the things you are attached to, end it, so that you really understand the depth of freedom.

5th QUESTION: After listening to you and thinking about these matters on my own, how am I to really not just solve my problems but radically bring about a change in my life?

The question, to put it very simply, the question is: what am I to do or not do to bring about a radical mutation in my whole existence? That is the question - right?

Now how do you approach that question? How do you draw near to it so that you are in contact with the question, with the problem? First of all, is one aware how our brains are conditioned - right? Are you aware? Oh, for god's sake. Are we aware, are you aware that you are conditioned? After two thousand years of steady propaganda - baptism, mass, constant repetition, repetition, repetition, you have become a Catholic. Or the other constant repetition is becoming a Hindu, or a Muslim. It is the same process. Are you aware that your brain is conditioned? Right? Sir, that is not difficult to be aware. When you say, "I am a British" - British, British you are conditioned - German, Russian, Hindu. The Hindu may think "I have the greatest culture" but that culture has gone. In India they are completely at a loss, disorder - I won't go into that.

So if one is aware that you are conditioned - right? - is that awareness an idea or actuality? You understand? Are you actually

aware of your reactions? Don't be puzzled. It is nothing to be puzzled about. Are you aware that when you meet somebody that you dislike him, or like him, are you aware of your prejudices - you follow? Are you aware of your own laziness? Your own incapacity to think clearly? All your pretensions that you are, oh something extraordinary you have reached? Are you aware of all this? If you are and if you say, "I like this kind of thing", then live it, nobody is going to pay much attention, at least not the intelligent people. You may collect a lot of neurotics, thoughtless people, that is all right too if you want that kind of stuff. But the moment you become aware, watching, all your reactions, but to correct your reaction implies an entity who is also reacting. Have you understood? You react. I hit you and you hit me - right? I hit you because you have said something earlier, so that I react by hitting you. And you react because you don't like to be hit, so both reactions are similar - right? I won't go into it, it is clear.

So when one is aware that one is conditioned and look at it, not as an outsider looking in, the very entity that is observing, or being aware that it is conditioned, that entity is part of that conditioning. Right? Oh don't go to sleep. Right?

Put it another way: the observer who experiences, the observer is not different from the observed. The thinker is not different from his thoughts - right? The analyser is not different from the thing he analyses. Only he has separated himself. I examine myself. I am separated by thought as being a little more knowledgeable, a little more accumulative, past memories, that entity is observing. That entity is part of that which is observing. I won't go into it. If you haven't understood it, read, struggle, go to sleep, whatever you like

to do, be lazy with it. Probably you will.

So apparently nothing external or internal changes man - right? Religions have tried to control him, tortured him, forced him, go through all the baptism, and all the circus - and also they do it in their own way in India and in different parts of the world - they have tried everything. And you yourself have tried to bring about a change - right? Haven't you? If you have and the result is negligent, then what do you do? You have tried leaders, you have tried gurus, you have tried various philosophers, you have tried various religions, and yet we remain as we are, lazy, indolent, indifferent, callous, without any spark of love, violence and all the rest of it. What will make us change? Nothing! Nothing from outside, or your own desire to change. So start with nothing, no agency inward or outside, is going to change you. Start with that fact. Right? Don't go to sleep please.

Then you start with something actual, something that is real, you can put your teeth into it then, as nobody outside is going to help you. The Buddha hasn't helped you, all the Christian religions haven't helped you. You are what you are now - right? Start from there. Nothing from outside, or your own desire is going to change you. So you start then and say, look, do I really want to change, basically? Most of us don't. So you carry on. But if you really want to change, it is simple. Change your fears, end your fears completely. Don't say how, we went through all that. Unless you deny totally every form of outside agency to help you or your own volition, your own desire, your own will, that hasn't functioned either, so put aside all that, then you start from what you are and see if that thing cannot be changed radically. It is up to you.

I have got another seven minutes more. The last question.

6th QUESTION: What is a spiritual life?

A religious life, not all the religions, not the monks and all that. They are not religious. I know they would abhor me when I say that. I will show it to you logically why it is not. It is all put together by thought. The invention of god is put there by thought. It is simple. All this is clear when you understand the activity of thought.

So what is a spiritual life? I am asking you. You have strange robes, you attend churches, mass, or do some kind of puja in India, or go to temples and mosques, what is a spiritual life? The word spiritual is not pleasant but we will use it for the moment. What is a spiritual life? Would you say a spiritual life is a life of total freedom? Freedom from sorrow, freedom from fear, freedom from all the conditioning - right? To be free. Most of us are in prison - prison of our own making of ideas, or other people's concepts, their own prejudices, their own experiences, they are like bars that hold us in prison. Most of us are slaves to tradition, slaves to some kind of belief, faith, or to experience. To be totally, completely free of all that. Freedom as we said before, that very word implies love. If there is no freedom there is no love. You cannot possibly achieve that freedom through some figure, symbol, person, idea. Freedom means the ending, the ending of the self, the me, the images I have about myself. Then when the brain is free, only then is there that supreme intelligence. Not all the rituals, all you know, all the trivialities, for god's sake, sitting in a posture, meditating, breathing, you follow? That is not - if one can use that word - spiritual. That is all the movement of memory and thought. And

thought is limited, which we have gone into, I won't now. So we have reduced our life into a very small petty little affair. To be free of that entirely. And it is possible. Don't accept my word for it. I say it is possible. Find out. Do it. So that a religious, a so-called spiritual life, then there is no division between you and another. You won't kill another. Your country is the country of the world. The world is your country. The world is your religion. But when you say you belong to no religion, living a spiritual life, a life that is holy, it is not something for the elite, for the few, but if that is what is necessary work at it, not pretend and all that nonsense.

So a religious mind, a religious human being, one that doesn't belong to any religion, but a brain that is functioning with truth and therefore with great intelligence and compassion.

Right sirs. May I get up please?

SAN FRANCISCO NEW DIMENSIONS RADIO INTERVIEW WITH MICHAEL TOMS 28TH APRIL, 1983

Introducer: Born in South India and educated in England, J. Krishnamurti has devoted his life to speaking and counselling. He is regarded internationally as one of the great religious teachers of all time. Krishnamurti is the author of over thirty books, and has founded eight schools to spread his belief about the alleviation of sorrow. To some J. Krishnamurti is an enigma; he does not advocate social reform, nor does he encourage the guru disciple relationship. Rather he suggests that we are the original creators of the chaos, what we see out there starts inside ourselves. He presents us with the ultimate challenge: the challenge of self-transformation, to move through appearances to truth, to liberate ourselves from all systems, all 'isms' and 'ologies', to move beyond the tyranny of the mind and body towards unity and wholeness, complete understanding and love. Join us for the next hour in exploring the depth and dimensions of his work as we speak with J. Krishnamurti. My name is Michael Toms, I'll be your host.

MT: Krishnaji, welcome. You've written and spoken a great deal about meditation, and certainly in America there is a great deal of misunderstanding about meditation, and I think it might be useful for you to speak about your understanding of what meditation really is.

K: I think we ought to talk over first what generally meditation is supposed to be. There is the Zen meditation, there is the Buddhist meditation, there are different kinds of Hindu meditation,

and also they have introduced the Tibetan, Mahayana and the Hinayana, South and North, and also all the latest gurus who have come here talking about meditation. After all meditation, the meaning of that word, is to ponder over, to think over, to be concerned, to discern. It's not what we are talking about. All such forms of meditation are a kind of exercise of will, or an attempt to achieve something, a state of illumination, if you like to call it, a state of peace, a state of a kind of bliss and so on. Or it might be considered as a relaxation. One considers all these forms of meditation are really not meditation at all. We have gone into it very, very deeply, with all the people concerned with various types of meditation, they ultimately, after a great deal of discussion, they agree that their form of meditation is really an exercise of will, effort, a sense of achievement and so on.

The word 'meditation' is not only to ponder over, think over and so on, but the word, and in Sanskrit, means to measure: to measure, and to be free of all measurement. I don't know if I am making myself clear.

MT: Yes.

K: To be free from comparison, from becoming. Here in this country they have used the word mantra a great deal. The meaning of that word in Sanskrit, the root meaning of that word, is, consider not becoming, think about it, go into it. And also the word mantra means to put away all self-centred activity. The depth of that statement, very few understand it.

So meditation is not separate something from daily life. If it is separate it merely becomes an escape, a romantic imagination and all that kind of nonsense. But real meditation is to be concerned

with one's behaviour, one's relationship, not only with one's own little family, but with the world, because human beings have created this society in which we live, which is rotten, corrupt, immoral and all the rest of it. And meditation is a form of understanding one's relationship to the world and one's relationship to nature, so it becomes not a self-centred activity of some kind of escape from daily boredom and weariness and the general nonsense of life, but it means a tremendous enquiry in which there is no illusion, no self-deception, no imaginative theories and escapes. I hope I am making myself clear.

MT: Enquiry implies a goal of some type. What are we enquiring after?

K: No, enquiring into the whole nature of thinking, enquiring into the nature why human beings are behaving in this way, enquiring into or probing into the depth of life, what it all means, if there is something beyond the ordinary daily monotonous wearisome life. To enquire if there is something sacred.

So one must begin with doubt. That's one of the things in meditation: question, enquire, probe, doubt, and not follow any particular system because that is invented by thought, by another man. And also meditation means enquiring into the whole nature of yourself, your consciousness and so on. It is a very complex thing, not just meditate for twenty minutes and relax and carry on with your daily ugly brutal life.

MT: And certainly part of what you are saying involves us having to release the conditioning that we have all been programmed with as we've come through life.

K: That's right.

MT: Is there a method to that process of releasing conditioning?

K: No, you see the moment you use the word method, it means a process, a system, you practise day after day until you reach something. Which means your brain, which is already mechanical, programmed, if you follow a system, a method, you make it more mechanical, more routine, more stupid. Whereas this meditation as you began to question is something very, very complex. It is not just something you play with, it is part of your daily life.

MT: So it is important to bring meditation into every part of one's life.

K: Life is meditation, not 'you bring meditation'. You understand, sir, you have to question, doubt. In Christianity that is denied, because if you doubted the authority of the church you were either burnt in the old days, or tortured. If you really doubted the whole structure of Christian mythology and Christian doctrine, it would be non-existent, you would destroy it. Whereas one of the things in Buddhism and Hinduism, is you must begin with questioning, doubt, go into it, don't accept authority.

MT: Can the very non-acceptance, or non-believing, become a belief system?

K: Of course, you can make it. But to question why one has belief at all; belief implies a sense of security in some form of ideal, in some form of god, and so on. That is, why should one have belief at all about anything? You don't believe the sun rises and the sun sets, you don't believe in the constellation of Orion, you don't believe London exists, it is there. Belief really, like ideologies, has divided man: the communist ideology, the capitalist ideology and so on. One of the divisions in the world is brought

about by ideologies, by ideals, beliefs. And so there is always conflict between human beings.

One of the questions is to find out if man can live without conflict. That requires tremendous probing, not just say, yes he can, or he cannot. Why do human beings live in conflict, why have they accepted conflict as the way of life for the last forty, fifty thousand years?

MT: Some people say it is human nature.

K: That's another slogan we accept. But we have never enquired why human beings live the way we do, why we always have wars, why each human being in his relationship with another, intimate or otherwise, is perpetually in conflict. You see to enquire into that requires not only intellectual comprehension but it requires self examination, not the examination according to some psychologist, whether Freudian and so on but to actually enquire into yourself. And in enquiring one begins to discover that your consciousness with all its reactions - after all, do you want to go into all this? You are interested in all this?

MT: Yes.

K: I am talking, I don't know if you want me to go on.

MT: Please.

K: Some people don't accept, some psychologists don't accept subconsciousness, they say there is only action and reaction. Nothing else. A mechanical process. But if you go further into it you see that human consciousness, which is not only action and reaction, which is mechanical, biological and psychological, you also see that human consciousness is its content, what it is made up of, which is faith, belief, superstition, illusions, fear, pleasure,

ideals, ideologies, my country, your country, my god and your god, all that and more - if you want to go into it - is our consciousness, is what one is: a linguistic, psychological conditioning. Right? That's what we are. What we are is what every human being in the world is, psychologically. They suffer, they are in turmoil, uncertain, anxious, lonely, depressed, weary of this whole business of earning money, money, money. So if you go to India, Japan, anywhere in the world, every human being goes through this, whether black or purple, or blue or whatever colour they are, or whatever race they are, whether they are totalitarian, or whether they are other. So human consciousness is not my consciousness or your consciousness, it is human consciousness.

MT: Of which we are part.

K: We are that. Not a part, we are that.

MT: We are that.

K: And therefore we are not individuals psychologically.

MT: So I have to give up who I think I am.

K: Who you are is merely your name, your form or your bank account, if you have one, and your passport.

MT: Most of us become pretty identified with ourselves, we like ourselves and so it is a fearful thing to think about giving up ourselves.

K: It is not a fearful thing, it is a factual thing. One has lived in such fanciful illusions. If I think, sir, that I am an individual free to do what I like - this is what is happening in the world, right - everybody wants to do what he wants to do, what he likes, and he calls that freedom, which is creating such havoc in the world. So in questioning all this, questioning what society is, society has been

made by us, if we are in turmoil society is in turmoil. If our house inside is burning we will create an ugly society; we are violent, we have divided the world geographically into America, Russia and India and Japan and so on. So nationalities have been one of the causes of war. It is glorified tribalism. Obviously.

MT: One might say that nationalities and the separations that are created are really out of our mind because we tend to separate and compartmentalize.

K: Therefore you begin to enquire what is thinking, what is thought, why thought has made this society, why thought has created gods and the churches. It is all the work of thought. I mean there is no question about it. You can't say it is divine revelation. One can say it but it has no validity. It is just a belief like any other belief.

MT: So there is a direct relationship between how we think and the world around us.

K: Yes. So one begins to ask, it is part of your question with which you began about meditation, why thought has created this. If you grant that thought, thinking, has brought about the great divisions in the world, why thought has brought about wars in the world, perpetual wars. At the beginning you killed one or two men with an arrow, now you can blast off human beings by the million. You follow, that is what we call evolution.

MT: We create terms like, mega-deaths.

K: So what is thinking? Why has thinking become so extraordinarily important in the world? Technologically you must think to create this microphone, to create an aeroplane, to create the submarine, to create the neutron bomb, but we have also

thought and created god. God is our creation.

MT: So as you have said once or twice, god is disorder, because he is a reflection of our disorder. We have created that god.

K: Yes. If you accept, it becomes so absurd the whole thing. So we have to not only investigate what is thinking, and also we ought to probe into the whole question of what is intelligence.

MT: We usually associate it with collecting knowledge in our brains, intelligence.

K: Being programmed in a certain way, using that programme more cunningly. Once you admit, sir, that thought is responsible for everything - right - both psychologically and technologically. Thought is limited. I think all scientists would agree to that. One has talked a great deal to other scientists, they would all see this, obviously, because knowledge is limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything at any time, in the future or now. Perhaps you won't agree to this.

MT: When we think we are thinking about things that have past already.

K: Which means what? Knowledge. Thinking is first the response of memory. If I had no memory I couldn't think. Memory is stored in the brain, memory is the response of knowledge, knowledge is experience. Right? Experience, knowledge, memory, thought. So as knowledge will always be limited, so thinking is limited. Thinking can imagine it is illimitable but it is still limited.

MT: You are suggesting that chain can be broken.

K: Yes. Absolutely. But that requires, sir, not some kind of acceptance of authority. It requires examination, probing, questioning, doubting, which very, very few people are willing to

do because they live in false security.

MT: You know in America, Krishnaji, there are probably more 'How to' books sold than any other type of book. Everyone is looking for how to, how do I do it.

K: Yes.

MT: Whatever it is, how do I do it.

K: And also the specialists are willing to tell you how to do it.

MT: Lots of people out there are willing to tell you, yes.

K: If you want to have your hair done properly you go to a specialist; how to raise a baby; how to think; what to do. So gradually, I don't know in this country if one is aware, you are all becoming slaves to specialists: how to make up your face. The other day I heard the most extraordinary thing: as a woman was asking a specialist how to sleep with her husband. You follow, sir, it is incredible.

MT: Yes, it is. We pride ourselves about being a free people.

K: You see, that's what I am questioning. So if we could go into the question of what is thinking, why thought has made life so utterly wearisome, cruel, bestial, you follow, what it is now. If you once admit not only logically but actually that human consciousness is not individual consciousness, it is the consciousness of all humanity. Right? That's very difficult not only to intellectually accept it but to feel it, then you become tremendously responsible for what you are doing.

MT: Once you feel that.

K: Of course.

MT: Krishnaji, when you say feeling the whole, there is a lot of energy behind those words when you say them. And I am reminded

about what you said about we are not being serious about the deeper issues of life, and relating that back to what you were saying, feeling the whole, perhaps the reason we don't feel the whole, or can't even think about or move ourselves to feeling the whole is because we are not serious about the deeper issues of life.

K: It is not a question of feeling it. You can imagine you are living in the whole, a feeling of wholeness of life. But what does wholeness mean? To be whole implies living a life in which there is no fragmentation: business life, artistic life, poetic life.

MT: A unified life.

K: Life is one. And we have broken it up. Broken it up professionally, as in career, psychologically, and religiously.

MT: It goes back to thinking again, a fragmented way.

K: That's just it. So, sir, thinking has produced this world. There is no question about it. The marvellous cathedrals and the things that are inside the cathedrals which are considered sacred, but it is the invention of thought. All the Roman structure of hierarchy is the invention of thought. So that instrument, which is thought, has produced this world; the chaos, the wars, thought has killed. So that instrument is no longer valid, which very few will accept. It is not valid because it is worn out, it is producing problem after problem. The politicians try to solve one problem, in the very solution of that problem they increase multiple problems. The scientists are doing the same.

MT: But there are well intentioned, sincere dedicated people who see the problem and feel that there are solutions that can be had by thinking.

K: By thinking. That's just it. So that instrument which human

beings have used for thousands of years is worn out, is no longer valid, is no longer worthwhile because we are both outwardly and inwardly we are in great crisis. Economically, socially, morally, in every way we are in a tremendous crisis and all this is brought about by thought. And if we once see that thought which human beings have used has no longer the quality of strength, is no longer valid - if I can keep on repeating that word - then we must look to another instrument. Is there another instrument, or is man condemned for ever to this way of life which is brought about by thought? I don't know if you see this clearly.

MT: Yes, it is very clear.

K: So is it possible for human beings to find a totally different dimension, an instrument which is not the product of thought, which is altogether different? If I may point out, one says it is possible, there is such an instrument. Not what the scientists, the biologists and the doctors are doing, dividing the brain into left and right and all the rest of it. After all, sir, look at this way, or put it this way: we have used knowledge as a means of achievement, and a great many philosophers and biologists say man will ascend through knowledge. Bronowski and others have said, step by step by step. That's called evolution. Evolution implies time. Time means a movement which is thought. Time is thought. And time as evolution, time as thought has not solved a single human problem, psychological problem. It has solved the problem of communication, the problem of travel and so on and so on, but psychologically, inwardly, knowledge has not changed man. He has been what he has been for the last fifty thousand years or more. And we say, give me time we will change. Time may be the enemy

of man. I don't if you are following all this.

MT: Yes, sir.

K: So is there another instrument which will radically, psychologically change not only the human cells in the brain but also fundamentally psychologically. You understand? Now one must question it, which means one must doubt the validity of thought, and see its place in the technological world, in the world of communications, in the world of business and so on, and psychologically has it any place at all? We think it has. That is the illusion we live in because we want security. Right? Every human being wants security. The greatest intellect, and the poorest uneducated person who doesn't know how to read or write, he says, give me food, clothes and shelter; I don't care for anything else. We have lived in property, we know this. Is there security in the things thought has created?

MT: There doesn't seem to be security there.

K: I beg your pardon?

MT: There doesn't seem to be security in the things that thought has created.

K: No. It is a fact. In nationality there is no security. In the whole invention by thought of the churches and religion there is no security there.

MT: Sometimes we fool ourselves into thinking there is.

K: That's right. So is there security in the things that thought has created? If there is no security there, is there a security that is irrevocable, unchangeable? One says there is. But to find that out one must move away from the whole time process.

MT: So one has to move outside of time.

K: Not scientific fiction time but time is brought about by thought: yesterday, today and tomorrow. Yesterday is all the accumulation of a million years.

MT: Genetic memory.

K: That's memory. That's tradition. That's what I have been told, programmed. I am a Catholic, Protestant, or a Hindu, Buddhist, all that kind of silly stuff. So is there an instrument, a way of living which is not the way of knowledge? When you put it that way it sounds crazy, but after examining it, discussing with you just now, if one understands the limitation of knowledge and therefore limitation of time, therefore you cannot possibly look to time to change, which is called evolution, then your brain is working totally on a different wave from the former. I don't know if you are following all this. Because you have set aside the importance knowledge, therefore what is important is learning. Learning is not to accumulate, learning. So one begins to learn about fear, whether man can ever live without fear, because we must enquire into it otherwise we can't find the instrument. Whether you can live, not only psychologically but deeply, most profoundly, whether the brain can ever find a place where it has no fear. We say there is such a thing.

MT: How do you know that you are not fooling yourself?

K: Oh, absolutely because you begin with doubt, doubt of everything you think, you feel, doubt, question, probe into whether when you say there is a sense of freedom from fear, is it real? So you watch, you question, you look. Sir you never accept a thing. Therefore there is no authority because man has sought security in authority: the church, the religions and so on. So when one rejects

all that as being the invention of thought and therefore limited and so on, then your brain now is not cluttered up, is not conditioned by time. I don't know if you are following all this.

MT: So it is a matter of recreating one's intention?

K: Not intention, there is no intention in this. You see, intention implies thought. I intend to do something. I intend to become a businessman, it is still... the very word creates the element of time. So one must be very, very careful in the usage of words.

MT: Rigorous.

K: Oh, yes, sir, rigorous. And the word must be understood by others, not your own meaning that you give to words. Time we understand, thought we understand, and we understand thought has come to its end. That's very difficult to accept for most people because they don't want to think, they don't want to look, they want, 'Please tell me how to escape'. The entertainment industry is now rampant: football, cinemas, all the religious ceremonies are entertainments.

MT: Clearly there is a lot of desire to escape from what we see as the world around us.

K: Of course, of course. So to find out if there is another instrument you have to exercise your capacity, your intelligence, your way of living, why knowledge has become so important.

MT: Are we coming to intelligence?

K: Yes, sir, I am coming to that slowly. Which means intelligence cannot exist without love. Love is not desire, pleasure, sensory sexual responses. We have made love into all that. We say, as somebody said the other day, sometime ago, that without jealousy I have no love. It sounds so appalling, so trivial.

MT: Yes, it does sound trivial actually.

K: But that person was very well known, a writer and a scholar and all the rest of it.

MT: Do you think love is something you can write about?

K: No, no. You can write it but if there is no feeling there, if your heart has no love how can you talk about it? You may, a poet like Keats, may have had this feeling - I don't know. But I am saying there is no intelligence without love. And there cannot be love if you are ambitious, if there is conflict in you. And love is not the movement of thought. The picture it creates is not love. So love means the freedom from all conflict. It is not a negative state, but through negation you come to the positive. And when there is that love there is that intelligence, which is compassion. That intelligence is completely secure, that intelligence is security. But to come to that one has to meditate, not all the silly stuff, moneymaking business, but one has to be very, very serious about all this, this isn't a passing thing for one day and then pick up another thing the next day. This is one's life. If one doesn't understand one's life, how can you have intelligence, how can there be love and so on?

So it really, sir, requires a clear brain, to think clearly, objectively, unemotionally, unromantically. And thought has created fear, pleasure, sorrow. Where there is sorrow you cannot love. I know people think if my son is dead there is sorrow. Sir, I wonder if we realize that human beings have killed each other, and that has created enormous sorrow in the world. They are still doing it. How many women, men, wives, have cried about this. For thousands of years, and nobody stops it. They talk about peace on

earth, they don't mean it. To have peace on earth one has live peacefully. And that peace cannot be brought about through legislation. Peace means a state of mind, brain, where there is no conflict, and therefore there is no limitation, no division. You understand? There is division now between the Arab and the Jew, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Christian and the non-Christian and so on. So division creates conflict. Is it possible to live in this world now, married and all the rest of it, to live without division?

Sir, these are really very, very serious questions, not just pass on on the television or radio for a few minutes. One has to give one's energy to find out all this, not just read about it, or hope to achieve it some day or other. One has to give one's capacities, energies, thought into all this. And very few people are willing to do it. 'Tell me how', they are all concerned 'how to'.

So to come back to your question: meditation is love, and intelligence and compassion. Without that life has no meaning. You can be a millionaire, a great president, a prime minister, generals, or businessman, all that has no meaning. Actually they are just... So to live a life in which there is no conflict means no division. You are no longer a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian, an ideologist and theorist. In this way, sir, to live, there is great beauty in this. Beauty isn't the perception of something beautiful. It is the way of living. And without love and beauty and a sense of immensity of the universe, all this becomes rather trivial stuff.

There are some people we happen to know, who say, you can't change the world; the world will go on for the rest of their lives because they are conditioned, programmed - Catholic, Protestants and all the rest of it - and why waste your time on all this? Retire,

go back to some monastery, or to some Himalayan cave or jungle and just live there. We don't accept that kind of thinking at all because if you retire into your monastery the thinking is going on. You may worship your particular symbol, your particular image, but it is still the product of thought. So through thought you cannot achieve the immensity of life.

MT: So we have to move beyond thought.

K: Not move, give it its right value. To come here to your house, you have to follow certain rules, you have to think, you have to watch, there thought is necessary. To learn a language thought is necessary. To go from here to there thought is necessary. But psychologically, inwardly thought has no place. But to see that, in the seeing of it thought has its right place. But we don't take time to look at anything.

MT: We are supposed to have dismissed time, Krishnaji.

K: Yes, sir. We never look at the moon, never look at a tree, live with it, look at it, see the beauty of it, the strength of it, the quality of it, or the moon, or the stars, we never look. All that we are concerned is with pleasure, money, and money gives you freedom, power, position, all the rest of it. One is not depressed or optimistic or pessimistic, these are facts. When you look at facts it is neither optimistically or pessimistically. It is so. That thing is red, that's all.

MT: Just like meditation is love.

K: Yes, sir.

MT: Krishnaji, I want to thank you for being here with us today.

K: No, please.

SAN FRANCISCO 1ST PUBLIC TALK 30TH APRIL 1983

One should be clear what the intention of these talks are. They are not to inform, or to instruct, nor to do any kind of propaganda, or programme the audience in a different direction.

From the beginning we must be very clear that you are not being told what to do, or what to think. We have been programmed enough. But in this talk, and tomorrow's talk, we should think together, look at the world as it is, what is actually going on, together, without any bias, without any prejudice, to look at the world that man has created; each human being throughout the world has created this society. This society is corrupt, immoral, and it has always had wars. From time beyond measure they have had wars. They used to kill with arrows, now you can blast whole generations, and millions of people. This is called advancement, evolution. There is poverty all over the world. In the part of the country where the speaker comes from - he has lived in poverty, he knows what poverty is.

And there are religious divisions throughout the world - the Catholic, the Protestant, the Muslim, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Tibetan and so on. There is a great deal of conflict throughout the world, economically, socially, nationally. And one wonders what is the cause of all this, why there is so much division, so much struggle, so many problems, multiplying. Any problem that is being solved brings about other problems. Why there are wars, there are about forty wars that are going on now. All the religions and the politicians, and so-called leaders, talk about everlasting

peace. To have peace in the world one must live peacefully. And there is the threat of nuclear war brought about by different ideologies: the communist ideology, the democratic ideology: the one completely totalitarian, controlling one's thoughts, actions, movements and so on; in the so-called democratic world there is more freedom to do what one likes, each one expressing what he wants to do, 'his thing'.

And what is the answer to all this? Who is responsible for all this? The chaos, the disorder, the insecurity, the sense of great confusion - who has created this society in which we live? And what is our relationship to that society? What's our relationship to the wars? As the speaker said - and I hope we are serious enough to consider all these questions, observing without any bias whatsoever the events that are taking place in this world - what is our responsibility to all this? To the wars they are preparing, the Generals and the politicians are having a marvellous time, inventing new ways of destruction, total destruction. And there have been demonstrations all over the world against a particular kind of war, the nuclear war. Europe is in a turmoil about this. And nobody, including the highest so-called religious leaders, or the politicians, or the recent invasion of gurus into this country, have ever talked about ending all wars.

So one must ask, if one is concerned seriously, whether it is possible to live in this world, both outwardly and inwardly, psychologically inside the skin, as it were, and outwardly, to live in peace, to live without conflict, man against man, man against woman, and all the rest of it. When one looks around objectively, sanely, rationally, as one must if one is to live on this beautiful

earth which we are gradually destroying, who is responsible and what can each one do about it?

So please, as we said, we are looking at all these problems together. Not that the speaker looks at it, and you just listen to it. This is not a lecture as is commonly understood. Lecture is upon a particular subject, to instruct, to inform. We are not doing anything of that kind. Together you and the speaker are investigating the cause of all this misery, the confusion, the chaos, the utter callousness of human beings.

To understand all these problems, which are becoming more and more complex, and life is becoming extraordinarily difficult and dangerous, one must question, doubt, be sceptical, not gullible. That is for most of us rather difficult. Because specially in this country the authorities, the specialists, are taking us over. You don't know what to do, you ask a specialist about almost everything - your sexual life, the way you must think, how to do your face, how to dress, and so on. We think we are free, we are not. We are going to probe into all this together. Please this is not an entertainment, and we want to be entertained. The whole entertainment industry, the television, the football, all the entertaining books and magazines have so conditioned us that we want to be told what to do, to be entertained, to run away from ourselves. And this is not a talk of that kind. This is very serious because we are concerned very deeply to understand the cause of all this. Why human beings have become what they are after forty, fifty thousand years, or more. Why human beings outwardly have changed tremendously; the whole technological world, and the extraordinary things they are doing. But inwardly, psychologically

we remain more or less what we have been for thousands of years. That's a fact. It's not something invented by the speaker. The so-called evolution which is the time process, time sequence, of a million years, or less, or more, has not changed fundamentally man. And man, human beings, what will make them change radically so that we live on this earth peacefully?

So we must examine together, the speaker means together, you and the speaker, look at all these facts. Not as a democrat, or a republican, a communist, or a Hindu, Buddhist, and all that nonsensical division, but look at all this, face it. And who has done all this mischief, this misery, this nastiness in the world? Human beings throughout the world have created this society in which they live. Society is not different from us, we are the society. You cannot possibly bring about a change in society if you yourself, as a human being, do not fundamentally, basically, change. That's an obvious fact. If you and I, or another, consider that society is something that has existed in spite of us, if we think that, that is a fallacy. It is not a communist conclusion, dialectical materialism; it is an obvious fact that we, as human beings, living on this earth, have created the society, and the society then controls us, shapes us. It is like a tide going in and out. It's this constant reaction between us as separate human beings and the society in which we live, what we are - our agony, our suffering, our confusion, our disorder. Society is what we are. And there is no question or doubt about that. You may disagree, but please examine it. Let's use our brains to look, to observe what we are. Not according to any psychologist, modern, recently, or ancient, not according to some philosopher, or according to a book, but to see what we are,

actually. If we are in conflict we will bring about conflict in the world. If each one of us wants to live peacefully - and that again is a very complex problem, whether man can ever live on this earth peacefully - there must be an end to conflict, both inwardly and outwardly. And whether that is possible, living in the modern world, to live without a shadow of conflict. We are going to together to examine that question.

One of the factors is that we are trained to solve problems - biological problems, architectural problems, engineering problems, and scientific, religious problems, from the days we spend in school, universities and so on, our brain is trained and educated to solve problems. So we have made our life into a vast complex problem to be solved. That again is a fact. And we are only dealing with facts first. And when we are able to look at the facts clearly without any resistance, without any direction, then we can go beyond the facts.

So first of all we must look at the fact that we live in disorder. Our life is confused, unhappy, a struggle, aggressive, competitive. And so is society. We are violent people, human beings throughout the world, perhaps derived from the animal, the apes and so on, biologically we are violent people. We get so angry so quickly; we hate people, you are jealous of people and so on. Violence is not merely physical, violent is most complex and deep psychologically. And so we have created a society that has become appallingly dangerous.

So first we must examine, probe together, why this condition has been brought about in the world; and why we human beings live as we do, endlessly working, working, working, quarrelling,

having rows, miserable, frightened, unhappy, lonely, depressed and so on. We must look at what we are first, and then we can affect the society in which we live. So the transformation of society is not important; but what is important, essential, is, can our brain, which is the centre of all our thought and emotions and feelings, can that brain which has been conditioned, can that brain change radically? We are saying, the speaker is saying that it can fundamentally, deeply bring about a mutation. We will talk about that presently.

It is not a matter of acceptance. As we said, please, always have a doubt, question, never accepting anything from another, because all leaders have failed. We have had leaders galore, politically, religiously, but they have not brought about order in our lives, nor happiness, security. So one must totally reject psychologically - please bear that in mind - totally, completely reject any kind of spiritual authority. Because we create the authority. If we are disordered, live in disorder, confused, uncertain, that very uncertainty, confusion and disorder brings about the authority. Politically also. I saw this case in Italy with Mussolini and other leaders; where there is disorder in us, that disorder creates the authority, the dictator, the tyrant.

So our concern is, can this disorder in our lives end? And then only can we live peacefully, wholly, with a sense of security and certainty. It is most extraordinary, one of the things is, that we always start with certainties - that god exists, that heaven is there, of course that is old fashioned, but it is still there, about 800 million Catholics believe all that, so do the Hindus; but the Buddhists have no god, but they have created the Buddha into a god. So we live in disorder. What is the cause of this disorder? If

one can find, not in abstraction, intellectually, but actually find what is the cause of this disorder. There may be many causes, or only one cause. And if one can discover for oneself, not to be told by another, including by the speaker, if we can find the cause the effect then can be radically changed because the cause can be ended. If one has some kind of disease the causes can be found diagnostically, then that cause can be ended. Similarly if we can find the cause of this conflict, these wars, these religious absurd divisions, then the causes can be eradicated completely.

So we are probing into this question. One observes there is great division in the world, geographically, nationally, religiously, politically, economically, racially and so on. There is tremendous division in this world. That's a fact. In this division man has sought, including woman - forgive me if I don't include the woman; when I say man, woman is included in it, don't get annoyed, or assert yourself when I don't mention the woman. It is all becoming so absurd. Really it is so childish. And we are all supposed to be grown up men and women. We are asking: are we aware of this division first of all, outwardly, linguistically, and inwardly? We are so fragmented. Again this is a fact. Now what has brought about this division? And what has brought about these terrible wars? Because consider we have had two appalling wars in this century, consider how many women and men and wives, husbands, mothers and so on have shed tears, maimed, so-called heroes who have killed more. These wars seem to have no end. And we are responsible for it. So we are considering why this division exists in the world, actually. Who has brought it about? Who is responsible for it? All those people who are being killed, near to

this country, and far from this country, who is responsible?

So we must first ask why this division exists? Each one of us wants to live in security. That is natural. That's an instinctive response to have food, clothes, and shelter. Every human being in the world, the most ignorant, the most sophisticated human being wants security both outwardly and inwardly, to be safe. And this division, the national division, has made that security impossible; outwardly wars, you are being threatened by another country, by another ideology, and so you say you must protect yourself. This is what the politicians and all the so-called leaders are saying, because each one of us sought security in division. The family, we thought there we can be secure in the family. From that the nation, the nation is only a glorified tribalism. So we sought security in individuality and we sought security in family, in various forms of division, religiously and so on. So one realizes, actually not theoretically, not intellectually, but actually in daily life that where there is division there must be conflict. That's a law, a natural law. If there is a division between a man and a woman, the husband and wife, and so on, there must be conflict between them. This is so. That's why in this country, and other countries, there are so many divorces, each one wanting his own way, each one wanting to express himself fully, urged on by the psychologists, "Don't restrain, do whatever you want immediately".

The gurus throughout the world, not only imported from India and the Far East, you have your own peculiar gurus too here, the gurus have created this division too - my guru is better than your guru, more powerful, more assertive, more money, more property, because we all want to be secure. And that security is being denied

outwardly by war; you may be secure now but what about your children, grandchildren and so on? This earth is not just for one's particular life, or the duration of a particular life. We are meant to live on this earth happily, without suffering, and not only you but your grandchildren, generation after generation. And this division has denied all that.

So is there an end to division? And what has brought about this division? We see security, but much deeper than that, what is the cause of it? I hope we are together in all this. We are thinking together. The speaker is not trying to stimulate you, he is not acting as a drug, intoxicant. But together, with strength, with clarity, we are looking at all this. Our lives, our daily monotonous routine life, lonely, occupied, going to the office from nine to five for the rest of one's life and then die, following some crazy guru, crazy leaders. I do not know if you are aware what is happening, specially in California. Each one has his own particular little sound, his own particular little guru, his own particular nonsense.

So we are probing, please this is very serious, we are probing into what is the cause of all this, apart from security. Man wants security. That security has been denied by his own actions, by his own life, by his own lack of integrity, by his own lack of sanity, intelligence. We will go into the question of what is intelligence a little later.

So who is responsible? Thought is limited because all knowledge, all knowledge, present, past and future, all knowledge is limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything. The scientists, the biologists, the chemists, engineers, whatever they have learnt, whatever they have accumulated through experience as

knowledge, is always everlastingly, knowledge in the future or the past is always limited. That again is a fact. As all experience, whether your personal experience or the experience of humanity, there is no difference between humanity and yourself, all the accumulated knowledge of past centuries is limited. And thought is the response of knowledge, response of memory, held in the brain. And so thought has brought about this division because in itself it is limited. If you are thinking about yourself, as most people do unfortunately, from morning until night, about themselves, about their problems, whether they are doing the right thing, or following some bearded guru and so on, that very thinking about yourself is limited. And any action that is limited must invariably bring about division. That's clear. That's factual. That's not imaginary, or an intellectual conceptual theory. Where there is division, between the Jew and the Arab, between the communist and the so-called democratic, where there is division between the Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, all this has been brought about by thought. Thought has built the great cathedrals of the world, the great temples, the marvellous mosques, and all that which is inside the temples, mosques, cathedrals and churches, is put together by thought. Thought has been evolving slowly from a great many thousand years, and thought has put together the religious life, the monastic life, the celibate life, the life of so-called particular religious life. And thought also has created the marvellous world of technology: the computer, the extraordinary instruments of war, the submarine, the carrier and so on and so on, marvellous surgery, engineering. You must have time to learn a language, a skill, all that is brought about by thought. I am sure nobody can deny that. It

is so obvious.

And thought also has brought about this division as me and you, psychologically. The 'me', the ego, the personality, with all its tendencies, idiosyncrasies, with its peculiarities, is brought about by thought. The psyche is the essence of thought. What you think, what you feel, what you imagine, your illusions, your aspirations, your gods, and all the rituals, is the result of a great deal of thinking, a thousand years and more of thinking. Without thought there is no thinker. The thinker is thought.

So thought is responsible for all this. And thought is the content of our consciousness. You may not like to use the word consciousness. Modern psychologists may say, there is only action, and reaction, nothing else. But action, reaction, have the movement of time, memory, thought. Thought with its reaction and action has put together the content of our consciousness. Please be patient in your investigation, if you are at all probing into what is being said. It is not that you are being instructed or informed. You, yourself, sitting there, looking at yourself. Your consciousness with its action and reaction, with its beliefs, ideals, aspirations, fears, the pursuit of pleasure, loneliness, the agony, the anxiety, the uncertainty, the constant suffering, is the content of your consciousness. Again there is no doubt about it, it is a fact. This consciousness is common to all mankind. You go to India, or the Far East, they may have a different form of culture, outward behaviour, outward manners, or no manners, but their consciousness, they suffer like you, they are lonely like you, they are unhappy, uncertain, anxious, desperately lonely, just like you. So your consciousness is not yours. It is the consciousness of

humanity, of which you are. You are humanity. You are not separate from other human beings. You are the rest of mankind. This is not a theory but an actual daily fact. You go to the office, being kicked around there. This happens in India and Japan, in Russia. You quarrel with your wife, or husband, and so on; this happens too in other countries. It is a daily common factor. Please realize the truth of this. For god's sake, see what we are all doing. Your consciousness is not yours, it is the whole of humanity's, therefore you are the entire humanity. Therefore you are not an individual. You may think, or you may have the illusion that you are individuals. That has been created by religions, that you are an individual soul; and a different word is used in India. This illusion has been created from childhood. It is one of our conditionings. A fragment says, I must fulfil, I am more important than anybody else. But it is still a fragment. And the fragment is making tremendous mischief because it clings to its division. You are a fragment of the whole of humanity, and when you give importance to the fragment, as you do, your whole culture is that, you have been encouraged by the politicians, religions, psychologists and so on, ambitious, greedy, competitive. The fragment is this. And so you are maintaining the division. And therefore you are utterly, completely responsible for wars because you are insisting that you are American, another is insisting he is an Indian and so on. Not only there is division linguistically, but ideological division. So thought has been responsible for all this.

It is not a question of ending thought, or asking how to end thought. That's one of our favourite conditionings, 'how to', 'tell me what to do'. But thought has its place. Otherwise you couldn't go

from here to your house, you couldn't speak a language, you couldn't drive a car, you couldn't possibly do all the technological things that one has to do in daily life. So thought there is necessary, knowledge there is necessary. But is it necessary in the psychological world? We are going to examine that very closely, deeply, taking one thing after another.

We are asking: psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin, as it were, is knowledge - please listen to this a little bit attentively, if you will kindly - is knowledge, which is the movement of time, thought, that movement, is it necessary in our inward life, psychologically, inside? We are going to find out, we are going to question. And I hope you are questioning with the speaker.

We live in disorder, that's a fact. Thought has brought about this disorder, which is again another fact. So we have to examine whether this disorder of our daily life can end, not seek order. Through negation of disorder there is order, naturally. Through the negation the positive is always there. So we are going to find out what is the cause of this disorder. How does it express itself? To see this disorder we must look first at relationship in our life, in the daily relationship with man, woman and so on. Why is there disorder in our relationships? Not with the universe, or cosmos, or something outside, far away, but actually in our relationship with each other. Relationship is the most extraordinarily important thing in life. If we had no relationship we wouldn't be here. The man who retires, or the nun, into a monastery, or the man who disappears into the hills, or takes to a life of a mendicant, as they do in India, there are those people who are very learned, they are not mere mendicants, they too are related. They may abandon their

own particular family, abandon their name, and take on a new name, but they too, the hermit, is related to the earth, to his neighbour, to nature.

And to come nearer, which is you, your wife, husband, or whatever it is, there is disorder in our relationship. Why? One dominating the other, each one wanting to fulfil in his own way, each one earning his own livelihood. You know all that is going on in this modern civilization, especially in this country. They may meet sexually but otherwise they are totally unrelated because each one pursues his own individual inclination, his own ambition, his own greed, and so on. So our relationships are like two parallel lines, never meeting, so maintaining perpetual division. And this division, with all its anxieties, quarrels, jealousies, you know this better than the speaker does - your family life. That life is in disorder. And can that disorder in relationship end? Because that is the closest thing we have. To go very far you must begin very, very near, which is you. And can the disorder in this relationship end? Please ask yourself this question. If you say, "It is impossible, man has always lived this way, he has always been conditioned this way", as some of the philosophers, writers, psychologists, professionals maintain, that the brain in its conditioning can only be modified, it can never be completely free from conditioning. We totally disagree with that personally.

So why is there this division between man and woman, and so on? Has not each one of us not only his own image about himself, what he should be, what he must be, and so on, an image about himself, he has an image about his wife - or a husband. That image has been accumulated for ten years, or one day, or fifty years. I am

sure you are aware of this. The relationship is between these two images, which thought through time has put together. So there is actually no relationship. There is relationship between two images which time has put together. Now one asks: can one live in this world without a single image? Not only about your wife or husband and so on, but about anything, without a single image. I don't know if you have even thought about all this, if you have thought about it, or gone into it, and if you have questioned it, probed deeply into the question, whether it is possible to live without a single image. Is love an image? Is love thought? Desire? Pleasure? Remembrance? Is that love? Perhaps you never even use that word. You might say you love your wife, or your girl, and so on, but behind it, behind that word, there are a great many complex reactions.

So one begins to ask: how is this - not 'how' - whether this image building can ever end? I hope you are asking this question, being aware of your own images, how you look, your vanity is part of your image, your arrogance, your aggressiveness, your ambition to become something, psychologically. Why have you an image at all? But to find out whether it is possible to live in this world without a shadow of an image requires a great deal of investigation, which is part of meditation. Meditation is not some silly practice, following some absurd system - which we will go into if we have time tomorrow. Meditation is this, to find out for oneself whether it is possible to live without a single image about yourself or another. When there is that freedom there is love then. Love is not then memory, knowledge. It is something totally outside the brain. And disorder exists as long as there is this idea -

please listen, if you will - there is this idea of evolution. We are not talking about fundamental absurdities. There is evolution, from the child, from the baby into a grown up man. There is evolution as the seed which grows into a marvellous tree. There is evolution in learning. I don't know Russian - one doesn't know Russian but it needs time to learn, and that is part of evolution. To learn a skill requires time, that is also evolution. Time, thought, is the process of evolution.

So we are questioning: is there - please listen, if you will kindly, amicably - is there psychological, physic, evolution at all? I, you, becoming something? To become implies time, growth, like the seed into a tree. Is there psychological evolution at all? I know we accept that as a fact, that I will become something. Perhaps that is the result of being a clerk, becoming a manager, the manager becoming the executive, the executive becoming god! We carry that same principle into the psychological world, that I will become something, reach heaven, reach illumination, or whatever one aspires to.

So we are asking, questioning, doubting whether there is psychological evolution at all. That is, the psyche, part of the psyche is violence. We all know what violence is, both physically and psychologically. Violence is a very complex problem. Violence exists as long as there is comparison, as long as there is imitation, conformity. Violence, we all know violence, inherited from the past. And it is a common effort to end violence through non-violence. Right? We are all saying this, probably led by several people from India, Tolstoy and others. Pursue non-violence, politically, in other ways. Non-violence is a non-fact. It is

an illusion, it has no reality. What has reality is violence. And when you pursue non-violence you are cheating yourself. Non-violence doesn't exist, it is an idea. It is a theory. But what exists actually is violence. And we are asking, as we said, this violence is part of your psyche, of you, will violence end through time, through evolution? I hope you are putting the question to yourself. That is, one will gradually understand, delve, find the cause, and gradually dissipate this violence. The moment you admit graduality and the future, that implies evolution. Violence cannot end through evolution, now or in the future, because man has lived for a million, or less, a thousand years in violence, it is part of his nature, part of his psyche, part of his consciousness, his action and reaction. You hate me and I hate you, you kick me and I kick you. That's what we are doing. That is what man has done for thousands of years. And we say to ourselves, some day it will end, through the League of Nations - absurd, isn't it - through some divine action, through some mutation in the psyche, suddenly.

So is it possible to end violence, not some time in the future, but immediately? The whole content of violence, not the word only, but the significance of that word, the depth of that word, the content of that word, which is not merely the physical action but the whole movement of me, the ego and you, separate, trying to conform, trying to imitate, trying to become. All that is part of violence. Aggression is violence. Competitiveness is violence. And to talk about being free from competitiveness is an anathema in this country. You abhor it. You will say, "Doesn't all nature compete. Doesn't a tree struggle against other trees to find light". But we are supposed to be human beings with some kind of

intelligence.

So violence, we are asking, is it possible for it to end instantly, not gradually? It is a very serious question. We will see whether it is possible or not to end violence without any motive, because the moment you have a motive to end violence, that very motive becomes part of violence. I hope you understand all this. If, or when you want to end violence because it is profitable, because it is the right thing to do, or you think violence is anti-religious, you want to live a peaceful life, any kind of motive behind the act of ending of violence, is the continuation of violence. One hopes you understand this. You can look at it for yourself. If you want to end violence it can't have direction, you can't have a motive which says, "I will end it".

So we are going to find out, if there is time this morning, I think there is - half past twelve, we will go on. May we? You aren't too tired? Aren't you?

Audience: No.

K: I am surprised! One is surprised because this is a very serious matter. You have listened for an hour and a half. If you are working, if your brain is active, enquiring, questioning, doubting, your brain must be tired because you are not used to this kind of thinking, looking. But we will go on.

We are asking the question, when we ask a question there is doubt behind it, there is scepticism. And scepticism, doubt, clarifies the brain - which is against all your religion. You don't doubt your guru, you don't doubt your religious authorities, you don't doubt the whole rigmarole of religious entertainment. So when you question whether violence can end instantly, the whole complexity

of violence, you are doubting, questioning, asking, asking yourself. Now let's find out, probe together whether it is possible to end violence completely so that you can live on this earth peacefully. Because if you are violent you cannot possibly live peacefully. That's not a motive. But the fact is we are violent - violence between man and man, woman and man, and so on.

What is violence? It is a reaction. It is a response. It is there, inherited perhaps in the very genes themselves. We are asking, can all that end? How do you observe? Observe a tree, observe the lovely sunset, or the beauty of the sky in the evening. How do you observe things? When you look at the new moon, just over the horizon, a slip of light, hardly perceptible, when you look at it, what is your reaction? Do you say, "How beautiful it is", and turn away to other things? Do you ever look totally, completely, attentively at anything? Do you ever look at your wife, or your husband, or your children completely, without any reaction of parent, and all that business? Just to look. Can you look at a tree without naming it? Can you look at the moon, full moon of an evening when the heavens are clear, and all the evening light is awake? Do you ever look at it without the word, without all the remembrance of full moons of yesterday? Just to look at it. When you so look at it there is a totally different movement going on. It is not the movement of thought, it is not the movement of pleasure, it is not a remembrance of something past. You are looking at it as though for the first time in your life when you don't name it.

So can we move from the outer, which is looking at the moon, move inwardly to this whole structure of violence, look at it, without any reaction, without naming it as violence. That sense of

clear observation, without any motive, without any reaction, just to look at this extraordinary thing we have called violence. It is like looking at a great precious jewel. It is not yours, or mine, but it is there in your hands. When you so look at it so completely, attentively, that which has been called violence with all its movement ends totally.

You are not, please, you are not learning from the speaker how to observe. You are learning for yourself what it means to observe. Observe the hall, be aware of the nature, the structure of the hall in which we are, the rain, the clouds, those extraordinary clouds full of light and depth and quality, just to observe all this. And so one can observe what violence means. And when there is such observation with great attention - because you cannot observe if there is no attention. The word attention means to grasp, go out and take. We are not meaning it in that sense. To attend, to attend to what you are saying, to attend to your thoughts, to attend diligently to this violence which has brought such great misery to human beings. When there is such pure attention, which is the gathering of all your energy, to focus on this fact of this reaction called violence, there is an ending completely of that violence. Please don't accept it from the speaker. He is not your authority, he is not your guru, he is not a professional. But you are observing this fact for yourself, seeing the truth of it.

Right, sirs. We will continue tomorrow, if we may, go into fear, what the nature of time is, fear, pleasure, whether there is an ending to sorrow, and meditation. There is no time this morning, so we must stop but we will continue tomorrow.

SAN FRANCISCO 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST MAY 1983

May we continue where we left off yesterday morning? We were talking about together, having a conversation, friendly, unbiased, a careful examination of what is going on in the world, and what is going on in ourselves, in our behaviour, in our ways of life. And we came to the point yesterday about disorder and relationship. And we were pointing out in our conversation together how important relationship is, because all life depends on relationship. All existence, all activity is a movement in relationship. And there is conflict in our relationship however intimate it may be, or it expresses itself outwardly. If we are violent, greedy, aggressive and so competitive and so on, we human beings create a society out of the pattern of our own self. We came to that point yesterday.

And we have got to talk about this morning, pleasure, fear, sorrow, and whether there is an ending to sorrow of mankind. And we will also go together in our conversation about death, and perhaps if there is time, and we will make time, go into the whole question of a religious mind. Which means the investigation of what is meditation, not how to meditate, but what is the nature and structure. Structure means movement, this movement of meditation.

So as we said yesterday, this is not an entertainment, something romantic, sensational, exotic, nor mere intellectual investigation, exploration which satisfies only a part of our own self, that is the intellect. And most of us are satisfied with the appreciation and understanding verbally of the intellectual activity. But we are

concerned with the whole of life, not with theories, not with beliefs, not with some new philosophical concepts, but we are dealing with our daily actual life. Why human beings after living on this earth for so many thousands of years are still what they are; violent, aggressive, brutal, the naughtiness and the ugliness and the brutality of wars. We are together, if you are serious, and one hopes that you are, because only the serious people live rightly, not the flippant, not the generation that does what it likes.

So together we are going to investigate the nature of fear. Because that is part of our life. It is in the very deep recesses of our own brain, this fear that has been the human lot from the beginning of time. And apparently nobody seems to have gone into it very, very deeply, some may have and perhaps some of you have, to find out for oneself, not to be told, not to be persuaded, not to be rewarded, but to probe into the nature and the structure of fear. I hope we can do it all together.

To understand the nature of fear we must also first investigate what is time. Time by the watch, the chronological time, time to learn a language, a skill, time to go from here to there, time to evolve an intellectual concept and put it into action. Time is necessary for the acorn to become the great tree, to construct a robot. In each, time and energy and knowledge. So there is physical time.

Now we are asking: what is time in the psychological world? What is time where the psyche is concerned? I hope we are together in this. It is a pleasant morning, I don't know why we are cooped up here. But since we are cooped up here let us be a little serious, at least for this morning. Because we are going to talk over

many things that require a great deal of attention, that demands your energy, not just casual listening and saying, "That was an enjoyable talk". This is not to be enjoyed. This is a very serious matter. And since man has carried fear, a great burden, all the days of his life, one must find out if it is possible at all whether this fear can end. And in the probing into the question of fear one must go also into the question of time. We live by time. We get up in the morning, go to the office, come back home, and this whole process of time is involved. There is physical time, sun rises, sun sets. And we must find out for ourselves, not to be told, not to be suggested, discover for oneself the nature of time in the psychological realm. Time has built up the egotistic, the personal, the whole psychological world. We think time is necessary in that area. And we are questioning whether the psyche, the 'me', the ego, the self, the centre from which all action takes place, whether it is caught in illusion, and therefore pursues the idea of time, whether the psyche, the you, has evolution at all. Or there is no future for the psyche, for the 'me'. The future is the movement of the past, modified by the present, and continues as the future. So the past is maintained, however modified, the past is the accumulated knowledge, experience, the past is the observer. I hope all this is clear.

The past is the knowledge that we have accumulated, whether it be of yesterday or thousands upon thousands of yesterdays. That's the past. That past meets the present; the present environment, society and so on. And the past gets modified, slightly changed, but the past remains as the past, and continues as the future. This whole cycle is called time. The accumulation of knowledge in the

physical world, or in the scientific world, needs time. That is, acquiring more and more knowledge, however limited that knowledge is. But we are asking is time necessary at all? Or time is a factor in the psychological world, and the evolution of the psyche, that is, the 'me', the ego, the self, has a future. I hope - one hopes this is all clear. May we go on if it is clear?

Knowledge, which is the accumulation of experience, which is tradition, which is the past, is in fact time. Now we are questioning whether fear which is part of time, whether fear has a process of evolution, gradual growth, ending. Or the future has no time at all. That is, the ending of fear instantly, not gradually. Are we together in all this? Somewhat together? Because our concern is whether fear can end ever. Or it is the lot of man, as sorrow, to have fear to the end of his days. We tolerate it, we accept it as a part of life, and we try to escape from fear. Fear being something that is painful, dangerous, to be avoided - fear of some incident of the past, continued as memory, and that memory breeding fear. We all know what fear is. Not a particular form of fear, fear of darkness, fear of something or other, but we are concerned with the root of fear, what is the cause of fear. And in asking that question to discover for oneself the root of it. Not merely the clipping off the branches of fear, the various expressions of fear. If you want to cut down a tree you don't trim the branches, you cut at the very root of the tree. So we are asking what is the root of fear. And whether it is possible, in the discovering of it, whether it can end, totally, completely; not partially, not it ends sometimes and begins again. Which means the brain - the speaker is not a specialist in the brain, but he has observed very carefully, not only in himself but in the

activities of human kind - this fear exists among the animals, and that fear is rewarded or punished. So we depend on reward and punishment. But in the understanding of fear one must go into very, very deeply. That is, we enquired into time, which I think is fairly clear, and also is thought the cause of fear?

Thought is time. They are not two separate activities. Thought has created fear. That is, psychologically one remembers some incident that caused fear, and that incident is recorded in the brain, and the brain then is afraid of that incident happening again. So thought is responsible for fear, as time is. This is a fact. This is not an invention by the speaker, but when one observes, these two elements, time and thought, bring about fear. And out of fear we create a great many illusions. The illusion of god - I hope you don't mind me saying this! The illusion that one can escape from fear by forgetting it, suppressing it, denying it, or tolerating it. Fear has done a great many horrible things in life. Things that any sane man would never do. Fear of war, being destroyed, your homes, yourself, your relations and all the rest of it. But we never enquire into the cause of war, which we went into yesterday: separate tribalism, and whether it is possible to live without any nationality, without any other division. We talked about it yesterday.

One does not know if one realizes, we are in a great crisis, not only outside as war, but also a crisis in our lives, crisis in our consciousness. We are trying to stop a particular kind of war, nuclear war and all the rest of that of business, the desire to find security in division, which creates fear, then that fear brings about wars. I hope we all following all this. Please we are thinking together. We are walking down a lane in a wood, sitting down on

the ground, looking at all the magnificent trees, and talking about serious matters, like two friends who are concerned with the world and with themselves. And in their conversation this question of fear arises. They are asking themselves whether this fear can ever end completely. And one of the friends says it can, it is possible. So one must understand, not intellectually, superficially, but very deeply that time and thought are involved in the causation of fear. Now the friend says, I can't stop time or thought, it is impossible to stop it. But the other friend says, it is not a question of stopping it, it is not trying to exercise will in order to stop it, but to understand where time and thought are necessary, and where they are not. So the friend says, time and thought are necessary in the physical world. Learning a language, a skill, and so on. To put together a computer requires time, and thought and knowledge. There it is necessary, the friend says. And the other says, yes, I accept that, that is natural, it is inevitable, it is necessary. But in the psychological world my brain has been conditioned through time, through thought, so to understand the nature of fear one must understand why the brain - I hope you are following all this, we are two friends talking together - my brain is conditioned by knowledge, which is experience, and that experience and knowledge has been the process of evolution, both outwardly, and I thought inwardly. But you are suggesting that what we consider necessary psychologically is an illusion, not a fact.

So they discuss the matter because they have plenty of time, it is a lovely morning, the birds are singing, and the shadows, numberless, of the trees on the ground. It is a pleasant, lovely morning, and the subject is not morbid, but they have to find out.

And it is important to find out. So one of the friends says, if one can understand the necessity of time and thought, where it should be, but has it any place in the area of the psyche? That is, the psyche is put together by thought, and thought says, I will become better. The 'better' is the movement of time. The 'better' is measurement. The 'more' is measurement, comparison. Now can one live without comparison whatsoever? Of course you have to compare between two cars, two houses, two gardens, two machines, and so on. But why should we live always comparing inwardly? Is it possible, he asks his friend, to live without comparison whatsoever? That is, never compare, never try to become something more, because the self, however evolved, however it becomes better, will still be the self, still be very, very refined selfishness.

So when one realizes the fact, that truth, that thought is necessary, and time, in the physical world, then thought and time have no place in the psychological world. I will explain it a little further, more, if you will bear with it.

Why does the brain record every incident? Naturally it records when you drive a car carelessly in an accident, and it has recorded the accident, as painful, or just avoiding injuries, it has recorded. There the recording is necessary, the recording is knowledge. But why do we record inwardly? Why does the brain record if you insult another? Or flatter another? Which is, when you record the insult you are building up gradually enmity, violence. So is it possible not to record psychologically anything? This is meditation, to find out. It isn't just a verbal dissertation, a verbal argument, or deduction. This requires a great deal of enquiry, a

great deal of attention, giving your energy to find out. And the friend says, it is possible not to record anything in the psychological world. Which means the self, as we know it, is not. And therefore you have tremendous energy that can be used intelligently, wisely, sanely, in the physical world.

In talking about fear, we also should be concerned with pleasure. Why man has pursued pleasure above anything else, above fear, above sorrow, above anything else, even god - if you believe in god. Why? Why in the West and the East - there is really no West and the East, there is not Eastern thought and Western thought, there is only thought, which can be expressed in the East in a different way, and in the West perhaps in another way - but thought is the ground upon which all human beings live, exist. It is neither East nor West. Expressions may vary, and we cling to expressions. So we are enquiring why pleasure has become so important. Not that there is not pleasure and delight in watching a sunset, or the rising of a moon, or seeing something beautiful, not only in museums, but in the world of nature. To see a tiger in the wild is an extraordinary thing. And what is pleasure? Is it memory? When there is the actual fact of something happening there is neither pleasure or displeasure, there is just the happening. But a moment later thought says that was a most pleasurable thing that I have had; and that means the remembrance of something that has happened before, and that remembrance as pleasure and pursuing that pleasure. And we are caught up, or conditioned in fear, in pleasure. Reward and punishment. That's the way of our life.

We are not advocating the ending of pleasure, which would be stupid, but to understand why the brain, thought, your whole

energy, is spent on pleasure, on entertainment, whether the entertainment be religious, in a church or a cathedral, or on the football field, or sexually, sensory pleasures. Why are we a slave to all this? To answer definitely, to say this or that, would be rather unnecessary, but if one understands the whole movement of it, which is to understand desire. Why are we so crippled, or pursue so energetically desire? What is desire? I wonder if one has ever asked this question. Or the moment you see something you like in the window, and you go in and feel it, and you buy it. But you never ask, perhaps, what is the nature and structure of desire. Why man has tried to escape from desire. All the monks, the sannyasis of the world - the word sannyasis is used in Sanskrit and so on. Why has man tried to escape from desire, suppress desire, or overcome desire, and so on? You cannot possibly suppress desire. It is always there. Whether that desire is identified with a symbol, with a person, a concept, that desire is still there. Desire exists in the monk - desire to be saved by some imaginary person. And so on.

So we are enquiring into the nature of desire because that is part of pleasure and part of fear. What is desire? It is important to understand this, if one may point out. In this world desire is rampant. The whole commercial world is based on it. And also in the technological world, ambition, success, and all that. So what is desire? We live by sensation, sensory responses. That's natural. Seeing something clear, beautiful, that very seeing, and the contact, physical contact with it, brings about a sensation. This is a fact. Then thought creates the image, you in the car, you in that shirt, you in that garden, house, or whatever it be, there is sensation.

Then thought creates the image of you in the car, or in the house. At that moment desire arises. Are we together in this, somewhat?

One wonder why you find it all so difficult. You are making a tremendous effort, I hope - I didn't mean "I hope" - you are making effort to understand the speaker. Don't, if one may say so.

Understand your own desire. Look at it. Desire to be beautiful, desire to be tall, desire to be successful, desire to be noble, desire to find out if there is god - you know all the whole business of desire. The objects of desire may vary, but it is still desire.

So we are saying, sensation is natural, is obviously a fact, and when thought creates the image, then at that moment desire begins. This is again a fact carefully looked at and examined. So if one understands that very clearly, even intellectually, because first we say understand intellectually. The bombing, killing many people, and all their friends, their wives and their mothers, their husbands cry. I wonder if we are aware how the world is suffering. There is not only the personal suffering, the pain, the agony of loss, the loneliness, the unbearable sense of separation, and that suffering is not only so-called personal, but it is the suffering of all mankind. We have tried to escape from it, saying that one person has suffered for the whole of humanity, but that suffering still goes on. You have all shed tears. You see the poor man in a far away village, and he will never know a clean bath, a hot bath, clean clothes, ride in a car, not that you should drive in a car, but he sees all the others. And there is the suffering of that man.

Suffering has existed from time immemorial until now, we still suffer, and we have never been able to resolve it, end it. Because where there is suffering there can be no love. I know it is difficult

to accept that statement. When you are suffering you are only concerned with yourself, or with suffering of mankind. Concerned, wanting to help. I wonder if we have ever asked why we seek help at all from another. You are all sitting here, and one hopes, the speaker hopes that he is not helping you. Right? Because it is a matter that you, yourself, have to understand, and nobody in the world can help you. That's appears to be rather a cruel statement but it is not. We have had thousands of helpers, leaders, politicians, or "The present politician is not good but the next one will be better." And we keep this game going. The helper is the helped. I wonder if you understand that. So when we suffer we are always wanting comfort, to be helped out of it. And there are people who will do this, help us to escape from it. But the deep rooted agony goes on. Superficially you may smile, but the agony of pain and loneliness goes on. One never asks if there is an end to all that. If my son dies, he is gone. But the memory of it remains. The memory of playing together, talking together, walking together, holding hands, looking at the trees and the beauty of the earth. That son is gone, but the photograph, the picture, the memory remains. That is, the memory is something that is gone. So memory is not actual, living, it is something that is finished, gone. And we think that is disloyal to move away from all this memory. It is like living with a dead thing. Again can we look at it without running away from it? Observe the nature of this suffering, remain with it, not run away, or suppress, or seek comfort. That is, to give all your attention to the loneliness. Then if one so gives whole attention to that there is an ending of that loneliness, that division.

So there is a possibility, there is an ending to sorrow. Then only

love is. Then love is not pleasure, is not desire. It is as strong, as deeply rooted in one's heart as one of those marvellous trees. It can never die.

And we should also talk over together what is death. It is not a morbid subject, but one should consider death because it is part of our life. It is part of our existence. My brother and my mother, my son, may die. But we are all going to die, that is inevitable, that is the one absolute fact. Whether you die of old age, senile, gaga, or you die through an accident, some disease, and so on. Death is inevitable for all of us. Thank god! Imagine a world where all the people who are dead living! It would be impossible.

So we are enquiring, the ending, which is called death. The ending of what? The ending of one's bank account? Don't please laugh, this is much too serious. Perhaps you are laughing because you see what it means. The ending, the total separation from your family. The ending of all the things that you have cherished. The ending of your memories, idiosyncrasies. The ending. The ending of your attachments to a picture, to your furniture, to your house, to a person, to an ideal, to an ideology and so on, attachment. That's what it means. Death means the ending completely of all attachment. And is it possible to live a life without any attachment? Because that is what is going to happen. We are concerned mostly what happens after, after death; is there a continuity of me, the self. The whole world of the East believes in some form of incarnation next life, called reincarnation. But what is it that reincarnates? The psyche? Not your bank account, surely. The psyche, the 'me'. The 'me' is put together by thought. It may think that me is super, super something, but it is still thought. The psyche, the 'me' is time and

thought, pain, anxiety, loneliness, a sense of utter futility of all this life, the weariness, and so on. That's me. There is no doubt about that. That's me, my name, my form, my bank account, if I have one. All that is me. That they believe will continue next life. So that each life will become more and more - less and less, rather - conflict, less and less loneliness and so on. That is admitting the psyche has evolution, which obviously seems so absurd.

So are we concerned with what happen after death, or are we concerned with what happens before death, this whole life? It may be the life of ten days, or the life of eighty years. What is that life? The life that you lead, what is that life? Not what happens when you die, which becomes so unnecessary, and rather infantile, but what is your life. Pain, ambition, failure, depression, anxiety, uncertainty, conflict, all that is your life. That's a fact. You can't escape from it. And in that life you are attached to your memories, to your experiences, to your knowledge, to a person, to an ideology. And when death comes it is the end of everything that you are attached to. So please just listen, for the fun of it even. Is it possible to live a life in which there is no psychological attachment whatsoever? Which means, living with all your capacities and energies, and at the same time dying, which is the ending of attachment. Not committing suicide, that's too... But a life that is so totally aware of all its activities, its thoughts, its actions, and its actions based on attachment, for example. And ending that attachment now while living with all your capacities. That is living with death all the time. You understand all this? That requires also deep meditation.

We ought to talk over finally, if we have time, there is plenty of

time, what is meditation. The very word means to ponder over. That is the dictionary meaning. To ponder over, to think over, to be concerned, to be concerned diligently, using common sense. So we are going to find out together what it means to meditate. Not how to meditate. If you ask how to meditate from another, then you want a system, a method, a practice. When you practise, if you are a pianist you practise, and you practise the wrong note, you are practising the wrong note. So this is what is considered meditation: following a system, a method, and practising that method, that system. This has been brought over in recent years by those Indians who think, or know how to meditate. And they have made a lot of money out of it, an enormous amount, fantastic amounts because people in this country are very gullible. There have been the different types of meditation; transcendental, Buddhist meditation, Zen meditation, the Tibetan form of meditation, the Hindu. They all come over here - I don't know why, I know why, money! In India if you talk about meditation, they know all about it already, at least they think they do. Here it is something new. And you live on fads, change from one thing to another.

So we are going together to find out what is meditation. Which is to ask what is a religious mind. What is religion? One can see what religion is not. Religion is not all the things that are going on in the world, the churches, look at what happens in the churches, in the cathedrals, in the temples, in the mosques, in the Tibetan shrines and so on, that's all put together by thought, by centuries of thought. And is thought sacred, and the things thought has created, apart from the technological world? Is thought and the thing that it has created, are those things sacred? Please ask this of yourself.

The content of a church, the practice, the mass, the rituals that are daily perpetuated in the name of god, in the name of saviours, in the name - all over the world they have their own particular god. In India there are, I believe, one is told, 330,000 gods! It is nice to have so many gods, you can choose any one of them according to your pleasure, according to your comfort, according to your personal inclination. But to have only one god is rather tiresome.

Q: Why?

K: Just a moment, please. I am not being rude. May I finish the talk, and if we have time you can ask the question. I hope you don't mind my saying this.

All that is put together by thought. So one asks, is thought sacred, holy? Or is it only a material process? Thought is a material process stored in the brain, in the very cells of the brain. The cells are matter, and thought is the outcome of knowledge, experience and so on, so thought, whatever thought creates is not sacred. So meditation is to find out if there is anything sacred, or not. But if you practise, follow a system and so on, it is merely making the mind, the brain, more dull, more repetitive, mechanical. If I practise some system of meditation, yoga breathing - you know, I won't go into all that business - if you practise all that your brain, which should be extraordinarily active, full of energy, have a sense of deep perception, that brain if you keep on repeating, repeating, repeating, becomes more and more mechanical, more and more dull. And those people who have meditated for twenty five years, and we happen to know a great many of them, are extraordinarily dull people. (Laughter) I am not laughing at it. They have spent their life on something that is so cruel, that is so limited, that is so

mechanical, so superficial.

So we are going together to find out what is a religious mind. The brain is conditioned by our culture, by our knowledge, by our experience, by all the impressions that we receive, conditioned by newspapers, television, by the books we read, and so on, the beliefs, the faiths, all that has conditioned our brain. The language - I question whether language ever conditions the brain but that is a different matter altogether. We are conditioned, the brain is conditioned. And when the brain is not conditioned then it has got infinite capacity. As is shown in the technological world, it has got extraordinary capacity; look at all the things it has invented, from the most convenient things to the most complex, subtle things. But psychologically we are conditioned, the brain is conditioned, and therefore its energy is very, very limited. And meditation is to find out, come upon that freedom which comes from total unconditioning. When the brain is totally unconditioned, then the mind is the religious mind. Not the mind that believes in some ideology and all the rest of that immature stuff.

So we are going to find out together, if you wish, if you are concerned, if there is something utterly beyond thought, something that is sacred, beyond all words, something that is not measurable, something that is totally free from all contamination of thought. When you begin to enquire, when one begins to enquire one must put aside totally and completely the whole world of belief and faith, and all the things that thought has put together as religious activity. Totally, completely. You are neither a Hindu, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, Tibetan, and Zen, all that is finished because you have understood them. Not that you have read all

about it, or talked to a great many people about these various matters, but you see they are all the activities of a material process which is thought.

So if one is really concerned, enquiring, probing, doubting, all illusion through doubt ends. That is, then you give complete total attention. Illusion, the word illusion means, the root meaning, the etymological meaning both in Sanskrit and English, which is Latin and Greek, illusion is to play with something. To play with something. And we play with illusions. So there is an ending to all illusions. Then only you are facing facts and nothing else. The fact that there is no attachment, not the pretension of not being attached. That there is no psychological fear. And in this meditation there is love and compassion. That love is not within the brain, because love is outside of it. It is not the effort and the convenience of thought. Where there is love there is compassion, passion for everything in life. And where there is compassion and love there is intelligence. Not the intelligence of books and cunning thought and professorial minds, or the intelligence of great knowledge. The very word intelligence is something totally different.

When there is that complete attention, which comes about naturally, not learning what attention is, going to a college, or to somebody to learn and practise attention, it becomes so silly. To be so diligently aware in life, whatever one is thinking, doing, and when there is that total attention the brain is silent. It is not everlastingly chattering. The brain then becomes quiet, though it has its own rhythm. Then in that stillness of the brain and mind is that which is not to be measured by words, that which is holy,

which is completely utterly sacred, which is the strength of all life,
which is the basis of all life.

May I get up please? Don't clap.

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 4TH FEBRUARY 1984

First of all I would like to remind you, if I may, that this is not a lecture. A lecture is intended to inform, instruct, and bring about certain data, factual or imaginative and so on. So this is not a lecture but a conversation between you and the speaker, a conversation in which you and the speaker are sharing, walking together through the whole field of existence, not only outwardly, externally, but also inwardly. And to understand each other we must think together, not agree or disagree, but to have the capacity to observe together, think together, explore together, and share what we have explored, not from any particular point of view, either yours or that of the speaker. If this is very clear from the beginning that we are together going to take a long journey both externally and in the whole psychological world, which is much more complex than the external world. And to explore both the outer and the inner requires a very clear objective, non-emotional, non-romantic observation. I hope this is clear.

Why do you come to listen? That's an important question to ask. Is it merely to have some kind of religious, emotional excitement? Or is it you want to discover for yourself a way of living which must be totally different from the way we are living now, because at present the world is in great trouble, great uncertainty, there's a great deal of insecurity for human beings. So why, if one may ask most respectfully, why do you come, and why does the speaker has to make a speech? You understand? Why you come, and why the speaker has to say something. Please, are you listening to what I

am saying? Why you come and why I speak every year in Bombay. Are you really interested, concerned with the world as it is, and to find out if possible whether a few of us, or all of us, can bring about a way of living which is not monotonous, boring, routine, all the ugliness of modern existence. If that is why you come, because you want to find out from a speaker, who apparently has a certain reputation, and are you listening to the reputation, the image you have built about him, or are you listening to what he has to say? And what has the speaker to say? You understand? The speaker has a great many things to say, both obvious, logical, rational, sane. And also he has, perhaps, a way of looking at life totally differently, a way of thinking, observing, the whole complex process of life. And if you and the speaker meet, then we can go along together: you are sure why you come, what your intention is, whether you are serious, or ready to be amused, to be entertained, then you and the speaker won't meet. You will listen to a lot of words and those words will have very little meaning. But if we are together, taking the journey together, then one discovers enormously a great many things of life. Right? If this is clear, that you have come not merely out of curiosity, not merely as a follower - and I hope you are not - or merely come to be entertained, amused, to be told what to do, then I am afraid you and the speaker will not be able to meet. But if you come with the intention, with the urge, with that quality of seriousness to find out for yourself a way of living which must be rational, logical, sane, in this mad world.

And the speaker has a certain responsibility, to make what he has to say clearly, not obscurely, objectively; , it has to be

objective, clear, rational. Right? Do we understand each other now? I hope so.

And also it is important that you question what the speaker is saying, doubt, be sceptical. Not say, well I agree, or disagree, it is right, or wrong, but scepticism, questioning, doubt, not only what the speaker is saying, what everybody is saying, so that your own brain operates at its highest quality. Not just go off to sleep because we are going to look together into a very complex life. So you are not followers, I am not your guru. Because you have followed too many people already, and we have made the world such a mess. So please we are walking together, we are concerned together, perhaps we may have affection for each other, but the affection, the rationalization, has nothing whatsoever to do with our observation, so that you see clearly. Which means we see things together, not I see and then tell you, but together. You understand the meaning of that word?

We hardly ever co-operate. We don't know what co-operation is. We co-operate with a person who has authority, and you follow that authority. Or the authority of reputation. Or you follow an ideal. If you and I agree upon an ideal we then co-operate to do something together about that ideal. If you and I have a common purpose then we co-operate. Right? Because then it is profitable for us. But here the speaker is not offering anything. Right? He is offering you nothing. I wonder if you understand this. Most of us absorb, we are a sponge, take everything in, including what the speaker is going to say. And when you take something in, absorb, as this country is capable of doing, when you absorb you have nothing original in yourself. Right? I wonder if you understand

this? You absorbed the Buddha, you absorbed any kind of religious nonsense, and so on, so gradually your brain which should be extraordinarily active, becomes gradually dull. So please, as I said, the speaker is not offering you a thing, not how to behave, what to think and so on. But together you and the speaker are taking a journey. It may be a slow journey, or a very fast journey, express. Or you might go very slowly. So please, listen first. Listen: you hear with the ear, but also there is a hearing - listening is different from merely hearing. You see the distinction? You can hear something that is pleasant, then you will accept it, or if there is something unpleasant, you don't actually listen. So there is an art in listening. What the speaker is going to say may be quite the opposite of what you think or what you feel, but since you are here you have to listen to what he has to say. Not interpret what he has to say, but listen. Have you ever listened to your wife? To your husband? Please answer that question to yourself. Listen to find out what she or he feels, thinks, wants. Sensitive enough to find out. So in listening to the speaker one has to be very sensitive. Naturally.

So there is an art to listening. There is an art to learning. Most of us learn to acquire knowledge. When you go to school you learn about mathematics, geography, history and later on you go to the university, college and so on. You absorb all kinds of knowledge. And from childhood we are trained to memorize. Right? So that our brain is always accumulating knowledge. And that's what we call learning. If you want to learn a language you spend some time studying the grammar and so on, so gradually your brain is conditioned by knowledge. See all this please. So your knowledge is the enemy of love - we will go into that presently. And to learn,

it's like a river moving, renewing itself all the time, that's learning, not memorizing.

And also there is an art to observe. To look, not only with the eyes, optical observation, but to look at things without prejudice, without some kind of conclusion you have come to, to observe without the word, without the image that you have built. You understand?

So we are going to do all this together: the art of listening, the art of learning and the art of observation. It's great fun if you do this because it makes the brain extraordinarily sensitive and alive. But if you keep on repeating the same old pattern, then your brain goes dull, as most brains, perhaps, have gone. So together - please don't get bored by my repeating all this, it is important to repeat it, so that you and the speaker understand each other. We have laid a foundation of the house we are going to build together.

Can we observe what is happening in the world, not only the world of India, but the world, the global happenings that are taking place. There is a war, threatening war, nuclear war. Recently some scientists, top scientists have met and issued a certain statement saying that if there is a nuclear war the whole earth, the whole earth, not just Europe, or America, or Russia, the whole earth will be covered with dust and smoke so thick that the sun cannot get through. And the temperature will fall 5 degrees below zero. So nothing will exist. That is what they are all talking about, preparing, arguing. And also there are minor wars going on. And these wars have been going on for five to six thousand years. One started with an arrow or a club, now we have got the extraordinarily destructive nuclear bomb. What is the cause of

wars? You understand? What is the cause why human beings are behaving like this? The intellectuals, the philosophers, the scientists, and the so-called religious people, who are not really religious at all, what is the cause of all this mess in the world? Don't wait for me to answer it. You are asking that question yourself. Why is it that human beings who have lived on this earth, according to the biologists forty five to fifty thousand years, we have lived on this earth as homo sapiens. And from the very beginning we have been in conflict with each other: killing each other, maiming each other, hurting each other, competing with each other. Right? Conflict, struggle, pain, anxiety, loneliness, suffering. And we are so extraordinarily clever in the technological world, developing the most extraordinary instruments in surgery, communication, computers and so on, and we have not solved our human behaviour. You understand all this? Why? Yes, sir, this is a very serious question. Why, we human beings who are so capable, going to the moon, with all the extraordinary technological world that is going on, and yet we are primitive, savages, tribal gods, and tribal instincts. What's wrong with us? You understand? I am not criticizing, I am not blaming anybody, but it is a natural question that every decent human being must ask: what is wrong with us? Right? Why are there wars? Pakistan and India, Russia and America and so on, why? What are the causes of war? If you find the cause then it is easy to remove the effect. You are following all this? If I have a disease and the cause is cancer, and it causes a great deal of pain, either it can be removed, or I die, but where there is a cause, that cause, its effect can be ended. Right? Is this clear? Where there is a cause the effect can be ended, because the

cause can be ended. Clear? Is this clear?

What is the cause of these wars, the appalling things that are going on in the world? Probably most of you don't know about it. They don't print everything in the papers. The speaker has talked to a great many scientists and so on, and we are not told what exactly is going on - chemical warfare and all the rest of it. Now what is the cause of all this? Is it division? National division, religious division, individual against other individuals, division, separation? You are following all this, or am I talking to myself? You understand what I am saying? One family is against another family, in the family itself there is division. There is division between the Arab and the Jew; there is division between Catholic and the Protestant; there is division between the Hindu, and the Muslim. Right? The Christian, the Buddhist, the Zen, the whole world is fragmented, broken up. Is that the cause of all this mess? You understand my question: that where there is division between communities, between people, between countries, between various gurus, various religious, there must be conflict. Right? You understand this? Where there is division there must be conflict. That's a law. Right? Is that the cause of these terrible wars that are going on? The conflict that exists in each one of us, the competition against each other, division? Right? Economically, racially, socially, so-called culturally, everything brings about the division. Right?

Now we cannot do anything with governments, they are set. They have been unfortunately elected, you can't deal with them. The speaker has tried various ways, met many speakers, but they are... So what can we do, you and I? You understand my question?

You cannot deal with the most powerful people, like the presidents and so on. You cannot deal with them, they are at that level, they have their responsibilities, they want power, you know all the rest of it. So we are asking what you, as a human being, living on this earth, seeing all this is happening, what can you do? Please ask this question. What's your action? Not your theories. The Indians are pretty good at theories. Right? You are very good with explanation, analysis, and finding out the cause and there you leave it, which has nothing whatsoever to do with your daily life. Right? You believe in god, or you believe in some guru, or you believe in some philosophy, but that belief has no actuality in life. Right? This is a fact, I am not saying something abnormal. This is a fact. So we are asking, what is your responsibility as a human being, facing all this, what's your action? Most of us want to escape from it, most of us feel we cannot solve it, therefore we escape - escape in tribal gods, you know all that is happening in this country, or in Europe, drugs, religious entertainments, and the entertainment industry is enormously powerful, the cinemas, the magazines, the gods, their rituals. Right? Is it two gods marrying each other in this country? So there is either escape, or you face actualities, face facts. When you face facts what's your action?

Now together we are going to find out. Right? Together, not I tell you and you listen, or disagree, or agree, then that is too silly, that is childish. But if you and I observe the same thing, live the same thing daily, then it has a tremendous power - not power in the sense political power, power of doing the right thing. Right? Are we together in this so far? We are asking, what is the cause of this war, of wars? One of the factors of war is nationalism. Right?

Which is tribalism. You may not agree, but please quietly listen. Tribalism which has become glorified nationalism with its flags and so on - the British, the French, the Hindu, the Indian, you follow, divided, divided, divided. We are saying one of the causes of war is nationalism. That's obvious. Another cause is economic division, each country concerned with its own economy, and with its own culture - the British and the French and so on. And the other cause is the division in religion: the Christian, the Buddhist, the Hindu, Islam, and they all talk about god. Right? So these and perhaps others are the causes of war. And you, as a Hindu, or a Christian, or whatever it is, are responsible for the war. Right? Because in yourself you are divided. Agreed? Do you see this fact? As long as I am Hindu, committed to a certain tradition, and following some - if you will excuse me - some silly gods, playing with toys called gods, I as a Hindu am responsible for creating conflict amongst human beings. Right? Is this a fact, or not? It's a fact. You may not agree, you may not see the fact, but this is what is causing wars. Now what is your response to that? To be free of nationalism. Right? To be free to look at the world as a whole humanity, not as Indians, Americans and so on, we are human beings. Right? To look at the world globally as human beings. I'll make it more complex.

When you travel around, when you look at people all over the world, in this country, in France, in Switzerland, in America, in Japan and so on, you find that all human beings psychologically share. Psychologically they all suffer. Right? They all cry. They are all lonely. They have shed tears and you have shed tears. They are uncertain, confused, unhappy. And yet you, there, you are

unhappy, lonely, suffering, putting up with all kinds of brutalities from your husband, from your wife and so on. It is the world over, it is shared by all human beings. Right? That's a fact. So your consciousness is the consciousness of entire humanity. Right? Do you see that? Shall I go more into it?

We have been conditioned from childhood, both religiously, socially, economically and nationally, that we are separate individuals, separate souls. Right? This is a fact. And we never examine whether we are actually individuals. You are separate, you are a man and she is a woman, that doesn't constitute individuality. Your tendencies, your idiosyncrasies, particular character, your bank account, all that makes you think you are a separate human being. You may be tall, I may be short, I may be pink, you may be black, all that conditions the human brain to accept that we are separate individuals. Right? The speaker is questioning that. Don't accept it; doubt it, question it. He says our consciousness, which is what you feel, what you think, your reactions, your beliefs, your pain, your anxiety, your loneliness, your sorrow, your lack of love, affection, is shared by all human beings. Right, sir? So your consciousness is not yours, it is human consciousness. Right? If you kill another you are killing yourself. You understand this? If you hurt another you are hurting yourself. I wonder if you realize this. If you are in sorrow, it is not only your sorrow, it is the sorrow of mankind.

So you are humanity. You understand? You are the rest of mankind, not a little man working in a little backyard, thinking about himself, his problems, his anxieties. But when you actually realize this fact in your guts, in your blood, not a theory, then your

whole outlook on life changes, then you have a different effect, love, compassion comes into it.

So what's your responsibility? When you have seen this, not intellectually, but actually in your heart, with your eyes, with your ears, with all your senses, see this, it is a global problem not a particular individual problem. Take for example, this country has a great deal of poverty. Right? Enormous poverty, you go round the streets of Bombay, they are sleeping on the pavements, go to any village which is not near a town, there is poverty. Since independence you may have a little more but there is still poverty. And this poverty cannot be solved by one government, because there is poverty in America, poverty in France, in England four million people are unemployed. Do you understand all this? So what's your responsibility? Will you still remain as an individual fighting for yourself, fighting for your own illumination, enlightenment? You understand my next question? Or will you look at the world as a whole, not as a Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, and so on? Unless we do this we are going to destroy each other. It is obvious that is what is going on. We want security, we must have security otherwise you and I wouldn't be here. Security, food, clothes and all that, that is denied because each country says, I must solve my own problems. Right? There is no global outlook at all. And all the problems that we have, we reduce it to communal, social, you follow, make it very small.

So after hearing this, is your brain free from nationalism, racialism, religious nonsense, so that you have a global outlook, global feeling? You understand, sir? Or you say, it's marvellous, a lovely idea, make it into a lovely theory, speculate about it and kill

it? Right? So that's the first thing. That demands a brain that is free to look. But our brains are now so conditioned with problems. Right? You have problems, haven't you? Please, say, yes or no. You have problems: which is sexual problems, religious problems, economic problems, problems, problems, problems. Right? I can't get on with my wife, my wife bullies me and so on and on and on. What are problems? What is the etymological meaning of that word? The etymological meaning of that word is, something thrown at you. Some challenge thrown at you. Right? That's the meaning of that word, problem. Now, how do we meet problems? We will go into it together. I'm not telling you. Please bear in mind I am not teaching you, but we are learning, observing together. The speaker may have observed it long ago and seen all this, but he is sharing this, he is walking with you. Not sentimentally, not romantically, he says, face all this. Our brains have been conditioned from childhood to solve problems. A child goes to school, learning becomes a problem, mathematics becomes a problem. Problems. Then college, more problems, university, still more problems. So his brain - please listen to this - is conditioned to solve problems. Right? You are following this? Are we following this?

Our brain is conditioned to solve problems. So what has happened to the brain? It's a machine now to solve problems. Right? So problems are increasing because it is mechanically dealing with problems. You are following this, sir? See what is happening. There are many political problems in this country, and the politicians who are trying to solve a problem, in the solution of that problem they have increased other problems. You see this,

don't you? Don't you know all this? So our brain is conditioned from childhood so solve problems. And you can only solve problems if the brain is free to look at problems afresh. But if it isn't trained it acts mechanically and always seeking solutions, not understanding the problem. Because the solution lies in the problem. I wonder if you see all this. Right, sir? Can I talk to you?

So is it possible to have a brain that is free so as to solve problems? Not having problems it then tries to solve problems. See the difference? Right?

So what we are talking about is, you and I, that we are the rest of mankind, psychologically, inwardly. That's a fact. It's not a theory, it's not my conclusion, it's a fact because all human beings go through terrible times. And we too go through all kinds of turmoil, travail. So we are one humanity, you are entire humanity. That's one. Second: wars exist because you have divided yourself into nationalities, races, religions, and if you don't change that you will have no security physically, because wars are coming. Third: we have many problems, and to solve those problems the brain must be free to look at them. But if the brain is conditioned to solve problems it is not able to look at problems. You understand?

Now can you do this? Can you, listening to what the speaker is saying, if you are listening at all, can you do this? Don't call yourself a Hindu at any price - all the superstitions and all the rest of it, not belong to any religion, to any group. Yes, sir. Or to any book. Books, religions based on books; the Bible, Christianity is based on the Bible, the Koran is the bible of Islam, have you ever observed what religions based on books become? Here in this country you have dozens of books about religion, you can choose

them all, one of them, play with them. So you understand what I am saying? That is, in India there are several religious books, the Upanishads, the Gita, and so on and so on. Therefore you are able to choose one or the other, and play with one or the other; you have dozens of gods you can choose for your own amusement, for your own entertainment. But if you have only one god, according to the Koran, or according to the Bible, you are stuck. And you become bigoted, narrow, and therefore brutal. This is what is happening. So can you, please, seriously the speaker is asking, can you put away all this from you and be grown-up? No nationality, no belief in gods, because belief, faith, is another form which is destroying you. If you have faith, and therefore no doubt, you understand - the whole Christian world is based on faith. Right? And they never talk about doubt, scepticism, question, it is banished. In the Islamic world too it is banished. The ancient Indians had this doubt, question, don't accept, find out. Will you do all that? Or sink back to your own pattern? See the danger. If you see the truth and go back to something which is not truth, that very truth will poison you. You understand? I wonder if you understand all this?

If you see danger you keep away from that. If you see a cobra, a tiger, you keep away, but we don't see the danger psychologically this division is bringing about. If you once see the danger of it, not only theoretically but actually with all your heart, and all your senses, with your intellect, with your love - if you have love - then you will not belong to anything: no nation, no religion, which doesn't mean you are sceptical, which doesn't mean you are anti-god, you don't know what god is, you all pretend.

So could we all put away all this so as to have a free mind, a

free brain that we can look at the world and change?

May I also point out something? We said presently that knowledge is the enemy of love - does it mean anything to you? You understand my question? Knowledge, book knowledge, knowledge of experience, knowledge of your wife or your husband, the knowledge of your children, this whole tremendous accumulation of knowledge through experiences, all that. The speaker is saying all that knowledge is the enemy of love. Now look at it closely. In one's relationship with another, the wife or the husband, each has knowledge of the other. Right? Each has knowledge of the other. Right, sir? I know how my wife behaves and so on, I know, and she knows. Right? What happens? When I say, I know my wife, and the woman says, I know my husband, what is the quality of that knowing? Knowledge. Obviously. Which means what? The image I have built about her, and the image she has built about me, the picture. Right? So knowledge is that picture. I wonder if you understand? Right? Do you understand this? So knowledge between a man and a woman, of each other, destroys love. Do you accept that? The women accept it very quickly. I see that. And the men sit back and look. You are a crazy crowd all right.

So what happens, sir, in our relationship - relationship is the most important thing in life. No? Because without relationship you cannot exist. Life is relationship, whether it is my wife or husband, relationship with a neighbour, relationship with governments, relationship is a tremendously important thing in life. And are we related at all? When I have an image about you, and you have an image about me, how can we be related? You understand? Images

are meeting, that's not relationship. Relationship means to be whole. Right? Not broken up as a woman and a man with all the ugly problems that arise. Therefore knowledge destroys love. For god's sake understand this. Not how to get rid of knowledge, you can't. But if you understand that in relationship knowledge is an element that brings about all kinds of quarrels and all the rest of it. Knowledge is necessary, otherwise you can't get home. Right? If you hadn't knowledge of English we couldn't understand each other. If we hadn't knowledge how to drive a car - you follow? There knowledge is necessary, but psychological knowledge is dangerous. Please understand this. And that very knowledge is destroying love.

Now I would like to ask you a serious question: do you love anybody? Answer this in your heart, not to me. Do you love anybody? Do you love your wife? Do you love your husband? Do you love your children? Do you understand, see the implication of that word. You can't answer it, can you? And that's what is destroying the world, because we have lost all love, if we ever had it.

So listening to all this has either meaning, or no meaning. We have taken a journey together, and the speaker means actually together, I'll hold your hand and say, let's walk together. If you want to walk fast, let's walk fast, if you want to run, let's run, if you want to go very, very slowly, all right, but you must walk and not theorize. So the speaker has put all this before you, either you share it, like sharing a good meal together, share a beautiful view of a mountain together, see the beauty of a sunset together, or the beauty of a single star in the sky together, but it must be together,

not that you have reached there and I am following you. Together we are building a new world, one person can't do it. Do all of you really see this? Together we can change the world. And the world needs complete change, and no group, or one or two can do this, this must be done together. A baby is produced by a man and woman. And this global outlook, this feeling that we are one, that you are humanity, you understand what it does to you when you feel that? It will change your whole outlook on life. Separation then ends, therefore conflict ends. We will talk about tomorrow, the nature of conflict, and see if conflict can end, not outwardly only, but first inwardly. You understand? Whether conflict has no place, whether it is possible to live in this world, in the modern world without a single conflict. That requires intelligence, you understand, an investigation, a mind that is active to find out. The speaker says, it is possible. The speaker says there is living without conflict. You may not believe it, you must question it, doubt it, and if you doubt it then we will go into it. But merely to say, yes, I would like to get to that state, tell me how to get there, then that becomes too childish.

So can we, please, walk together, listen together, learn together so that we have a different quality of brain, a different quality of life.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 5TH FEBRUARY 1984

Can we wait a little until that noise goes by?

Now we can begin. We were going to talk about, weren't we, if we can live in this world, which is pretty insane, if it is possible to live without conflict. And we have accustomed ourselves to make every kind of effort to achieve, not only biologically but also externally. Our society is so constructed that we have to make tremendous effort to have a vocation of imitation. Can we talk to each other quietly? We are saying that our society is made so that each one of us has to make a great deal of effort; to have a job, to have a career, to accumulate money for security and so on. A great deal of effort is necessary, school, college, university and so on. And also we have the concept that inwardly we also must make tremendous effort. Effort implies control. Effort implies conflict, inwardly, psychologically and outwardly. To this state of things we have become accustomed. Religious people, business people of every kind, must make effort. And in that effort there is involved a great deal of energy in conflict and so on.

We are going to talk over together (what a noisy place this is, isn't it?) - we are going to talk over together this question: why we live in conflict, why we have accustomed ourselves to live in this way, why human beings, right throughout the world, have not found a way of living a daily life without all the turmoil, all the anxiety, pain. And we are trained in vocation, which is imitation. One can understand why we have to make an effort externally. In an overpopulated country like this, badly managed governments

and so on, we have to make an effort to live, to have a job. That's understood. And we are asking, why we human beings have to make inward effort. In that is implied control, conflict and various forms of struggle, anxiety and so on. We are questioning why human beings have to make inward effort at all, have inward psychological conflict. Is that question clear?

We are asking is it necessary for human beings in their relationship with each other because we cannot possibly live alone, even though you are a hermit, you are always related to somebody. So we are asking whether it is possible to live in this world of immense turmoil, immense complexity, externally, whether we can live without a single conflict. Right? That is the question we are going to ask. The speaker is not asking the question, you are asking, as both of us are taking a journey together. If that is very clear, we are both of us going to enquire carefully into this question. As we said yesterday evening, we are not giving a lecture. Thank god! Lecture implies giving you certain information on a particular subject, to instruct, to inform, or to do any kind of propaganda. We are not doing any kind of propaganda. We are not trying to convince you of anything. Right? We are not trying to instruct you. And so please as most of us are trained to obey, trained to follow, trained to accept, if your brain is so conditioned you cannot possibly enquire into this very complex question whether it is possible to live in this world without any sense of conflict. Right? So please you are asking these questions of yourself. The speaker is only acting as a mirror in which you see yourself. When you see yourself in the mirror reflected exactly, then you can throw away the mirror, destroy the mirror because

you have seen yourself very clearly so you need no longer have a mirror, an interpreter, a person who explains, or analyses. Right? We understand each other up till now? We are not doing any kind of propaganda, we are not trying to convince you of anything. On the contrary we are saying you must have doubt, you must have a great deal of scepticism, because doubt frees the mind from all the accumulated tradition, all the accumulated nonsense which we call religion. Religion is something entirely different, which we will go into a little later.

But to understand this problem, which is whether we can live in this world without a single breath of conflict. Probably you have never asked this question. And probably you will say, it is impossible to live in this world without conflict. If you say, it is impossible, then you have closed the door. Right? But if you say, it is possible, then you have also closed the door. You understand? But if you say, we are going to enquire into a very, very complex problem, because all our life from childhood until we die is a series of struggles, a series of conflicts, everlasting pain and misery, confusion. Right? So please, you are asking this question. And let's go into it carefully.

Why is there conflict in our life? We can understand that there must be conflict, struggle to survive, as the society is constructed at the present time, where each man is out for himself. Right? Aren't you? In your business, in your religious affairs, in your concept of salvation, enlightenment, each one thinks he is separate. And this separation outwardly and inwardly is one of the major factors of conflict. Right? We went into that a little yesterday. Are we following each other? Or are we all asleep on a Sunday afternoon,

it is pleasant, having a restful day, and perhaps you have come here to be entertained. We are slaves to entertainment - the cinemas, the magazines, the constant religious ceremonies, they are forms of entertainments, stimulation. And perhaps Sunday evening is another form of entertainment. But this is not an entertainment, it is a very serious matter, and requires a great deal of not only intellectual capacity but a quality of brain that is enquiring, pushing, driving.

To live peacefully in this world we need a great deal of intelligence. To live a religious life requires far greater intelligence. We mean by that word, not only what the dictionary says, which is to read between the lines, to gather information. That's the function of the intellect: to read between the lines, to gather information, store it and use that information, knowledge skilfully. Right? So we need not only the intellectual capacity to understand the depth and to discern, to watch, to observe very clearly what is a fact, and what is not a fact. Fact being that which has happened, which is the past. That's a fact. And also what is happening now, that is also a fact. You are sitting there and the speaker is sitting here, that's a fact. One might have had a beautiful sunset yesterday and you saw it, that's a fact. But the future is not a fact. The future is 'what is', now. This is a little bit complex, I'll go into it.

We are the past, our memories, our remembrances, our accumulation of knowledge and so on, all that has happened in the past. And that past meets the present, modifies itself and goes on to the future, so the future is the present. Right? Have you understood? That is, the present contains not only the past, then the

present but also the future. That means the present is all time. I won't complicate it, we'll go round slowly.

So as you observe we are living in the past, our memories, our knowledge, our remembrances are the past. And the present is the past modifying itself and going on to the future. The culture, the so-called culture of this country has disappeared, the ancient culture. And it has adjusted itself to the modern conditions. Right? Money, power, and so on, adjusted itself and is going on into the future. So the future is the past, modified. Right? Right? So the whole of this movement is time, which is evolution. I wonder if you get all this. It is not clever, this is not a clever experience, don't go off and think how clever this is. But see the fact of our daily life; our daily life consists not only of the past, past incidents, past accidents, past hurts, wounds, psychologically, and also the past remembrance of having a toothache, all that is the past. And in that past we live. Right? And that past is all the time modifying itself because there are new incidents, new accidents, new impressions, and therefore it is adjusting itself, but it is always the movement of the past, rooted in the past. Right? Do you see this? Need I explain further any more of this? I will because it is very complicated.

So our life is the past, meeting the present, and therefore the past meeting the present is one of the factors of conflict. Do you understand? Observe for yourself the present state of the world, specially the world of India, of your country - it is not my country; my country isn't Europe or America, I have no country; it is good to be like that, except one has to have a Passport, but Passport doesn't make you an Indian, it is a piece of paper. So look what is happening in this country: an ancient culture, three to five thousand

years old, has utterly disappeared - whether it is right or wrong that is not the point. The Brahmanical culture - don't get excited about it - and that has gone. And the Western civilization, which is both cultural, aesthetic, technological has invaded this country. So you have adjusted yourself to that pattern. You see it. So the past is continually modifying itself. Right? And the division between the past and the present is one of the factors of conflict. Do you get this? Please. And therefore is it possible to live a daily life, not a theoretical life - the word and the deed are two different things. For us the word is more important, not the deed. You hear all this, and that becomes words, and it becomes a theory and you carry on with your daily life, totally divorced from what you have heard, or read, or theorized. So there is a division between the word and the action, deed. And that's also one of the factors of conflict. Right? You understand? Somebody say, yes, for god's sake.

So is it possible to live in daily life - please understand this - in daily life so that there is no division between the past, the future and the present. That is, the brain is recording. Right? Like that recorder there, every incident, every accident, tendency, impression, physical hurts, psychological wounds, all that is being taped. The brain is a recording machine. And as long as it is recording, which is the past, that record is preventing you from looking at the new. Right? I wonder if you understand all this.

Now just take a very simple example: psychologically you get hurt, from childhood, through the family, through school, college, university, you get hurt psychologically: you are not as good as your brother, you are not doing well in the examinations and so on. All this process is a factor of hurting psychologically, and that

wound is the past. Right? Look at yourself, find out whether you are wounded. Of course you are wounded; every human being is wounded psychologically, by a harsh word from a father, from a mother, from a husband, wife, it acts as a wound. Now where there is a wound psychologically you build a wall of resistance, naturally. Right? So that wound prevents you from further meeting others so that you never want to be hurt again. Haven't you noticed all this? Yes? Or you are so extraordinary human beings you have never been hurt?

So that wound is the past, that wound has been recorded. Right? In the brain. Now as long as that record remains there must be fear. Get it? And therefore conflict. So can we not record? I need to record how to drive a car, to learn a language, to do a crooked business, I need to have all kinds of knowledge to live physically. There the brain has to record. Right? We are questioning, why should the brain record the wound? Do you understand? Because as long as there is a record it must continue in the fear of being further wounded. Right? So we are asking a question, complex, which requires careful examination, whether it is possible not to record psychologically, inwardly. You understand? Put that question to yourself, please, find out. Somebody flatters you, says, what a marvellous person you are - why should you record it? And somebody comes along and says, you are an ass - and you instantly record it. This recording is one of the factors of conflict. Right? If you understand that then you will see whether it is possible not to record at all. Because the self, the ego, the 'me', is the collection of all the records of humanity. Right? Right sir?

The brain has two functions: one to record, where it is

necessary, and not to record where it is not necessary. So the brain then is uncluttered, free, and therefore you are not any more living in the past, therefore there is no conflict. Right? You understand? Sir, don't accept what the speaker is saying, for god's sake, or for your own sake. Understand for yourself the fact. The fact is not what you think, the fact is 'what is'. You can think about it, what you think about it is not a fact. Right? The fact is 'what is'. So if you see how to live a life in which there is extraordinary energy, and therefore no conflict, and conflict exists as long as this recording process goes on, then you will ask the question inevitably: how is this possible. Right? It sounds theoretically excellent, but how is this to take place. Right? You are asking this question naturally. Now when you ask 'how', what is implied in that question, how, in that word how? You want a system, you want a pattern, you want a method, which is the past. Do you see this? I wonder if you see this? You see we are always asking, please tell us how to do something. I can understand if I am a carpenter I need to go to a master carpenter to show me how to do things, look at the grain of the wood, whether it is the right wood and so on and so on. But when I ask 'how' inwardly I want a pattern which I can follow. Right? A method which I can copy. So the method, the system, the practice, is being recorded in the brain. Right? You are following this? So never ask, 'how'. That's one of the greatest discoveries: never ask 'how', of anybody psychologically. Of course you will ask, how am I to get from this place to the room I live in. I'd have to ask a policeman, that's a different matter. But to ask a guru - there are you, I see various people with their peculiar dress who have got gurus - they will ask

the gurus how to attain enlightenment. The poor chap tells you how. All that you do is repeat, so that your brain is recording. Do you follow? And that record prevents you from clarity.

Now if you don't ask 'how', if you can put that word totally out of your consciousness, then what is left? Then you are looking at yourself, you are looking at your own activity of the past operating on the present, modifying itself, and going on. This cycle. Right? The cycle of action, reaction; and reaction, action. Right? This is the cycle we live in. It's like a tide going out, and the same waters coming in. Right? This is our life.

Now we are going to ask another question, which is - am I disturbing you too much? It's up to you - that is, our life is action and reaction. It's like the tide going out, the tide coming in: challenge, response, question, answer. Now as the water goes out and the waters comes in, can there be a state of brain when there is no action and reaction? This requires a great deal of observation of yourself. I won't go into it, it is too complex for the moment.

So is it possible not to record? Right? Not to record insult or flattery, not to record, somebody says you are an ass, or an idiot, and you think you are a clever man, not to record. That is only possible when you see what the recording process does in life. Right? Suppose you are married, or unmarried, or live with a girl and so on, every incident in that relationship, whether it is sexual and so on, every incident, the word is recorded, is taped, recorded. This is so, isn't it? And you have a record of the husband, those two records are memories. And therefore you are living in the past. Naturally. So what takes place? You never meet each other afresh. Right? You never see anything anew. Right? And there lies the

conflict, you are always meeting the new and changing the new to conform to the past. And the making the new conform, similar to the past, is a process of conflict. I wonder if you understand all this.

Are we exercising our brain, or merely listening? Are you using your brain, capacity?

So come back: when you are recording all the time you are wasting energy because you remember what you said to me, and I get angry about it. You follow? So you discover all recording is a wastage of energy. And you need energy. The people who are great scholars, who have read such a lot, who know so many things, haven't you meet them - tremendous lot all stored in the brain. Why carry all that in your brain? It is in the books, you can read them, why carry it here? Enquire, go into it, you will see. You carry it in here because it gives you power, position, scholarly, great pundit. Right? So your brain then becomes so burdened with knowledge, and knowledge is the ending of love. For god's sake. Learn this from your heart, not intellectually. Then you place knowledge - knowledge has its place, and psychologically it has no place whatsoever. Right? Can you live like that? Can you live a daily life never recording psychologically? Would you try it? Would you do it as you are sitting now, there? Or go home and think about it? I know you are going to think about it, which is what you are probably doing, you are thinking about it. And that thinking, which is born of knowledge, is going to prevent love. Right?

So we are going to go into another question: when you think about something, what do you mean by thinking? I think about you, about my wife, my husband, I think about my business. Think.

What is thinking? Thinking about something, and thinking, not about something. Do you see the difference? Oh lord! Can we go on? You aren't too tired? Sunday afternoon! You can learn all over again on Monday morning, the routine so it is safe. This evening you are more or less free you can enjoy yourself to listen to all this rubbish. But it is not rubbish, it is something terribly serious because man is destroying himself, and knowledge is one of the factors of destruction, and therefore where there is love there is no destruction.

We must understand a certain thing, which is, what is thinking, and what is thinking about something. Right? Thinking about something is one factor, and thinking is another factor. Right? Thinking. So I can think about Europe, or Lebanon, the destruction, the murders, the appalling things that are going on, or I enquire what is thinking. You understand? Would you join me in this game? We are working out this together, I am not doing it for my amusement, we are doing it together. What is thinking? When you say, 'I will think about what you have said', which is thinking about what I have said. Or you are actually thinking without the object. Right? Now what is thinking? Because thought has created the most extraordinary things in life: the great temples, the great mosques, the marvellous cathedrals, the splendour of those marvellous structures soaring up into the sky, the great paintings, the sculpture, the great poems. Right? And also thought has created the extraordinary instruments of wars. Thought has also created all the things in the temples, in the mosques, in the churches. Right? These are facts. You may say, no, they are a direct revelation from god, when you say that, that is also thought. Right?

So thought has done the most extraordinary things; and also done the most appalling things. Thought has burnt people, calling them heretics and burnt them. And thought said, you must follow Marx, Engels and so on. Thought has been extraordinarily important in our life. Right? Do you understand this? Now what is thought? What is thinking? Look, enquire, look at it. Look at your own way of thinking. You think about your wife - suppose, if you ever do - you think about your wife, or husband, what is that thinking, when you think about her, or him? You have the experience of that person, the image of that person, the nature, the look, the structure, the appearance of that person, which is memory. Right? Right, sirs? And that memory is based on knowledge of that person. Right? And that knowledge is based on the experience with that person. Right? Do you see this? So thinking is born from experience, knowledge derived from experience, stored in the brain as memory, and the reaction to that memory is thought. Right? So thought is a material process. Right? Would you see that? Right, sir? So thought is not sacred, and whatever it creates is not sacred - your Upanishads, your Gita, your Bible, Koran, is not sacred. See what you are accepting the moment you say, thought is a material process. It is a material process because the brain cells contain the past memories, the past knowledge, past experience, and from that thought arises. If you had no experience, no knowledge, no memory, there is no thought. Right? So look at it carefully, you will see it for yourself. So thought is a material process. Right? Would you see that? So thought has created god, and then thought worships god. Yes, Sir, you are had! This is very important, please look at it.

And if thought is a material process, then what are we? You understand my question? What are we psychologically? Thought says you are a Hindu, thought says you are a great man, thought says you must achieve enlightenment. Right? Thought says you must meditate, thought says obey, follow, become like somebody else. So thought says, become: outwardly, if you are a clerk become the manager, if you are the manager become the executive, if you are the executive the Chairman. Then also thought says, you are a disciple, you will eventually be the master and ultimately the guru, and still further, enlightenment. Thought is constructing all this. I wonder if you realize all this.

So thought, we live by thought. And as experience is limited, so knowledge is always limited, whether it is scientific knowledge, biological knowledge, arithmetical knowledge and so on, all knowledge is always eternally limited. Future knowledge is limited. Right? Do you see this? No, you don't. Right, sir? Knowledge is limited because it is based on experience, and because it is experience it is limited. Therefore thought is limited. Thought can imagine the limitless, and imagine you achieving the limitless. Right? Are you following all this? Thought is words. Thought is the symbol. So enlightenment, the measureless, is a word. And the word is not the actual. You understand all this? So can the brain be free of the network of words? Yes, sir!

And the self, the 'me', the ego, is knowledge. Right? Right, sir? You pundits, would you agree to that? The self, the 'me', is the essence of knowledge. No? All right, let's put it round the other way. What is the self? What are you? Come on, sirs, what are you? Your name, your form, the clothes you wear - you are a sannyasi,

you have a peculiar kind - you have a bank account, you are a businessman, you have had a lot of experience, you have had a great deal of pleasure, pain, anxiety, loneliness, sorrow. Right? You are that, aren't you? Right? Would you acknowledge that? Or do you say, 'I am Atman, something far superior'? Oh, yes, you all do. If you say, 'I am far superior', that's also the invention of thought. Right? Because you have read about it, so you think there is a higher self, or some guru comes along and says there is super consciousness, and you must draw it down. Right? So all that process is a movement of thought. Right? And thought is time, because to acquire knowledge requires time. To acquire knowledge, say Russian or English, or Spanish, or French requires a great deal of time, you may spend three months, or a year, that is time. So to acquire knowledge inwardly or outwardly requires time. Right? To learn about yourself is to have time. Right? Do you understand this? See what game you are playing with yourself. I want to learn about myself - self-knowledge, which I have talked a great deal about. Self-knowledge, to know myself, and to know myself I must investigate, I must observe, I must analyze, I must have introspection. You follow? Watch, learn, observe, self-recollection, be aware, all that takes time. Right? Would you agree with that? Do you see that? All that requires time. To know about the moon requires time. This is simple. And also to know myself, we have said, requires time. Right? Which means what? Oh, you are missing so much, what's the matter with you?

Time is the enemy of man. Illumination is not enlightenment through time, it isn't a gradual process, success after success. When you see thought is time, of course - you understand - thought is

movement. Right? And time is movement. Clear? So thought and time go together, they are not separate. Thought is time, and time is thought. So thought says, 'I must become enlightened. I must become from what I am to what I should be'. Right? Need I explain all this? I am violent. Human beings are violent. You are violent, aren't you? And you say, 'I must not be violent' or become non-violent. So to become non-violent takes time. During that interval of becoming non-violent you are being violent. So non-violence is nonsense. Right? What is fact is violence. So our brains are trained to become. As you become a clerk, reach the ladder, the same is extended to the psychological world. You are following? There, you say, I am ignorant, I must have knowledge about myself, I am violent, I must become non-violent. Right? I am angry, I must become without anger. Now look at it carefully. You are violent, violence is not separate from you. Would you agree to that? Right? The Hindus are very clever birds! They will agree up to a point. I can see it in their faces. But they have got behind them the idea that the 'me' is different from the observer, the witness, the person who witnesses is different. Right? I know the game you are playing. Is that a fact? Is it a fact that there is an observer different from anger? Careful, don't answer me, look at it carefully. Anger is me. I am not different from anger. Violence is me, non-violence is not me. Right? That's just an idea. The fact is I am violent. That is a fact. Non-violence is non-fact. But we pursue knowledge because we don't know how to deal with 'what is'. You are following this?

So the observer is not different from the observed. Right?

Goodness, I'll go into it. You see that tree over there, if you ever look at trees. When you look at a tree, the tree is obviously

different from you. Right? The cloud of an evening, full of light and beauty, is different from you. But when you look at that tree, what takes place, when you do look at the tree what takes place? You immediately use the word. Right? So the word interferes with looking at it. She is my wife, or my husband. Finished. Right? Don't you know all this? So the word is preventing you from observing. Right? And also the word is not the thing. Right? The word 'tree' is not the tree. The word 'my wife' is not the wife. I wonder if you see this. If you see this, your relationship with your wife would be entirely different.

So time is thought, and thought says, 'I am this, I must become that', therefore the becoming implies time. And what are you becoming? You, pundit, answer this. What are you becoming? More enlightened, a better human being? You are not good, but you say, 'I will become good', and when you are becoming good you will never be good. I wonder if you see that. So there is no becoming, which is one of the factors of conflict. But if you say, 'All right, the fact is violence is me, violence is not separate from me', that's a fact. The 'me' is my face, the 'me' is my talent and all the rest of it. But we have separated the 'me' from the thing that is happening. Right? That is, thought has separated violence from the thinker. Right? Are you getting tired? You must be tired. Because you are just not co-operating, working, that's all you say, 'I am not tired'. If you are co-operating, working, you would see what an extraordinary thing is going on with your brain.

Look: violence is me, greed is me, anger is me; later on I say, 'I have been angry', but the fact is anger, jealousy, hate, anxiety and so on, is me. So the observer is the observed. Right? Right, sirs?

Do you see this? Sir, one of the factors of conflict is that we have divided the thinker from thought. Right? Without thought there is no thinker. Right? But we have separated the thinker, the experiencer from the experience. We have separated the analyzer from the analyzed. Right? Haven't you noticed this? So there is perpetual conflict, division. So the observer is the observed. The experiencer is the experienced.

We should go into the question of - oh, we have got no time. You all know to experience, don't you - nirvana, or some other factor, sex, or any other, you want to experience. What is experience? How do you know it is an experience? Only you know it when you recognize it. Right? So, see what is happening, when you recognize it, it is not new. But yet you say, I must have new experiences. So all experiences when recognized are merely the past memories. Yes, sir, take this into your blood and you will see what takes place. Then your mind is so alert, so aware, so attentive, there is no experience at all. Oh, you won't accept this.

So we are enquiring into the cause of conflict. The cause of conflict - one of the causes, is duality. Right? Violence and non-violence, that's duality. The good and the bad, hate and love. Why do you have duality? Don't translate it into adwaita or some other Sanskrit word and get away with it. Why do we have duality? What is duality? You are a woman, I am a man, you are tall, I am short, you are fair, another is lighter, whatever it is. Only duality exists when there is comparison. Are you following all this? When I compare myself with you I have created duality. Right? Right sir? So if I don't compare there is no duality. Right? That is, I have invented non-violence, this country is full of that, non-violence - at

least they talk about it. But the fact is they are violent. The fact. The fact has no duality. Oh, do see that. I have just discovered that. You understand? The fact has no opposite. I am angry. That's a fact. But when I say, I must not be angry, then duality arises. So, it's very interesting, I wish your brains would go into all this. So I am angry. That's a fact. What am I to do? I won't say, 'I must not be angry', then I am in conflict. You understand? I won't suppress it. There is no suppression, there is no escape, there is no transcending it. So what happens? Go on, sir. What happens when there is no movement away from the fact? Go on. It is the movement away from it that creates conflict, creates duality. And volumes have been written by clever Indians about duality. The speaker said there is no duality, right from the beginning, because there is only the fact. But when I want to get over the fact, then I create duality. Right? Then what takes place? How to remain with the fact. Not move away from the fact. Any movement away from the fact is conflict and duality.

So when you remain with the fact, what takes place? You work it out. I am working it out, but you work it out. What happens when you remain with the fact? Which means what? I can tell you, you will say, 'Yes, yes', and go away. You don't apply. Sir, look: when I move away from the fact I have lost energy. Right? Do you see that? When I move away from the fact it is a wastage of energy. Right. So when there is no movement away from the fact, all energy is there, which means complete attention there, with the fact. And when there is complete attention then it is like light, a high powered light being thrown on the fact. And then the fact reveals all its content. You understand? Then the fact has no

meaning. You understand?

Sir, look: we said knowledge is an enemy of love. And love has no opposite. But we have made an opposite, hate. (Sorry, slight cramp. I am working too hard for you, that is what it is.) So, sirs, we have examined the very, very complex problem, we have examined together, the speaker has not examined, you have examined. The speaker is merely acting as your voice. The speaker is merely showing 'what is', and you are looking at it, looking at yourself. And when you look at yourself, carefully, you are nothing but the past - past memories, past remembrances, past pleasures. And when you suffer, as most human beings do, unfortunately, again escape from it. So when you remain with a fact it is like looking at a bud, looking at a rose bud, and you will see the rose bud open, the perfume of it, the beauty of it, the quality of it, the gentleness, the tenderness. And when you observe the fact it fades away.

We will continue next weekend talking about fear, sorrow, what is religion, what is meditation, what is death. Because all this is part of our life. You cannot separate one from the other. You cannot say, 'I am going to meditate' and be a stupid person. To understand life, this whole complex problem of life, you need great patience, not the patience of time, patience. You need a brain that is alive, questioning, asking, doubting, and then you will find out for yourself, without words, that which is not measured by words.

Sorry if I have kept you.

TALK AT THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY 7TH FEBRUARY 1984

One wonders why in a place like this we are being educated, for what? What is the relationship between this institution and the world? What place has knowledge, whether it is scientific, biological, or physics and so on - what relationship has that knowledge towards the world? And throughout the world we are all being educated along various lines and with their disciplines; and we human beings have very little place in this world. So one must, I feel, ask why these elaborate years of study, acquiring great deal of knowledge, great effort, and where is it all ending up? What place your scientific and other disciplines have, actual relationship, with the existing world? The existing world is the world in which we live our daily life, whether in America, Russia, Europe or in India or Japan, that very life is being threatened by war, not only conventional war, but also by nuclear war. Some scientists, we were told, top scientists, gathered and wrote what they thought would happen if there was a nuclear war. They said that the whole earth would be covered by a thick layer of dust and smoke and so the sun cannot possibly penetrate that, and the temperature will fall to 5 degrees below zero, so at the end of a nuclear war not a living thing will exist on the earth. That is one activity of human endeavour, highly technological, highly concerned, each technician with his own particular life, with his own particular discipline and totally disregarding what is happening to human beings throughout the world.

And also, as one observes, there is this vast technological

advancement, tremendous, so rapid and it may lead to extraordinary results. And also our human brains - not that the speaker is an expert in the study of the brain - but if one watches one's own activity in daily life, one sees there the various activities in the brain. There is this technological world which is progressing with abnormal speed in the last two hundred years, and added to that the computer which probably will take over all the activities of human beings - most of it. Perhaps it will not be able to write, great music of Beethoven, Mozart or Bach, classical western music, but it will do most of the things that human beings are now doing. And what is going to happen to the human brain? That is the technological world and the human world. We have given tremendous importance to the technological world. That is why you have this institution, scientific and various other forms of study with their discipline. And we seem to neglect, perhaps totally, the whole human way of living, what is happening to man; that is, what is happening to you as a student or as a professor, what is your relationship with all the world, with all the things, most terrible things, horrible things that are happening and also all the excellent things in the world of technology - rapid communication, surgery, medicine and all that side. And also they are inventing all the instruments of war that can destroy the whole of humanity with one blow. This is not an exaggeration on the part of the speaker but this is a fact. If one lived in America, they have been talking a great deal about what will happen if there is a nuclear war. Ten million people in New York will be evaporated, completely gone, and hundred million people within a radius of hundred miles, more or less. Technology is developing all that

side. And human misery, the hovels, that you see in this country, especially in towns like this - human beings living in those hovels, breeding children, living in dirt, squalor, misery on the other side. What relationship has knowledge - not only scientific knowledge but every kind of knowledge that human beings have acquired during the last forty-five thousand years that they have been on earth as human beings and we end up like this, war which has been going on for last five to six thousand years, destruction, hatred, misery, utter confusion and sorrow?

And on the other side, man is trying to find something beyond himself, beyond his own misery, his own selfishness, his utter insufficiency, his lack of affection. They invent gods, especially in this country, I believe there are over three hundred thousand gods, and all that superstition and vast sums of money spent on all that. We were told the other day that a temple in south India, every third day it has a million dollars. So, we are asking you, the professors with their knowledge and you acquiring their knowledge and searching for a vocation which will be imitation - and what has all that got to do with your daily living? The word and the deed are so far apart and one wonders if you are aware of all this. Or, you are enclosed in your own institution, enclave, so that you forget the world?

So we are asking, what place all your knowledge, we are not against knowledge, we are asking, enquiring, what place has knowledge which you are acquiring, which may be necessary in a certain area, what place has that in your relationship with the rest of humanity? Please, the speaker is not giving a lecture, he is not doing any kind of propaganda or trying to convince you of

anything, but we are trying to observe together, see exactly what is happening, without any bias, without the speaker's or your prejudice to see exactly what is taking place and facing it, answer what is our response to all this.

We are enquiring together. What place has knowledge in the world of human relationship, what place has all your scientific information, gathered, stored in the brain as memory? And memory is always in the past. Knowledge is never complete, whether in the future or in the past, knowledge is never complete because experience from which knowledge arises is also limited, incomplete; there can be no complete experience. So from experience knowledge, whether it is scientific, human and so on, stored in the brain as memory, and from that memory arises thought, and thought is the very essence of knowledge. The thinker is knowledge, is the activity of knowledge, and the thought of the thinker is also part of knowledge. There is no thinker apart from thought. And the world, both in the scientific world, and in all the cruelty that is going on, brutality, torture, inhumanity, the utter disregard for the other human beings, all the things that are taking place in the world, poetry, great paintings, music. And this evening when you saw the sunlight on the water, the sparkling water, clear, so extraordinarily beautiful, and all that thought has built, except nature. Nature, the tiger is not created by thought. That lake which you see everyday - probably you have got used to it, probably you hardly look at it - man has not created that. Apart from nature, the heavens and all the things of the earth, thought has not built, has no relationship to all that. But thought has invented gods, thought has built the most marvellous architecture, the great temples of this

country, the great mosques, the great cathedrals of Europe and all the things that are in it are put together by thought. And thought is limited; there is no complete thought. Thought can never be complete. It can imagine, it can measure the heavens, but thought is always limited.

And technology, the technological world is the product of thought. Without thought you could not produce a submarine or go to the moon or invent the nuclear bomb. Thought has been responsible for all this, and facing all this, we have innumerable problems, the world is faced with tremendous problems both politically, economically, socially and also, if you are interested in that kind of affair, in religion - not the religion that is going on throughout the world which is mere superstition, lot of faith and belief, which has nothing whatever to do with what is true religion.

So, having laid down, laid before you what is going on in the world - of which I am quite sure, you are quite aware - what is your response to all this, not just one particular aspect of life but to the whole of existence of man, that is, your whole existence till you die, from now till you die, what is the meaning of all this? So what is your answer, your response to the world, to your vocation, which is imitation, conformity, absorption, either using that knowledge skillfully or inefficiently? And what is your relationship with your neighbour, with your wife, with your husband? And what is your relationship with the rest of humanity? If you are at all thinking about these things, you must have an answer. We have lived on this earth, as the biologists and others point out, as homo sapiens for forty to fifty thousand years. We have had wars, confusion, uncertainty, insecurity, misery, great anxiety. After all these

thousands and thousands of years, we are still very primitive. We may be extraordinarily technologically advanced, but inwardly, in the psychological world which always dominates the outer, the external, we are primitive, brutal, violent, selfish, superstitious, frightened and so on. So, we are keeping the two, that is, the external, the technological, the daily travail, and the inward life, these two are completely separate. You may have excellent theories about human nature in the psychological world, you may be great technicians, but all that is the movement of memory, knowledge, and that has nothing whatever to do with your daily behaviour. The two are divorced, the word and the deed, and that is what we have been educated for. So, our education, our knowledge, which is completely limited, will always be limited. What has knowledge to do with our human relationship? Does not knowledge kill love?

Do you understand what we are saying? May I go on with what I am saying because this is not, as we have pointed out, a lecture to inform and to instruct? So this is not a lecture. This is a conversation, a dialogue between us in which you are taking part. You are not merely, if I may most respectfully point out, you are not merely listening to the speaker, words, intellectually grasping certain concepts, ideas, but we are having a dialogue, a conversation about the whole of existence as human beings. So please you are taking part in what the speaker is saying, not merely listening to certain words.

We live by words. Our whole brain is a network of words, and words are not the actual. This microphone, the word 'microphone' is not the actual thing you see. But we are so caught up, so

conditioned by words, by language, by tradition, by knowledge, and so our brain is never free. We are problem-solving machines, aren't we? We have been trained from childhood to learn mathematics, and that becomes a problem for a child, or geography, or history, physics and so on. And also it becomes a problem in a school, in college, in universities, in institutions. We are problem-solving machines, that is a fact. And we have made life, the living, into a vast dreadful problem. So we are so conditioned, our brains, and our brain has divided the world; that is, a Christian, into the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Islamic world, separate, divided. And this division of nationalism is one of the causes of war. The cause of war is economic division, each country concerned with itself.

There is great misery, poverty, brutality in this country. When you drive down from Bombay, you see all those huts, tents, filthy; human beings are living there. You want to cry when you see all that, and nobody cares. I know, you listen to this, what the speaker has to say, but it will make very little dent. Governments don't care, individuals don't care, because they are only concerned with themselves, with their power, with their knowledge, with their money. The modern civilization is based on power and money. And students throughout the world, because the speaker has spoken at many universities in America and some of the institutions in this country and they are all being trained to seek a vocation of imitation; to be safe, to pass examinations, get a degree, Ph.D. and all the rest it, and get a job either in this country or go to America. Probably, as I was informed this afternoon, 30 per cent of you go to America where you make lot of money. That's all your

knowledge is leading you to. And we are asking, if you are at all serious - and youth generally is serious about certain matters - what is your response, your action to all this that is going on? Either you withdraw from it, join some cranky institution, ashram, some gurus, who are making tons of money, or enter into the world, caught in it, or you have a life of your own. And what is the purpose of your existence? What is the meaning of your existence? Please, the speaker is saying all this in humility. He is only challenging you. What is the purpose of all this?

Is life's purpose merely to earn money, to be married, a house, power, position? Is that the purpose of your life? And apparently it is. That is what you are all being trained for. That is what you want, and if you are dissatisfied with that, then you invent a purpose; the purpose is to find god or some kind of imaginative illumination. Or if that doesn't satisfy you, you take to drugs, drink, and all the rest of the vast amusement. One wonders if you have realized what the entertainment industry is doing to you. There is not only the religious entertainment, going to temples, puja and all the circus that goes on around a temple or a church or mosque. Please don't get annoyed, I am just pointing this out. And what is the purpose of all this. On earth we have lived for forty to fifty thousand years. Please realize this. We have evolved, we have gone through great many tears, laughter, pain, anxiety and yet we remain what we are - selfish, narrow-minded, concerned with ourselves and to hell with everything else. That's an actual fact.

So, if one may ask, are you wasting your life - life which is so complex, which has no ready-made answers, life which is so vast and therefore it is something most extraordinarily sacred, and what

do we do with it? You have to answer this question, whether you are old or young, well established in a position, wealth, power - is that the whole meaning of life? And if that is the whole meaning of life, which is to have knowledge, knowing that knowledge will always be limited and therefore thought will always be limited and therefore divisive, therefore bringing about great conflict in oneself and therefore outwardly, externally, and knowing - if one has examined it objectively, without any fear - that the whole religious structure throughout the world is just utterly meaningless. So, you as students and professors, with that marvellous lake, with the sun on it, the beauty of it, the poem of it, the grandeur, what is your response, what is your responsibility.

You see, we have always had leaders. In this country especially and also in Europe, more so, you had great leaders here one after the other, both religious, political, social and all that business. And where have they led you? Where has Marx led the communist world? Where have all your so-called sacred literature, Upanishads, Gita and all those books - there is nothing sacred about them, no book is sacred - all those things that we have invented? So, what is the meaning of all this existence? You may not want to look at it, you may want to avoid it. You may say I am too young, it's not my business. And the older people say sorry, we are too old, we can't face it any more. They are willing to die. And so what is your knowledge leading to - conformity? Imitation? Absorption of all this information and nothing original, nothing pristine? And what place has knowledge in love? Is not knowledge the enemy of love, the destroyer of love? Would you please consider this? You give about twenty or thirty years to acquiring -

in the acquisition of physics, linguistic experimentation, with biology, sociology, with philosophy, psychoanalysis, psychiatry and so on, you give years and years and you don't give one day or one hour to find out for yourself what you are and why you are living like this. After all, sirs and ladies, you don't mind if I say sirs, sirs includes the ladies, all right? Don't be offended if we do not say sirs and ladies. After all sirs, have you observed that human beings whether they live in America, both the affluent and also there is a great deal of poverty, misery in America, a great deal of poverty in Europe, nearly four million people unemployed in England, and all the tyranny that is going on, in Russia, the brutality of it all in the name of Marx and socialism, or you come to this country, poverty, incurable, most appalling poverty. We have been brought up in it, not you perhaps, who have wealth, power, all of us have. My generation, that particular people, have lived through poverty. And have you realized, if I may most politely point out, that whether they live in an affluent society, whether they live in castles or in huts or whether they live as students, this human consciousness is shared by all human beings because all human beings suffer, go through great agonies, great sense of loneliness, despair, the meaninglessness of this existence. All human beings on this earth, which is so extraordinarily beautiful, and which you are very sedulously destroying. We are living on this earth and all human beings whether they are the poorest, the most illiterate or the highly sophisticated, great professors of great knowledge, they all suffer, they all face death, they are going through great sense of desperate loneliness. We share all this. Every human being on this earth shares all this. Do

please listen to what speaker is saying. Don't get bored. Nobody is going to tell you all this. We share the common sorrow, the sorrow of the whole of mankind. Our consciousness is made up of all this. Your consciousness is not yours, though your tradition, religious, economic and social, says you are a separate individual. Your whole consciousness, your consciousness is what you are - your beliefs, your superstitions, your fears, your anxieties, your faith, your lack of love, your selfishness is the consciousness of all humanity. There is no escape from that. That's a fact. And therefore you are not an individual. You may be tall, you may be a woman or a man, you may have fair skin and so on, but you are not an individual - not the individual in the sense, in the communist sense, Marxist sense; we are talking of something much deeper than the social product.

So you are not an individual. You are the whole of humanity, because you smile, you laugh, you shed tears, you go through great turmoil, you make effort, conflict, facing insecurity. The Americans are doing exactly the same thing; so are the Russians. So you are actually the rest of mankind. You are not a Hindu though you like to call yourself a Hindu. That is just your local, provincial, narrow conditioning. Facing all this, are you going to waste your life, getting a job, passing some examinations, being trained to imitate? That's what you are being taught - to imitate, to conform, to fit into the pattern. And is that the end of life? Then you will ask: What shall we do? Is there something else? To find something totally different from all this, you have to have a great deal of intelligence. Intelligence is not knowledge. Knowledge gives you capacity, knowledge gives you position, status.

Knowledge is not love. Knowledge is not compassion. It is only where there is love and compassion there is intelligence, and that intelligence has nothing whatsoever to do with the cunning intelligence of thought.

So we must ask - if the speaker can most politely put it before you - what is the meaning of your existence? Are you wasting your life? And this is the only life you have; you may think there is reincarnation, that you will be born next life; that may be merely theory. But what matters is, even if you believe in reincarnation, what matters is how you live now - if you are good, if you are not violent, if you are a total human being, not broken up into scientists, biologists, special careers. Then your life is broken up, in conflict, and so your life is never a holistic movement. So considering all this, will you waste your life? Nobody can answer that question except yourself. If the speaker were to tell you, which he won't because it is absurd, unintelligent, stupid to say what is the purpose of life. The purpose of life is what you are doing now - study or you have already a job, earn more money, more status, more power and that is what you want, and that is the purpose of your life.

And also you have to face the ultimate thing which is death. You may not face it now, as you are all young people, but it is there for you as well as for the older generation. It is always there, and can you live with death? That requires a great deal of enquiry, to live with death, not commit suicide, not run away from death, but to know the depth and the greatness and the tremendous vitality of death. This is all of life. This is the whole of life, to have knowledge, to be able to enquire into the whole psychological

world of which you are. To understand all that not from books, not from philosophers, not from your professors, but learn from yourself what you are. You will discover, if you go into yourself, that your whole life is based on becoming something, as a clerk becomes a manager, the reader becomes the professor, the chief minister ultimately becomes the prime minister and so on - they are always both outwardly and inwardly trying to become something. And this is what we call living, never a moment of quietness, never a moment of great beauty in our life, but the incessant chattering of the brain. And you, if one may point out, you are facing all this. Don't disregard all this because the psychological world, the inner world, what you are inwardly, overcomes whatever social structure, governments are established, always overcomes all that, as you see it in Russia. They started out by having no government, no army, no division, no nationality; they said governments will disappear, but the psyche was far more strong than the superficial social structure. So they have there now the privileged, the top people who have everything in the world, the best of everything, like here the top people.

So what are you going to do after listening to this talk - not a lecture - a conversation between you and the speaker? What is your responsibility? Is your brain open to all this? Is this a global affair or your own narrow little yard, the narrow little self, the 'me', which is a very small affair? Or you are going to be concerned with the whole world, which means you cannot be an Indian any more, you cannot be a Christian, a Hindu, a Buddhist? All those divisions are destructive, they have no meaning. We have to bring a new civilization, a new culture, a new way of looking at life.

I've finished talking. Do you want to ask questions? The speaker has stopped, do you want to ask any questions, written or otherwise? I am not the oracle. Mon Dieu.

Question: Knowledge of any kind cannot be bad. What could possibly be bad is the use of it, the use it is put into. In the opinion of the listener the call of the day is to acquire or cultivate the sense, which is again knowledge, of properly using knowledge for proper causes. Kindly comment.

K: Need I read that question again? Read it once more sir, louder.

Q: Knowledge of any kind cannot be bad. What could possibly be bad is the use of it, the use it is put into to. In the opinion of this listener the call of the day is to acquire or cultivate the sense, which is again knowledge, of properly using knowledge for proper causes. Kindly comment.

K: Who is the user? Who is the entity that is using knowledge properly or wrongly? Right? Is not the entity, the user of knowledge, himself knowledge? You understand my question? You have asked a question that if we use knowledge rightly it is all right, it is the wrong usage of knowledge that is wrong - that's bluntly put. But I am asking, the speaker is asking the questioner, who is the user who uses knowledge rightly? Is not the user, the thinker, the entity, isn't he also knowledge? Is he separate from knowledge? Or the problem is not the right usage of knowledge, right or wrong usage, but what place has knowledge? It is knowledge in the right place, which is to drive a car, to write a letter, if you are a carpenter, to use the knowledge that you have acquired about the wood, the shape of the wood, the quality of the

wood, the grain of the wood and so on. There you need knowledge, but do we need knowledge about oneself? Because oneself is knowledge. I don't know if you understand this. Is the speaker answering your question, sir?

First of all, if I may most respectfully point out, the question is wrong. You assume, if I may point out most politely, you assume that the user of knowledge is different from knowledge. Who are you who is going to use knowledge? Are you not the result of centuries of knowledge, unconscious, conscious? You, the self, is knowledge. So you have divided knowledge and the entity that uses knowledge, but both are based on knowledge. So we are saying that knowledge has a definite place in the world of daily activity, but psychological knowledge, that is, the knowledge that you have about your wife, and you have about your husband, that knowledge is divisive, that knowledge prevents love. You can see this simply. You have an image about your wife, and the wife has an image about you, and the images are built through knowledge. You have been with her for twenty years or five days and you have already got knowledge about her, so you have built an image about her, and the images have relationship, not you and the woman or the man. Sir, these are all facts if you examine closely.

Question: As said by you, we are problem-solving machines, which means machines meant for research and scientific investigation, do you think then that all the problems of humanity would be solved if life is organized from the point of view of developing, producing and maintaining these machines scientifically with an aim to promote research and science, and not left to develop haphazardly as is going on today?

K: I don't understand it.

Q: He says, you say we are all problem-solving machines, in which case...

K: Organize it. Yes, organize it. May I tell you a story? Two friends who were walking in one of the dirty streets of Bombay, and one of them picks up something from the pavement and looks at it, and his face is tremendously illuminated, happy, he cannot hold himself. And he keeps looking at this extraordinary thing he has picked up. And his friend says, 'What have you picked up? You look so happy, so radiant, something has happened to you, what have you picked up?' He said, 'I have picked up truth.' And the friend says, 'Marvellous, let's go and organize it.' No laugh? Do you see the point of that story? You want everything organized, put in their categories. Organization demands hierarchy, and you are used to hierarchy, both religiously, politically, socially, somebody always in authority above you. So what does authority do to you? Of course the professor knows more about physics than you do, the surgeon knows more than the beginner in medicine, but why do you need hierarchy, authority in the spiritual world - forgive me if I use that word 'spiritual' because that has been misused that word, why do you want authority about yourself? Who is going to tell you about yourself? The professor? Volumes have been written from the ancient Greeks and Egyptians, what you are. And probably some of you have read them but you remain what you are. And you want what you are to be organized.

So organization in certain areas is necessary, and in the other, the psychological world it is destructive because then psychologically we become slaves to organization.

Question: Throughout your talk you claimed that there is already a lot of confusion in this world, but I do not remember you having given a suggestion or a solution regarding that. Don't you think that this adds to the confusion rather than reduces it?

K: Certainly. Certainly it adds more confusion. But I didn't say the confusion is not there, it is there. I don't claim it. Walk down any street in Bombay, or in Paris or in New York, or where you will, there is a great deal of confusion, that's a fact. Aren't you in confusion? And the questioner says, that's a negative statement. What is your positive statement? You understand? You have said that there is confusion - I claim, as the questioner says - I don't claim it. It would be absurd if I claimed, but it is a fact. The fact is that where there is confusion there is conflict; like the Arab and the Jew, both are semitic people, divided by propaganda on the part of the Jews for four to five thousand years, on the part of the Muslim between sixteen hundred years. They are fighting each other, killing each other. That is the essence of confusion, it's not, I claim it, it is so. Aren't you all confused when you look at yourself honestly, clearly, aren't you all confused? You may be good at your science, you may have a good job, but inwardly, aren't you all asking, what is it all about? You are confused. And the questioner says, what is your positive remedy, positive action, or suggestion about this confusion. The speaker says, there is no suggestion, he is not offering you a thing, he is not telling you what to do, but look at this confusion carefully, don't say, there is no confusion. You mean to say when you drive to Bombay, the centre of Bombay, you don't see all those hovels, people living there, breeding, those children unhealthy, is that not confusion. Poverty is confusion, isn't

there confusion about gods - the Christian god, your Hindu god, isn't that all confusion. So the speaker says, look at the confusion, don't run away from it. Then what happens? Where does the confusion begin? Out there, or in here? Please answer that question, who put this question. Where does the confusion lie, who has created those hovels which we pass daily by? We human beings, you, because you have a rotten government, unconscious community, scandalous behaviour and you allow all that day after day, year after year. So if you realize you have brought this about, your government, your gods, you are responsible for all this. You are responsible for war because you are a Hindu or you are a Jew or a Christian. Therefore don't be a Jew, don't be a Hindu so that you are the whole of humanity, you are a human being not a label.

Question: What is love and how does it arise?

K: Good god! Don't you know what love is? Apparently you don't. Do you love your wife, if you are married? Do you love your children? If you loved your children would you make them conform to this particular rotten society, immoral society, send them to war to be killed?

So the questioner says, what is love and how does it arise? My god! It means, sir, first of all what is love? Can you describe it? Can you put it into words? Or would you find out what is not love? Would you approach it negatively, not positively and say what is love, tell me how to get it. Do you realize, sir, what this question implies? That you have never loved anybody, whether you are married, whether you have had sex, children. So what is love? Would you approach it negatively saying what it is not. Is love jealousy? Is love devotion? Is love possessiveness, domination,

man dominating the woman as in this country it is happening? Is that love? Is love attachment? Where there is attachment there is fear. Right? If you are attached to your wife and she turns away from you, you become jealous, angry, hatred and all the ugly things that go on. So could you, if one may point out most gently, find out what love is by negating what it is not? An ambitious man, as most of you are, can never know love, he is only concerned with himself. A man who is devoted to god, goes to temples, mosques, churches, tremendous devotion to his guru - you know how they kowtow to the guru, go almost on their knees to the so-called guru, who is just like you. Is devotion love? Or real sentiment, emotion? So find out, sir, find out what it is not, and then you have that perfume, that extraordinary thing, then life has a meaning, not all your knowledge.

I am afraid we must stop now. It is a quarter to eight. And also, if I may spend two minutes, Hindus are accustomed to meditation. It's one of their games. What is meditation? Why do you meditate? You meditate in order to achieve something. Right? Achieve happiness, peace, or whatever you like, illumination, peace of mind and all that business. Your meditation is just like any other person who says, I am going to become a businessman, only you call it meditation, the other calls it business. Both want to achieve something. Is that meditation? Or meditation is something entirely different? I won't go into that question, it is too complicated. But you should look at all this, not think about it, look at it. If you have time, if you have the inclination, if you are interested, and obviously if you are serious and concerned with what is happening in the world, happening to yourself, you have to look at all this.

And of course you are too busy studying books and you won't have time, and therefore you are destroying the world, not looking at your own life and your relationship to the world. Right, sirs.

BOMBAY QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 9TH FEBRUARY 1984

There are several questions, a whole packet of them. How do you approach a question? Is the question more important than the answer? Or does the answer lie in the question itself? So we are asking before we go into these questions, how you receive a question, how you look at a question, how you respond to a question. Or are you merely seeking an answer to the question? If you are seeking an answer, the answer is more important than the question. So we are saying it is very important how you approach a question. And the manner, how you investigate the question, for the answer lies in the question itself, not away from it. I hope this is clear, that we are both seeking to find a solution to a question, but we are saying that it is far more important to understand the nature and the content of the question. So we are both of us, you and the speaker, are going to investigate the question itself, and then in understanding the question the answer is in the investigation of that question. I hope this is clear.

There are several questions here and you and the speaker together are going to explore the nature of the question, and then perhaps we will be able to find the answer in the question itself. Is this fairly clear? So we are going to read these questions first.

1st Question: What is beauty? Why do we like things that are beautiful?

That's the question. So we are together going to investigate, explore, to find out the question itself, the content of the question. Is this clear? The questioner asks, what is beauty. Now when you

look around this hall, is it beautiful? When you look at the sky of an evening, with one star in the heavens, is that beautiful? Or when you see a marvellous sunset, full of colour, great depth, great sense of expansion, the whole universe is filled with light and colour, is that beautiful? Or only the things that man has made are beautiful? Man has made the cathedrals, the temples, the churches, and the various types of mosques all over the world. So man-made things like a painting, poem, a sculpture, a building, which are all man-made, and therefore are they beautiful? That is, is man the measure of beauty? Or man is the measure of all things? Do we understand each other?

We are asking to find out what is beautiful. It is a very complex question and requires a great sensitivity to find out for ourselves what is beauty. You see a marvellous sunset, the early morning rising of the sun over the trees, or you see a great mountain against a clear blue sky, tender, quiet, silent, great sense of tremendous dignity, a sense of wonder. When that takes place, that is, when you see a great marvellous thing, what happens when you look at it? When you look at a sunset over the sea, and a great light, brilliant ball of sunset, what takes place in you? Please we are investigating together, you are not just waiting for the speaker to answer your question. We are together exploring the question, whatever the question, political, economic, social and so on.

The questioner here is asking what is beauty. We are saying that beauty exists only when the self, the 'me' is not. Man-made things like a painting, like a marvellous photograph of a tree, or of a person, of a great river flowing down full of light and volume, when you look at all this, the wonder of the earth, the beauty of the

earth, what takes place in you when you look at something extraordinarily beautiful? For the moment you cease to exist. You with all your problems, with your worries, with your daily travail and misery, confusion, all that is dissipated or driven away by something that you see with great, tremendous beauty. You, for the moment, are absent. Would you agree to that? Are you listening to all this? If you are listening and you see or perceive when there is beauty, great beauty, not merely physical beauty of a woman or a man, when you perceive that, for a second your self is not there. I would consider that is great beauty.

And also - it is a very noisy place, isn't it - and also the questioner asks, why do we like something that is beautiful. And also that question implies, why do we tolerate something that is ugly, dirty, like the filthy streets of Bombay, why do we tolerate it, why do we allow it? You might say, it is not our responsibility, it is the responsibility of the government, and the government is corrupt and so everything goes to pieces. But are we aware, sensitively, to the environment in which we live, the room in which we live, whether it is orderly, clean, well proportioned or not, are we aware of all this? Or, we just put up with everything? And so most of us become when you see constantly day after day the squalor, the dirt, the inhumanity of man against man, you get used to it, your sensitivity becomes dull, corroded, and so you never see actually that which is beautiful.

2nd Question: Is the perception of the actual possible without the intervention of thought?

Do you understand the question? Is it possible to perceive a tree, your wife, or your husband, or your boss, or your helper, your

servant, or the nature around you, to perceive that without the intervention of thought? If the question is clear, that is, can you see a tree, or the new moon, or the setting of the sun, or your wife, or your husband, or your children, without thought interfering with your perception? That's the question. Let us explore the question.

What do we mean perceiving, to perceive, to observe? When you perceive your wife, or your husband, or your girl friend, or your son, do you actually see them as they are, or you have a picture of them, an image of them, and through that image, through those coloured glasses of memories, conclusions, you look through? Please examine kindly what the speaker is saying. Examine your own wife, or your husband, or your neighbour, or your boss and so on, whether you can look at them without a single movement of thought or image or the word. Suppose I am married - which I am not - suppose I am married, I live with my wife for twenty, or thirty, or fifteen days, and during that interval of time I have built through various incidents, accidents, an image about her. She has built an image about me. These images, these memories, prevent me from looking at her actually, what she is.

And then the question arises: is it possible to look at a human being, whether it be my wife, or a neighbour, or a stranger, to look at them without a single movement of thought. That is what the questioner is asking. You are sitting there, and the speaker is sitting up here, you apparently are here with an image, with a conclusion, with memories of the speaker. Right? Right sirs? Are you responding to my question? Can you observe the speaker without all the reputation that you have build about him, all the things that have been said about him, and all the things that you perhaps may

have read about him, what he has said, to put away all that and look at him, observe him. Will you do that? Can you do it? That is, to look at something, or a person, or anything, without a previous memory, conclusion, remembrance, just to look afresh, is that possible? That means thought not interfering with your observation. If you have ever tried, or if you ever will do it, you will find the most extraordinary things happen. You begin to discover something which you have never thought of. You begin to discover something totally new. If you look at your wife, or your husband without all the memory that you have accumulated about her, and she about you, then you are looking at her, or him, for the first time afresh. So a relationship is constantly renewed, fresh, not the old memories of relating and interfering. Have you ever tried all this? Or are you just listening, 'Yes, it sounds very grand, but I can't do it', and carry on. So if you actually do it once or twice, to put away all the accumulated memories that you have about her or him, then you are looking at the person for the first time afresh. And when you look at that person afresh something totally new takes place, a new kind of relationship comes into being.

3rd Question: How can one live with a husband who does not care?

I don't know! Let's look into the question. What is a husband, and what is a wife? In America, and other parts of the world, man, a boy and a girl are living together without going through marriage ceremony, or going through the Registrar to register their marriage. That's one thing: a boy and a girl live together without going through marriage, or recording officially. Then there is the other side: you go through a ceremony between man and woman, and

that ceremony, that going to church, or the Registrar, that officially makes you man and wife, husband and wife. What is the difference between these two? You understand my question? What is the difference between a man and a woman living together without going through the ceremony of marriage, and what is the difference between them and a man and woman who go through an expensive marriage, what is the difference between the two? One has a paper, legalized, saying, you are husband and wife, society says you are married, you have certain responsibilities to look after your wife, your children and all the rest of it. And also the others who do not go to church and all the rest of it, or go through a marriage ceremony, either they are very irresponsible, or they are very responsible. Both are responsible. Right? If they take living together seriously both are responsible.

So we are asking, what is a husband, and what is a wife? You answer that question, most of you, I presume who are here, are married, or you have a girl friend - perhaps not in India so much but in Europe and America it is quite common. So what is a husband? A husband is supposed to work, go to the office, or go to some kind of work from nine till five o'clock, spends most of the day in an office, either pleasant or unpleasant, a factory and so on. And then comes home. The wife, the woman, cooks the meal, looks after, if she has children, the children, and so on. This is our daily routine. Right? Do you agree to that? For god's sake. Yes? This is what is happening the world over: the woman stays at home, or she goes to the office also to earn more money, and the wife generally looks after the children if she has any, and stays at home. What is the relationship between these two people? The

husband who works from nine till five, and also the woman goes off to work from nine till five, what is their relationship? Have you ever thought about it? Life is becoming more and more complex, more and more expensive, so both the woman and the man have to work. And if they have children, which perhaps unfortunately they have, what happens to the children? The woman comes home and the husband comes home, tired, and will they care for each other, except sexually? Will they really care? You ask this question to the speaker, and he is supposed to answer that question. You should put this question to yourself and not to the speaker.

The question is: how does one live with a husband who doesn't care? Either you say, goodbye, old man, or, old boy, or you put up with him. This is generally what happens, you put up with him, getting more and more indifferent to each other, more and more isolated, more and more depressed, and all the misery of living with a man or a woman who doesn't really care at all. It's your problem, not mine. So what will you do? Go after another woman, go after another man? And it happens. It will also happen there, after a little while he will not care. So you are probably always caught in this problem. Which means, is there love at all? When two people live together, is it a sexual, biological activity of coming together, or is there love in their lives, caring for each other? Perhaps you know this answer better than the speaker.

4th Question: Is it necessary to marry in love? What is the physical relationship between man and woman?

I don't know, you ought to know. What a strange question this is, isn't it? Is it necessary to marry in love? What do you say? If the speaker puts this question to you, what will you answer: is it

necessary sirs, and ladies, that I should marry? What would be your answer? Your answer probably would be, do what you want to do, why bother me with it. It's up to you.

But you see the question is really much more complex than that. We all want companionship, we all want sexual relationships, a biological necessity. And also we want somebody on whom we can rely, in whom we can find security, in whom there is a sense of comfort, support. Because most of us cannot stand alone, on our own feet, therefore we say, I must marry, or I will have a friend, or whatever it is, I must have somebody with whom I can be at home. We are never at home with anybody because we are living in our own thoughts, in our own problems, in our own ambitions and so on. And we are frightened to stand alone. Because life is very lonely, life is very, very complex, troublesome and one needs somebody with whom you can talk things over. And also when you marry you have sexual relationship, children and so on. So in this relationship between man and woman it is always, if there is no love, that you use her and she uses you, you exploit her and she exploits you. That's a fact.

So the questioner says, asks, should one marry. And what is the physical relationship between man and woman. Don't you know? It's up to you, sirs. But to really enter into this whole complex problem of living together, not only with two people, living together with humanity, with your neighbour, with your boss, with your servant, if you have a servant, with your father, and mother, and children, to live together, it's a very complex thing. Living together as a family gives you a certain security, certain safety, and so you extend that family to a group, to a community, to a state, to

a nation, and from a nation which is opposed to another nation, and so there is always division and conflict, and wars. So one has to find out how to live with another without any conflict, without any sense of struggle, adaptation, adjustment. That requires a great deal of intelligence, integrity. But we just marry on because of sexual, biological demands and so on.

Did you make up these questions?

Audience: No.

K: They say, no.

5th Question: What is the difference between the brain and the mind?

This is a very complex question. We know what the brain is. The scientists are saying now, there is the left side of the brain and the right side of the brain. The left side of the brain is used daily. I won't go into all the details of it, you can read it, if you want to, I haven't read it, but some friends who are scientists have told me about it. The left side of the brain is in operation, activity, functioning with all the daily activity. And the right side of the brain is not operating fully, not functioning fully because the right side of the brain is much more intelligent, much more acute, much more aware. And also the brain is the centre of all action and reaction, of all the sensory responses. This is what the speaker is saying. So the brain contains, or has, the whole content of consciousness. Consciousness is your belief, your faith, your name, your faculty, capacity, all the memories, all the hurts, pleasure, pain, agony, sorrow, all that, affection and so on, all that is the content of your consciousness. The content of your consciousness is you, is the self, is the 'me'. That content of consciousness may

invent a super-super-consciousness, or invent various kinds of unimagined, or imagined states, but it is still within the content of your consciousness. Do we see this? You, you are your name, your body, your anger, your greed, your competition, your ambition, your pleasure, your pain, and so on, affection, all that, you are that. And that means the content of your consciousness. The content of your consciousness is the past. Right? Past memories, past incidents, past - all kinds of activities, experiences, you are the past. You are knowledge, which is the past. So that is the brain.

We are saying, and the speaker may be wrong, and he has discussed this matter with some of the so-called scientists, and even then the speaker may be wrong, don't please accept what he says; doubt what he says, question, enquire. He says, the brain is the whole limited consciousness, with all its content, pleasant, unpleasant, ugly, beautiful, struggle, all that is your content. And the mind is something totally separate from the brain. The mind is outside the brain - the speaker is saying, the scientists are not saying that. The speaker says the brain is one thing, and mind is something entirely different. The brain with all its content, with its struggles, with its pain, anxieties, can never know, understand the beauty of love. Love is limitless. It is not, I love one person only. It is too vast, too tremendous. And the brain with all its contents, miseries, confusion, cannot comprehend, or hold, or be alive to love; only the mind, which is limitless.

So there is a difference between the brain and the mind. Then what the questioner doesn't ask, there is still a further question involved in this: what is the relationship then between the mind and the brain? The brain is limited, limited because it is made up of

all kinds of separate parts, fragmented, broken up, and therefore it is in constant state of struggle, conflict. Whereas the mind is totally out of that category. There is a relationship only when the brain is completely free, if that is possible, from all the content of its memories. This requires a great deal of enquiry, sensitivity.

Intelligence is not of the brain. The intelligence of thought cannot contain the intelligence of the mind. Do you understand all this?

Does somebody understand what I am talking about? No. All right.

Look, sirs, be very simple, because if one can be very, very simple you can go very, very far. But if you begin with lots of complex theories and conclusions, you are stuck. So let's be very simple. Your daily life, going to the office, working and working and working, trained in certain disciplines, as doctor, surgeon, businessman, or a cook, or whatever it is, your brain is being narrowed down, limited. If I am a physicist I spend years and years learning about physics, studying, investigating, research into it, so my brain is being narrowed down. There are two scientists here, they agree! And our brain has become mechanical, routine, small, because we are so concerned with ourselves, always living in a very, very small area of like, dislike, pain, sorrow, and all the rest of it. But the mind is something entirely different. You cannot understand or comprehend the nature of that mind if your brain is limited. You cannot understand the limitless when your life is limited. Right? So that is the relationship, the relationship between the brain and the mind can only take place when the brain is free from its content. This is a complex question, and requires much more going into but we haven't the time for it.

6th Question: What is faith?

Faith in god, faith. I have faith in my wife, she won't betray me. I have faith in my husband. I have faith in my business. Faith. The whole of Christendom, all the religious structure, nature, of Christianity is based on faith. And there they do not question, they do not have doubt, scepticism. If you have faith in god then you cannot possibly allow any form of scepticism, doubt to enter; or in the Islamic world. But in the Hindu world, and in the Buddhist world, doubt is one of the necessary qualities to cleanse the mind, brain. You have faith, haven't you, all of you, belief? Have you ever questioned your belief, your faith and your illusions? Or you just accept them? When you have faith you have put aside altogether any question of investigation. Suppose I believe in god, believe, have faith in god, then every question, every doubt must be set aside because my belief in god is based on fear. I don't know what the world is, somebody has created it, and I like to think god has created it - that's one kind of belief. The scientists say there is no such thing as god, it is a natural growth of evolution from the cell into very, very, very, complex cells of the human brain.

So why do we have faith? Isn't that very restricting, narrowing down, limiting? And doesn't faith divide people - the Christian faith, and the Islamic faith, and the Hindus who probably have no faith about anything at all. And so there is constant conflict between them all.

You see there is also another complex question involved in this: why do we have ideals? The whole communist world is based on the theoretical supposition of Marx, Stalin and so on, Lenin - they are their gods. And they believe in what they have said as the Christians believe in what the Bible says, or the Koran, or you,

with your Gita, Upanishads, or something else, you are all absorbing what the books say, but you never, for yourself, question the whole thing, because the moment you question, doubt, you have to rely on yourself, and therefore you are frightened; therefore much better to have faith in something illusory, something that doesn't really actually exist. But if you know for yourself, I have to understand my own life, I have to see if it is possible to bring about a great revolution in my life, then you start from there. But if you have faith in something, you are living in an extraordinarily illusory world.

We have got a lot of questions.

7th Question: If human consciousness is one, how is it that one person is happy and the other is unhappy? Also you say, thought is me - please show me how.

Are you happy? And why is another unhappy? You are born rich and your grandfathers and grandparents have left you a factory, or a business, and you are quite happy with it. And another is born in a little village, uneducated, toiling day after day on a piece of earth which is the size of this room, or half the size of this hall, working on it, living on a pittance, and he is unhappy, he doesn't know what happiness or unhappiness is, he is working, working, working. Does happiness depend on circumstances, on work, on what you are doing, or on your satisfaction in doing something? What do you call happiness, and what do you call unhappiness? Happiness can be said to be when you are satisfied, satisfied in doing something, and feel very happy about it. And I am not satisfied in doing something and I am very unhappy about it. Is satisfaction synonymous with happiness?

And am I seeking continuously satisfaction? Which means I am seeking all the time gratification and I will be happy. Or is happiness something that comes and goes, that is a by-product, it is not very important?

And also, the questioner asks, thought is me, show me how. What do you mean 'show you how'? On a screen on a television? Or make a diagram? Or show you verbally? Which is, you accept intellectually if the speaker explains, thought is me - would you understand it? The speaker will explain, that is, he will describe, he will explain, step by step. And will you see the truth of it, or say, no, that is not the self, the self is something far superior, it is divine, it is atman, it is something else. So how will you receive an explanation, knowing the explanation, the description, the word, is not the thing? Right? The window, the word 'window', is not the actual window. Right? I can paint a mountain, but the painting is not the actual mountain. Right? So we can go into this together, I can't show it to you. I can't put it on a screen, television, and show it to you, there it is. But if we can together investigate, if you are willing - if you are bored with it, all right, be bored with it.

So let us together find out. What are you? If you are really frank, serious, when that question is put to you, what are you? Aren't you your name? Aren't you your face, your eyes, your nose, your hair and so on physically? Aren't you the anger? Aren't you the greed, or the greed is separate from you? Aren't you, when there is anxiety, aren't you that anxiety? When you are suffering, suffering when one loses one's wife, husband, children, or grandmother, you know all that, are you not suffering, and is that suffering something separate from you? Aren't you all that? Or do

you think - think - that you are separate from all that? Right, sir? Are you separate from all that? Are you separate from your anger, jealousy, from your bank account? You are your bank account, aren't you? Or if I take away your bank account you say, that's not me? Would you say that? 'You can take my bank account because it is not me'. How you would howl if I took away your bank account! So you are your bank account. You are your furniture; you are your house, your insurance, your mortgage, your money. But if you say, 'I am not all that, there is something in me that is watching all this' - is that a fact? Or you have invented it. Many people say there is super-super-consciousness, above all this consciousness. That is, is that not invented by thought? Right? Is not your bank account, not the coin, not the note, all that is not the result of thought? Is not your recognition of your wife, your husband, isn't that thought? So aren't you all the memory of the past, all the tradition of the past, as a Hindu, as this, you know, a Brahmin, non-Brahmin, and all that business, aren't you all that? Of course you are. So you are the knowledge which is the past. You are nothing but memories. Would you accept that? Of course not. Aren't you? If all your memories were taken away, what are you? You would be a vegetable. So your memories, which is always the past, is what you are. Your tradition as a Hindu, as a Parsi, as a Muslim and so on, that's the result of years of propaganda, years of tradition, which is the activity of thought.

So you are thought. If you don't think at all, what are you? So you are the whole content of the past. That past is modifying itself in the present, and continues as the future. So you are the past, the present and the future. In you all time is contained. Oh, you don't

understand all this.

And the self, the 'me', my name, my quality, my achievement, my ambition, my pain, my sorrow, is all the past. And so the self is the essence of the past, which is memory, knowledge. And therefore the self is very, very limited. And that's why the self is causing so much mischief in the world. Each self is out for itself. You are out for your own self, aren't you? If you were honest, see this clearly, aren't you out for yourself? - your ambition, your achievements, your fulfilment, your satisfaction.

So thought is you. Thought is limited, because all knowledge is limited, therefore your self is the most limited thing. And therefore you are causing enormous sorrow, enormous conflict, because the self is separative, divisive.

So, sirs, the speaker has explained. The explanation is not the fact. The fact is for you to see this for yourself. If you see this for yourself and say, 'I like the way I am going on', perfectly all right. But you know for yourself that you are creating havoc in the world. And you prefer to live that way, good luck to you. But there might be some who say, that is not the way to live. One must live with a global brain, without any division, without any nationality, without any self. Don't make that into some kind of heightened illumination - only a few can reach it. Anybody who sets his brain and heart to understand the nature of the self, and be free of that self, anybody can do it if they put their mind to it.

Right sir. May I answer one more question? After that we will stop. It's ten o'clock, probably you have to go to your own jobs and all the rest of it. It's ten past ten, sorry. One more question, and that's the end of it.

8th Question: If the great religions of the world are not true religions, what is true religion?

Right, that is the question. Why do you say, if the great religions are not true, why do you say, if? Are they religions? You answer that question. You all go to temples probably, you have all had marriage ceremonies and puja, and all the rest of it, are they religions? Great religions, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, are they religions? Which is, their rituals, their hierarchy, their faith, belief, their going to temples and offering enormous sums of money to some things made by hand or by the mind, which you call god, is all that religion? You accept it as religion. But if you question, doubt, then you begin to ask, obviously, these things are all put together by thought. Right? The Bible, the Koran and your own so-called religious books, they are all put down by thought, they are not divine revelations, they are not straight from god's mouth. I know you love to think that. But thought has operated and put down on a piece of paper, and then you accept it as something extraordinarily sacred.

So if you brush aside all that, and that requires scepticism, a sense of freedom to observe, freedom from fear, totally free of fear, then you can find out for yourself what is religion. That is, is there something sacred, not invented by thought, not measured by words, is there something that is immeasurable, timeless? This has been a question from the ancient of times. The ancient Egyptians, the Greeks, all the great past civilizations have asked this question: is there something beyond all this, which thought has not invented, which thought has not touched, because thought can be measured? Thought is a material process, and whatever it invents is not

sacred. So to find that out the brain must be entirely free from its content, from fear, from anxiety, from the sense of terrible loneliness, from death. Then only you will find out what is truth, what is the highest form of religion.

BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 11TH FEBRUARY 1984

May we continue with what we were talking about the last time that we met here? We were talking about conflict, whether it is possible to live in this world without problems and conflict. We shall go on talking about that because for most of us life, the daily living, is a series of struggles, conflicts, pain and varieties of anxieties. And we were asking whether it is possible living in this crazy world to live a life in which every kind of problem and conflict doesn't exist. It may sound rather absurd, or even crazy, to think about such things, to live without a single conflict.

As we were saying the other day, all this requires, the enquiry into this question, considerable intelligence, considerable energy, application. Merely to discuss, or to have a dialogue between you and the speaker verbally, theoretically, has very little meaning. So if we could together this evening, in spite of the crows, if we could think together, go into this problem whether there is an art of living in which one can live in daily life, not in a theoretical world, in daily life, can live without, psychologically, inwardly, without all the turmoil, the pain of change, and the anxiety involved in that change, whether it is possible to live such a life.

To ask such a question may seem quite incredible because our life from the moment we are born until we die is a series of conflicts, struggles, ambition trying to fulfil itself, and all the pain of existence, with sorrow, pleasure and so on. So if we could go into this question: the art of living, daily life. We have many arts: the art of painting, the art of making a marvellous shoe, a first-class

shoe, and the art of painting, the art of engineering, the art of communication, there are many, many arts. But for most of us, and probably for the rest of the world too, we have never asked this question: the art of living. To find that out - Bombay is rather a dirty country, it makes ones eyes water, I am not crying - requires investigation, how to live. Because the art of living is the greatest art, and the most important art, greater than any other, greater than the art of governments, the art of communication, in spite of all that we have never enquired very deeply, what is the art of living our daily life, which requires such subtlety, sensitivity, and a great deal of freedom. Because without freedom you cannot find out what is the art of living. The art of living isn't a method, a system, or ask another how to find the art of living, but it requires considerable intellectual activity, and also a deep abiding honesty. Very few of us are honest. It is getting worse and worse in the world. We are not honest people: we say one thing, do another, we talk about philosophy, god, all the theories that the ancient Indians have invented, and we are rather good at all that kind of stuff, but the word, the description, the explanation, is not the deed, the action. And that's why there is a great deal of dishonesty. And to enquire into the art of living there must be a fundamental, unshakable, immutable honesty. Honesty which is not corruptible, which doesn't adjust itself to environment, to demands, to various forms of challenges. It requires a great integrity to find out because we are dealing with a very, very complex problem. It isn't just easy to live a life which is perfectly orderly, without dissipating energy, without living in any kind of illusion or tradition. Tradition, however old, however modern, is merely carrying on the old

pattern. And the old pattern cannot possibly adjust itself to the new.

So together, and we mean together, it is not that the speaker is saying something to which you agree or disagree, but together exercising your intellect, your reason, your sanity, if you have sanity, and together looking at this very complex problem. As we said the other day, this is not a lecture, this is not a lecture to give you information, facts, instruct you, to persuade you, to slightly, delicately direct you in a particular direction, not doing any kind of propaganda, to inseminate a new set of ideas. It is not anything of that kind. That would be dishonourable on the part of the speaker when he says it is not that, and he means that. So you are exercising your own brain, your own sense of urgency, demand to find out if there is a way of living which is totally orderly. So please, if you will, be serious for this evening. You may not be serious for the rest of the year, or the rest of the week, but at least for once in one's life to be totally earnest, to be completely honest with oneself. Then we can together go into this question, what is the art of living.

How are we going to find out the art? To put everything in its right place, not exaggerating one or the other, not giving one's instinct, one's urges, in one direction, and neglecting totally the other, not trying to fulfil in a particular direction but together you and the speaker are going to find out for ourselves, not that you will be told by the speaker. This is important to understand. I am sorry, the crows are having fun! They are saying good-night to each other. They will quieten down when it gets a little darker.

So please, for this evening at least, see how important it is to

find out a way of living in which conflict, problems don't exist. Because conflict and problems waste our energy. One has to find out why problems exist. There are mathematical problems, geographical problems and so on, academic problems; we are not talking about those problems. We are talking about the problems of human beings. They are first human beings, afterwards they are scientists, engineers, businessmen and all the rest of it, first they are human beings. But when you give importance to other things you forget that you are a human being. So please, together, let's find out.

The art of living doesn't it mean to lead a life, a daily life, with tremendous precision, accuracy of order. Order does not mean, does it, conformity, following a pattern set and adjusting yourself to that pattern. We will go into this slowly. Does it not mean to become fully conscious, aware of one's own disorder. Are we aware of that? Or do we think that is merely an environmental difficulty, but inwardly we are perfectly orderly. We are pointing out together that inwardly we live in disorder, in contradiction. That's a fact. Even the greatest saint - they are generally slightly neurotic - even the greatest saints live in disorder, because they are trying to become something all the time. The very becoming - you understand what I mean, I hope we are following each other - becoming, I am this, I will become that, in that endeavour to change 'what is' to 'what should be', there is an interval, a gap in which conflict takes place. And that conflict is the essence of disorder. You have understood what I am saying? Where there is division, different classes of people, racial divisions, and in ourselves a contradiction, a division: I am this, I must become that,

in that there is a division. That very division is the root of disorder. Because in that there is a contradiction: I am this, I want to be orderly. When I say, 'I want to be orderly' I recognize I am in confusion so I attempt to bring about order, so I make a barrier, a sketch of what is order and then I try to follow that. We are saying, if you will kindly listen together, that the very fact is the cause of disorder. Right? Have you understood? Are we together in this a little bit, slightly? Not too much, but just enough.

So where there is division in us psychologically there must be conflict, and therefore disorder. Now as long as there is disorder, trying to find order is still disorder. Right? You understand? I am confused. My life is in disorder, I am fragmented, broken up inside, and being confused, out of that confusion I create a pattern, an ideal, a scheme, and I say I am going to live according to that scheme. But the origin of that scheme is born out of my confusion. Right? Clear? So what I have to understand is, why am I confused, why am I disorderly. If I can understand that, then out of that comprehension, perception, order naturally comes without a single effort. That is, if I can find the causation of my confusion, then confusion doesn't exist, then there is order. I wonder if you see this. Are we together in this, a little bit? Are we?

Q: Yes.

K: Good. When you say, yes, sir, do you really mean it? Or is it just a verbal assertion, let's get on? That is dishonesty. If you don't see things clearly, don't say, yes; say, I don't see it. Then we can together have a dialogue. But if you say, yes, then your concern is, let's go on.

So please, look at it carefully. We have got a full hour. And this

awareness of confusion, not we should not confused, but the very awareness of confusion brings about the cause of it, the causation. So what is the cause? Do you understand? If I am ill and I go to the doctor, and the doctor, if he is fairly good, says, you are eating or doing certain things that upset your whole organism, so he says, don't do this, don't do that. So I change. I eat properly. In the same way if we can find the cause then the effect is changed. And if there is a change in the effect there is change in the cause. Do you understand? Are we together, or are you asleep? Let's proceed.

So order is only possible when we understand the nature of disorder. And the nature of disorder can be totally wiped out. If I am quarrelling with my wife, or the wife is quarrelling with me, I find out why we are quarrelling. If we like to quarrel, that's a different matter; but if want to stop quarrelling we say, let's talk about it, let's see why we quarrel. And then we find we are quarrelling about opinions: I want this and you want something different. And thereby we begin to communicate with each other and ultimately come to some point where we both of us agree. So similarly, together, to live a life, the art of living so that it is completely orderly. That is the art of living.

Then the art of living implies that there should be no fear. Right? Shall we go into it? Are you interested in this? We are saying that the art of living demands that there should be no fear at all - fear of psychological security, fear of death, fear of not becoming something, fear of losing, you know the whole problem of fear. Shall we talk about it together? Whether it is possible to totally be free completely of fear, because a mind, a brain that is frightened, a brain that is frightened is a dull mind, a mind that is

not capable of observing, living. Aren't you all frightened? Be a little honest. You are all frightened inwardly. We will first examine the inner, then we'll look at the outer, not the other way round. You understand? We all want physical security, that's what everybody demands: money, position, safety, security physically. But we never enquire into the security, certainty inwardly. Because the inward activity shapes the outer, controls the outer. Right? You understand?

So, we are asking, the art of living consists of not only having complete order, but also to be totally psychologically, inwardly free of fear. Is that possible? Because we have lived with fear from childhood: fear of the husband, fear of the wife, fear of not achieving, fear of not fulfilling, fear of not being satisfied. You know the nature of fear, I am sure, all of you. So we are asking, what is the nature and the structure of fear. Ask yourself the question first. What is fear, how does it arise, what is the cause of it, the root cause of it? I may be afraid of darkness, I may be afraid of public opinion, I may be afraid of somebody who is going to beat me up. There are various forms of fear. So shall we deal with the various forms, one by one, your particular fear, her particular fear, or my particular fear; or shall we go together and find out the root of it, the cause of it? Right? Which do you want? The various branches of fear, or the very hidden root, hidden nature of fear? You understand? What is the root of fear? Look at it, the speaker is asking you this question, and if you will kindly be honest this evening, you can be dishonest afterwards because that's your nature, that's what you want, but for this evening find out for yourself what is the root of it, what brings all this fear about.

Because fear is most destructive. If one lives in an enclosed - a sense of physical nervous tension, feeling small, frightened, you know the feeling of fear, and where there is fear every kind of neurotic action takes place, irrational, pretending to be rational. So it is important to find out for yourself what is the root of it. Or are there many roots of it, or only one single root? Probably you have not thought about this, you are too busy earning money, you are too busy worrying about your states, you haven't probably ever given thought or enquiry to find out if you can live without fear.

Change from 'what is' to 'what should be' is one of the causes of fear. I may not ever arrive there so I am frightened of that too. I am also frightened of what is going on, I am also frightened of the past. Right? So we are trying together, not accepting what the speaker is saying, but to find out. That requires honesty, scepticism, not accepting a thing that the speaker is saying, but to see for ourselves the essence and the structure of fear. Right? What is fear? Not what we are afraid about. I am afraid about death - suppose - I am getting old and I am getting frightened. We are not asking what you are afraid of, but what is fear per se, in itself. You understand? Are you getting tired?

So what is fear itself? How does it come about? We will go together into the investigation of it, but you must together share it, not verbally accept it. Then if you verbally accept it, theoretically, or intellectually, at the end of it you are still frightened. And that's a waste of time - your time and the speaker's time. But if you and I, the speaker, can walk together, journey together into the whole nature of fear, and you yourself capture the truth of the cause of fear, then you are free. Unless you want to be frightened for the

rest of your life, you may like it, because people do like some kind of fear because that makes them feel at least they have something to hold on to.

What is the past? Please listen, we are talking about fear. What is the past, what is the present, and what is the future? The past is all that you have accumulated as memory, the remembrance of things gone, and the present is the past, modifying itself to the future. Right? This is an actual fact. So you are the past memories, past remembrances, past accidents, the whole accumulation of the past. You are that. You are the bundle of memories. That's a fact. If you had no memories you don't exist. So you are that. The past - please listen - is time, isn't it? The past has been gathered through time. I have had an experience, a week ago, that experience has left a memory, and that memory is born from the past experience - when I use the word 'past' I have already time. Memories stored in the past, and also the past is memory, knowledge, experience. Right sirs? The past, the experience, knowledge, stored in the brain as memory, and from memory thought arises. This is a fact. So time which is the past, and also memory which is the past, so time and thought are the same. They are not separate. Right? Are you understanding this? Are we together? A little bit?

So we are asking, fear is both time and thought. I did something a week ago, which caused fear; I remember that fear, and I want to prevent that happening again. So there is the past incident which caused fear, and it is recorded in the brain as memory, that recording is time. Right? This speech, this talk is being recorded, this recording is time, between the word and the thing, that is time. I hope you understand all this. And thought is also time, because

thought comes into being through memory, through knowledge, through experience, so thought and time are similar, together, they are not separate. Right? And we are saying, asking, is that the root of fear, time and thought, time/thought? That is, I am afraid of death. Right? Death, I am still young, old, or whatever it is, I am healthy, but death is waiting for me and I am afraid of death. That is, I have put it away from me, but I am still afraid of that. Aren't you all afraid of death? Yes? No? You must be strange people if you are not afraid of death.

So fear, the root of fear, is thought/time. Don't say, how am I to stop time and thought. If you say, 'how', then you demand a system, a method, then you will practise that method which means time. Right? So you are back again in the same old pattern. Have you understood? But if you understand, grasp, have an insight into the nature of fear and the causation of fear, which is thought and time, if you really grasp that, then hold it, don't run away from it.

Look, I don't know why I should explain all these things, they are all so simple. But you are all very complicated people, too intelligent, too learned, too experienced, you can never meet anything simply. We'll go into it.

Fear arises from something that has happened before. I have had a toothache, go to the dentist, he heals it, but it has been recorded, the pain has been recorded. Where there is a recording there must be the memory and saying 'I hope it will not happen again tomorrow'. So the pain of yesterday is recorded, then the memory, which is the recording, says, 'I hope I will not have it', the whole process of that is fear. If you understand the principle of it, the fundamental nature of fear, then you can deal with it, but if you are

escaping from fear, trying to rationalize it, trying to say, tell me, help me to escape from it, then at the end of it, as you are, for the rest of your life you are frightened. Right?

So the root of fear is time/thought. If you understand that, see the beauty of it, the subtlety of it. And the other thing is, people are afraid, as you are, most human beings throughout the world, are afraid of death. That's one of the fundamental fears of life. We all know death is for everybody, for you and the speaker. That's an absolute certainty. Right? You can't escape from that. You might live longer by not wasting your energy, by leading a simple, sane, rational life, but however the way you live, death is inevitable. Right? Would you accept that? Not accept, it is a fact. Would you face that fact? You are going to die, so is the speaker. You, who are you? Who are you, sirs, and ladies, who are you? You have money, you have position, you have capacity, you have dishonesty, your confusions, your anxiety, your loneliness, your bank account - you are all that, aren't you? Be simple and honest. It is so.

And we are asking, what is the art of living when we are going to die? It is there, whether you like it not. What is the art of living so that one is not afraid of death? You understand? Let's go into it. Let's go into it not verbally, not intellectually, not theoretically, but actually so that you know what death means. We are not advocating suicide. There are certain philosophers, the existentialists and others, who say, life is a perpetual going up the hill and coming down the hill, pushing up the hill, and after you reach a certain height coming down. And life, such a life has no meaning, therefore commit suicide. Do you understand? We are not saying that is the way to live. That's not the art of living. But

we are asking ourselves, why are we afraid of death. Whether we are young, old, and so on, why is there this torment of which we are so - it may be conscious or unconscious. And the fear of death is also suffering. Right? Suffering in leaving my family, suffering - you know - all the things I have accumulated, and I am leaving all that.

So the art of living is not only to find out how to live our daily life, but also to find out what the significance of death is while living. Right? What is death? There is the biological, organic, ending through disease, through old age, accident, through some misfortune - I go down the street a gate may fall on me by chance and I am killed. So what do we mean by dying? If we can understand that then life and death can live together. You understand? Not death at the end when the organism ends, but to live together, to live with death and life. Have you ever asked these questions? Probably not. You ask that question. Put it to yourself, this question: whether it is possible to live, which is the art of living, living and living with death. Then to find that out you must find out what is living. Right? Which is more important, dying or living, before or after? You understand my question? Most people are concerned with after, whether there is reincarnation, all that kind of stuff. But they never ask, which is more important, the living, which is an art, if there is the right living perhaps death is also part of right living. You understand? Not at the end of one's stupid life.

So one must enquire first, what is living. You answer it, sir. We will discuss it, have a dialogue about it, but you have to answer that question for yourself. Which means, what is your life? What's

your daily life, which is what your life is, a long series of daily lives. What are those long series of lives? Pain, anxiety, insecurity, uncertainty. Right? Some kind of illusory devotion to some entity which we have invented, some kind of fanciful, illusory existence, a make-believe life, having faith, having belief, all that is what you are. Right? You are attached to your house, to your money, to your bank, to your wife, children. Right? You are attached. This is your life. Would you contradict that? The description, which the speaker has pointed out, that you live a constant struggle, constant effort, comfort, pain, loneliness, sorrow, that's your life. And you are afraid to let that go. And death says, 'My friend, you can't take it with you'. You can't take your money, your family, your knowledge, your beliefs. Right? Death says you have to leave all that behind. Right? Would you agree to that? Or do you deny that? Face it, sirs.

So the art of living is - need I answer it? You see, you are waiting for me to answer it. Look sir, I am attached, to my wife, or to a certain conclusion, I am tremendously attached to it. Now death says to me, 'When I come you have to let go'. Now is it possible for me, living, to let go? Yes, sir! Will you let go? Absolute silence! Right? I am attached, to my furniture, I have polished it, I have looked after it, it's an old piece of furniture, I won't give it away, it's mine. I have lived with it for years, eighty years, it is part of me. When I am attached to that piece of furniture, that furniture is me. I know you laugh, but you won't let that furniture go. So death says, to you, 'My friend, you can't take that desk with you.' So can you be totally free, totally free of that attachment to that piece of furniture. You live with that furniture,

but totally free of attachment to that. That is death. You understand? So as you are living, living and dying, all the time. Oh, you don't see the beauty of it. You don't see the freedom that gives you, the energy, the capacity. Where you are attached there is fear, there is anxiety, uncertainty; uncertainty, fear causes sorrow.

And to go into the question of sorrow, that's part of life. Every one on earth has suffered, has shed tears. Haven't you shed tears? Your husband doesn't care for you, he uses you and you use him. And you suddenly realize how ugly that is, and you suffer. Man has killed man throughout history in the name of religion, in the name of god, in the name of nationality. Right? So man has suffered immensely. And they have never been able to solve that problem, never solved suffering. Because where there is suffering there is no love. In suffering there is not only self pity, there is also fear of loneliness, of separation, of divisions, a remorse, guilt, all that is contained in that word. And we have never solved this problem. We put up with it, we shed tears, and carry the memory of the son, or the brother, or the wife or the husband for the rest of your life. Is there an end to sorrow? Or must man for ever and ever carry this burden? To find that out is also the art of living. The art of living is to have no fear. And also the art of living is to have no sorrow.

So to enquire into that complex problem, why man, not only has been inhuman right through, cruel to other people, brutal, violent, killing, by the millions, thousands, and how many people have shed tears over their sons, or their husbands, or their relations and so on? And we are still carrying on the same old rotten, filthy, brutal way, killing each other.

You are going to have, I believe I saw as we came down, a naval show here. Right? And you are very proud of your army and your navy, all that rot. And every culture is proud of its own military instruments, killing thousands of people. And you agree, and you carry on the next day, never enquiring whether you can stop in yourself violence, why wars exist. Do you realize, sirs, there have been wars for six thousand years, man killing man. The filthiness, the ugliness of it all. And you don't mind. It is happening far away somewhere and you don't mind. But you are preparing for it too.

So that is one of the problems of life, whether it is possible to live without sorrow. What is sorrow? Why, when my son dies, my son, not yours, that's your affair, when my son dies something has broken in me, specially if I am a woman. I have born him in my womb, given birth, and I have nursed him, looked after him, and the pain of all that, the pleasure of it, the joy of the mother, and then he ends up being killed - for your country, he will be killed. You understand all this? Why do you allow it?

So what is sorrow? Is it that my son has gone, can never return, though I think we will meet next life, or in heaven or in hell, he is gone. That's a fact. But I carry the memory, I keep his picture round my heart. I live on that memory, shedding tears, I can't forget. It is part of my burden. Don't you know all this? Or is the speaker saying something irrelevant? And you have never asked why we suffer. And we have never enquired into sorrow, into suffering, and asked whether it can ever end, not at the end of one's life, but now, today. If you begin to enquire into it, as we are doing now, I hope, what is the cause? Is it self pity? Is it that he was

young, fresh, alive, and gone? Is it that I am attached to him? Face all this, sirs. Is it that I am attached to him? And that attachment, what is that attachment? To whom am I attached? To my son? What do I mean, by my son? Be rational, logical. What is my son? I have a picture of him, I have an image of him, I want him to be something, I want him to be something and he is my son. And I am attached desperately because he will carry on my business, he will be better at getting more money. You know, you are all playing this game, you know it very well. And that's one side.

And also I have a certain affection, we will not call it love, but we will call it a certain kind of affection. If you loved your son you would have a different kind of education. Right? A different kind of upbringing, not just follow in your footsteps, he is the new generation. And a new generation may be totally different from yours. I hope he is. I want him to be a new generation, of a different type of person than me. Not follow what I have been doing - engineer, businessman, and all that business. But I want him to inherit my money, my possessions, my house. You know the game you are all playing. And when he dies everything goes. That is, my picture of him, my wanting him to be this and that, that has come to an end and I am shocked. And I turn to my nephew, my niece, to someone to carry on the same pattern, because I have lots of money. Don't you know all this? How cruel all this is. And this is one of the causes of great sorrow.

And death, of course, is the final sorrow. But if you are living, death and life together, then there is no change. You are incarnating everyday afresh, not you, a new thing is incarnating every day afresh. And in that there is great beauty. That is creation.

Not merely painting a picture, building a house, an architect, but living with this death and life. And that gives you - in that there is tremendous freedom. And freedom implies also, the root meaning of the word freedom is also love. Living, the art of living and the art of dying, together. That brings about great love. And love has its own intelligence, not the intelligence of a cunning mind, intelligence is something outside of the brain. We will talk about that tomorrow.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 12TH FEBRUARY 1984

This is the last talk. We were talking about the art of living yesterday. I think we ought to go much more into it. Most of us have given very little thought to that, we have hardly enquired into the nature of what life is, and how to live it. Our daily life, with all its ugly turmoil, passing pleasures, and a great deal of entertainment, both religious and otherwise. We have studied almost all the academic subjects, spent years to become a doctor, a surgeon, or an engineer, and you never at the end ask, how - if you have studied perhaps five or six years, have learnt a great deal of information, stresses, strains and the material and so on - you never ask how to build a bridge, because that is his job. But we, ordinary people like us, we are always asking 'how: how am I to live a life without any conflict, without any of the problems that are involved in our daily unfortunate lives. We are always striving, reaching out, getting somewhere, and when a question, a challenge is put before you, like, is it possible to live a life in which there is no problem, in which there is no conflict, when you hear that question, you say, yes, it sounds good, but tell me how to do it, what is the method, what is the system, so that we can live a life of great tranquillity, with a great sense of wonder, a sense of great beauty. Then we say, tell me how. I think we ought to banish from our minds, not in the academic subjects, but in the psychological world we should never ask, if one may most respectfully point out, how, never ask anybody how. They only can offer you a system, a method, which then becomes another bondage, another trap in which you are

caught.

So we ought to this evening, go into this question. We have talked about wars, we have talked about human beings psychologically hurt from their childhood, hurt by their parents, by their schools, colleges and universities, by their families, and so on, so they are wounded people. And that wound inevitably breeds fear. We talked about fear a great deal. And we also talked about time, not only the chronological time by the watch, but also time as a psychological means of achievement: I am this, but I will be that, I am violent, I will one day be non-violent. This constant becoming from 'what is', to 'what should be' is also an element of time. Because time is very important for us, not only the physical time, to get from here to there, but also the ideal which thought has invented, to achieve an ideal also requires time. So we are bound to time. And writers and some other people have asked, is there an end to time, is there a stop to time.

And as we said yesterday, and during all the other talks here, we are sharing this together. This is not, I'll repeat it ten times, this is not a lecture. Please kindly pay attention to that. This is not in any way to inform you, to instruct you about various academic subjects, which is what a lecture is. But this is a conversation between you and the speaker; a conversation about life, about the extraordinary complexity of life, the great sense of travail, anxiety, desperate loneliness, and innumerable tears that human beings have shed, wanting to be loved and never finding it, or if one loves you, there's always the danger and the pain of his leaving. So we have talked about all this. And if some of us, perhaps a few, even ten, who are really serious in the sense, honest, an honesty that is

unshakable, an integrity that can never be broken under any circumstances, and if there were such people, a few at least, then we could bring about a radical change in society. We talked about society. Society is what we are, we have made this society, this ugly, brutal, venomous - you know what this modern society is. We are responsible for it, each one of us. And to bring about a radical, fundamental mutation in the structure and the nature of society, we have to undergo a tremendous examination into ourselves, not theoretically, not problematically or philosophically, but to see what actually we are. And face that fact, not escape from it, go into it very deeply, and then perhaps a few of us could really bring about a different culture.

And as we said yesterday, for at least this evening, let us be serious, honest. That is, the word is not the thing, the explanation is not the actual, the description of a mountain, however beautiful, writing a great poem about a mountain in the blue sky and the lovely shadow, all those descriptions and the painting is not the actual mountain. But most of us are satisfied with the description, with the explanations, and then we make of that explanation into an ideal, and then strive to live up to that ideal, which then again becomes a series of conflicts. We went into all this during the last few years, and in the last three talks here. So please kindly remember that you and the speaker are investigating together deeply, seriously and with great honesty, how to live a life which is really a great art.

So let's begin to enquire more. Humility is necessary, isn't it, to learn. Humility, not humbleness, not a sense of remote acceptance, but one needs a great deal of humility to learn. But most of us have

not that quality of humility, not to somebody whom you respect, that's not humility, that's merely acceptance of authority, and you worship the authority. You saw what was happening this morning.

So humility is one of the factors in life, not arrogance, not vanity. A man who knows a great deal, that gives him a sense of self importance, and he is a vain man, a man who has achieved a position, a status, power, money, and then that vanity tries to become humility. Don't you know all this? And humility is not born out of vanity. Humility is necessary to understand the extraordinary complexity of living. And humility with freedom: we think we are all very free to do what we want to do, what we want, our desires, to fulfil our desires, this is one of the structures of society, each one of us is free to do exactly what he wants to do. Right? You are all doing that. You want to be rich, you want to express yourself, you want to have your own particular way, you are very strong on your opinions, your conclusions. You are free to choose. And we call this freedom. And if you observe what that freedom has done in the world, brought about great confusion, brought about havoc in the world, each one expressing his own particular desire, competitive. And we call this freedom.

So we ought to enquire what is freedom. Please ask this question of yourself. Is freedom a matter of choice. You are free to choose, free to go from here to there, free to have different kinds of jobs, if you don't like one you go to the other. Freedom to express yourself, free to think what you want, and to express it, perhaps, in a democratic society, not in the totalitarian states, there freedom is denied. So what is freedom? Because that is part of our life. As we talked yesterday, death is part of our life, the living and the dying.

We went into it very carefully. Whether there are two, death and life, live together. That requires, as we pointed out yesterday, a great deal of attention, a great deal of enquiry, and great intelligence - the art of living with death. We talked about that. And in the same way, we ought to talk over together what is freedom. Does it really exist? The word freedom, also, some of its root meaning, is love. And is love a matter of choice?

And so we ought to find out for ourselves what is actual freedom. Freedom from something, from pain, from anxiety, and is there freedom, not from something. Do you understand? If it is freedom from something it is merely a reaction. It is like a man in prison saying, 'I must get out of my prison', we live psychologically in a prison, and when it is painful, ugly, not satisfactory then you want freedom from that. So we are saying, freedom from something is the same thing as being in prison. Do we meet each other, or am I talking to myself?

So what is freedom? This sense of inward authentic, deep sense of unshakable freedom, not from something, what is that freedom? Can we together enquire into this, not accept what the speaker is saying, because we went into that. If you accept what the speaker is saying then you are back again to the old pattern of following an authority. The speaker then becomes your guru, and the speaker abhors all gurus. In the world of, if one can use the word, spirit, or spiritual, authority is a sin. So together let's enquire what is freedom.

Probably you have never asked that question. You all want to escape from something. I am lonely, and most people are very, very lonely, they want to escape from it, through various forms of

entertainment, religious and otherwise. But is there a freedom which is not a reaction? And to find that out one has to enquire what is love? Is love a reaction? Is love attraction, whether it be sexual or otherwise? Please ask those questions of yourself to find out the right answer. How do you find the right answer to a question? I ask a question, the speaker asked the question, you naturally reply to that question, if you are at all thinking, going along with the question, then you respond to that question. Then the speaker then answers your response. This is really dialogue. Answers to your response, then you respond to my response. Right? Are we following this a little bit. So that there is both question and answer, answer and question. If we maintain this answer, question, question, answer seriously, intensely, then in that process you disappear and the speaker disappears, only the question remains. Do you understand this? Then that very question has vitality. Don't agree please, test it out for yourself. It's like a bud, a rose bud; if the question is left in the air, as it were, then it is like a bud which gradually unfolds and shows its nature. The depth of that question, it has its own vitality, energy, drive. That is a dialogue, not just accepting what the other fellow is saying.

So we are asking, is freedom, not from something, is it love? And is love a reaction? That is, I see a good face, a woman or a man, or a marvellous statue, I'd love to have it, I'd love to have it in my room, look at it day after day, and each time I look at it, it is different, it's a great masterpiece. And for most of us love perhaps may not exist. Please, I am just asking this, I am not saying it does not exist. For most of us perhaps we don't know what it means. We know attraction, we know tenderness, we know pity, we know

guilt, remorse and jealousy. Is all that love? Do you understand my question? If it is not love, then love has no reaction. Then that is freedom, which is not born out of a reaction. You may be a Christian, and being intellectual you might become a Buddhist. You have chosen, you are free to become a Buddhist, because Buddhism is much more intellectually active, interesting, and all the rest of it. And you are free from one and trapped in the other. And you may love the Buddha, rejecting your own particular deity. And this is called freedom. The crows are free! This is very important to understand, not intellectually, not verbally, but the depth and the beauty of it.

And we also should ask when we are talking about the art of living, what is beauty. The great architecture, the cathedrals of Europe, the great temples and the mosques of the world, constructed with great architects, great painters, the great sculptors, Michelangelo. When you see all that, that's beauty. So is beauty man-made? Please exercise your brains to find out. A tiger is not man-made. Thank the Lord! A tree in a solitary field alone, solitary, with all the dignity of a marvellous old tree is not man-made, but the moment you paint that tree it's man-made, and you admire it, go to a museum to see that tree painted by a great artist. So another line, which is part of the art of living is to understand the depth and the beauty of freedom, and the goodness of it. And beauty, not the picture, the poem, the marvellous writer, but what is beauty? A beautiful man, a beautiful woman, a face that has depth. And without that aesthetic quality in life, which is born of sensitivity, which is born out of all the senses in action, not one particular, or two, or three senses, but the whole movement of the

senses. Surely beauty is when the self is not. When I am not, beauty is. When the self is not, love is.

And so love, freedom, goodness, beauty, are one. Not something separate, not something pursued, one pursues what is beauty and spends the rest of your life on that. But they are all interrelated. Goodness, that word, though it is very old fashioned, that very word has extraordinary depth to that word. To feel the depth of goodness, and that can only be when there is freedom, when there is love, beauty.

And we ought also to talk over together this extraordinary problem, as we dealt with yesterday about death and suffering, we ought to enquire together what is religion, because that is part of our life. And to find out what is truly religious, not all this phoney stuff that is going on in the world - sorry if you are Christians, don't be upset by what the speaker is saying, nor the Hindus, please don't get upset, or get angry. It is all a network of superstitions, a network of beliefs, hurts born out of fear, you invent god. All that, the ceremonies, all the things that are in the churches, in the cathedrals, in the temples and mosques are put together by thought. Nobody can deny that. And thought, as we pointed out, is a material process, because thought is based on experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, and contained in the cells, therefore it is a material process. That which thought creates is nothing to do with sacredness. You may worship the things that thought has invented, you may worship your guru and your scriptures, the Bible, the Koran, whatever books you read, so-called religious literature, but they are all the product of thought, not straight from god's mouth - or the horse's mouth. All that is not

religion. Right? It is very difficult for most people to see this clearly because we always have hope in our heart for something which will give us strength, which will free us from our mortal travail. We want somebody to comfort us, the great father. Here, I'd love to tell you a good joke, but I won't, it's not the moment.

So we want somebody to comfort us, somebody to tell us what to do, somebody to worship, somebody to cling to in our loneliness and despair. When we are shedding tears we want somebody to hold our hand. And so thought invents all these extraordinary illusions, like god, all the rituals, all the things you worship in temples and mosques, and churches, it's all the product of thought. And so we are saying, all that is not religion. Would you see that? Not just intellectually, then it becomes a game, rather a stupid game, but if you actually see that it has no meaning, it is a sense of deception, hypocrisy, because that has nothing to do with our daily living. You have had every kind of god, from the most ancient of times, pre-history, and these gods and their goddesses and their rituals, have not changed the human brain, human brutality, human wars. You may worship your gurus, follow them, but you are not going to stop any wars, you are not going to change your whole being.

So we ought to enquire what is religion. To enquire one must be free of all superstitions, naturally, from all authority. Will you do that? The authority of the book, the authority of tradition, the authority which you create for yourself based on your own experience. You understand all this? So that your mind, your brain, is free from every kind of illusion. Is that possible because the brain invents illusions, myths? All the mythology of Greece, of

ancient Egypt, and your own Christian, and Hindu mythology, they are all the inventions of thought - super-star and so on. Can the brain be actually free of all that? And the brain has been conditioned for centuries upon centuries through propaganda, through tradition, through books, to what religion is. Will you do it? Will you be free of that? Not become an atheist, which is another reaction, but to have a brain that's completely free. That requires a great deal of investigation into oneself, a great deal of attention to every movement of action, so that your whole being is completely denuded of every kind of illusion. Which is not easy because we don't understand the nature of desire. It is the desire for comfort, for some help - you understand - that creates illusions - to desire illumination, that's what you all want.

So we ought to investigate what is desire. You understand this? We are enquiring seriously, honestly, at least for this hour, honestly find out for yourself what is desire. Why desire has made us what we are, fighting each other, competitive, hating each other, then you have a conflict, and conflict destroys, degenerates the brain. So either don't listen, or listen with all your heart and mind so that the word is the action. The two are not separate. So can you have a brain which is totally free from all tradition, all authority, including your own authority, which is having confidence in yourself, which gives you authority. You understand, this is a very complex problem: the authority of a policeman, the authority of the government, the law, which we apparently disregard totally, the authority of taxes. Is that all right, may I go on?

So can your brain be free from all this, and that freedom is not a reaction, because you understand the nature of authority, you

understand the nature of tradition - that is mere following mechanically accepting, which degenerates the brain. You see that, and therefore you put it away, it is not a reaction. If you react then you back again into the old pattern.

So then one can ask, what is religion. You understand? Only then you can find out. And that implies meditation. May I use that word? Because that word has been used by every kind of guru, and the money-makers of gurus, with their power, position, they teach you, there are many schools in different parts of the world, teaching you meditation - Tibetan meditation, it all sounds so silly, all this, Tibetan, the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Zen, and your own guru invents a particular form of meditation, and you are caught in it. But you never enquire, because you are too greedy to get something, you never enquire what is meditation. What does it mean? Not, how to do meditate. If you ask how to meditate, then it is very simple: do this and don't do that, sit for ten hours on your head - stand on your head - sit in a certain posture, breathe in a certain way, control your mind, thought. And who is the controller to control the thought? Have you asked that? Who is the controller when you want to control your thought in meditation, or in your own business, or in anything else, who is the controller? Isn't he also part of thought? Right? Isn't he? So the controller who is also thought controls thought. You understand the game you play?

So what is meditation? The meditation that we do is born of desire. No? We want to achieve peace of mind - I don't know whatever that may mean. We want to achieve illumination, we want to reach Nirvana, we want to become something. That's part of meditation, climb the ladder - ladder to heaven - which is, climb

the ladder of success, it's the same thing, not much difference: the man who is born a clerk wants to arrive, become the manager; you meditate in order to become, god knows what. So you meditate. Sir, if you can put all that aside, what is meditation? To find that out let's go briefly into what is desire.

What is desire? What is the source of desire? Where does desire spring from? Is desire born from the object perceived? I see a beautiful car, the seeing creates the desire. Right? Please, careful, don't agree with what I am saying. We are going to contradict all that presently, so don't be caught in a trap. Does the object create desire? I see a beautiful house, and I see an extraordinarily intelligent beautiful, dignified man's head, and I say, 'My god, I wish I had that'. So we ought to enquire very carefully into what is desire. Not suppress desire. We are not saying suppress desire, or give in to desire. Like the monks suppress desire, and the others indulge in desire. So we ought together find out for ourselves, for ourselves, not be told, and the speaker is not telling you, for god's sake, he is not telling you, find out what is desire. The object, a car, or a woman, or a beautiful tree, all that you see in a lovely garden, green lawn, the border of flowers, the scent of it, you see all that, and you say, 'My god, I wish I had a garden like that'. Don't you all know that kind of desire? Yes, sir. So we are not suppressing or indulging, we are enquiring into what is desire. If one can understand the nature and the structure of desire, then you can deal with it. You see the car - I am taking that silly example, you can take your own particular example - you see something mechanical, a car, a good watch; seeing, that is visual seeing, then from that seeing sensation - right? - from that sensation what takes place?

Contact, which is part of sensation, then what takes place? Don't repeat it. If you have heard this before from the speaker, don't repeat it, because then that means nothing. Repetition. I saw a parrot once, a beautiful parrot, lovely plumes, it was chattering away what the master had been talking about. And that's what you generally do, repeat, repeat, repeat. So please don't repeat, then you become secondhand human beings without dignity.

So seeing, contact, sensation. Now what takes place after that? Go very slowly, find out. I see this very good watch, a friend of mine gave, I see this in the window. I go inside, examine it, touch it, feel it, feel the weight of it, who made it, and then what happens? Then thought comes in, creates an image and says, 'I wish I had it'. That is, seeing, contact, sensation, then thought immediately creates the image and then that very second when thought creates the image of you in the car, or you having that watch, at that second desire is born. Right? Are we clear on this matter? At least intellectually?

Now if you see that, can there be an interval between seeing, contact, sensation? An interval before thought takes shape, makes a shape of it? You understand? You understand all this? An interval. Can you do it? It's all so rapid. So when you slow it down, like a motion picture, slow it down, then you see everything in detail. And that's desire. So extend the gap. Because you are desire, you are the very structure of thought and desire. So if you understand, if you look into the nature of thought, and your reactions, you can slow the whole mechanism down, very quiet, slow; or you understand this instantly. That requires attention, that requires passion to find out.

So let's go back to meditation. That is, if you have understood, not verbally, if you understand the nature and the structure of desire, then we can go back and find out what is meditation. Is conscious meditation, meditation? You understand my question? Is it? Obviously not. If I consciously sit down for ten minutes a day, or twenty minutes in the morning, twenty minutes in the afternoon, twenty minutes in the evening, then it becomes a relaxation, a siesta, a nice comfortable, enjoyable 'go to bed' - that's what is called, I won't name it, you know all that business. So what is meditation? If you consciously meditate it has a direction, a motive, a desire to achieve. Surely that is not meditation, is it? That's like becoming the clerk, becoming the manager, he is working, working. The two things are the same: you call that business, the other you call religious achievement. Both are exactly the same thing. Do we see that? Gentlemen, do you see, those who meditate? Of course not. That means giving up your pet enjoyment, pet entertainment.

So we are saying, conscious meditation is no meditation because it is born of desire. Therefore it is born out of desire to achieve, to become something, which is the self becoming something. The self, the 'me', becoming god. It sounds so silly. Forgive me for using that word. Then what is meditation, if it is not conscious meditation, then what is meditation? You understand? The word 'meditation' means also to ponder, to think over, and also measure, to measure. That's part of the root meaning of that word, meditation, both in Sanskrit and so on. Now, can your brain stop measuring? You understand? I am this, I will be that. I am comparing myself with you, you are so beautiful, you have grace,

you have brains, you have got quality, depth, you are aesthetically wearing something extraordinary, I am not that. You are measuring, which is comparison. Right? Can you stop comparing? Don't agree, stop comparing, find out what it means to live without a movement of comparison.

So, you understand, love is not a reaction, therefore it is free - not to express what you want, that is a reaction. And free is part of that love. Where there is love there is intelligence, not born out of thought, intelligence is something outside the brain. I won't go into all this, it's too complicated. Compassion. Compassion, love, freedom is outside the brain. I know, I could go into it but there's no time. Because the brain is conditioned, it can't contain this.

So meditation is not conscious deliberate act. There is a totally different kind of meditation which has nothing whatsoever to do with thought and desire. And that means a brain that is really, if I may use the word, empty. Empty of all the things that thought, man has made. And where there is space - because freedom means that, love means that, space, vast, limitless space - and where there is space there is silence and energy. If you are thinking about yourself all day long, which most of us are, then you have reduced the extraordinary capacity of the brain to such a small issue about yourself, therefore you have no space. And so the brain, though it has its own rhythm, not that the speaker is a specialist on brains, but he has lived a long time, studied all the time himself, watched others, the brain has its own rhythm, that can be left alone. But when the brain is silent, not chattering, quiet, utterly, then there is that which is not measurable by words, that which is eternal, nameless.

BROCKWOOD PARK DIALOGUE WITH STAFF & STUDENT 16TH OCTOBER 1983

K: What shall we talk about?

Q: I think during the last talks we talked about the question of intelligence, the bit we have touched on, and how to bring intelligence to our lives so that somehow intelligence operates in our lives. And I wonder if we could pursue that.

K: Right. Any other questions?

Q: When and why will a human being genuinely ask what is intelligence?

K: Why do we ask?

Q: And when do we ask.

K: When do we ask what is intelligence.

Q: Genuinely ask.

K: Yes. Any other questions?

Q: I wonder what is the morning meeting for?

K: Good lord! Any other?

Q: Why do you give these talks?

K: Why do you give talks.

Q: Yes.

K: Would you like me to shut up?

Q: No. What is the purpose, if you have any purpose for giving these talks?

K: Why do I talk? I really - no, I mustn't. Is that all?

Q: How do you know all the things that you are speaking about?

Q: How do you know when you are becoming intelligent?

K: How do you know all that you are talking about? Not from

books, not from other people. The ancient books, or the modern books, modern philosophy and so on. I'll explain all this a little later as we go along. May I? Any other questions?

Q: How do you know when are starting to get intelligence.

K: How do you know what intelligence is.

Q: No, when you start to become more intelligent. How can you tell?

K: We will find out presently. We were driving the other day, nearly two weeks ago, along the Pacific coast of California. It was a lovely morning. It had rained, and generally in California it doesn't rain that part of the year, and it was a very, very lovely morning. There wasn't a cloud in the sky. And the Pacific was blue, light blue, so calm, like a great lake. It was not the same dark blue of the Mediterranean but it was a light blue, and the sun was just touching it, making a great light on the sea. And in front of our car, Mrs Zimbalist was driving, and it was a good car and on the bumper there was a sticker. The sticker said, 'Question authority!' So we are going to question authority this morning. And in questioning authority we are going to find out for ourselves in the understanding of the very complex problem of authority, we begin to see, for ourselves, what is intelligence. Why we follow, why we accept, why we obey, whether authority and the acceptance of authority leads to intelligence. We are going to talk it over together, right?

Do you question authority? You know what that word means? We won't go into the root meaning of that word, the etymological meaning, but authority. There are various kinds of authority. Right? The authority of the government, however rotten that

government that is, the authority of totalitarian governments, the authority of the policeman, the authority of a lawyer, the authority of a judge, the authority of the pope, the authority of a priest. Right? All those are outside, outside the skin. But inwardly, inside the skin, there is the authority of experience, of one's own experience, one's own convictions. Right? Are you following all this? Authority of one's own opinions, authority of one's own convictions - I am convinced I am a great man - that becomes the authority. I am convinced I am a good poet, whereas I may be a rotten poet but I am convinced. I am convinced about so many things. So experience, knowledge become one of the sources of authority. Right? Are you following? Because we are examining a very complex problem, the problem of authority. The authority of the parents, the authority of tradition, the authority of the majority of the voters. Right? The authority of the specialists, the authority of the scientists - there are several of them here - the authority of the Bible and the Indian so-called sacred books, and so on, the Koran, you know what the Koran is, the Bible of the Muslims, the Islamic world, the Mohomaden world - they accept that completely, obey. So there are many, many forms of authority.

Now, what do you question, when you question authority what are you questioning? The authority of rules, the authority of those educators who tell you, inform you? Please discuss this with me. Because in enquiring very carefully step by step and going deeper and deeper into this question you will yourself begin to awaken your own intelligence. You understand? Your own perception, your own how to look at things intelligently, without authority. Is this clear? Have I made my statement clear? You are clear?

Q: Yes.

K: Good! Are you quite sure? The authority that exists outside of us - law, governments, the majority of people who vote for a Prime Minister, the authority of the policeman, the authority of a lawyer, the authority of a surgeon, the scientists who are building the nuclear bomb, the authority of the totalitarian states and so on and on. Outside. Inside of us, I say, I know, that becomes the authority. Or, I am convinced, I am quite sure my opinion is correct. I am quite sure my experience tells me what to do. That becomes the authority. Or, I practise a certain discipline and that has become my authority. You understand? So we are going to question all this. The outer, and the inner; the environment and the psychological realm. Clear?

Now, let's proceed: we are going to question, not say it is right, or wrong, but enquire, question, doubt, ask. Now let's begin. The authority of the policeman. Right? Do you question that?

Q: Isn't it necessary?

K: But question it first. Don't accept, don't say, it is necessary. You see you have already accepted authority.

Q: There's not very much that we can do about it.

K: No, you can't do anything about it.

Q: We don't want that kind of authority.

K: You don't want that kind of authority? Suppose I have been driving in France on the right side of the road, and I come here, I am used to driving a car on the right side of the road in France, in Austria and so on, I come here and I keep to that side. Right? To the right side, and there will be accidents. So the policeman says, 'Hey, get back, go over to the left'. But if I insist on keeping to the

right he will give me a ticket. So I accept the authority of a policeman who tells me, 'You are driving in the wrong lane, please kindly go to the left', because that is the custom, that is the law in this country. Right?

Q: That's quite sensible.

K: That's quite sensible, it is. Now: then the authority of governments. This is much more complex. The authority of the government says, you must become a soldier. In Europe you have to become a soldier for two years; fortunately not for women. In Switzerland, in France, in all the European countries, for two years you have to be a soldier. Do you accept that authority?

Q: If you don't, is there anything you can do?

K: No, let's think it out, look at it carefully. They say, we have to protect our country. Right? In case of war we are prepared to fight the enemy. Have you ever heard of that phrase, a General says, 'We have met the enemy, it is us'. Have you heard of that phrase? Have you understood that phrase? We have met the enemy, it's us! We are the enemy to ourselves. Sorry! So find out. The government says, all governments, the most inefficient government also says, you must fight for the country. There is a tremendous authority. Right? What's your response to that?

Q: If I was in that situation, and I'm asked to join the army, I wouldn't do it.

K: Then you would go to prison.

Q: Oh, I'd go to another country.

K: They won't let you.

Q: Well, there are ways.

K: Oh, yes. But you can never go back to your country again.

Q: Yes.

K: I know several people who have done this. But they can never come back to their own country. Is that the answer? Question, question what you are saying?

Q: Perhaps to some degree it is.

K: I said question, sir. Question what you will do when governments say you must become - you are conscripted, drafted, as they use the word in America, here the word is conscripted, and you are asked to join the army. That is supreme authority. Do you question that?

Q: By question, do you mean where authority comes from?

K: No. The government says you must.

Q: What exactly do you mean by question?

K: I mean by question, we are questioning authority, you understand.

Q: It's not clear, I don't understand.

K: I've explained, sir, haven't I, haven't we? I told you the sticker in California, it said, 'Question authority'. That means do you accept authority. Where do you accept authority, where do you disregard authority? Now the government says to you, as you are a young man, or going to be when you are 18, 19, 20, they say you must become a soldier for two years. And you have alternatives, which are rather boring, or when there is a war all the people, grown up boys and young men are conscripted. There is that authority of the government. Do you question that authority.

Q: Yes, but what can you do about it?

K: You are going to find out. We are going to find out. But first question, is that what you will do when somebody, the

government, asks you to become a soldier? This is a very complex problem this, I don't know if you can go into this. They say, we must protect our country. Right? Right? So you have to question, what is our country.

Q: It's all that we know around us, our language...

K: Which means what?

Q: That which we are familiar with.

K: Take for instance, England says to you, the British government says to you, we are going to be attacked by somebody, and you must train yourself, carry a gun and all the rest of it and fight. Now what's your response? Poor chaps!

Q: You probably don't want to.

K: Probably you don't want to. Then they either, if you are in Russia, or in other countries, they shoot you. Or they say, if you don't want to, what is your reason.

Q: Don't want to kill another man.

K: So is that your conviction?

Q: No.

K: Careful. I am asking a question. He says, you don't want to kill another human being, is that your conviction, is that your religion, are your parents also religious that way? They ask all these questions, old boy, I am not inventing them.

Q: What's the point of killing somebody else?

K: What is the point of killing people? They have done this for five thousand years, and more. The Greeks did it, the Egyptians did it, the Sumerians and Babylonians and so on and so on. Great empires were formed that way, killing people. The British empire which lasted one hundred and fifty years, not like the Persian

Empire, or the Greek, or the Egyptian, the Egyptian civilization for three thousand years, undisturbed. So people have been killing each other for the last five thousand years or more. So what's your answer?

Q: Perhaps you just become a soldier, but not the attitude of doing it for your country, because if you protest, the very fact that you are protesting, in a sense that becomes your own belief.

K: So you become a soldier and you are ready to kill? He said so. He said, you might become a soldier, that means you are prepared to kill for your country. Right? Wait, go slowly. What's your country, what do you mean, your country? We are questioning everything. You understand? What do you mean, your country?

Q: It's the American way, it's the way its done.

Q: I mean you don't go in it patriotically, if you don't perhaps you will be put in prison.

K: You don't go in patriotically, you don't go in for your personal reasons, but you are going to kill people.

Q: We tend not to, we don't kill anybody.

K: Then they kill you. All right. I know a man who became a soldier, he was forced, and the officer said, 'We are going to the front', and this friend of mine said, 'All right, but when I get to the front you are the officer I am going to shoot you first, because you have forced me to that position.' And they said, this man is crazy. And they had the psychologists and the psychiatrists who examined him but he kept on repeating that, so they said, 'Get back home. Don't play tricks like that'.

So you understand, we are questioning. You are not

questioning. I am sent, the Indian government - fortunately they can't, I am too old - they questioned me, as in England, and said, you must become a soldier, and you must protect your country. I questioned and said, 'What is my country, what do you mean my country?' Right? Question it. Who says, it's my country?

Q: They won't listen to that.

K: I am questioning myself, forget what the government say.

Q: What do you mean by your country?

K: That's what I am asking you.

Q: The country you were born in is supposed to be your country.

K: Where you are born.

Q: Yes, that's supposed to be your country.

K: That is supposed to be your country. Why do I say, it's my country?

Q: Because you live there.

K: Yes, and you say, it's your country. And I say, it's my country. Right? Why do we say this? Why do grown-up people say this, and the young people say it, and it has been the tradition of thousands of years - it's my country, I am going to protect it; it's your country, you are going to protect it; let's kill each other.

Q: They want to possess it, and if that possession is threatened by another country who feel possessive to their country, then you obviously are going to try to fight to possess your country.

K: I know. So you are willing to kill for your country.

Q: No.

Q: If we had a war, and Russia took over our country.

K: May I ask your name?

Q: Tessa.

K: Tessa. You are not following step by step into this. What is my country? Why has the world, the earth been divided into my country, your country?

Q: It's always my book, not your book.

K: No, no, question all this, sir, don't... Why have human beings for thousands of years said, this is my country, and that's your country.

Q: Well, you have...

K: Why? Why?

Q: OK. You have dark skin, I have light skin, you speak that language and I speak this language, there's a group of people around me who speak the same language, a group around you speak your language and look the same as you. That's your country and I am in my country.

K: Why have we done this?

Q: Well, because you look different, and language.

K: All right. Are we different?

Q: No, it's just skin.

K: Answer him. I am black.

Q: On the surface, yes.

K: You are pink or blue! I am sorry! I am black and you are pink, or white, or whatever it is. Now for that reason we fight each other?

Q: Yes, and you believe in that.

K: No, no, begin slowly. Do you kill me and I kill you because I am black and you are fairly near approaching white - why?

Q: Yes.

K: Why? No, question, sir. Don't answer, question first.

Q: I don't think so because I think it's my book and it's a very precious book, and my friend said, 'It is my book', and I kill him for my book.

K: Yes. So?

Q: And I think that is not because he is black and I am white.

K: Quite right. So what do you say? Go on. Why do we do that?

Q: Because...

K: Question it, I am questioning you and you are answering, you are not questioning it yourself.

Q: Is it not a natural response to want to possess something?

K: Yes, that's a natural response. Where does it begin, when does it begin? Careful, question, question, don't accept anything natural and say it is natural and stick. Question why it is natural.

Q: I don't think a baby...

K: That's it, begin with a baby. That's quite right, begin with the small baby. You give him a toy and he holds it. Right? And the other baby pulls it away. Haven't you seen this? So there it begins. Mine and yours. And we build this up.

Q: It makes you feel safe, you feel threatened when people want it.

K: That's right. So I am saying we build this up gradually as we grow older, this is mine and that's yours. And I am going to hold to mine and you hold to yours. So what does it all mean? Question this. I say it is my country, and you say it's your country. Question why people say that.

Q: Well perhaps through repetition, through education.

K: Of course, through education, through history, through

propaganda, through everything you come to the point when you are so conditioned you say, 'It's my country and your country'.

Q: Perhaps because...

K: Question. Question first.

Q: Is it not a matter of security.

K: Security. Now you understand what Mr Smith said, he said, it is a matter of security. I feel secure with my family, right, my father, my brother, my sister, my aunts, I feel they will protect me, they are part of me, the family. Then increase it, the community, move it still further, the nation. Right? I identify myself first with the family, then with the community, with the society, then with the nation - I am British. Right? That means I feel secure. Right? Right, we agree to that? You are quite sure? I feel secure when I say I am British, and the Frenchman says, 'I am French'. He is completely secure: the language, the custom, the tradition, the intellectual approach and so on and so on. French, English, and the German says the same thing. Right? That is they all want security, all of them. Right? Agree? You are questioning: they all want security.

Q: And they are willing to kill for that.

K: That's it. So each person says this is my security and your security, so we are going to fight, which means what?

Q: Then your life is threatened.

K: Yes. So there is no security. Right? Look at it carefully first.

Q: So your security has been completely psychological security.

K: That's it. That's it.

Q: Nothing having to do with actually what's happened.

K: That's right. So, now haven't you become intelligent? Right?

You see something. That is, I seek security in the nation, you seek security in your nation, and we are going to fight each other to be secure. And the governments exploit us, people exploit us for that reason. So there is no security as long as there are nationalities.

Q: What can we do about it?

K: Darling, wait.

Q: But we insist that there is security in the nation.

K: No, first see by questioning we have come to this point that when we try to seek security in the family, in the community and so on, in the nation, and you also seek in your own way the nation, and they quarrel when they fight each other, kill each other, security is denied to both of us. Right? So in nationalities there is no security.

Q: How do we actually see that, that there is no security?

K: It is obvious.

Q: Nothing can be done if everybody thinks like that.

K: The vast majority, ninety nine point nine, say yes, we must kill each other to be secure.

Q: OK.

K: Not OK.

Q: No. Could I just say something? You know, if it is so obvious why don't we actually change? I've talked to students and staff after these talks, and they are just as confused as ever. If it really is obvious that there is no security in my belief, my country and so on.

K: Wait a minute, my country. It's an illusion, isn't it? It doesn't exist. I want security, and you want security and we say security lies in my nation, and you say security lies in your nation, and we

are killing each other. Right? The United Nations is like that.

Right? So there is no security in nationalities. Right?

Q: But we see that, but it doesn't change, it is the same, it's my country. I think it is not the security, it is always here.

K: What?

Q: He says it doesn't change after you know it's your security.

K: You change. Don't bother about the rest. You become intelligent. We are talking about intelligence. When you see for yourself there is no security in nationalities, that very perception is intelligence. Right?

Q: But he is saying that he has only partially seen it so when he goes out he still goes on with it.

K: Then you haven't seen it. Be as simple as that. If you don't see it, don't say it's partial. It's like examining a lot of blind people looking at an elephant.

Q: Why do we all say we do see it?

K: Then don't be a nationalist. That's intelligence. Right?

Q: I don't know what intelligence is.

K: You explain it, somebody explain.

Q: Well somebody tell me what intelligence is.

Q: He has just told us.

Q: No, I've already heard what he says, now I want to hear what somebody else says.

Q: What you mean a definition?

Q: No, intelligence, what is it for you?

Q: You mean - well I believe what he says.

Q: No, I don't believe.

K: You don't believe what I say.

Q: No. Would someone care to explain.

Q: I would say it is an action that is not contradictory, somehow intelligence has to be whole, it cannot be fragmented, not that you say something and then you do something completely opposite.

Q: But do you actually live that way?

Q: No.

Q: So it's just a bunch of words.

Q: Yes.

Q: But don't make it is complicated because Krishnaji is just taking one thing and he is talking about nationalism, and he says, if you drop nationalism you are beginning to be intelligent, that's the beginning of intelligence.

Q: Yes, but we always talk about this intelligence, we all want to live intelligently but we never do.

K: It's up to you.

Q: We do that.

Q: Do we really?

Q: From now on.

Q: It's clear that everyone here knows a bit of what is going on, and is a bit intelligent, I think, and still you see the mess in the school. I mean it's nice to be here, but still, exactly the same problems are here as everywhere else.

Q: I can understand it but it's hard to actually do it.

K: If you understand, I have lived in India, and I believe, I am convinced my security is in India, and you are convinced in Pakistan, next door, that your security lies in Pakistan, and we fight each other for our security. Right? Kill each other. You have no security when you kill me, and I have no security. Right? This is

intelligence.

Q: I don't actually see it.

Q: Are you nationalistic? Or are you talking about the subtler issues?

Q: Perhaps, I don't know. I can see it on the surface, to believe in nationalism, there is no security in it, but...

K: All right, let's leave nationalism.

Q: But there is still something, I feel I must feel something to actually see this. You know what I mean?

K: Oh, yes, I understand what you mean. People feel very patriotic, don't they? When this country is attacked, or went to war in the Falklands, people were tremendously very patriotic. And for that reason go and kill somebody.

Q: That's murder.

K: Let's take another thing, perhaps that will explain it.

Q: But if he can't see that one, what is he going to see?

K: What?

Q: If he can't see that as intelligence, what can he see?

K: She is insulting you!

Q: I don't mean to insult him.

K: She says, if you can't see that what the hell can you see! So let's take something else. We are questioning authority. In Christianity - I am not condemning Christianity, I am just examining it - in Christianity belief and faith are essential. Right? Why have they made belief and faith so important?

Q: Well according to the Christian belief, how to live eternally.

K: We are questioning, what does that mean?

Q: It is another kind of security.

K: Yes. Right? If I believe in Jesus, if I believe in the Virgin Mary, if I believe, have complete faith, I feel safe. Right? And the Indian, for five thousand years, says, I believe not in Jesus, but I believe in my own god. You come along and say, what nonsense this is. It is just a belief. You can invent any belief and find security in that. Right? So is there security in belief?

Q: No.

K: Right? Why do you say, no?

Q: Because...

K: Why do you say, no, question why do you say, no.

Q: Because if you believe that, and I believe this, there is no security, because we will blow each other into smithereens.

K: It is the same thing with nationalities. Right? That's all. So, understand now, a vast majority of the western world accept this, belief and faith, in all their church and all that, they believe that, very strongly. Which means what? They create an illusion, an image, and believe in that. Which means they are living in illusion. And illusion gives them strength. They feel safe in illusions. Right? Now have I got illusions? Have you got illusions?

Q: Perhaps...

K: Wait, question it.

Q: No, I've read that most of my thoughts are controlled by the subconscious, that which we are unaware of.

K: We will come to that, old boy, presently. I am asking you - I have asked that question, answer it. Do you have beliefs so strongly which give you comfort, you feel, my god, at last I have found something that gives me satisfaction. That means, are you living in illusions. Right? Have you got illusions?

Q: Yes.

K: Question why?

Q: If you think I am a good student, and you think you are a good student, but then you see another person who is a better student, perhaps a bit quicker, and you get jealous.

K: Yes, go on.

Q: And so you definitely - if you try to get away from the jealousy by suppressing it, it doesn't work.

K: No. I am asking you, old boy - if I may call you old boy - I am asking you, have you got any illusions.

Q: Yes.

K; Question why you have.

Q: Because...

K: Question. First realize, first become aware that you have illusions. Right? I have illusions of my country, I have illusions that I am a Christian, I worship and all the rest of it. That's an illusion. And have you any other kind of illusions?

Q: We all have ideas or illusions of what it is to be orderly.

K: Go on. So are ideas illusions? Go on, sir, question. Are ideals illusions?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes, because they never deal with what is happening.

K: That's right.

Q: It's always something that you want to be, compared to something that you are.

K: So ideals, ideas. Right? And your beliefs are illusions. Why do you have them?

Q: Because if feels secure.

K: Yes. You have found security in illusions.

Q: Everybody thinks.

K: Yes, everybody thinks but I am asking you.

Q: He has something too and sometimes I think.

K: Not sometimes, no. I am asking you now, have you got illusions of such a kind with which you are living? Now, please understand why we are questioning. We are questioning all these things by understanding them, realizing their nature and becoming intelligent. If a man lives in a kind of false illusions he is not intelligent. Right? So we are trying to find out what is supreme intelligence. Supreme intelligence is to have no illusions. That's only the beginning of it. Right? Have you got illusions.

Q: Well I have made an illusion of intelligence. I think that if I find out what intelligence is I will be completely by myself.

K: Oh no. I might join you.

Q: You know, and that scares the hell out of me.

K: All of us might join you, and say, by Jove what an intelligent man, let's find out how he got this intelligence. So do you, all of us in this room, do you have illusions?

Q: Aren't your words illusions for us?

K: What?

Q: Aren't your words illusions for us.

Q: That depends on you.

Q: Isn't what he is saying an illusion for us.

K: If you accept it. But if you begin to question your illusions, not my illusions.

Q: You don't talk about stopping your illusions or suppressing them, just questioning them.

K: Yes. If you suppress them they will pop up again. Like Kleenex!

Q: Isn't it true also that many of our illusions breed from our conditioning?

K: Yes.

Q: And what I wonder is - OK, this is just for myself only, that I've grown up with an exposure to what you have been saying since I've been a baby.

K: So, wait a minute, as you said, do not all these illusions indicate our conditioning.

Q: Yes.

K: Now question your conditioning.

Q: Well I think...

K: First look at it carefully. What's your conditioning?

Q: I haven't had that religious or political conditioning.

K: No, you may not have religious or political conditioning, but you are conditioned. Right? Question that. What do you mean by conditioning? Are you conditioned?

Q: By my own experience even.

K: That's right. Then you begin to question your experience.

Q: I am trying. It's so difficult to separate it.

K: No. By questioning, not saying I am right or I am wrong, by enquiring, exploring, your mind which has become dull through conditioning begins to quicken - not quicken, it becomes more alive. Now will you all do this? You are here at Brockwood not only to be academically excellent, but also psychologically supremely intelligent. Right?

Q: That's an illusion.

K: What's that?

Q: It's an illusion, because it doesn't work.

K: No, no, no. Now just listen. Is it an illusion that you have to be academically good?

Q: If you work hard enough you can be academically good.

K: You can be excellent academically, can't you? By studying.

Q: Yes, but...

K: Wait, wait. Right? Studying, applying, paying attention to your beastly little books.

Q: Yes, but some of it's interesting.

K: What?

Q: Some of the work that you do is interesting.

K: You have to be because if you are excellent academically you may get a good job. Money. You have to earn money. Now psychologically, can't you be supremely excellent? Which means you live intelligently therefore there is never conflict and so on. I won't go into all that.

Q: So we have to think about everything we do, all our reactions.

K: Yes. You have to watch what you think, why you think, why you have such emotions, why you separate yourself from them, and so on. You become aware, you become sensitive, alive.

Q: We try.

Q: Yes, most people in this room have actually tried this, but after a period of time we forget about it.

K: Can you forget hunger?

Q: No. But we become aware of...

K: No, don't go off. Can you forget danger?

Q: No. But that's all the result of the intelligence of the body.

K: Now just wait a minute. Can you forget danger?

Q: No.

K: Sir, why, why don't you forget it? Question it. I am questioning you, and you answer.

Q: I don't want to die. If you are pointing a gun at me.

K: Please, you know what danger is.

Q: Yes.

K: Do you forget it?

Q: No.

K: Why not?

Q: I think you do.

Q: OK, physical danger. I don't forget.

K: Is not nationalism danger?

Q: Yes.

K: So you say, I am not a nationalist, I don't belong to any country. That's a danger, why do you forget it? You can't.

Q: But we do.

K: You do?

Q: Often.

Q: This is all very difficult.

K: No, no. You see you are not questioning, you are saying something without - I am asking you to question everything you do, think, ask.

Q: Well perhaps that is not possible with modern conditions.

K: That's an excuse. You can question.

Q: It seems the past year I have been really questioning, everything I think. And sometimes I feel I am just going in circles.

K: Of course. But you are not questioning thinking.

Q: Well, I am questioning that right now. I am questioning that it seems that within our intellect we try to become more aware of our thoughts, and our it's like our thoughts are aware of our self.

K: Yes, quite right. But, look, I begin to question nationalism. Right? Then I come to the point I question my thinking, thinking itself.

Q: So it's like the intellect is only an instrument, and it's like it becomes sharper and sharper, to a certain point it just becomes - well, there is nothing more you can do with it.

K: It becomes sharper and sharper, though at the end of it it becomes dull.

Q: It's...

K: Are you interested in what I say? The more you sharpen an instrument it gradually wears off and becomes dull. Right? A chisel, keep on polishing and polishing and using it, it becomes dull. So question why your mind is becoming dull by merely going round and round.

Q: Because it is all thought.

K: No, you are not questioning it. I get depressed - suppose I do, I have no depression, I never have been depressed. Suppose I am depressed. I say, yes, I am very depressed. I accept it. I don't say, now why am I depressed? Is it I am thinking about myself? Is it I can't get what I want? Is it somebody is better than me? Somebody is more beautiful than me? Somebody is more rich? And so on and so on. Is that the reason why I am depressed. Right? If I am, then I say, why am I doing this. You follow? Move. Right sir? Are you doing it?

Q: Sir, I think there must be a result or a decision from this very questioning, so shall we go on questioning.

K: I don't quite understand.

Q: The questioning brings about a result. Should we question the result as well?

K: Of course.

Q: When we react.

K: You stop questioning only when there is nothing more to question! That's not a clever statement, but see what happens: that when you begin to question seriously, step by step, then there is a point where there is only that state of mind that has no problems at all. I won't go into all this. But you don't start. You want to reach the end instead of beginning.

Q: Sir, do you say then that if you are depressed, question it, or just be aware of it? If you are depressed you say we should question it, or just be aware of it?

K: Yes. I am depressed. I'll show it to you. I want to know why I am depressed. I don't say, yes I am depressed. I say, why am I depressed. Is it that I have eaten the wrong thing? I have not slept properly? Or I am depressed because I can't get what I want? Or I can't - I am not as good as you, or I am not as clever as you. Right? Which means I am always comparing. Why do I compare? Is it possible not to compare? You see I am questioning all this. Can I live without comparison?

Q: If we ask continually why, can't that process just reinforce the whole...

K: Of course.

Q:... ego thing we are trying to question.

K: That's why I am saying it must be done with intelligence. So you begin with the most ordinary things.

Q: And that intelligence we don't have. We try to get intelligence and we have to use intelligence to get our intelligence.

Q: Exactly.

K: Exactly.

Q: It's like, what intelligence are you talking about? I mean the description of intelligence that we understand is that intelligence is not limited by thought, or experience.

K: Yes.

Q: So how can I use the intelligence I have right now that is limited by thought and experience? I mean it seems so...

K: No. Have you got intelligence now?

Q: I think I do sometimes, yes.

K: Not sometimes. You see, now why don't you question that. Have you got intelligence now?

Q: I don't think I do, no. No.

K: So begin.

Q: Not the kind of intelligence that I want to have.

K: Begin. Begin. Are you nationalistic, or are you seeking safety in your little family, seeking security in your ideas. Sir, I am doing all the questioning, you're not.

Q: What if you seek security in some things but not in others?

K: What?

Q: If you seek security in some things, but not in other things?

K: So what do you seek security in? In your looks? In your family? In some god? In some illusion? You see, I am doing it all. Sir what I am pointing out very simply is, most of us are so

conditioned, right, that we become very dull. We repeat what somebody has said; or we read a great deal and are very knowledgeable, but you may be stupid. So I say, find out for yourself what is intelligence. And you can find out that by asking, questioning, doubting. You can't doubt everything: there is electricity, that light is there, you can't doubt it. Right? The tree, you can't doubt it, it is there. Right? The governments are there, the policeman is there, all the churches, all the things in the churches are there. So you begin to question.

Q: Your anxiety is there.

K: Yes, or the scientists.

Q: He said, your anxiety.

K: Anxiety. All right. Question anxiety. Why are you anxious? The majority of people are anxious. Right? Because they have no money, or they are anxious their husband may be looking at somebody else. Right? Anxiety. Are you anxious, any of you?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes.

K: You are anxious?

Q: Yes.

K: Why?

Q: Because of different things.

K: Tell me one.

Q: No.

Q: Isn't it the desperateness for security is very forceful, that the atmosphere of questioning is not there.

K: Tunki, I can't hear you.

Q: What he says is that the desperate search for security

prevents actual questioning.

Q: So how can questioning...

K: Now just a minute, Tunki, when I am very anxious I can't question. Right? But then there must - I am not anxious all the time. There is anxiety when I wake up, and as I take my coffee or tea, or whatever it is, that anxiety recedes a little bit, then I begin to question.

Q: In this questioning of why, would it not be important to question without trying to find an answer. It seems that if we try to find an answer we just give ourselves excuses.

K: Of course. When you question and find an answer, question that answer. You follow, sir? Learn the art. It's not just that you begin to question everything, learn the art of questioning. You stop questioning sometimes and say, yes, by Jove, why am I questioning. Look without questioning. You follow? Learn about it.

Q: People become discouraged with their questioning because they don't get something.

K: Yes sir. They get discouraged, disappointed, hurt.

Q: Because they want something that will give them security.

K: Yes. Or, I have been secure and you have taken it away from me. I become anxious. What I am saying sir - just two minutes, just listen.

I saw that sticker on that bumper in California, and I said, I wonder if the gentleman, or the person who put that sticker on the bumper really questions, or it's just a slogan. You understand what I am saying. It is just a slogan, but he never questions, says, why am I doing this? Why am I thinking this? Why do I believe? So

questioning is a great art. Right? It isn't that I question, I move, I see the subtleties of it. Right? See the depth of it. And the beauty of enquiry, see bit by bit, how extraordinarily complex this thing is: why man has lived in illusions for thousands of years, if it is not Christian gods then there are Muslim gods. Right? If it isn't that, there have been gods by the thousand for the last five thousand years and more. Some people, like the Buddhists, deny god, but there is always this search, longing for something beyond all this misery. Right? All this conflict, all this ugliness in the world. So they invent something and they worship it.

Q: Like enlightenment.

K: Yes, quite right. Enlightenment is not something you experience. Or something that somebody gives you. That's all such nonsense. So as I was saying, sir, find out the art of questioning. Learn a great deal about it. You spend a great deal of time, don't you, in mathematics, learning mathematics. Right? Or geography, history, or whatever it is, and you don't give even ten minutes to this. And so you become excellent in one direction and dull in the other direction.

What time is it?

Q: One o'clock.

K: I think we had better stop, don't you. No? Would you like to try something?

Q: Yes.

K: Sit very quietly - just a minute, before you sit very quietly, absolutely quiet, with your eyes closed and find out what you are thinking. And why you are thinking that particular thought, or a series of thoughts. Try it! And find out if your brain can be so

quiet, without a single thought. Don't go to sleep though!

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST BRAIN SEMINAR 8TH JUNE 1984

A: Some of the unresolved questions in the area of brain research lie in perception, memory and the nature of intelligence. You, Krishnamurti, have explored these questions without any scientific background and yet have indicated that thought is limited. You have also indicated that there is an intelligence beyond the ordinary functioning of the brain. As long as there is psychological conditioning, which is the self, this intelligence cannot act.

I would like to introduce you to Dr. Shainberg, he is a psychiatrist from the United States. Dr. Peat is a physicist, writer and film maker from Canada. Professor Bergstrom is a neuro-physiologist at the University of Helsinki, Finland. Professor Varela is a neuro-biologist at the Max Planck Institute for brain research in Frankfurt. I am a neuro-biologist and teacher at Brockwood Park.

One important instrument in the understanding of the brain has been thought. I was wondering if we could discuss whether thought can help us to understand the brain, and the complexity of life.

K: Do I start right off?

A: If you wish.

K: Sir, can one understand one's own brain and the activities and the complexity of the brain without operating on animals, dead bodies and so on? Can one observe the very complex structure and nature of the brain in oneself, rather than seek it externally, outside? Is that possible? I feel it is possible if one can watch very carefully, objectively, without any bias the reactions, the biological

responses and the inward urges and temperaments and idiosyncrasies, the whole complexity of human existence.

To approach this very, very complex problem, if one has a complex mind then it is not possible to understand complexity, but if one can approach it very simply. I mean by simplicity, without compulsion, without will, without a direction, motive, just to watch the whole operation of one's own activities and so on. And then I think it is possible to examine, or to observe the activity of one's own brain without seeking it externally.

C: What do you mean by understand?

K: By observing, I don't mean understand. By watching very carefully the complexity of oneself. What is the operation of thought, how thought arises, what is the cause of it, the origin of thought and the activities both externally, technologically, the moment of thought and the limitation of thought.

B: When you say, is it possible to understand the brain, do you mean only thought and psychological reaction, or do you mean things like the fact that I can see the glass. Perception, do you mean, as well?

K: Yes, perception, surely.

B: And the use of language?

K: Surely. Linguistics, all that. The whole complexity of human endeavours, actions and feelings, all that, imagination, the whole content of that.

B: And learning.

K: Watching.

B: Watching and being able to learn something new. Being able to learn and work in a totally new situation.

K: Would you call it learning? What is there to learn by just watching?

E: Well that seems to me precisely where there seems to be a fundamental distinction between merely observing, not merely, observing, completely observing...

K: Yes, without the me.

E: ...without the me, and a notion of creating a way of understanding how that observation comes to be, which is traditionally what western thinking has done, including science, creating what one can call a model, a process, a theory, a law, whatever. Now would that endeavour be out in the approach you are proposing?

K: I don't quite understand out, what do you mean?

E: Would not be pursued, would be left behind. That actually coming up with a theory or a model that would explain how does it come that we see what we see.

K: Theory or model. Is it necessary to have a theory and model to see what is actually going on?

E: I wouldn't say it is necessary to see what is going on. But it seems to be necessary, as far as I can understand it, to understand why do I see what I see. If one has the inclination of asking the question beyond the seeing, why do I see what I see.

K: Why do you see what you see, why do I feel what I feel.

E: Yes, why do I see blue when I see blue. Very simple questions like that, which are the ones that I have been concerned with.

K: Yes, I understand. Is it we have all called that book, book.

E: Right.

K: And I accept that. We accept it, all of us. That thing is called a book. And that thing is called a table. But a computer can't call it a table immediately.

E: But then you can ask yourself a question why the computer can't and we can. How are we made different?

K: Because we have got the capacity to see anything, four legs, or two legs, or one leg, a table, instantly.

C: But what is that capacity?

E: This is the point.

C: What is the capacity to do it, and then what is the relationship of that capacity - in other words, what is the relationship of your capacity to say, "That is a book", to your capacity to say, "It is a table"? What is your capacity to see it is a table?

A: Well perhaps I think we should go to the very beginning question. You introduced the question of observation somehow, which was different from theorizing about something. I think perhaps it would be good to clarify what we mean by observing something.

K: Shall we do that sir?

E: I felt that he clarified it very well. I felt that I understood what he meant by observing.

C: Well can you tell me what you think he meant?

E: All right, I'll try! I think he meant by observing completely bracketing a preassumed understanding and going into a mode of not being self-centred but of being with the object or with the movement without any precondition. To the extent that that is possible then there is an experience, there is an observation.

K: Sir, does that imply to observe there must be no conditioning?

E: Yes, I think I understand that.

A: We have to go slowly here because somehow you mentioned an observation without the me. It doesn't seem for me so clear because whenever I am looking at something there seems to be the separation between my observing and something. There seems to be this division in the brain.

K: Is that our conditioning?

A: It seems to be one of them. Why is that?

K: There is the see-er and the seen.

A: Yes.

K: The observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experience.

B: Well turning it the other way from what Professor Varela was saying, I would like to know what you think the relationship is between the theory and observation?

A: Well this is precisely where I wanted him to move.

K: I don't think there is any theory.

B: Well all right. You accept therefore that the endeavour you are proposing would be a radical departure from what has been all of the models of knowledge from the west.

K: Yes sir. I may be wrong.

B: No, but this would not have anything...

K: In observing why should I have a theory about it?

E: Well it seems to me - may I try just for a moment?

K: Yes, please.

E: When I look at that question it feels that there is something

inside me that by itself is inquisitive about why is it, how comes this is the way it is. Isn't it interesting that the paper is white and book is blue, isn't it interesting, why isn't it red?

K: Oh, there is a red book there.

E: Yes but why is that red and not this one red?

K: We have called that red.

E: Yes, but why have we called that red? What is the process from which that comes about?

K: Yes. What is the process.

E: That is the natural inquisitiveness that leads one into building this sort of theory, which eventually, for example, might allow me to build a machine, which would have a mind, with big quotation marks, with thoughts which could say, "Oh, that is a red book and that is a blue book", just at the same time when I would say it.

K: Yes.

E: I would consider that interesting. That is what interests me in science.

K: That is not very interesting.

E: No.

K: Go on sir!

E: I find it interesting.

K: All right sir, go ahead. I thought you said that was not very interesting.

E: No, no, I find it interesting. That is why I said when you asked do we need a theory at all, I said not really but there is this inquisitiveness that seems to constantly come up of asking the question of how is it like that, how can we understand that, how can we have an image, a representation of the process where that

comes up?

C: I don't think you are saying enough. I wish you would say more. It is not just the theory because you are inquisitiveness but the theory also functions to establish for you and for me the interrelationship between these issues, therefore you are not just looking - because this will ultimately come down to our question of what is the relationship of theory to observation - but your theory function is a way to help you to distinguish red, white and blue and why you are seeing it, and therefore you have an interdigitation of many different aspects of your curiosity.

E: We are talking about perception and it is not clear if we are talking about perception as psychological perception. But if we just ask how you see the glass and Krishnamurti has said it is possible to explore the whole mechanism of seeing the glass of water by one can observe oneself doing it. All the other scientists would say that is nonsense, that can't be possibly be true. There must be many levels of operation which are purely mechanical, which we never can have any direct experience of, at the level of the eye and the optic nerve. And Krishnamurti seems to be saying something different but I am not sure if I understand that he is saying something much more radical than that. We must be aware of every level of the process.

D: Coming back to the original question about the brain, understanding the brain as such, or dissecting it. So if we see from the point of view of the brain surgeon, there exists as a matter of fact two kinds of brain. The whole brain, which sees red or blue and so on; and then the other brain is the brain which consists of the parts, the cells, molecules and so on. And the physiologist

looks, and here comes the theory, experimenting, dissecting, theorizing and so on, looks at the brain which consists of the parts. And then the other way - now I am coming to the original question - we had to face as physiologists also that brain which perceives, which is only one me, or whatever the individual calls itself, and that is another way. I always think that we have to distinguish between those two. And the first will be the theoretical brain, with fragments, parts and so on, and the other will be the human brain.

K: Sir.

D: And therefore I think we can really know about brain without dissecting it.

E: That we cannot?

D: That we can study the brain as a whole.

K: Why do we divide the brain at all?

E: Yes, that's the question.

K: Why not treat it as a whole movement?

C: I don't have anything against that. That doesn't resolve the issue of whether we need a theory for the observation.

K: No, wait sir.

C: Because I can have a theory which is a holistic theory, which deals with the brain as a totality.

K: Not a holistic theory but it is so.

A: But I think the theory comes into being in order to organize the certain facts that you have. You have to give certain coins and logic to the facts that you are accumulating. And I think Professor Varela said something very interesting, you take for example a child. From the very beginning it seems this natural tendency to discover things and to attribute meaning to things.

D: But a theory cannot be holistic, there are always parts, a collection of parts.

E: Oh, that would take us in another direction.

K: By collecting all the parts you make the whole?

E: No. Of course not. I agree absolutely but what I mean by holistic theory is a theory that has built in itself the awareness of its fragmentedness.

K: All right.

E: Which is quite a different thing.

K: Can we put it this way: one is aware that we are fragmented human beings - right? Those fragments we are trying to bring all of them together, and that doesn't make the whole.

E: Absolutely.

K: So.

A: How is one to proceed then?

K: You see the obvious.

A: It doesn't follow from that

K: I mean spokes. You collect all the spokes of a wheel and the spokes don't make the wheel, you have to put it together - right? I don't quite see the difficulty in this.

B: To put the wheel together you also need some technical knowledge as well as the perception of the whole.

K: Yes.

B: And where does the technical knowledge come from?

K: Is that what we are trying to do? Technical knowledge, how to put the brain together?

B: No but you say to understand the brain, the technical knowledge is not really important.

K: I didn't say that sir.

B: Oh.

E: I said, can we.

B: Can we, without the dissection, I don't mean the whole of seeing all the parts inside.

E: For my part I can say that for me is a fascinating question because there is nothing that I would like more than to be able to ask the questions about how knowledge works without having to disrupt an embryo. It sort of pains my heart that we have to carry on with this knowledge by disrupting life. I don't like it. As a matter of fact I don't want to do it anymore.

K: No, sir.

E: But still the inquisitiveness is there.

K: Now wait a minute sir. Where shall we begin, we have put some many things?

D: There is one reason why we should know a little bit about brain cells and so on, and that is the diseases and so on, and that must be one of the reasons why they began to fragmentize this.

A: Perhaps we could come back and stick to one question. We started by saying that can the brain understand itself, what does that mean really? And is it possible that thought can understand the brain? I think we should stick to that somehow.

K: Would you say, sir, the brain is the centre of thought, feelings, physical responses, biological responses. And also the brain is the centre of one's 'consciousness', fears, pleasures, anxiety, all that, sorrow, the whole of that consciousness, if you will accept that word, is in the brain. It is not out there.

B: I am afraid I would have to disagree.

K: Oh, delighted!

B: I don't think that thought or consciousness is in the brain.

That this is precisely one the greatest mistakes...

K: Wait sir. Thought is outside.

B: It is neither outside nor inside, there is a quality of relationship which thought...

K: Wait a minute. Then we have to enquire what is thought. Can we begin with that? Would you agree?

E: Yes, let's do that.

K: Let's do that. What is thought? What is thinking?

B: Do you want us to answer?

K: It is a discussion.

B: OK. I would say that thought belongs to a form of action which is related to separating precisely, to separating a unit from its context. That any separation of a unit from its context is a form of cognition or thought, at a fundamental level. Therefore the thought cannot exist without the relationship between that which is distinguished and that which it is distinguished from.

C: Wait a second. Would you say that thought is an event that arises... or is it some sort of process event which articulates the separation and arrives at the awareness - in other words the arrival of thought is the articulation of the separation of thought?

B: It is an emergent quality.

C: So it is not the no-go separation, it is an emerging of that.

B: Yes.

K: It is emerging.

C: Yes, but emerging not a separation at the instant but...

B: ...it is imminent in the action.

K: It is emerging, being born.

C: That is an important distinction.

K: Yes sir. Being born all the time.

B: Exactly.

K: From where?

B: What is the source?

K: Wait, wait. Thought is being born, emerging, growing, coming and going - right? From where?

C: Wait a minute, that may be the wrong question: from where, because you have already defined a definition.

K: No, no.

C: You have separated out process, you have made a distinction, by saying where you have got a definition.

K: No, I want to know the cause. Put another word if you like.

C: I would prefer what is the action that arrives in thought?

K: Wait a minute sir. Then you have to ask what is action.

B: What is this movement.

K: Yes, what is this whole movement.

E: OK When I inspect that question for myself, in myself, the only answer I can give to it is, its an unlimited frontier, that is, the moment I am in thought I have obscured for myself that which I am asking. Therefore the source of movement, or the source of thought is an unlimited space which is beyond thought.

K: I wonder!

E: All right. What do you wonder?

K: I wonder what is the relationship between thought and action? That's what we are discussing, aren't we.

E: Yes. But thought occurs, thought happens. I find myself in

thought.

C: Therefore it is action.

K: Sir, you just now said thought is born, comes into being - right? It must have some causation.

E: Yes, but in order to see the causation I have to put myself out from thought.

K: We will see. Sir we ought to enquire whether it is possible to observe the causation without the observer, who is the outside - right?

C: Right.

E: Right, absolutely. And the question as you phrase it.

K: Wait. So can one observe the cause without the observer? Can the causation be observed without the outsider or the observer, the witnesser, which means the observer, the person who perceives, is not the observed the observer?

C: Say that again.

K: I can't repeat. I'll put it another way. There is a perception of you sitting there and I sitting here. When I see you, you have been introduced to me and so on, I remember all that memory of it, it is the observer. Can I look at you without the observer? Without the knowledge of you? You understand? Of course I can.

A: I think we have to go slowly there, it is a great step.

E: Yes, you can.

K: Of course. Therefore the observer is the observed.

E: Yes.

K: There is no separation. There is separation only when there is the observer different from the observed.

B: Absolutely.

E: So that is an observation.

K: That is real observation without the observer. The observer is the past, memory, knowledge, experience. All the observer is the past. Can I look at something without the past? Of course it is possible.

D: I don't know.

K: Just a minute, let me finish. And then what is action? You understand?

E: What is action for that...

K: What is action. Leave that for the moment.

E: OK

K: What is action? When there is no observer - right? - what is action?

A: Well I would like to come back to the question. You see why are we normally doing this separation between what we observe, the brain is normally doing that anyhow. So perhaps one could say it might be normal for the brain.

K: That may be our tradition, that may be our education, that may be we have been told from childhood that is different from you, you are different from me.

C: Yes, but when you were introduced to him your perception of him at that instant was the observation without the observer. Then now when you look...

K: I begin to accumulate. The brain begins to accumulate the knowledge about him. He says he won't operate anymore, so I say, "By Jove, is he..." you know all the rest of it. Forget. No, my point is to put it much simpler: not to record.

C: You did record.

K: I did but that is very simple.

C: You didn't record, then you did record.

K: No sir. No. Just a minute. In my relationship with you, with you all, I have recorded - suppose I have recorded - then that record becomes the observer; but if there is no record there is only seeing, observing.

C: Suppose we say the brain is recording.

K: I see. No, sir, is it possible not to record? I know the mechanism of recording.

C: But we have agreed that it is possible to observe without recording.

K: Is that a theory or.?

C: No.

K: Actuality?

C: Yes. It is possible.

K: No, the moment you say it is possible you have made it a theory.

B: I think we have to agree it is a theory for us.

C: I don't think we are being honest.

K: Of course sir.

C: We are just saying yes, but we don't really believe that, no.

A: You see for example I don't know what you would say.

Normally in science there is a person doing science and to a certain extent one could say that this division between the observer and the observed is necessary to a certain extent. Right? When you are dealing with some experimental outside world. So now it doesn't necessarily follow that psychologically we are doing exactly the same.

K: I understand sir. After all as a human being with the result of fifty thousand years - right? - tremendous accumulation of knowledge, experience, all that, I am that. And that is looking at something else, so separating itself constantly.

E: Yes, but go slowly. You see this is precisely the point that this separation has to be sustained by an ongoing process which has constant breakdowns. And the point of those breakdowns there is the closing the gap. So in my perception of you right now I am constantly having gaps or flashes of this observer.

K: I say why is this contradiction all the time.

E: No, no, this is precisely the point. Why do we have to see contradiction there?

K: One can explain it.

E: I was actually going back to something you raised. That it seems we have both of them, observation with the observer and...

K: At one level, yes. If I met you again tomorrow I can't re-introduce, it would be silly. But at that level it is necessary - right? But at a deeper level, why should I carry all the memory of meeting you, why should there be a recording of it at all. I meet you, finished.

E: You have just answered the question by saying if you did one without the other, if you just met me without accumulation then tomorrow we would have to go through it again.

K: Sir that is insane.

E: Therefore both of them are necessary.

K: Yes, at one level.

C: I have never heard you use those words 'level'. What do you mean by levels and what is the relationship between levels in your

terms?

K: I think it is fairly simple.

C: Well I am stupid I don't understand!

E: That makes two of us!

K: Sir, I need to know how to write a letter - right? There knowledge is necessary, to drive a car or anything. Physically to do anything I must have a great deal of information, knowledge and accumulated memory and so on. Right? Psychologically, if you don't like to use that word, inwardly, why should I accumulate? Why should there be accumulation?

A: Yes but if I understood what you were saying, Francisco and you, even when you say that the brain does not record there is still a process of recognition, you see, which necessarily must involve certain levels of memory.

K: We said that. We said that.

A: So what do you mean by, when the brain does not record?

K: Is that possible first of all psychologically not to record? You understand my question? You say something brutal to me, why should I record it? This recording is the self.

B: Suppose I said that to see anything there has to be a great accumulation. You could say there could be no perception without the accumulation and accumulation includes the actual structure of the brain that has evolved over millions of years, that is in a sense a form of memory. Matter is born in certain connections and that is preserved over a very long time. So I could say that there is no perception without so-called accumulation of memory and knowledge.

K: Of course, sir, we agree, we have stated that.

B: So without it there is no perception and this is something that always continues. And is this different from psychological recording?

K: That is what we are asking.

A: That is an important question to clarify.

K: Sir, we made it clear just now, didn't we?

E: Absolutely.

K: That we need knowledge - if I am a carpenter I need a great deal of knowledge. The quality of the wood, the grain and the instruments, and so on and so on. That is necessary. I don't object to that. That is so, otherwise we can't live. But at the inward level, inward - forget the word, throw the word out! Inwardly

C: What is inward?

K: The feeling, the psyche - you should know!

B: Is there a connection between the two? Are you pulling the two apart and saying that is the psychological, that's the practical?

K: No, no. I see knowledge is necessary, and also I am questioning whether inwardly, psychically, psychologically - any word you use - inside the skin as it were, why should there be any recording at all?

C: OK.

K: Just a minute sir. This recording inwardly is the divisive process. The divisive process is the self, the me and the not me, which is creating havoc in the world - right? That's all. Let me finish.

Is the mechanism which has gone on for centuries the me and the not me, can that mechanism stop so that there is no me inwardly? The me being the self and all the rest of it, that's all. This

has been not only a question for the scientists, but for the religious people, the serious ones, not the phoney ones. The real religious people have said, can there be no self at all, and live in this world, not go off into monasteries or run away to some kind of fanciful entertainment. Actually live without the self. That's all. Which requires a further statement, which is: is it possible not to record inwardly, psychically, and all that? I say it is possible. You may say, "You are a nut, you are crazy", but that is all right, we will discuss it.

D: There is I think a stage in the development of the child, you see very, very early child, possibly a child can have this.

K: You see it already in the child. Give him a toy and you try to take it and he says, "It is mine".

D: But I think before that stage, a child at one or two years, but then comes the time when it is mine, but I think they live together, they are one with the mother and so on, so there might be...

K: Sir, I have read somewhere, or been told, I am not a reader, I have been told by scientists who are looking at the babies that the babies already know when a visitor is friendly to the mother or not.

D: Yes.

K: Already, you understand sir?

D: Already.

K: By the atmosphere, by the feeling, by the mother's shrinking, or seeing the mother.

E: But in your question, one of the reasons why it has so many sides to it, as a brain researcher, as a scientist, it seems reasonable to say that the brain is organized so as to construct a stable world, therefore to solidify, to be caught, in your words. That is what it is

there for.

K: I understand sir.

E: I mean this is what his history has been. Now it is only when it comes to human beings where this question is posed. Then we can ask ourselves the question, is this no recording possible, as a swimming against the current of natural history, as it were.

C: Of evolution.

E: Of evolution. Because natural history goes the other way. And at the moment the possibility arises and it is impossible to unlearn evolutionary wise so as to come to the state of living in the world without recording, without self, and yet be a functional human being, able to brush your teeth.

K: Of course. I said that.

E: Yes, I know. My feeling is that is a question that can only be answered by exploring it from actual experience of human beings. And the history seems to say, yes, it is possible. We have examples and we know people who seem to have done that. Now from a point of view of what that implies for the brain is a fascinating point.

K: Therefore could we put the question differently? The brain has evolved through time, centuries, a million years, or forty million years, or whatever it is, forty thousand. And it is probably at its highest level, as much as it can. And that involves time, duration. What is time? Right? Unless we understand what is time I can go on indefinitely - right? People have asked too, is there an end to time, not science fiction, actually. Right? Now what is time, apart from the clock? Cut that out. Time is the past and the present and the future. So time is contained in the now, all time. So the

future is now.

E: Yes.

K: No, sir, it is not a theory.

E: No, I understand.

K: The future is now and the past is now - right? Then what is action? If action is, "I will do", the future, or "I have done", it is not action. Action is now. The very word 'act' means now - right? So can the brain which has evolved - you follow my question - go on sir.

E: The description of saying the brain has evolved, is already the trap.

K: We said that, it is a fact. I am not denying that. But if there is no radical revolution psychologically I will tomorrow be exactly, modified, as today.

C: I would like to come back to where we were at the very beginning of this because I see a connection here, which is the fact that at the level at which you talked about, the so-called inward level...

K: Leave the word level, I said cut it out!

B: Inwardly.

C: ...inwardly, there is an action. Now at the beginning we talked about the fact that imminent in that inward action is thought, and imminent in that movement of action is thought which separates. Now that's where time gets...

K: Yes sir, that is what we are saying. We are saying thought is limited.

C: Yes, but what I am trying to get at is the fact that in the inward level, and I will keep that word for the minute, out of the

inward level comes thought. Now the question is what is the relationship of that movement, that action to thought?

K: I don't quite follow you.

C: In other words, the state of observation without the observer, the action is imminent within a thought.

K: No sir. The observer is the observed. We agree to that - right? It is not a theory.

C: But imminent in that...

K: Sir, just wait a minute sir. The observer is the observed. That is a tremendous fact. It is not a theory. It changes the whole way of living. There is no division as the observer and the observed, therefore no conflict. That's a theory, but to live that way, which means total eradication of conflict, upon which the brain has evolved. You follow?

E: Yes.

K: So when the observer is the observed and no conflict, there is a radical change in the brain. You follow?

E: Yes.

K: A whole mutation takes place, if I can use that word.

E: Yes, but your mutation implies time.

K: No, mutation is, biologically as well inwardly there is a radical revolution, because the brain has lived for forty thousand years on conflict.

E: Now can I ask you what is the connection now between that possibility...

K: You see I wouldn't use the word possibility.

E: All right. What would you use?

K: When you use the word possibility, it means it may be

possible.

E: Yes, OK that actuality.

K: Actuality.

E: And the question you posed at the beginning: can I observe my brain?

K: Yes.

E: Without tearing it apart.

K: Yes and without books.

E: How do these two things relate?

K: Would you state that question again?

E: OK. You said at the beginning, I would like to say that I investigate my brain without tearing it apart, by seeing 'what is'.

K: Yes. By seeing exactly 'what is'.

E: And now you have also said, there is the actuality of the everpresent nowness of the non distinction where the observer is the observed.

K: Sir, do you realize what that means?

E: I do and I don't! It comes and goes.

K: To you it is a theory. Forgive me, I am not being personal. It is a theory.

E: Well sometimes it is not.

K: Ah! Either it is, or it is not.

E: It comes and goes.

K: No, it can't.

E: Why not?

K: Sir, make it simple. When you see something dangerous, it is finished. You don't go and say, "I'll go and play with something dangerous", it is over.

E: No, but you can see the car coming and get out of the way.

K: No, but you can't each time you see a car coming keep out of the way all the time.

E: Sir are you telling me it is not possible to learn by having a glimpse of something. When you have the glimpse you are there, and then something else happens that takes you off. But there is a possibility of building on the continuity of the glimpse. Why does it have to be a black and white.

K: Don't put it as black and white. There is total division.

E: That's what I understood.

A: I think what you are saying in one's life time one sees certain things one discovers and then that becomes again a memory from which one acts.

E: Which is not the thing itself.

A: Yes, but I think what you are saying that the moment when you have an insight into that it is obviously not memory somehow.

E: It is actuality.

A: Yes.

E: But then it becomes memory, then it becomes actuality again.

K: Back and forth, back and forth.

E: Back and forth.

K: No.

E: How is it then?

K: Sir, look, I am not a philosopher or anything, I will put it very simply. I have been going north for the last forty thousand years. You come along and say, look that goes nowhere, go south, or east, or west. The very movement of moving away from north to

south, in that second, moving, in that movement the cells of the brain have changed, because it has been accustomed to going there - keep it simple.

E: So your reason is that at all the case? Is that available to human beings?

K: Oh yes, if they pay attention.

E: Yes, but this is precisely my point that in my own experience...

K: They don't.

C: Why don't they?

K: Sir, that is simple enough. They have so many interests, so many. First of all that they have to earn a livelihood, not that we don't have to. They have a dozen problems.

C: You came in and you have been introduced to Professor Varela, you were introduced to him.

K: And to you and to him and him.

C: And tomorrow you come along and you say to me, "Oh hello how are you today?" implying that you have remembered. So now what is the relationship between that and this other?

K: Sir, we have made that clear.

C: No, we haven't because are you in that state at that moment, it seems to me you are caught by something else.

K: I recognize sir that it is necessary that constant being introduced is silly. I see that is necessary, but inwardly it is not necessary.

C: What is your relationship to me at that moment that you are recognizing me and seeing it is not necessary?

K: What do you mean, it is not necessary?

C: But at that moment what is the state?

K: I don't quite understand.

C: In other words at the moment there is recognition what is the action - is there a state of action without the memory also going on?

K: I don't quite follow this.

A: Well perhaps what he is saying, the very fact that you recognize somebody implies memory.

K: Of course, I have said that sir.

C: But what is the action then at that moment of the memory?

K: What do you mean by action sir?

C: Is one able to observe without memory while using memory? While seeing the relevance of memory but not...

K: I see it is relevant to have memory of a certain kind. Inwardly why should I have the burden of memory? You say something to me flattering, why should I carry that, it is silly.

E: So here is our man, walking for forty thousand years to the north, and then you come along and say it is possible to walk south. And for the first time I turn around...

K: At that moment there is...

E: Yes. But now the observation, this is not theory, the observation of both the world, the natural world and in myself, is that I tense up and say, no, I have to go north. Well maybe I can go south. There is this kind of process until one finds a permanent or reorientation.

K: Now, why? Why? I'll show you in a minute. Why do we do this? I have been going north and you come and tell me, look don't go that way, it is stupid, go east. And I am not quite convinced. I

am not quite sure whether you are right because I have been used to going north.

E: That's right.

K: Wait. I have been used to that, and you say to me go east. I wonder if he is right. Let me look at this. There is this attraction to north, which I have been going on for forty thousand years and also I listen to you, there is some logic in what you say, reasonable, seems sane, and I turn but the attraction goes on, which means what? I have not really listened to what you have said. Whether you are really serious - you understand? Whether you mean what you say. It's your, not theory, it's yours, you understand in the sense you have found it. So what you are, the quality of your voice, the quality of your being, says, go east. And I say, by Jove, I have listened to you very, very carefully and then I go east, I forget north. It depends whether you are speaking the truth or a theory. Not you personally.

E: No, no, I understand.

K: I mean somebody says go north, I say, my dear chap what do you know about it?

E: But again I go back to the observation that that kind of complete communication...

K: That's all.

E: ...but that kind of complete communication...

K: Complete communication then I forget north.

E: Why doesn't it happen?

K: Because we have never - it is really simple sir. Going north you have found security.

C: But that's not true.

K: Yes sir. Don't reject it. Look at it a bit more closely. Sir to change a habit, physical habit, which is fairly simple, but a psychological habit demands much greater energy.

C: OK Then look, let's go at more concretely, what is it that would break the habit of memory?

K: No sir, no, no. Memory is necessary - right? To write a letter, to read a book, to drive a car, linguistic communication, all that is necessary. But inwardly why should there be all this memory carried on: what you said to me, why you hurt me - you follow? All that stuff, throw it out.

C: That's too simple. That's simplistic, just throw it out, we don't.

K: It may sound simplistic but it is not.

C: We don't.

K: Why. That is the point he was raising. Because first of all sir, you come and tell me, I have been going north for the last forty thousand years, and you come and tell me, go east. I don't believe you. Who are you to tell me? What do you know about it? I begin to doubt, I begin to question, I become cynical, so I have shut it off, all communication. But if you are really serious, in the sense that you have gone east, your whole being is different. I don't know. It is no longer a theory, it is a fact. I think we are cursed with theories - sorry!

E: I go back and look at the history of many of the greatest and most alive spiritual traditions, and all they have been concerned with is precisely coming up with skilful means to constantly open up, reopen up that communication because human beings seem to be incapable of actually sustaining that communication except in

the most extraordinary cases.

K: Why?

E: The only way I can say of why, is to become again a biologist and say there is just too much past.

K: Yes sir.

E: And it takes a long time for a change to occur.

K: Look sir.

E: There is no way we can change that fast.

K: I know that argument. So we have taken forty thousand years and now another forty thousand years.

E: Well maybe less.

K: All right, twenty thousand years! You don't say that to a person who is suffering.

E: No.

K: No. Exactly. A person who is frightened, lack of security, would say we can't wait twenty thousand years.

C: Wait a second. You just said that I am going north and I don't change because I am finding security in the north, but I am not really finding security in the north.

K: I think I am.

C: But I think I am.

K: That's it.

C: That's it. OK Now what is the understanding of the false security? In other words how am I going to understand that it is false security?

A: Where does understanding come into the whole thing to see what is false?

C: You tell me I am going north and you say go east and I say,

this is fine by me. Why should I listen to you that that is any better?

K: You don't.

C: That's right.

K: Why?

C: Because both seem - I don't know why!

B: I will tell you what I think, why one listens at least for glimpses, and then frightens back, is because north causes pain.

K: Going north, why?

B: Because the security is constantly based on this sense of struggle, which is painful. Therefore that is what allows the communication of the alternative to happen because you say, that seems better. It is as simple as that.

K: But would you grant that human beings want security?

B: Yes.

K: The brain can't function as its highest energy if it is not secure. Right? So where is there security? Wait. Either it is an illusion, or in a bank account - right? Or in my relation to somebody. I want in my relation to somebody, I want to be secure. No change. For god's sake remain as you are, and no living being can remain what they are, so there is conflict. And in spite of that conflict I say I must have security in her, or in him - right? Or I seek security in god, in some faith, in some belief - right? That is all illusion. So I seek security in illusion, in relationship, in the bank account, or in the nation, in my tribe - right? My brain is wanting security.

A: The brain wants security in memory and thought but why is that?

K: Of course. Of course. It must have security. And now the professors, the scientists come up with new theories, new problems, new issues, and the politicians, you know what they are doing. And you come along, oh, so many gurus, you follow, I am lost. So I say, my god where am I going to find security - right? So another theory comes along and I say, yes, I will hold on to that, it sounds reasonable - right? So the brain is always searching for security somewhere - right?

C: The same perspective but slightly different in the sense that the brain is not only searching for security, but the brain is offering itself security in the process of the actual insecurity.

K: Yes sir. Agreed. Add that to its...

C: But that is essential because it means that we are stepping on our own toes all the time.

K: That is what I am saying. You invent god and then worship god.

C: Exactly.

E: So it like somebody building up a Hollywood state and then forgetting it is built.

E: I think we have the same question. This is precisely the point, we are so used to that which we can understand, it is crazy, it is completely crazy.

K: Absolutely.

E: But it is like a body which has been falling for twenty thousand metres and five metres before the ground he cannot say, stop! He can say, it is stupid that I am falling, but there is this mass of inertia and so on. And the experience of man's past has been that that kind of complete communication of completely grasping the

craziness of keeping on going north, has to go through that flicker and if the learning is stabilizing that flicker until one internalizes that. It might take a - I don't know, a life time, or whatever.

K: That's the whole point. You say going north has taken time.

E: Oh, a long time.

K: A long time. And also you need time to go east. So you think - not you - we think time is necessary to change. Yes, yes.

C: No, I don't think that. No. I don't think that. I think we need to come to an awareness. The thing I object to in what you are saying is that you are implying somehow or other that we can see it, and I am saying that we are so caught by stepping on our own toes we will never get out of it, we have to somehow come to terms with what we are.

K: Yes sir. Just a minute.

C: We are stepping on our own toes, that's our nature.

K: Yes sir, but wait a minute. Somebody like me, or X, comes along and says, just keep quiet for a minute. Please keep quiet. Just listen. But we can't keep quiet - right? There is chattering, telling me you are right, you are wrong. And I say for god's sake keep for five minutes quiet!

C: Do you know the story of the scorpion and the turtle? The scorpion comes along and he says to the turtle, "How about taking me across this lake?" The turtle says, "Do you think I am a nut. We are going to get out in the middle there, you are going to sting me and we are going to drown". "Why would I do that?" says the scorpion, "We will both drown". So the turtle says, "You are right, we will both drown, get up on my back." So they get out into the middle and the scorpion stings the turtle and he says, "What did

you do that for?", and he says "That's my nature".

A: But I mean where are we now? We started with the question can we understand the brain.

K: Let's begin again! First of all I would like to ask: do we see thought is limited? Whatever it does it is limited. And I don't know why you accept it so quickly!

E: That is something that I have been exploring myself.

K: Which means our experience is limited, our knowledge is limited, now or in the future. Therefore our memory is limited and without memory there is no thought, so thought is limited. The sequence. So whatever it does is limited. Technologically, psychically, or inwardly, it is limited - right? And limitation must inevitably cause conflict, division - right? And therefore is it possible for thought to operate where it is necessary and not operate in other directions? You understand?

D: Is there something which is not limited?

K: Maybe, we don't know but you can only find that out if thought has its proper place and no other place.

A: But I think the confusion arises when you say thought might be used in one place and in the other place not. You introduce a certain fragmentation in it.

K: No, sir. Thought is necessary, I am speaking to you. There I must know English and you know English. If you spoke French and I spoke French, then we would be speaking the same, or Spanish, or Italian - right? So knowledge is necessary to speak in English - right? Of course. Has knowledge any place in the psyche?

A: It helps to a certain limited extent to understand oneself.

D: May I say that in Finnish, the Finnish language has a word ? and it would be in English rote, as knowledge. But then understand in Finnish ? is to embrace. In the Finnish language to know would be to go along a road and not to know anything else but then this understanding in Finnish, is embrace, go around, and therefore I objected when you said knowledge and understanding would be the same. But the brain has two ways: the knowledge is really to go a particular way, to search and search and search, but then this understanding that is a function of the brain also, it is to embrace. That might clarify.

A: What I was saying was that even knowledge has in itself a certain understanding that might be limited, might be so.

K: Would you use a different word?

A: A different word?

K: Insight.

E: Or intuition.

K: No. Intuition is a bit doubtful, because having desires you can...

A: Could be say then the understanding coming out of memory and thought is to a certain extent...

K: Let's use the word insight. I have an insight going north is futile, and the insight says goes east and I move. There is no interval between the movement.

E: Again we keep coming back exactly to the same point.

K: That is what I am saying.

B: Yes, but sir, you asked a question a moment ago: can we have thought to take its proper place, there. That is to say we are respectful for what it is. Now when you say I have the insight to go

east and I do it, to be respectful to thought is also to realize that it is in the nature of thought to obscure that insight, to fill it with thought.

K: Of course, then it is not insight.

E: And continue to go north.

K: It is not insight.

B: Well it was for a moment and then it was occluded.

K: I understand, you are repeating the same thing.

E: Well we are all going around the same subject because I am trying to see - let me put it this way, the question I have: what is the basis from which you are saying that in that insight all thought would be put into its right place without the flickering. What is the basis for that?

K: It is now five minutes past one. Shall we stop?

E: We can pick it up next time, from there please.

K: Anywhere you like sir.

So first of all we ought to discuss what is insight, the word. To have sight in something. An insight implies no memory, no time, quick perception, instant perception.

A: Yes but the perception has to display itself through...

K: Wait, wait. Instant perception. Have we got that? Have you got that? Say for instance, I see something instantly and that perception never changes. I see the futility of all religions, organized. That's over, I don't belong to any religion. There is no going back to the temple, or to the church, or to another guru, it is finished. I recognize those are all forms of entertainment really, so I don't want to be entertained, it is finished. Wiped out. There is not any kind of temptation to go and investigate, to look, I understand

it. And this is a fact to me because I have done it. I am not boasting or anything, it is so. Right? Take any factor which human beings cling to, this terrible nationalism. I say to be a Hindu, to be a Muslim - right? So I have finished with it. I don't go back and say, "Oh, let me play with nationalism a little bit." So can one move that way, all through life?

Do we stop sir?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND BRAIN SEMINAR 10TH JUNE 1984

A: I would like to say few words today, at the beginning of the Seminar. I would be somehow nice if we could have a friendly dialogue in the sense that when we go into the questions we have a certain hesitation, rather than assert things. And somehow all of us together could go into whatever the questions that we are going to discuss. And yesterday we were saying, we opened up the Seminar by asking whether thought can help us to understand the brain. And also we went into the question of whether it is possible for the brain to not have psychological recording. And finally we opened up very briefly the question of insight. And I think that is where we stopped. So I wonder what question would we like to start with.

It seems to me the question doesn't seem so clear of whether the brain can be in a state of not recording. I think perhaps that might need a little bit of clarification. What do you think?

K: Sir, I would like to ask whether we are discussing speculatively, theoretically, or actually? Actually in the sense of applying, apply in the sense, functioning not theoretically but with facts. Right? Could we do that? Am I proposing something outrageous?! Because to me theories, speculations, whether psychological, spiritual, have no meaning to me. What has significance to the speaker, to K, is dealing with facts. Facts being that which has happened, that which is happening, not what will happen.

E: So is the brain a fact now?

K: Of course.

E: How so?

K: Because it is functioning. Functioning in the sense that it wants to communicate something verbally, and also perhaps non-verbally.

E: All right communication is fact.

K: Is a fact.

E: But when you call it the brain that is an inference, a theoretical inference. But when you describe that as the brain doing something or other, that is a theoretical inference.

K: That is a fact.

E: No because there is inference between the fact of communication now and when you used the word brain, because the brain is associated to communication through a long series of observations which are not now.

K: Of course, of course. Which is now taking place. Now observation has been, I said that, the fact is what has been, what is now. What has happened, what is happening now - right?

D: May I ask if you mean that insight has really something to do with brain? Or would it be apart from brain?

K: Are we discussing insight, or are we establishing first whether we are theoretically discussing, or discussing - I have pain, suppose I have pain.

C: That's the fact.

E: OK Now the question is, how are we going to address such a fact?

K: Fact. No, how am I going to be free of my pain? That's all I am concerned with.

C: No, no. You have made a jump though. First you have your

pain, that is your fact.

K: Wait sir. The fact is I am in pain.

C: Period.

K: Full stop. And also the fact that there must be freedom from the pain.

C: What do you mean there must be?

K: It is human nature. What are you saying? There must be.

A: What K might say, you see when you are in pain you somehow want to get rid of it.

K: That is all, a fact.

C: The thing I am trying to say is that the fact is the pain, the next fact is...

K: ...is also wanting to get rid of it.

C: Ah, that's two facts.

K: Those are both facts.

C: Right. Those are the facts.

K: But wait a minute. Are we discussing about pain, not having pain, which becomes a theory?

E: I would like to discuss pain as a fact. I want to go back to the fact that you used the word brain as related to pain.

K: Of course. Otherwise if the brain didn't function I wouldn't know what pain was.

E: But sir, isn't that an inference? How is that happening now? The fact is you used the word brain is because there have been people in the past who...

K: I would like to get at this, I don't quite understand this. I am not disputing.

E: Maybe I am not understanding you correctly, but when you

say, "I experience pain", it is clear to all of us that this is now. Now I come around and say, "Pain has to do with brain". Now the relationship to juxtapose these two words, brain and pain has a long series of intermediate steps, which required work from the past of people who actually pointed out the existence of such a thing as brain, which is not something we are doing now. We are not opening up a skull and saying this is brain, and cutting the brain in parts and doing all the kinds of things...

K: Don't do it with me please!

E: I won't. So you see what I am saying, the moment I invoke the word brain, I am bringing with it a huge edifice of inferences and relationships which are not now.

K: Yes, sir, which is all the past.

E: So how is the fact that you use the word brain now consistent with your desire to deal only with present facts? Could you clarify that?

K: I don't quite follow. I am trying to understand this.

E: Can I say it in some other way?

K: Please understand between us: I am not resisting anything.

E: Absolutely. OK.

K: I am enquiring.

E: May I phrase it some other way?

K: Yes.

E: You are trying correctly, as far as I am concerned, to establish the ground of what are we dealing with. And you say, can we deal with facts now and not theories about things. Fine. So the next moment you say brain, which I am claiming cannot be said unless we invoke theories.

K: I agree.

E: OK So how are these two things consistent?

K: The brain is the result of long evolution - right?

E: That is also a theory.

K: No, it is a fact.

E: Can we say that from what we are experiencing now?

K: That is a fact.

B: If I have a pain in my hand, there is a pain. But to talk about the brain is to talk about something I have read in a textbook.

There are a lot of nerve cells and...

K: Yes sir, if I had no brain I wouldn't feel it.

B: But what we are saying is...

K: Nerves and all the rest of it.

E: That you don't know from the observations you are having now.

K: I don't understand your point.

B: We don't experience the fact of anything being in here, I don't experience the nerves, the connections.

K: Tell me simply, sir.

A: Yes, simply.

K: Sir, I am a stupid man so tell me simply.

A: What we are trying to say is that there are facts that are actually taking place now, and some facts that are in the future.

K: Not future, I said past. I said the past with all the memories, etc. etc. are also facts.

C: That's a jump. What we are saying is that really all you have is the fact of your pain, and then you have the fact that you want to be free of the pain.

K: That's all.

C: But when you make the statement, "the brain is responsible for the experience of pain", you have entered a whole new world of language. When using the word brain it connects you to assumptions that people have made about what a brain is, what a brain does.

K: I know nothing about that.

C: Well then you can't use the word. All you have got as fact is pain and that is all you have got.

K: Wait sir. All right. All that I have is pain.

C: You have got pain.

K: Pain. And also the fact I must be free of pain.

C: That is all you have.

K: That is all I have. All right proceed from there.

E: No, no. The point is, and I really appreciate it honestly, that to have these conversations and we are all biologists or scientists, so supposedly the enquiry has something to do with what science can contribute to it, maybe not but maybe yes, it's open. If there is something that science has to contribute, then it must address to what science can say. Things like brain, or atoms or whatever.

K: Yes, I understand.

E: So if you rip that apart and say, all we have is the moment you experience now.

K: No, I don't rip that apart.

E: OK. So we have to evoke brain, therefore we have to jump out of the immediate experience of now.

K: Yes, sir, agree.

D: So that in order to be free of pain we need nowadays to do

something with the brain, with medicine or...

K: Yes, I go to the doctor, he gives me a pill and I take it and the pain is gone.

D: Yes, it influences the brain. Is that a fact, this process of getting free from pain, getting pills, or something, is that a fact or is that a theory?

A: Could we say that whatever goes inside the brain is the fact whether it is an illusion, whether it is a pain, or so on, but perhaps the difference is whether it is actually taking place in this moment or not.

K: Is that it? Is that it?

B: Could we ask you have the pain which is the fact, and the fact of you wanting to be rid of the pain, does knowledge and science have anything to do with the very next step? Does knowledge and science come in in the next step?

E: What is the relationship between the actual fact and...

K: ...and knowledge.

E: ...and knowledge.

K: Keep it to that. At last! What is the relationship between what is happening now, pain, and knowledge.

E: Such as brain, etc.

K: What do you mean by knowledge? Go slowly. I am not a scientist.

E: I am only an apprentice.

K: I am a human being. I am not a scientist. What do we mean by knowledge? What is knowledge? Knowledge is accumulation of various experiences, incidents. And those experiences can be enormous or very small. And all those experiences have become

knowledge - right? Knowledge stored in the brain as memory.

That's all. And from that thought.

E: Yes, absolutely.

K: Right?

E: I would add one more thing, which is, scientific knowledge is accumulated by language agreement between people. This is the fact, do we agree, yes we agree and so we put it aside and move to the next. So there comes this network of assumptions and presuppositions.

K: It is all that. I said that. Knowledge is all that. Now what place has knowledge, what is the relationship of knowledge to pain? It is not a question, it is a fact. If there was no knowledge I would have no pain.

E: Can you go slowly now please? You must go slowly at this point.

K: Please sirs, you are all scientists, you are all experts, I am not. I am saying, knowledge is stored in the brain, or in the heart, or wherever you like to call it, stored - right? And we function with that knowledge, as a carpenter, as a surgeon, as a psychologist, we function with what we have learnt as knowledge, accumulated.

E: Absolutely.

K: I communicate with you in English, or French if you want it, or Italian, or Spanish. I know those four. So we can communicate with each other. So there is knowledge, accumulated, and what is the relationship of that knowledge to action? Let's put it that way. Not pain, let's leave pain for the moment. Would you agree?

B: Action.

K: There is this knowledge - right? And I have to act. Is action

born of knowledge?

A: It seems to be that way.

E: That is the question you are asking?

K: I am questioning. Apparently it seems so - right? Agreed?

So, of course.

D: In the brain, not always.

K: Leave the brain for the minute, we will come back to it a little later, if you don't mind.

E: It is not so clear because if I look at that I see that knowledge has something to do with it but with action, with the manifestation of a present situation.

K: So we have to enquire what is action before we...

E: To me it doesn't follow that it is just knowledge that...

K: Now wait sir. There is knowledge, we have come to that - right? What is action? Either action according to a memory, knowledge, from the past, or action which is an idea in the future, or an ideal. Either according to the past, or according to the future. I will do this. Right?

E: But what about the actions that your description doesn't cover? In my experience is those actions that seem to be born out of nowhere.

K: Wait, I am coming to that. Out of language.

E: Out of nowhere.

K: We will come to that in a minute. Right? Action born from the past, memory, I have done this, I will do that tomorrow. So what we know of action is born of the past or of the future.

A: So action involves information.

K: Information - right? Agreed?

E: Maybe.

K: Then that is a limited action.

D: Yes, limited.

K: Right?

E: It is limited by the knowledge you have.

K: Or knowledge which you have accumulated, which the race has accumulated.

A: The present, the past and the future, that is the...

K: When action is based on the past or on the future that action must invariably be limited.

D: Is there another kind of action?

K: Just a minute, we will come to that.

D: I am interested in that.

K: So is there an action which is not limited? Because if action is limited it must create conflict.

D: Yes.

B: Maybe I haven't quite gone that distance. I don't quite go that whole distance. If every action born of knowledge must be limited...

K: No, I didn't say that.

B: Action born of knowledge must be limited.

K: Action - we first of all said action according to the past or to the future is limited.

E: By definition because you are acting on a limited resource of knowledge.

B: I pick up this glass and drink the water, now is that limited, does that lead to conflict?

K: No, no.

E: I am not sure about the leading to conflict but it is limited in the sense for example you are not a left hander but a right hander. And you pick it up with your right hand and not with your left hand, but I pick it up with my left hand. Why do you do that and I do this is because we have accumulated a different style of approach and it is limited. That is why you pick it up with your hand and not with your foot.

B: But can there be an action in that which is just a simple, mechanical self-contained action which begins and ends and that is the end of it?

E: OK Why is the limited action leading to conflict?

K: That's it.

E: Not necessarily, it can.

K: I am going to explain why. If I am thinking about myself all day long, which most people do, it is a very small action, a limited action. Right? When I am associated or identified with a nation, it is a very small action. Therefore there are wars. One of the reasons of war is nationalism, based on economic division, and so on and so on. Those are all very limited. Right? Agree?

E: Absolutely.

K: So...

B: Well these are psychological actions.

K: Even physical actions.

B: Well yes but are they to do with simple things like digging a hole, lighting a fire? Let's make a distinction between that and the larger actions which are motivated by nationalism or relationships.

A: It seems you know that you might have an action within the limitation that can be also be rational, it might not necessarily

create conflict.

K: Of course.

A: It seems we understand. But I think you are addressing another question, which is, psychologically, when your action is based on the limitation there is conflict.

K: Just a minute. When I am thinking about myself, I am digging a hole for myself, it is small. Right? When I am thinking about my future, my problems, you follow, it is all enclosed, small.

A: So it is limitation that creates conflict.

K: Yes, naturally. Right? You are doubtful.

E: Yes, I am doubtful because it seems that when you say that if the knowledge has me has reference point it will create conflict.

K: That's all.

E: Question: does it have to have that me reference by necessity? Or is there not a possibility of a limited action, limited understanding, but which does not have me has a reference point?

K: There may be limited action, sir, when I am digging a hole, to take his example. But we are talking about a much wider issue.

E: No, even wider issues for example...

K: No, let me finish what I want to say. Any action born out of limitation must inevitably create conflict. If I am a scientist and I am only concerned with my career, with my investigation, with my research, you follow, and it is a very small affair. And I don't care a hang what happens outside in the world.

E: But is that a limitation of thought or it is a limitation of...

K: It is a limitation of thought, limitation of capacity, limitation of environment. I include everything.

D: How can you widen this?

K: Just a minute. We will come to that. You understand sir, are we communicating with each other?

E: I understand what you are saying but again you seem to me to be shifting from the nature of knowledge to the nature of a kind of knowledge.

K: No, no. We started with knowledge, we agreed. And I said, what relationship has action to knowledge?

E: And you said every action born of knowledge is limited and it creates conflict.

K: Yes, because knowledge is limited.

E: Yes, but again I am trying to examine that step of the relationship between the limited actions born of limited knowledge, which we agree is limited, to the conclusion that such actions necessarily lead to conflict.

K: I'll show it to you.

E: You invoked an extra quality to knowledge which is self-centred knowledge.

K: No, wait. We said knowledge and action - we both understand that - and action born of any limited knowledge the action also must be limited. Next step: such action breeds division. Let's take it step by step. Where there is division there must be conflict. Just a minute, he is working it out!

E: I must say that I can see the conflict arising only when this extra quality of having an absolute reference point to the division arises, such as me.

K: I say this, sir.

E: The division in itself is not conflictive. It the division plus a solid reference point that makes the division divisive.

C: Suppose you work in the laboratory and your knowledge is limited and you are working on this chemical, or whatever, you forget about everything outside. Now you may say there is no self in that but that phase a lot of conflict for the world. Your starting point is so limited, you don't take into account the whole environment, you don't take into account the implications of what you are doing.

E: I don't see that. Let's transport that metaphor to an ecological metaphor. If I take foxes. Foxes like rabbits. Is the limited inclination of foxes to chase these other animals a limitation because they do not take into account the entire eco-system. It doesn't seem to be the case. The eco-system is a very harmonious totality. Every part of it has a limited part but they all work as an harmonious totality.

K: We don't.

E: I mean the eco-system, not human beings. Human beings add something extra. What you are pointing out is something extra to knowledge, to limited knowledge, which is a solid reference point of 'me-ness'. This the fox does not do. It simply does what it does.

C: What is the distinction between difference and division. You seem to put differences and division into one part.

K: Sir, division, all right, let's stick to the word division.

C: No, let's make a distinction between difference and division.

A: What do you mean by difference and division?

C: In other words, foxes are different from rabbits.

E: And they only know how to chase rabbits.

C: And they only know how to chase rabbits. And that is a difference but that is not a division.

K: No. That tree is different from me.

E: Exactly.

C: And there is no conflict necessarily.

K: Of course not.

E: OK So we agree then that this step from knowledge that is limited and creating divisions or distinctions does not necessarily lead to conflict. Because for example the fox being limited in his knowledge of the world doesn't create conflict.

K: Sir, see what is happening in India, or in Beirut, or the Arab and the Israel.

E: Sir, I have been through a civil war myself.

K: Yes sir, I know that. So what happens? What has brought about this division?

E: It has been brought about by the division plus this sense of me being right.

K: Yes. That's all.

E: No, no, please understand me. I am not denying that point, I entirely see it, I think. But it seems to me that we have to separate that extra, which is the 'me-ness', or the self-centredness, from knowledge as such. Knowledge as such can exist in a limited way.

K: I understand. Knowledge as such in those books.

E: No, no, knowledge as such as, for example, my knowledge that I can pick up this glass of water, or larger knowledge of how to run an economy.

K: Of course, that is understood.

A: Are you trying to say...

E: I am trying not to put what seems to be a distinction of knowledge for a particular kind of knowledge...

C: I can't quite go along all the way on that, particularly with the foxes. I don't think that is a good analogy between foxes and humans. I think maybe we are going off the track.

A: Let's return to the question that all our actions seem to be born out of knowledge. There seems...

K: Yes, sir. And that knowledge, as we already said, is limited. So action is limited - right? Of course. Let's start from that.

And the next step for me: that as knowledge is limited, action is limited. And that is one of the reasons, or one of the causes of human division, in their relationship, the me, my ideas, my ambition, his ideas, his ambition, his competitiveness and my competitiveness, my aggression, and so on. This constant division is naturally breeding conflict in the world. That's all.

A: The next question would be...

K: Wait, wait. Let's agree to that. Right? And I say, for god's sake let's stop this conflict because it is killing human beings, the Russians, the Americans, the democrats, the totalitarians, you know all the game. The Arab and the Jew, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Sikh and - I say we are destroying each other - right? And I say to myself, is there an action, seeing all this, which is not limited? That's all. Which transcends this, goes beyond this, otherwise we can't solve this. I stick to my Indian, and he sticks to his Arab, and we fight - right? So can we communicate dropping your Arab and my dropping my Hindu, and as human beings let's solve this problem, not to kill each other. Right? So is there an action which is not divisive, which is not limited - right? Would you agree to that? Now how are we going to find that out? That's all my point.

E: It seems to me that you are asking two questions at the same time. If the hope to find a way in which this strife can be stopped.

K: That's one question.

E: We are fully agreed it is something absolutely essential, necessary. It seems to me there are two possibilities of answering. One, is the one you propose, which is: can we have an action which is not born out of limitation? But the other possibility is to say, is there not a possibility of learning action born out of knowledge, therefore limited, but which is not centred in defending the point of view of me.

K: Of course, of course.

E: Both are equally valid to me.

K: Of course, both are valid, and both are contained in this one question.

E: Both are contained in the same question?

K: Of course.

C: Now wait a second. Both are contained in this same question but there is another question: now we are all scientists sitting here in a sense, and one of the things that has come out of science, or investigation of the brain in a scientific way has been the fact that we never perceive anything except with reference to what we already know.

K: I question that.

C: I know you question it. But it seems to me that there is some sort of edge of discussion here, then if that is true then the only way we can discover an unlimited action, the only road that we can take is through that kind of situation.

K: I understand.

C: If that is not true then it may be possible to have an unlimited action. Now how can we discuss, you question if there is all this other statement to the effect that it questions you.

K: Yes sir, what are you trying to say sir?

C: Well I am saying that there is some question among scientists as to whether it is possible to have an action that is not born out of knowledge.

B: You are saying that perception...

K: Keep to that, keep to that.

C: Action goes from perception.

E: There are two separate questions therefore. One is, can we actually discover actions which are unlimited, and two, is that action something that can be possibly related to what science is.

K: To human existence, which is part of science.

C: You see what I am interested in is the fact that we really only know limited action.

K: That's all.

C: That's all we know.

K: Agree. Agree. Don't go on! And somebody, he comes along and says, perhaps there is an action which is not limited.

C: Exactly, yes.

K: Unless I am totally blind, and deaf and dumb and stupid, I listen to it.

D: I just wanted to go back, not to the brain because - yesterday I talked about small children. There is a stage in children where action is not that limited. It begins of course the limitation then, but in the beginning they have some quality of action which is not that limited. They are open to the whole of the environment, to the

family, to other children. They don't distinguish between nationalities.

K: Babies, children don't. Later on they are trained.

D: Quite.

K: But they are educated to hate the black and purple and blue.

D: May I still say one thing: when we grow older we have still this brain of the little child in our brain, in our mature brain. We have it, we know it, and as I see it we have in our brain - I beg your pardon, I am talking about brain - we have this part which can act, we know it, which can act quite unlimited, but not that limited. So I think we have to, as a scientist I am saying that, we have to find again being adult we have to find this childlike view. You understand me?

K: Yes, I understand you. Yes sir. You are also saying the same thing in a different way that there is in all of us a divine spark.

D: Yes, exactly.

K: It comes to the same thing! Please I am not laughing at it. Millions of people feel that there is in them something far superior than this ordinary brain, far superior to environment, economics, etc.

C: Krishnaji, if you take a small child, take a child of three months, an experiment that was done with a child three months old. And these children were hooked up to where they were sucking a breast. If they sucked that breast there was a picture on the wall... no, no, listen.

K: I am listening!

C: There was a moving picture on the wall, if they sucked this breast in a certain way - these were three month old children - the

picture came into focus. In other words, the child responded at three months old positively to the picture coming into focus.

K: I understand.

C: There is something built into the organs which responds to focussing.

K: I understand all that sir.

A: May I say something, K raised a question as to whether there is an action not born out of limitation. How are we going to find out?

B: I think David added the question is there a perception, could there be any perception that it doesn't require knowledge?

K: Yes sis, yes sir.

E: OK Let's stick to that one.

D: But in the little child there is this kind of perception. Little children are still perceiving. I a little child.

E: Yes, but a little child is different but not because it is different, it is less limited.

A: Can we go back perhaps to the original question? We said there might be - let's perhaps say what is perception.

K: No.

E: Let's continue with the investigation of how can we know, or come to know, this unlimited action, unlimited perception.

C: Is it possible? That's the whole question. Science says no, there is no such thing as unlimited action.

K: All right, finished.

D: No, science says yes.

K: Just a minute sir. There are millions of people in the world who say there is god. You come along and say that is just the

invention of thought. The other says, all right, go to hell, I will go on worshipping. That's that. We are not in that position, I hope.

E: So let's investigate.

K: So we have to explore it. We have come to a point where we have said action born of limited knowledge is divisive, and therefore conflict arises where there is division. That's all we have stated. Then the next question arose: is there an action which is not limited? Right?

C: OK. Right.

K: Now, how are you going to find out?

A: Do you have any suggestions?

K: Go into it. I am asking, you are the scientists.

E: Well I said before, I agree entirely with David, from the point of view of the scientific framework there is no way to approach that question. But at the same time, as a human being, by examining my own being...

K: You are a human being, not a scientist. Thank god! We can talk as human beings.

E: I see, I am a human being. Fine. But also I happen to have this craft as a scientist.

K: Yes, yes, sir. That is of secondary importance.

E: Secondary important, all right. But as a human being when I observe my mind I do notice that there are certain actions I do which do not seem to come out of knowledge.

K: That's it.

E: But seem to be born out of themselves.

K: We will find out.

E: OK This is observation now.

K: Yes. So it may be false, it may be true.

E: It is observation.

C: Before we go on, I want to present him this question: is it conceivable, or isn't true, that in our scientific investigations very often when we think that this action is born out of an unlimited, it seems to appear that on further investigation we discover how limited it was. More often than not.

K: Agree.

E: There is nothing I could counter to that.

K: I want to find out if there is an action which is not limited.

B: Exactly.

K: Which is not consciously or unconsciously connected with knowledge. The same thing.

C: Same thing, fine, there we are! That means that you have to be available from my most astute going after it to find out if I can find a way to show to you that really did come out of your knowledge.

K: I am willing.

C: OK.

K: What is your response sir to that question?

E: Oh, I think I said all I know.

K: I know what you said. But let's go a little deeper than that.

E: Fine.

K: We are asking a question, is there an action in which there is no limitation? Right? The self is limited, the me - right? The self is knowledge. Go slowly. I'll explain. The self is a bundle of memories. Right? So as long as that self is acting there is limitation. Right? So is there an ending to the self, ending not

continuing? That is the first question. To end the whole, may I use the word consciousness, with all its memories, with all its fears, sorrows, pain, anxieties, depression, faith, belief, the whole content of consciousness is the movement of thought. Right? Agree? That is the self. Right? That is knowledge. We said the self is a whole series of memories, it is a bundle, and as long as that action is born from there it is limited, therefore conflict. Agree to that?

E: Yes, yes, no problem.

K: So can the self end? It is only then there is action which is not limited. It is a logical step.

B: Yes, absolutely.

K: Can the self end? And the self is so deceptive, it can hide behind the most holiest things - right? And the most extraordinary imagination, and in the scientific - it can hide like a cockroach! Can that self end? Sir, the word mantra, you have heard that word, means that. The original root meaning of that word is ponder, think over, meditate on not becoming. And also put away all self-centred activity. The meaning of that word is that, the root meaning. You understand what I am saying?

E: Yes, I understand.

K: Meditate on not becoming, which is an immense factor. That means there is no psychological evolution - right? For the me. There is no me to evolve.

B: Absolutely.

K: But we think there is me continuing, in heaven, in hell - you follow? I write a book, there it is, immortal! Or you throw it in the waste paper basket. So can the self, which is a whole series of memories and time, can that completely end, knowing that it is the

most deceptive thing - right sir? Find out! I say it can totally end and live in this world.

E: Well, if indeed it can end, and you are saying you are still in this world...

K: Absolutely.

E: It means that for example this person who has no self and who is in this world, drives a car.

K: Of course there he has to use self.

E: But then that means that that knowledge is there.

K: Of course.

E: So that action out of knowledge is limited.

K: Of course. But we said also...

E: So what is - now this is the question I am asking you...

K: It is simple, sir, it is simple, you can see it. Don't ask me, it is simple.

E: No, let me put it this way...

K: Sir, I have to write a letter, which means a great deal of knowledge writing the letter, sequence, the word.

E: Fine.

K: It means tremendous knowledge is involved in writing a stupid letter. That knowledge is necessary.

E: Then its self-centred action.

K: It is not.

E: Why not?

K: If the self is not that is not.

E: But how could it not be self-centred action according to your definition of self, it is a bunch of memories.

K: Not my definition. At least we agreed. Don't say.

E: Wait a second, we agreed but I repeated at least a couple of times that at least to me there was a difference between knowledge, and self-centred knowledge, and that not all knowledge was self-centred knowledge. And there was a possibility...

K: Wait. I said sir, the self is knowledge.

E: Yes, so if there is no self there is no knowledge, that follows.

K: But I can use it. Just a minute, careful. So we have to enquire into something totally different, which is: what is intelligence?

E: OK. I am willing to enquire into that, but why do we have to do that?

K: I tell you why in a minute. I will show it to you. Where there is intelligence, that intelligence can use knowledge. And intelligence is not born of knowledge.

D: From where is it?

K: Take it slowly. You may all disagree, tear it to pieces, but I will go into it. Right?

So we have to enquire: what is knowledge? If knowledge can say, well I will use this, and nowhere else, knowledge has a certain place, but psychologically, etc. etc. it has no place whatsoever.

A: From what you say it seems to me that being free from the self doesn't mean that you are completely free of knowledge.

K: Sir, I said to drive a car, to write a letter, to talk a language - right?

E: Yes but we are back to the question.

K: That is why...

E: We have to be careful then.

K: We have settled all that.

D: Intelligence.

K: What is intelligence? Is it born out of knowledge, born of thought? Sir, it required tremendous knowledge to go to the Moon. Tremendous - right? The work of three hundred thousand, or ten thousand people, co-operating, making every part perfect, to go the Moon. That is the intelligence of thought.

E: Yes, and then you are asking the question where does intelligence come from.

K: No, that intelligence is limited.

E: It is clear, yes. Yes, so when I examine what happens is that in thought there is intelligence that is proper to thought, which is limited, like when I resolve an equation.

K: Yes, limited.

E: And there is also an intelligence which seems again to have a quality out of nowhere.

K: We will come to that in a moment. We will come to that.

E: All right. Therefore to me there is the two intelligences.

K: Yes sir. Let's wait. There is the intelligence which thought has brought about.

E: In the logical sense.

K: No, rational, illogical, clever, cunning. The businessman is very intelligent in his business. A terrorist organizes beautifully to kill somebody.

E: There is an intelligence to build itself as ego.

K: So there is so-called ordinary intelligence born of thought, therefore that intelligence becomes cruel, kindly, you follow, the whole series of human activity, which is limited. Then is there an intelligence which is not born of thought? I say there is, I may be cuckoo. I say there is. And that intelligence can only come about -

if you want to go into it I will go into it.

E: Yes but we have gone into investigating the nature of intelligence.

K: Yes, that's it.

E: Out of the quandary or the paradox of what you said before, in order to find out unlimited action I have to finish with the self, which was a collection of memories. But if I am finished with the self as a collection of memories it seems, from what we said even before, that there would be no knowledge, therefore that this person could not write a letter.

K: I didn't say that. On the contrary he can write a letter.

E: But if he writes a letter which requires thought...

K: That is why I said sir, let's enquire into intelligence which will then say, "I will use knowledge, and no one else".

E: I see. So intelligence is now the mediator.

K: Don't use the word mediator. Keep the word for a minute.

E: Right, so what is intelligence?

K: What is intelligence? If we say thought with its extraordinary capacity has created a certain intelligence, building a cathedral, most beautiful houses, gardens, furniture, implements of war - right? It is all the result of thought. The atom bomb - right? Such intelligence is limited. Agree? Now is there an intelligence which is not limited? Right? Now how do you enquire into this?

Exercising thought...

C: Well we seem to...

K: Wait, wait, wait!

E: The same way you would investigate action which is unlimited, namely by observing, by completely observing without

thought.

K: Is that possible, first?

E: Well it seems that it is possible.

K: Not a theory.

E: No, no, no.

K: Let's be clear. That perception is not based on thought.

E: Yes, right.

K: Keep that perception going.

E: Do you agree with that?

C: I don't agree, no.

K: Convince him please!

E: You mean it is not possible for you in a day that you are walking out of your house and all of a sudden, it is a very sharp beautiful day, and you open the door and you see the tree, and there is a moment when you simply see the tree, there is no thought coming in. The quality of the experience is that there is no thought, there is a gap in your thoughts and there is absolute purity of perception. There is a complete sense of present-centredness. The treeness of the tree is right there. And then thought comes up again. Isn't that an experience for you?

C: Well I think - I am going to play the devil's advocate. The devil's advocate is this, that I think in that very experience there are elements in which there is a sense in which we project out our knowledge.

K: No.

E: Wait a second. I didn't say there was no knowledge. I said there was no thought.

K: Please just a minute. Is there a perception without the word?

C: Without the word?

E: Yes.

C: I think...

K: Just answer step by step sir.

C: Well your step by step is sometimes - well you set up a question that is already a trap.

K: I am not trapping you.

C: Perception without a word, yes.

K: Without the network of words.

C: But there is a sense in which perception without the word is already based in some sort of knowledge.

K: No sir. I am just saying, look we have been through all this. Can you look at me without all the image, all the nonsense, just look at me?

C: I don't think we can, no.

E: Are you saying scientifically?

C: I am saying actual fact, I think in some way we are always operating out of some knowledge.

E: Can we take this slowly.

C: Very slowly.

K: I understand.

E: I can look at you, I think, I can look at you, or a tree, whatever, and not have thought.

K: Yes, sir, that is all I am saying.

E: Fine, fine. Question: when I see the tree, nevertheless I see a tree, I don't see a cat.

K: Of course not.

E: No, what he is saying, which I think is important, that that is

knowledge.

K: Important sir, I have got it.

E: It is limited knowledge.

K: All right. Begin to move.

C: So there was a point.

K: I understand this.

C: But there is an important question here, Krishnaji, what is the relationship of intelligence to the actuality that I am saying you can't have a perception without knowledge?

K: We are going to find out, sir.

C: That's what I want to get at.

K: We are coming to the same thing in a different way. What is this intelligence, if there such intelligence, which is not cultivated by thought - right?

A: But it uses thought.

E: We don't know if it uses it yet. We have come to the point of seeing that there is an intelligence that seems to come out without based on a train of thought.

K: Yes, that's all I am asking. Is it temporary? Is it something casual, perchance? All those. Or is there an intelligence which is not intermittent, which is not fiction, theoretical and so on? Or imagination, deceptive, illusory, you know all the implication of all those words. I say there is.

E: How do we find that out?

K: Now I am coming to that. You are all - I am ninety years old. I have been at it for a long time!

What place has all this, what place has love in all this? Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love sensation? Right? Is it?

D: No, limited love.

K: Don't - love is love, not limited, unlimited. Go slowly sir. Is love desire? All the rest of it.

E: Why do we need to examine love now?

K: I will tell you in a minute, we will come to it! The ball is in my court!

E: So you are now asking us to examine the nature of love because it seems to be necessary to answer the question, of how to we get to examine, to understand...

K: Not get. How does that intelligence exist? I say it cannot exist without love.

D: What is love?

K: We are saying what is love. You understand? I say that intelligence which is not born of thought which is limited, that intelligence is the essence of love. Therefore I say, is love desire? Is love ambition? Is there love when there is pleasure and so on and so on. Or is love something outside of the brain? Do you understand sirs? Let me finish. You can jump on me afterwards. It is still my court!

E: OK that's the question.

K: And which means compassion. Where there is love and compassion there is that intelligence, which is not the product of thought. And that is not intermittent. That doesn't come and go. And that love is not the opposite of hate. Love has no opposite. Right? And compassion, love cannot exist if there is any form of attachment. I am a Catholic, or a Hindu, or a Sikh, and I am attached to my god, attached to my anchor and say I have compassion, then it is not compassion. Limited.

D: Yes, it is limited, yes.

K: Right Sir? Now proceed. Wait, wait! Get ready. To me, or to K that is the only thing that matters. If that does not exist the rest is all limited. And therefore you will have perpetual conflict between each other, between the world and so on and so on. That's all.

C: Are you ready for me?

K: Wait sir, have you understood what the speaker has said?

What K said?

C: I think I have but I have a question.

K: Wait, wait. Have you felt it, smelt it, have you tasted it, have you swallowed it before you kick it?

C: I don't want to kick it.

K: Wait a minute, I am asking you.

C: I say, I think I have.

K: Sir, it means unconditioning the whole human, or the structure and the nature of thought. Right?

E: Now we have grasped that, and listened to that.

K: Now proceed. It is in your court!

C: May I ask you a question: a few minutes ago I brought up the fact of this three month old infant that drives the focus.

K: Sir, just a minute. I have seen it with my eyes actually, I don't have to look at that.

C: Fine. What I want to say is what can we say about that here we have a three month old infant that I told you about and this in a way is the basis for desire. In other words the desire for that focus.

K: Yes sir.

C: That is the essence of desire at three months old.

K: Yes sir.

C: Now given that back, the desire is so central to the brain, we will use that word, what is the relationship of what you have just said to this basic fact that desire is so...

K: Yes, sir, I will tell you. Then you have to ask what is desire.

E: I have another question which is related. We might be able to handle both of them at the same time. Which is that I have heard you, I have grasped it or felt it and then I have the question, how do I know it is true?

K: You don't know.

E: I don't know.

K: Which means?

E: Which means I have to investigate it.

K: With what?

E: Well this is exactly the point, with what? The only way I know is to observe very carefully what happens in my experience, which means that what I see is not the continuity of that intelligence but the intermittency of that intelligence. So how can you, beyond saying, actually make it possible for people to see that it is not just words?

K: Therefore you have to go into the whole question why, what is the place of desire.

E: Yes, that is why the two things are related.

K: What is the place of desire, and why has desire become so important in our life. You follow the whole movement of desire.

E: Yes.

K: Have we time?

C: A few minutes. Not really.

E: It is up to you. I am happy to go on.

K: There are people waiting for lunch!

C: Well I mean this is a crucial issue.

K: Yes sir I will come to that.

A: We have got five minutes.

K: If there is no becoming psychologically, you understand sirs, there is no self. Theoretically it sounds all right.

C: You keep going back to this, in theory it sounds all right, but...

K: To see the reality of it and cut it.

A: How do you see that?

K: I mean he tells me, he has been at it for a number of years, he says, look, there is no becoming. Is it this becoming has spilled over from the physical becoming, becoming a clerk, stepping up the ladder - you follow? Is that movement spilled over into the other field and therefore you are still thinking in terms of becoming psychologically, inwardly. And don't let it spill. Expand from there. Then is there a becoming? I will be. I must not. I am comparing myself. So the ending of measurement. You understand? Complete ending of measurement, which is comparison.

Sir, is there an end to knowledge?

C: Well is there an end to desire?

K: No, sir. Is there an end to knowledge?

E: I don't see that.

K: Ask that question sir.

D: I think there is an end.

K: If we are functioning all the time within the field of knowledge it is very limited. Is there an end to something?

E: Is there an edge, a place where it is no longer there. Yes there is.

K: Sir, which means what?

D: That means we are not coming forward always with this kind of knowledge.

K: Sir, could I put another question? Can the brain stop chattering? Completely, empty? Only act when it is asked, like a drum, highly tuned, but it is always empty, it is only when you strike on it that it gives a note. Right?

D: What is emptiness?

K: That is what I am saying: is there an end to knowledge? Of course. That's another matter.

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD BRAIN SEMINAR

12TH JUNE 1984

A: During the last two days we have been talking about many topics, and what has struck me is that it seems very difficult to penetrate a topic. And I was wondering what does it mean to enquire into something in an intelligent way. And perhaps with that spirit to go into the question of intelligence, what we were talking about yesterday.

K: I thought we did that yesterday. We said, if I remember rightly, that there is the intelligence of thought, and that intelligence is limited. And is there any other kind of intelligence which is not bound to time? And we said that there is. So we went into that, love and compassion, and out of that, that intelligence which is not limited at all. Because we said if love is limited then it is not love. If love has an opposite as hate, anger, jealousy and so on then it is not love. That is what we discussed yesterday.

How would you enquire into that intelligence which is not born of thought?

A: Well it seems to me that if we are using thought then we have to be very hesitant in what we say.

K: Not only that, but how would you enquire into that intelligence which is not the product of thought? How would you enquire into it? Right sir? That is what you are saying. How do you enquire into it? Would you enquire into it by saying that which it is not?

A: You mean by what is false?

K: Yes, what it is not. I don't know if I am conveying this. We

said hate is not love - right? So is there in our psyche, in the brain - in the skull, I won't even use the brain now because I am apprehensive with all you experts! - in the skull, which is all the enormous activity of human beings, all the activities of human beings are contained in the skull, within the skull, within that sphere. And is love within it, or outside it? We asked that question too, yesterday. How do you enquire into it?

A: Well perhaps we could start by saying what is an action which is not intelligent? For example if we take a machine. A machine you could say that it is repetitive all the time, doing the same thing. And in the same way one could say that the brain is disposed to work according to its condition. And this condition is somehow always the same. For example when I see a person that I don't like, the brain seems to give meaning to that situation and plays itself out. And in that sense I would say that it is the same as a machine, you see a machine has a programme, preset.

K: After all we are programmed.

E: Well but also this very same process, I wouldn't call it a machine, is capable of coming up with something which is completely new, creative. So in that sense it is nothing to do with a machine. And precisely the fact that it can up with creative acts...

K: Creation?

E: It means that the process cannot be so simply characterized as being mere repetition, as in a trivial machine. I would make a distinction between what we call a trivial machine, which is a coca-cola machine, you know 10 pence going in or 50 pence going in and a coca-cola comes out. That is a trivial machine. This is not what life is about.

K: Of course not.

E: So let's not set up a strong man and say what it is not. The brain is not that kind of machine.

A: Could we say that this intelligence has not to do with a certain pattern which is repetitive? Would you agree to that? Because somehow intelligence has to do something that's new, out of the pattern.

D: I think what you said is true. We know in brain surgery, when we are studying the brain in the usual way, then we know that for instance that the brain is capable of producing values, constantly it is ordering the whole outer world in a new way. In that sense it produces quite new kind of attention or values. And that is not the same as knowledge, it is just...

K: Is it new, or is it a different aspect of the old?

A: Yes, that is an interesting question.

D: That is a good question.

B: What is the nature of the creative act?

K: Then we must go into what is creation, and what is invention.

E: All right, shall we do that? I don't know.

A: Yes.

E: Not interrupting you?

A: No, no. Yes I mean the question is how does one come about this intelligence?

K: That intelligence, can it be cultivated? All cultivation implies thought, time.

C: Are we acting intelligently now?

K: No, just a minute. Let's finish this. What did I say just now?

E: That all cultivation is in time.

K: Is in time and also it has a motive and a result. Cultivation implies motive, result and time. That is the factor of any cultivation. Is that intelligence which is born of some totally different time, carrying a different state, or whatever you like to call it, is that cultivable?

A: It doesn't seem so.

B: I am not so sure.

E: Well I would say that the cultivation would come from actually observing that in our life this quality of the new, the flash of the creative, the fresh of perception, for example, the freshness of perception is something that is happening all the time, but we normally tend to obscure it because our mind is too speedy. But it is possible to cultivate a more slow pace of thought and thereby one begins to see constant flashes of this quality of creative insight, or creative intelligence happening all the time. So it seems to me that it can be cultivated, not so much as to cultivate it as such, but to cultivate one's accessibility to it.

A: You mean by a process of observation rather?

E: Well observation is not the word I would use. It is more a quality of taming the poor quality of one's mind.

K: Would you use the word attention?

D: Attention would be good, yes.

E: I am not so happy with attention because it implies something that is too forced somehow.

K: No, awareness - I don't want to go into all that. What are we discussing now, let's be clear.

C: Intelligence.

A: Intelligence, yes.

E: You have asked the question: can this intelligence be cultivated?

K: Can that intelligence which is not born of thought, can that be cultivated? Obviously not.

A: Yes. But somehow there must be...

K: We will come to that in a minute, sir, go slowly. We will get at it. We said any kind of cultivation implies a motive, time and a beginning and an end. Is love cultivable in that sense? I know you don't like that word, it is foreign to you, probably to all of you.

D: If we begin to evaluate things differently then in my brain I am changing my brain also. We know that changes occur which we don't know from where they come. They come there. So I think after all there is some kind of possibility for changing the brain and it is with the values.

K: Sir that means, doesn't it, a quality of silence.

D: Yes, a quality of silence.

K: The quality of quietness, a sense of everything in abeyance. And then in that tranquillity something happens.

D: Yes, not of thought, being quiet, letting the brain just be.

K: Can that be?

D: Yes.

K: But our brain has been active from childhood: work, work, work, struggle, pain, learn, don't learn, the whole human struggle, human endeavour, can the brain, which has been so conditioned, can it ever be quiet?

D: There exists the possibility but it is difficult. But can you tell us brain researchers what value could it possibly be because we are

limited, you see, but in the brain changes occur and these changes bring about new values, but what are they? We don't know because with knowledge we cannot go into them. We cannot. Can you please?

K: We both agree that there must be a certain ground of quietness, of tranquillity so that something new can come. Right? Would you agree to that?

E: And that that can be cultivated.

K: Wait sir, question it, go into it.

E: I mean the attitude.

K: No silence is not an attitude.

E: No, but to make yourself available to silence is an attitude.

K: No. Then who is it that is making you available?

E: That which needs, or requires or wants the silence.

C: Desire.

K: Again desire. Again thought.

E: There has to be a desire to make itself available to non-desire.

K: You go back again, you see.

D: Physiologically no because we let the brain be, it is just there.

E: We might go into a very long discussion here when you say the brain stops. I have never seen a brain stop which is not dead.

D: I have seen my brain stop. Be silent.

E: If I put an electrode, as an electro-physiologist you know that if I put electrodes in your brain it will not be inactive. It will be just as active as now. So that doesn't mean anything.

K: Would you say the brain - I won't even say that! - that thing

which is inside the skull, it has its own rhythm.

E: All right.

D: Yes.

K: And there is the rhythm of thought - right? Can the rhythm of thought be quiet? That is all we are saying.

E: Yes, it can.

K: No. Wait a minute sir. Quiet, not just temporarily, not off and on but quiet.

E: Once and for all?

K: Yes. Just let me explain. You see you are objecting to this when you say once and for all it means time. You see this is our difficulty. Silence is not once and for all. You want it once and for all. And then when you say, once and for all, you introduce the whole movement of time.

E: Are we in time now? Right now?

K: Of course.

E: So we can only point to what we are not now. We are in time and you are mentioning something which is out of time, how can we do it except by a pointer in time?

K: No. We are asking sir, whether the brain, the thing inside the skull, can ever be quiet apart from its own rhythm? That is the question we are asking.

A: I think this is important to clarify that perhaps quietness doesn't mean that the brain rhythm has to stop.

K: I said that. The rhythm goes on.

E: He is talking about the rhythm of thought, not the rhythm of the brain, which if it stops is dead.

A: Yes.

K: Of course. No oxygen and there is the end of it.

B: This is the old St.Peter experiment, cut off your head there is no life.

D: It is possible for that which is inside, I don't mention brain!, it is possible for it. We know that the thought stops but nevertheless there are functions going on which are part of thought. We call it in brain research, consciousness. It is just a being or whatever is inside, that is not the thought, not the sensation, the sensory, not the perception, not action. That we know quite well.

A: But let's come back to the question.

K: This has been a question not only put now but in the most ancient days they put this question: can thought come to an end? Stop?

C: But if we say thought can come to an end, will it be a function of choice?

K: No.

C: You don't think there is any choice?

K: The sun is setting, it is finished. It may come up again tomorrow, but the sun has set.

C: And that is not an act of choice.

K: No, of course not sir.

E: But it is an event in time.

K: I question that.

E: But the sun setting is not in time?

K: I introduced that, forget the sunset. Silence, quietness, tranquility, which means the ending of thought - right? Not for a few seconds, but ending. Apart from the realm of...

C: Would you conceive of that as being some sort of event of

the brain? Or of thought?

K: No, sir. I am thinking all day long about my problems, my wife, my children, my career, my research, I am at it all day long, and when I go to sleep it is there again going on, all day and all night, ceaselessly. And it is wearing itself out. Now I am just asking can all that movement stop? Stop, not stop for some days, or some hours, stop.

E: It is not my experience. Because...

K: Wait, please.

E: May I something at this point please?

K: When you say it is not my experience then your experience may be very limited.

E: Of course.

K: Therefore that's not...

E: But that is all I have.

K: No, no.

E: I can hear something when you say thought can stop, I can hear it as a possibility but it remains for me a possibility unless it becomes reality.

K: Would you like to learn about it?

E: Of course.

K: Would you like to find out?

E: Yes, but can I say something before?

K: Yes of course.

E: It seems that there is a third middle way, may I say possibility, which is not thought as ceaseless, neither is thought gone, but there is an intermediate possibility which is close to my own investigation, or experience, which is, thought as being

permeable. In other words, thought at the beginning, it seems that thought is a solid thing, that it never stops; upon close investigation one sees that thought has actually lots of gaps. It is like not a solid veil but it has big holes in it. In between the holes there is...

K: An interval between thoughts.

E: No, it is not just intervals, it is like thought is like little glimmers in a much large space. It is not just a space.

K: But it is still the movement of thought.

E: There is movement of thought but within a vaster context.

K: Yes, yes, it is still thought.

E: Yes but it is in a vaster context which is not the same as ceaseless thought. There is a dramatic change from one to the other. So I want to know whether this is not also part of your experience.

K: I distrust all experience.

E: Including yours?

K: Including mine!

C: Including yours?

K: Yes sir, I am very sceptical about my own experiences, because you can get deceived terribly.

E: So what is the source of the understanding then if it is not your own experience, or my own experience for myself?

K: Let's leave the word experience, that is a complicated word.

E: OK What would you use instead?

K: I don't know, we'll find out. We are asking a very simple question, which is very complex: there is the rhythm of the brain inside - right? You agreed to that.

E: Yes, no problem.

K: Then there is the rhythm of thought. Can that rhythm, not in a vast consciousness, can that rhythm of thought stop? Right?

That's all. Not induced, not cultivated.

C: Not chosen.

K: When you choose there is the activity of desire.

C: Right.

K: So is there a cessation of thought?

D: Could it be that if it should not be induced there would exist the possibility that if I devalue, you understand me, the thoughts, that I don't give any values to thought, could it be possible that then thought ceases?

K: I don't quite know. Just a minute sir. How do we investigate into this?

E: Fine I hear the possibility now.

K: I don't even know the possibility, I just...

E: Or the question.

K: I just posed that question.

E: All right.

K: No, just a minute sir. See what happens: if I pose a question, and you reply to it, and then I reply to your question, and we keep this dialogue going until only the question remains and you and I disappear - you follow all this? There is only the question, which then has a tremendous vitality. You understand what I am saying?

E: Absolutely.

K: Are we together in this?

E: Yes.

K: That is we have posed a question. That is, can the rhythm of thought which has been going on from the beginning of one's life

until we die, can that rhythm of thought come to an end? You reply and this dialogue goes on. And then you said, look, in that process only the question remains - right? You don't answer, I don't answer. Now when the question remains your brain is quiet, because you are not acting, I am not acting, only the question. Right? And this has been a problem of every human being, to have some quietness inside there, some peace, say, for god's sake stop. Right sir? And they have invented various methods to stop it - right? Control, suppression - agreed?

E: It seems that history records many, many attempts to do this, yes.

K: Many systems, many methods to say, for god's sake let me have some peace, so that my brain, the thing is quiet, apart from its own rhythm. Right?

A: Yes but why does the brain do that? This shutting, why did it fall in the dark from the very start?

K: I don't understand

B: Why does it have to be so full of itself?

K: Ah! From childhood, I have been trained that way, we have been educated, all education is work, work, work, learn, learn.

A: You mean it has been conditioned that way?

K: Yes, of course. Right?

E: It doesn't seem complete to put only the two alternatives of either having thought going or stopping it. There is again the middle way possibility of not stopping thought but making so much room for it that it is not bothersome anymore.

K: But it is still thought moving.

E: Yes but this is like having a very wild animal, a wild monkey

in a small room. That is very bothersome and very complicated, but if the same monkey gets in a large field it is fine, it doesn't bother anybody.

K: Yes it does, but still give it any amount of space it is still there, the activity of thought.

E: Yes it is the monkey running around.

K: Monkeying around.

E: But it doesn't bother anyone.

K: It is not a question of bother.

E: No, no, but you say, I want some peace. Or men have said, give me some peace.

K: People have asked this question thousands of years ago, saying can thought, however much it may have space, in that space can it be silent.

C: Krishnaji, it could be that the very reason that people experience so much noise is because they are looking for it to be peaceful.

K: No.

C: In other words if you take his position and have a dialogue here with the question, the fact of the matter is that if you give it plenty of space you don't experience the desire to have that peace. The people that experience you know, give me that quiet peace are people who are searching.

K: Are you saying because I live in a city, in a drawer, various drawers, I want space and therefore that is my desire?

C: Yes. Your relationship inside your thought process is the thing that's the matter, not the fact that you have thought. You are so busy trying to get out of thought that you are cramped.

K: So if you are in the country, not in a city's drawer, you then say, my god, how beautiful all this is. You revel in it, you say, it is beautiful. But thought is still going on. That's is all my point. I am not saying...

E: No, no, but you raised the question of stopping thought and that question was, and you yourself implied it and I agreed, it has a motivation which is the desire to be free from that slavery.

K: So, all right.

E: So we are raising the possibility that to be free from that slavery maybe it is not necessary to stop thought but simply to give it space and may be then that state of mystery can come.

K: Would you say thought was a material process?

C: What does that mean?

K: I don't have to tell you that.

E: I am afraid I would have to ask you that because in some sense it is and in some sense it isn't. In the same way that the image on the television screen, is that image a material process? It is because it needs those little chips, but it doesn't, it is not because it is a relationship.

K: Agreed but it is still a material process.

C: Yes but it is a relationship. What is more important it is a relationship with a material process.

K: No, no, I am not saying relationship, I am just stating something. I am not saying, what is the relationship etc.

E: Well if you just put the question so bluntly I would say, no it is not a material process.

K: All right, let's put it more softly! He doesn't want it bluntly, then softly.

C: How do you want to put it softly?

K: What is thought?

C: It's a relationship.

K: With what?

C: It's a relationship that is built like you were saying the other day, it is imminent in the fact that your existence as a human being on this earth.

K: Yes sir.

C: It emerges out of that.

K: All right. A human being, what is he?

C: He is a relationship in the sense that he is a form that has taken place in all of this.

K: All right, do you want to discuss relationship?

C: You can't discuss thought without discussing relationship.

K: Yes sir. Let's discuss relationship. What is relationship?

What do you mean by that word? To be related. I am related to my brother, my father, my mother, my wife, my children. I am related to the world.

C: To the trees.

K: Nature.

C: You are not related. You express the relationship...

K: I express - you see.

C: No, I am talking at a very basic level.

K: Yes sir. So am I. So are we related to nature?

C: By definition yes.

K: Definition, I don't mean definition, it has no meaning. When you see that tree in all those marvellous fields, and flowers, and the animals, are you related to it?

C: Actually yes. You are in actual connection to everything around you.

K: Are you? Sir, don't let's quibble.

C: No, no, I mean actually.

K: That means what? That you will not kill anything.

E: Right, OK.

C: That doesn't necessarily mean that.

K: Oh yes. Because if you kill that you kill yourself.

C: Yes but the fox is in relationship to the rabbit.

K: Yes sir, but kills the rabbit.

C: Yes and it is in relationship to it.

K: So you kill the fox.

C: That's right.

K: And somebody else kills you.

E: That seems to be the way of nature's relationship.

K: Just a minute. This is the accepted way of living.

C: Yes but that's built into nature.

K: Just a minute sir. I know this game! I have played this game.

I know all this.

A: But are we not going a little bit away from the main point?

B: There seems to be tremendous resistance. We have asked can thought stop, can there be an end to it and we won't go into the question. We want to go round in different directions and nobody seems to want to stay with the question.

E: I want to stay with the question but I want also to see that the entire question is dealt with, which is the possibility of thought continuing, the possibility of thought stopping, and the possibility of thought having so much space that it doesn't create the problems

that we find it normally creating. I would like the three possibilities to be considered and not discard one off-hand.

C: And therefore relationship becomes an issue.

K: Now which shall we take?

C: What would you consider an intelligent way to approach this issue since we have said that we want to consider all aspects of thought and we have said thought is relationship, what is the intelligent way to proceed, given this fact?

K: I don't know.

B: I don't think we have come here for someone to give us the answers.

K: What is the question? Step by step. First question, what is the question? Desire? I am asking. Is it desire? Is it space? Thought being contained in a small space? If it has vast space there would be no problem? Does space prevent thought from having problems?

E: OK that is a perfectly valid question.

K: You are saying yes?

E: I am saying yes because that is something I can explore and it is part of my experience.

K: Yes.

E: But stopping is foreign to my experience.

K: Forget the stopping. Throw it overboard for the moment.

E: If I may say so I would not like to throw it away because I am interested in learning something which is not available for me.

K: We will come to that presently. We said before, yesterday and the other day, that thought is limited. It can have vast space it is still limited.

E: Yes absolutely the monkey will still be a monkey.

K: It is well known this monkey business!

E: Agreed.

C: All right, agreed.

K: Next question: it is still the monkey, then what is the next question? You say there are three possibilities.

E: The three possibilities to me have to do with the fact that when the monkey is, when I discover that I can relate or see the monkey's action in a vaster space...

K: It is still the monkey.

E: ...it is still the monkey but the space around it has a completely new quality.

K: Yes, but it still remains the monkey.

E: The monkey does but not the space around the monkey.
That's new.

K: That's it.

C: Francisco, are you saying that somehow you can control thought?

E: No. Precisely not. This is exactly what I have not been saying.

C: If you have enough space...

E: Listen to me for a moment. Stopping to me is a synonym of control: instead if I take this wild animal which is uncontrolled thought, and not throw it away, and not hit it on the head and try to kill it, but seem to make room for it, then by itself the wild monkey in the big field simply goes to sleep.

C: Then you think there is enough room in the universe for thought?

E: That is precisely my point that it seems to be the human experience is that it is possible to grow infinitely.

K: Grow? I question that. What is it to grow infinitely? What is growing?

E: That which is around thought.

K: The space. Space can go on.

E: I am not talking about literal physical space. I am talking of that which is where thought lives, the space around thought.

K: Just a minute! You see where he is leading to!

D: I don't understand it.

K: It is speculation.

C: Well it's speculative to say thought can stop too.

K: No, I am asking a question.

E: It is speculative only to the extent that one is not willing to see the source of the observation. The source of the observation is to remain in silence and see how thought moves.

K: I don't quite follow all this, sorry.

C: I think Krishnaji was having issue there because he wouldn't say, at least I have never heard you say in our previous discussions - he would say staying in silence is an act of control. In other words to stay in silence implies that I am going to think my way into silence. That's just another form of control too.

K: The observer is the observed. We agree to that.

B: You are saying that all these actions begin with some sense of desire, or a goal, or some sense of control. And if you begin with control, can you control thought? Either by giving it a lot of space, or by controlling it, by trying to stop it. I guess we are saying that that doesn't seem possible to begin that way.

K: Sir, you used the word space. I can go to the Himalayas and there is immense space. I have been to one spot in the north where you see three hundred and fifty miles of snow. Tremendous. But the monkey is still there! That's all I am saying.

E: I am not disagreeing with that.

K: And that space doesn't affect the monkey.

E: Oh, yes it does.

K: Somewhat.

E: It makes it tame and it usually just takes a nap, goes to sleep. It is like a monkey in a small cage is all neurotic but once it has all the jungle it is a happy monkey, it goes to sleep.

K: Please. This isn't quite accurate sir because you give man any amount of space, any amount, both physically - are you talking physical space?

E: No.

K: Psychological space, inward space. Wait. Inward space. Then how does it come about?

E: It doesn't come about.

K: Then human beings haven't got that space.

E: They have it, it is a matter of paying attention to it, of making yourself available to it. It is not that...

K: Available to space.

E: Available to, yes.

K: Which means what?

E: Which means not speeding so much so that I don't see that it is there.

K: Which means sir, would you say for the skull to have space there must be no self?

E: Yes.

K: That's all.

E: I agree.

D: That's better.

K: Right? That means the self is limited, there should be no activity of the self, no deception, saying I have no self, but I am hiding there. Then the monkey doesn't exist.

E: Well this is again where I don't see.

K: We said...

E: It continues to exist.

K: No, wait sir, of course I exist, the self I am talking about. The me, both the physical, psychological, all the me, memory, this vast bundle of memories which is me, if that bundle of memory ceases, then there is infinite space - that's all.

E: Right.

K: Now...

C: Where is the monkey now?

K: There is no monkey.

E: Well this is what I don't see. The monkey is still there, it is just in a bigger space.

K: Let's define it. You mean the monkey as the body...

E: The monkey as the self, as the body, the memories, the sense.

K: We said that. Memory, thought, experience, knowledge is limited. Therefore give him any amount of space inwardly it is still limited.

E: One thing is that it is limited, the other thing is that in its limitation it is tame so that it is not the source or the cause of further trouble.

K: But it is still limited. That's all.

E: OK I sometimes I don't know what you mean by, that's all.

K: I mean it may somehow create, or bring about, or exist, or live in that space. And I say that space, however wide, however extensive, however deep, the monkey, the self is still there. You agree?

E: That's fine.

K: That's all.

E: We are in agreement!

C: That's an agreement. The monkey is there.

K: The monkey is still there. I know all the tricks of the monkey.

B: It doesn't matter.

K: I know all the tricks. I have watched the monkey operating at various levels, it is still the monkey. What is the next question? If the monkey is very satisfied, says, I have got a lot of space, I am happy, I am building my tail and related to everything and blah, blah, blah.

E: Fine. So the next question I would ask myself is: that seems to be the fruition of a process of cultivation which I need to start where I am, which is the monkey is small space, to cultivate the larger space.

K: Now can the space - it comes to the same thing sir - can that space be cultivated?

E: The space itself, no. My attitude to it, yes.

K: Ah! You see!

E: Well can I put an example. I can say for example, just a metaphor, if I close the curtains of this room it doesn't mean that

there is no sky - right? I have to have an attitude to open up the curtains, and say, oh, there is sky. So it is not that I cultivate sky, I cultivate my attitude to make myself available to the perception of sky. It is the same sort of phenomenon.

K: I have an attitude that war is ugly, brutal. I have an attitude but I go on killing.

E: It is a possibility.

K: But sir, that is what...

E: Or the attitude might bring me to say, I won't kill anymore.

K: It is not an attitude. What do you mean by attitude?

D: I wanted to ask what are they. Do they have something to do with values, attitudes?

K: Values are already...

D: Attitudes we are talking about.

K: No, I am just asking: how does the monkey create space for itself?

C: That is a big question.

E: That is a great question.

C: That's the great question.

K: I put that question.

C: Yes.

K: And what do you do with that question?

D: It needs a change.

K: Kick it around? Put it this way, that way, and the other way, but the question still remains.

B: How about trying different ways?

K: You have tried it, ten different ways now, this morning. I can see what we have done! You have kicked the monkey from corner

to corner, in the same field - right? So what is the next question: can the monkey create the space for itself, which means the monkey has to end? Not as a physical monkey, but the whole inward structure, inward state, inward - right?

E: Well...

K: I am putting it quickly. You can expand it, kick it around. We'll come back to the same thing! Can the monkey create its own space?

C: The question that comes up there is the monkey is caught in the self, the monkey makes small space.

K: The monkey wherever it is will make a small space.

C: Yes. Now that monkey is in that small space, it seems to me that there is some understanding of seeing that small space that dissolves it.

K: That's it. Now wait a minute. Keep to that one statement: when the monkey realizes, sees, perceives, pays attention, whatever word you like to use, that itself whatever it does is still limited - agree? Whatever it does, prays to god, goes to science - right? Whatever it does it is still the monkey, so it cannot create space.

C: Right.

E: At that moment it makes itself available to it though.

K: No. You see, when you say available, it is still the monkey.

E: Up until the point at which he actually lets go of his being the monkey.

K: Wait a minute, that's the whole point.

E: He has to be monkey, make himself available to drop it before he can actually drop it.

K: He is still the monkey sir whether he can drop it or not - right? It cannot create space. Agree to that? Just a minute.

E: Sorry. It is like going to back to David's point. The monkey to be monkey has to be very smart to create all of the illusions of its own enclosure. That intelligence is so intelligent that he can also see his own trappings.

K: We have said that.

E: Right. That is precisely the interesting thing: that this intelligence is two sided. On the one hand it can create this confusion and on the other hand it can see itself. But when it sees itself it is, in some sense in a limited sense but nevertheless in some sense, its own creation.

C: This is important Krishnaji because in our past discussions at this point we usually say that the insight of the monkey into the fact that he is enclosed in a space, it is that that in some way brings a stop to the monkey. But the question is, is there more to the stop than the insight?

K: When does the monkey realize its own limitation?

C: When did you say?

K: When.

E: At the moment it sees its own futility.

K: Now when does that happen? Go slowly sir. Go slowly!
When does this happen? When you knock it on the head?

B: When it is suffering.

K: Wait. I am coming to it. Let's look into it. When does it see, my god whatever I do will always be limited?

E: When there is a breakdown in its world.

K: When does it break down?

E: All the time there is a breakdown.

K: No, sir. Just. Look, I am the monkey.

B: OK, you lost your wife, or your house burnt down.

K: So it means what? In a crisis.

B: Crisis, suffering.

K: Wait. A crisis. See what you are saying! That it needs a crisis for it to wake up. Right?

E: Yes.

K: I question that.

E: It needs it as a usual first step. But then one realizes that the breakdown is happening all the time, right now.

K: No, no, just a minute sir. I asked just now, when does the monkey realize the fact, the reality, the truth, that it is limited? It can climb trees, it can run, it can swim, it can enter into laboratories and dissect, do everything it wants, it is still the terrible monkey. And when does it realize, when does it say, my god, I am limited - not theoretically.

A: In a crisis, we said.

K: I question that. We have had crises. Every year we have crises, every day we have a crisis. I quarrel with my wife. Governments are cheating us, misruling us. You say one thing, another scientists says another thing. When do I realize that I am limited? I have had suffering - right? Untold suffering, not only me but the world. When I see that D-Day entertainment, I suffer, I have suffered. That hasn't changed the monkey because we have suffered for thousands of years.

D: Why?

K: We have had thousands of pleasures.

E: So you need the convergence to think. The suffering and the possibility of somebody, or something, or some...

K: That's your brain, you are now off again.

E: I want to say you have to have the combination...

K: When you say off you mean outside agency.

E: No, I am saying, that the outside agency can be a perfect clear manifestation of the inside agency.

K: Yes.

E: But we have to have the combination of the two of saying it is futile and there is an alternative. It is like your example the other day you run into somebody who says, you could go south. It is the same sort of thing.

K: Yes sir. So when does the monkey wake up and say, I am limited? Do you know what that means sir? Any action - you understand? - any action of the monkey is still the monkey. Vertical, horizontal, create space, it is still the terrible little entity called the monkey. So man has invented god, outside agency will help me, he has prayed, he is still the monkey.

D: Can you say what should be done?

K: I can.

D: I am waiting.

K: Right? Just a minute sir. Have you come to an impasse?

E: In the dialogue, in the conversation?

K: No. When I said whatever the monkey does, whatever, it is still the monkey. Agree?

E: Yes agree.

K: That means you have come to a stop. It is an impasse, you have come against a wall. Wall. You understand? Don't

misunderstand wall. You are stuck there.

E: You come to a realization.

K: No, you have come to the realization whatever it does is...

E: ...is limited.

K: Limited. What does that mean? Is it a theory? Is it you say, yes, let's discuss it? Or it is an actuality that you are up against a wall, you can't move? Yes sirs! There is no escape.

D: But there are people who know that. Also researchers, scientists, know that it is so. We agree.

K: Then what do we do sir?

D: There are some of us who know that you are right.

K: What do we do?

D: May I say this: I don't know. What should we do? We should do something, we just can't wait.

C: We are stuck in the room now.

B: We are stuck with the question, we can't go out of the room.

K: Look what you are doing sirs, look what you are doing! You don't stop, and say, look I am at an impasse.

C: Let's stop right there. You say, we don't stop. What about that act of stop?

K: You are against a wall, you don't have to stop. The wall prevents you moving. We never come to that point.

E: I question that.

K: Otherwise you have the answer.

E: Of course.

D: What should we do?

C: Well tell us. We are here now.

E: We have already said. One thing is that we don't know what

to do, the other thing is that we don't apply ourselves to do it. We talked about creating space around the monkey, didn't we.

C: Nobody understood that.

B: There is nowhere else to move. We can't talk about it anymore. We are stuck.

E: We are not.

D: Then what should we do?

B: To speak about it is to move away from it. We are stuck there.

D: What should we do? Slowly, tell. I am waiting. Very much in my being at Brockwood I hoped that I would tell something to those people at home who are exactly of the same opinion.

K: Have I said I can't move anymore?

E: No, you have said we can't move anymore.

K: You have said that to yourself.

E: No, sorry, I never said that.

D: What should be done?

E: I don't feel that that is true. There is the realization of the absolute impossibility, and at the same time there are all the gaps, all the holes, all the space right there.

K: No, there is no hope when you are up against a wall.

E: It is not true. The sudden realization of the complete limitation brings with it the complete clarity of the space with it.

K: Is that an actuality to you?

D: I don't understand.

E: Is it not sir? Why couldn't it be shared?

K: We can share it together if we are both hungry and food is put.

E: But it is here.

K: Yes sir. Do I realize that whatever I do I am still the monkey? Either in the future, or in the past, whatever I do. It is a tremendous shock to realize that. Right? Shock, both organically and psychologically. Right? Shock. And if you can remain with that shock, not dissipate it - you understand? So that there is no escape, no explanation, no rationalization, anything I do is still the monkey. See what has happened. There is then a totally different action. Yes sir.

E: I thought you said there was no hope. This is exactly what I just said.

K: No, it is not a hope. I have no hope.

E: Oh no?

K: No sir, I have no hope because I am against the wall. If I hope I want to escape.

E: But you have just said there is a totally different action coming out of that.

K: Ah, for me, not for you, maybe.

C: What do you mean, "For me and not you"?

K: No, sir. Do I realize, you, Shainberg, that whatever you do, whatever you think, whatever you act, whatever you hope, it is still the monkey playing? That means you have come to a complete stop. Have you? I am not asking personally, that is up to you. Have you? Complete stop. No argument.

C: No, no. Let's take it in another sense. How can I put it, the stop - what happens to you in the now. Now we are together in this stop.

K: I asked sir, has Shainberg...

C: That thing Shainberg.

K: No, no, you are there in front of me. Have you stopped?

C: There is no answer to that question.

K: Yes sir, there is. Don't dodge it. We have argued for three days - right?

C: Well if I say, I have stopped, that's I and I haven't stopped.

K: No, no. That would be absurd. But you have come to realize, not you sir, forgive me, I am not being impolite or impudent, you have come to realize whatever you do it is still the monkey, and therefore always limited. You understand sir? I will tell you something sir. I met a man, I used to know him, he was a judge. And one day he said, "I am passing judgement, left and right, about crime and murder, all kinds of things, but I don't know what truth is." So he said to his family, "I am going away, I am going to find it." He spent twenty five years, these are facts, meditating to find out what truth is. So somebody brought him to one of the talks which I was giving, and he came to see me afterwards, he said, "For twenty five years I have been mesmerizing myself, deceiving myself. I haven't found truth." You understand? There it is. For an old man to realize that he has for twenty five years deluded himself. To admit that.

You see sir, when one actually faces the fact that you cannot do anything, the monkey, the brain, the inside, apart from the rhythm comes to be quiet, says, right. No tricks any more. Sir this has been the problem of meditation - you know the word? I am not insulting you sir, I am sure you know the word. They have tried every method - you understand? Zen, Buddhist, Tibetan, going off in solitude, following various systems invented by thought, to come

up against this and say, "Look, this is the end".

He is looking at you.

E: Well maybe he is looking at me because to go back to about half way in our conversation this morning when I said it is not my experience!

C: Yes, but what about right now? But now in a sense, not in a sense, this stop and now. Now what?

E: Now won't you cultivate that?

C: Is there cultivation?

E: I don't know if it is cultivating according to Krishnaji.

K: No, not according to me sir. Not according to me. We all said cultivation...

E: I don't know according...

K: We all agreed cultivation implies motive, time, end and effort.

E: Yes absolutely. I don't see that as an intrinsic problem. The problem would be that that motivation would not be cognizant of its limitations. But if a motivation says, "I know of my lack of vision but it is an attitude that makes it possible to constantly come back to that realization of limitation", then that is cultivating a meditative action.

K: Therefore...

E: Motivation by itself is not problematic. Motivation is problematic when it is completely devoid of any context of its limitation, when it believes in itself. At least this is as far as you know, any practical way of cultivation.

K: Sir, you, not you sir, the monkey is still active. Yes.

E: I said again I don't see a problem with the monkey acting and

being a monkey. The problem is when the monkey is in a little room.

K: Right sir.

E: I don't have any animosity against...

K: ...against being a monkey.

E: I don't have any animosity against being constrained.

K: No, no. I am not concerned sir. What do you mean by that word concerned?

E: Constrained, I said.

K: Constrained. Aren't we constrained.

E: Indeed. That is precisely what needs to be worked on and dealt with. Therefore what really interests me is what are the actual practicalities, the actual practicalities of cultivating that spaciousness? Because the monkey is not the problem, the constraint is what makes the monkey crazy.

K: You see the difference? I say it is not the constraint, it is the monkey constraining himself.

E: It comes to the same thing. The way we cultivate it is to make room for it. Not to hit it on the head.

K: The monkey cannot make room for itself.

E: Oh, I thought we concluded that it can because we said its intelligence can apply to see its limitations.

K: We said whatever it does is limited.

E: Yes, and when it becomes aware of that limitation there is space right there.

K: When it becomes aware that whatever it does...

E: ...is limited, it creates space right there.

K: Yes. All right.

E: Well isn't that a fact?

K: If you say so.

E: I am posing you the question very much in the spirit of hearing what your experience is.

K: I would question myself whether one has - not you sir, I am not trying to be impudent - whether one has really realized the nature of the monkey, the monkey whatever it does is still the monkey, and the depth of that realization, which may be very superficial, or it may be profound. When it is profound it totally changes one's life. That's all I am saying. I am not saying anything else.

E: I guess I am saying that that is possible but it may not be possible for every human being. Wait a second. My experience, and this is all I have, my experience, I cannot go by your experience...

K: Of course not.

E: ...nor anybody else's, my experience is that those realizations come and go and come in different degrees of depth. Sometimes it is a realization of a stupid limitation that I have imposed on myself and I can drop it. Sometimes it can be profound, then it is forgotten again. It is not a one-shot deal. It is not like that.

C: I think you are raising another issue. That is the fact Krishnaji is what you seem to be saying is that when the monkey is the monkey, caught up in the monkeyness, in the monkey business, that it has no relationship to the intelligence whatsoever.

K: It is still monkey.

C: It is still monkey. Therefore there is no intelligence at all. And in a way, the brain itself - again coming back to the brain, or

some of its functions - when that monkey business is going on it is all monkey business. Now the question is: whether the intelligence comes in and for instance there is an aspect of the monkey which is intelligent. And therefore the intelligence appreciates the limitations of the monkey and at the same time - yesterday you said, or our discussion took in the statement that the intelligence sees that thought is limited.

K: No, sir. I said let's first define and go into the question of intelligence. The intelligence of thought, and the intelligence of love.

C: And I asked you, or we tried to get at - that's where we ended the other day - what is the relationship between the intelligence of love and the intelligence of thought?

K: What is the relationship - I understand your question - what is the relationship of the man who doesn't hate and the man who hates? There is no relationship.

C: None?

K: No.

E: That's not true. That is not my experience.

K: Not experience. I doubt everybody's experience, including my own. But I am saying let's discuss that, not experience, then you are lost: my experience, your experience, but what is the relationship of the man who loves, in the sense we are talking about, and the man who hates? Just look at it sir. How can there be?

C: I think there is a relationship.

K: All right.

C: I think you think so too. I have seen you embrace people

who you know hate.

K: Just a minute sir. Of course.

C: So what is your relationship when you embrace a man you know who hates?

K: Ah! No. Hate has no relationship to love; but love has a relationship to hate.

C: OK

K: That's all. That's all. Not the other way round.

C: So then intelligence has a relationship to thought?

K: No, sir.

D: Love has to do with embracing. As I told you the first day, that is a good word, embrace in Finnish, so that I can understand. Not the other way round.

C: What is the relationship between intelligence and thought?

K: We said that sir.

C: No, we haven't.

K: Thought has its own intelligence - right? We agreed that. Love, compassion, has its own intelligence. The intelligence of thought has no relationship with that intelligence, but that intelligence has a relationship.

C: Sir, what is the relationship of intelligence to the monkey?

K: None.

C: Not this way?

K: That way, yes, but not the other.

C: OK Now what is the event of intelligence finding, seeing the limitations of the monkey?

K: Sir, just a minute. It is very simple: you are no longer the monkey. I am the monkey. What is my relationship to you? None.

C: But what is my relationship to you?

K: You have relationship, you have love, compassion, all that. But I have no relationship with you, I am still the monkey. When I cease to be the monkey I don't want you, I am - you are finished. Right. We had better stop.

I am not referring to you gentlemen. Each one is pursuing his own way - right?

E: Is there a way to overcome that?

K: Yes sir. I want my career, my business, and he says to me, all of us are doing this in the world - right? Creating havoc in the world.

E: So how could it be otherwise? You do what you do, I do what I do?

K: No. Can we all be together?

E: Yes.

K: Where?

E: Cultivate our love.

K: Oh, no. Don't say cultivate love.

E: Why not?

K: Sir, that means what?

E: That means making yourself available to that possibility. Why does it have to be...

K: Just a minute. We have discussed this point, you are going back to that again. That is not cultivatable.

E: Itself it is not, but...

K: All right sir. This is it. This is what makes us - you stick to your point, another sticks his point. And this world is like that.

D: Beginning again the same round.

E: Well it is not that.

K: The communist sticks to his ideology, won't budge.

E: But Krishnaji I wouldn't harm you because you think differently from myself.

K: I understand sir. But I am telling you sir...

E: Not for one minute.

K: Look sir, can we all be together, not physically but inwardly so that you are a light to yourself.

C: For that to happen it seems to me you have to see him as a monkey in your space who has plenty of room to play.

K: Don't go back to that monkey business! No, sirs, this is our difficulty.

C: I think one of our difficulties is that we don't recognize we are different. You do your thing, I do mine, I can love you but if you are different I love it.

K: If the love is there, there is no difference.

C: Well that is looking at it at different levels.

K: If I love my wife and I have any difference, no.

C: Yes, you have difference in similarity.

K: No, no, sir. Arguing again. It doesn't lead anywhere. We had better stop.

IN CONVERSATION WITH RONALD EYRE BROCKWOOD PARK 24TH JUNE 1984

Ronald Eyre: I would like to ask you about playfulness which matters to me more and more.

K: Playfulness?

RE: Playfulness, knowing that if I tackle a piece of work with a certain solemnity, however serious I am, it sort of destroys itself; but if there is in it an element, in my approach, of playfulness, of letting it happen.

K: I wonder what you mean by playfulness.

RE: Well, I suppose over-solemnity is rather conceited. I mean you have an idea that you would like to do this, you would like to finish it, so you have the end in the beginning, you know what it is going to be. What I mean by playfulness is allowing for things to come in from the side which you hadn't expected - thoughts, or notions.

K: You mean when you are working you are concentrating, and when that concentration is not focused then the other things happen.

RE: Yes, you see I was brought up, like many of us, in a very Puritanical way, brought up to believe that effort was a fine thing. And I believe I am having to learn that effort is a double edged matter, and that it can be over-solemn, it can push you towards conclusions, it can blind you and deafen you to all sorts of things you should be hearing and seeing. I need, I feel, to sit back and play more. Does that make sense?

K: Letting other thoughts come in rather than having one

continuous effort and thought.

RE: And let it organically shift so that it shapes itself organically, maybe in a direction you hadn't intended.

K: Would you say that distraction is necessary? It is that.

RE: It is distraction, isn't it. It is to do with - if I could use a phrase like, mindful distraction, not merely being open to anything.

K: Being empty minded.

RE: That's right.

K: So concentration, a sense of distraction of which you are aware.

RE: That feels quite important.

K: But when you are aware that it is distraction, is it distraction?

RE: It is extremely subtle concentration perhaps.

K: That's what I am asking.

RE: I feel it to be. I feel that it is connected with fear. When an element of fear comes into it - fear you may go wrong, or that something unwelcome may happen, then it freezes you, and you think you are concentrating, you are actually shutting out. Would you say that is correct?

K: That's it partly only. Can we discuss what is concentration and then come to the other. What do we mean when we say concentrate? To focus one's thought.

RE: Focus feels a bit positive as though your intention is maybe a little too much in it.

K: Yes. Concentrate on what one is doing. Don't let anything come in.

RE: To be available totally to what one is doing is another way of putting it.

K: Yes, all right. What does that do when one is so centred, focused? Aren't you shutting off every other form of thought, every other form of distraction, if we can use that word. So you build a wall round yourself and say, "Please, no, don't think of anything, let's think about this."

RE: There is a distinction, isn't there though, between somebody - when you did that gesture it was a slightly worried gesture, you know, please don't bother me, I am concentrating on this. That, I think - although I certainly do it quite a lot - it seems to me to have fear in it and to be probably not so useful as an openness to a thing which merely, quietly presses other thing to the side.

K: I am not sure.

RE: Ah! Tell me more.

K: Could we begin by discussing what makes us concentrate? Will, desire, an end to achieve, a motive, a direction, a purpose, an intensified desire which is in will, and say, "This I must do, this is necessary", I concentrate and therefore I push aside every other thought that comes in. So I build a wall round myself for a moment. So that is a form of resistance. That is a form of - may I put it differently? - a self-centred attempt to hold something, which then becomes fear.

RE: Yes, I see. It is quite certain, I find, that when you describe that, and the shutting out, I know that that is a prelude to failure. It's the thing that happens before you can't do it.

K: Yes.

RE: So I am interested in the further state of what is the state then in which you are really - we have to use the word concentrate again because it is the language, but perhaps there is another word.

K: There is another word.

RE: Freely open and available for things to come in.

K: There is another word, attention.

RE: Attention, more useful, yes.

K: But that is much more complicated. Not one is available, but to attend.

RE: In attention do you allow yourself to be surprised by things that come in to you?

K: I would like to discuss that a little bit. When one is attending, which means giving all your energy, all your sensitivity, your nervous organism as well, not only hearing, eyes, everything is tremendously alive, in that state of attention there is no centre as the 'me' attending. Therefore there is no fear in that.

RE: Ah, yes.

K: I don't know if I am making myself clear.

RE: I understand absolutely, yes.

K: We have been trained from childhood to concentrate. Teachers say, "Concentrate, don't look out of the window". And so there is a contradiction there, I want to look out of the window, so fear begins. So effort.

RE: So why I started talking about playfulness was entirely in this area. I am interested in that very necessary and fearless attention you may say, which is not unserious but it isn't solemn.

K: Attention is attention.

RE: Is just where it is. You see I am interested in the word 'play' because it happens that professionally all my life, I was a child that never got tired of stories. That has been my burden and my pleasure so I naturally work in a theatre, and I tell stories to myself

and others, or I write them. And then the word 'play', of course, happens to be the word given to these events and when I was in India making some films...

K: You saw that statue?

RE: Which?

K: Of Suba playing.

RE: Absolutely. And Lila as play. And I wanted you to talk to me about that because it seems wonderful that the word play should actually be the word to describe the way things are.

K: Dancing, playing football, playing golf and so on - why have those things become important? You play them, you dance. But when we say it is a release, away from concentration. That's what we are doing - work all day in an office, nine to five, or whatever it is, and then go to a bar, drink, distracted, you know, cinema, this, that, the other, so there is tremendous contradiction in this.

RE: None of it is play.

K: None of it is play, it is a distraction. Distraction isn't play.

RE: I have an increasing feeling - I mean I don't give myself programmes for what I am on earth for, but I give myself a little programme just to think that that's my job, it seems to me, is to increase the amount of play. That's one way of putting it. Does that make sense? Increase the possibility in my life, or even in the things which could be drudgery, it is kind of to avoid drudgery, which does mean altering your job.

K: No. Of course not. But suppose if we drop the word distraction, play, for the moment, then what happens?

RE: How do you mean?

K: I have been working in a factory, and it is a terribly tiring,

dirty, noisy, smelly job. I come home, or go to a bar, and there I relax, take a drink and so on. Go home in that state of relaxation and the wife begins to quarrel, say something, I get irritated and we clean that up. And in between sex and all that, but I keep that going. So sex becomes a distraction. You follow? The whole thing, the job forces me to distractions - the night club, you know.

RE: Yes, sure. I suppose I can look on areas of my life. I think of myself as very free footed because I move from job to job. In another sense I move from distraction to distraction, I actually move, I go to a situation for comfort - if you take on a new job it feels comfortable temporarily, and then eventually it becomes its own straight jacket and imprisons you, and you have to move from that prison. So I don't know quite - well I know there must be an alternative.

K: You see in all these there is an element of fear. I am not doing my job properly, I drank too much, or too much sex, and I am losing - you follow? So there is this cycle of fear set going.

RE: Now we can't crack that cycle by thinking we can crack that cycle, can we?

K: Do we do anything that we love?

RE: Not much.

K: No.

RE: If anything.

K: If anything. One is forced by circumstances, specialized as a carpenter, or as a scientist, or a writer, you know, all that. So gradually the brain itself becomes very, very narrow, limited. And that limitation itself becomes a bore. Right? And then break that, go and play, beer, sex, night clubs, football.

RE: There is almost a process in each of these things that for the moment of change it is almost as if a whiff of oxygen is given to you, a whiff of extra energy at the moment of change, and then as soon as you get into the next phase, whatever it is, beer or sex, or whatever distraction it may be, it hardens up and oxygen is then drawn away.

K: So is there an energy which is not wasted at all? And therefore no fear.

RE: And can this energy ever be constantly available?

K: It is there.

RE: Is it there?

K: Of course. But I misuse it. I do something which I hate to do. I want to go on a lovely morning like this for a walk but my wife says, let's go to church.

RE: Yes, that's right. Yes. So what are we frightened of then?

K: That is what I wanted to ask. Are we talking of the ending of fear and therefore living - not, playing and not playing?

RE: Do you think we think we will die if we don't have the next diversion?

K: Of course, of course. There is this terrible fear of death.

RE: In many subtle forms.

K: Of course. Sir, I don't know if you want to go into all that.

RE: Please, I do, yes.

K: You see that involves a becoming, not only physical becoming, I am weak but I will get strong, I haven't run so much but I will, you follow, get physically well. And I make tremendous efforts towards that. They are all doing that now, that is the fashion. And has that spilled over into the psychological realm? I

don't know if I am conveying it.

RE: Yes, I understand. You mean we are not talking about the fear of death, we are talking about trying to avoid the cycle of life in a way.

K: Yes. Therefore if I am afraid of life... So the whole way of living has become a movement in fear - fear of death, fear of losing a job, fear of my wife or husband, I am not becoming a successful man. You follow? This whole way of living has become step by step leading to the ultimate fear of death.

RE: Yes. Good. That's wonderful. All fear has these roots going back to the fear of death. If fear is to be absent at any moment it is some conquest of death.

K: No. If we understand living, the significance of living, not this perpetual battle, struggle, conflict, I must have, more, better, this constant measurement of myself with somebody else, he is famous so I must become famous, he is on the television, I am not! This terrible sense of poverty. And in the attempt to be rich there is the burden of fear. I may never get rich because there is somebody much richer.

RE: Sure. So in a sense I see these little prisons we inhabit, one by one, these little distractions, are the fact we know as we go into them that they are incomplete, there is something in us that knows that it won't work. So that is the cause of great misery. I mean at least if you go into a place where you think it may be nice you are not deceiving yourself until it becomes nasty. There is something in us that knows that it doesn't work.

K: We know it doesn't work but we go on with it.

RE: Isn't that strange.

K: Like war, we know it is appalling, most wasteful, destructive. I heard the other day, you know when they had the D-day celebrations, twenty thousand young men were killed at the first attack. Twenty thousand! And the politicians pass it over.

RE: The problem is, isn't it, that now if you, for instance, express that you won't watch D-day celebrations, or your pour scorn on the whole think of these memorials, you are considered to be disrespectful to those who died. But it's quite the opposite. I feel it is infuriating.

K: It sounds so monstrous.

RE: What you want to say is, because I loved those who died I don't want to have anything to do with the poppies. For some period of years, when I was making films that had a name religion over them I began to find obviously that religions have frequently been used as temporary havens from fear of death, obviously they have. But one can't just stop there because anything, a house can be a religion in that sense, or a job, or a distraction, so the world isn't quite so tidy, is it? If we could only say the religions are doing it we would feel free. But that isn't the case.

K: So what are we talking about?

RE: Well I am talking about fear of death, I feel. Because I feel it to be pervasive and I can't understand why moment by moment in my life there is some sort of censor or judge.

K: Would you say death is part of play?

RE: Absolutely, in the sense that good death is part of play.

K: What do you mean by 'good death'?

RE: Well I just mean the possibility if you climb a thing and may fall off it and don't care, then there is the possibility of the fall,

of the other side of the action. That's what I mean by a 'good death' the other part of the action, is what I mean by good death.

K: Say for example, a very rich man who has got everything in life, writes books, and at the end of it he says, "I have had a jolly good life", and dies. Right? And there are those who are paralysed or maimed and all those terrible cases that are more and more increasing in the world, to them death may be an extraordinary event.

RE: What may be an extraordinary event?

K: The paralysed ones.

RE: Yes.

K: The invalids, the incurables. Are we talking about fear of death, or fear of life which makes us fearful of death?

RE: That's more like it.

K: So why are we afraid of life? What is the cause, what is the reason, the many reasons, that make one fearful of living?

RE: I wish I knew.

K: Let's discuss. One of it is from childhood I am forced to learn, memorize, and I am trained to meet problems. One's brain has been conditioned to solve mathematical problems from childhood, college, university - problems, problems, problems. So the brain is conditioned to problems, and then it meets problems and its resolution of the problem is making the problem more complicated, and in the solution of it increase ten different other problems. That is what the politicians are doing.

RE: I get something quite good. Our education seems as you describe it, to be a series of trial runs, solving problems. But the problem when it arises is not the problems that you have done the

trial run on, never.

K: No, therefore what happens?

RE: You apply the rules you have learnt in the hope that they work.

K: They don't work.

RE: And they don't.

K: So that is one of the real problems of human beings, to approach a problem without having problems at all.

RE: Very good. In fact I suppose the way you are taught defines the problem for you. But the problem may be quite, quite different. So you can only solve the problems you have been taught to solve. You can only see as problems things that you have been taught to solve and may be much greater and more terrifying things are killing you.

K: And therefore you approach it with a brain that is trained to problems. Say, I mean, most religious people in the world believe in god. And to reach that godhead you must torture yourself, you must fast, you must undergo every kind of denial - no sex, don't look around you, don't feel anything, control your desires. You follow? And we are conditioned to that. So to reach god I go through all this. And you become a saint.

RE: Isn't it crazy when you come to think of it.

K: That's it.

RE: In Christian scriptures, for instance, there is enormous amount of stuff about people who were outsiders, about the prostitute and so on, but as the religion becomes hardened and is utilized it isn't so, is it?

K: It is crazy! So just let's look at it for a minute. We are afraid

of living because then we say, what is the significance of living, the meaning of life. And not finding any we invent - the philosophers comes in, the specialists come in, and the psychologists come in, you follow - we invent. And that invention becomes our security. Then I hold to that. I fight for that, kill for that.

RE: It is like a poison, isn't it?

K: That's it. This is what is happening, sir.

RE: Do you know why I am here actually? One of the reasons - I will tell you a little story that happened. When I came here for the first time there was two hours to wait and I was put in a room and shown video tapes of you. And over two hours I conceived quite a strong dislike for you.

K: Good.

RE: A strong dislike. And then I went with my dislike to have lunch, and a voice behind me said, "You should try the grated carrot, it's very good", and that's was you and we got on fine after that. Now this is the curious thing you see, I was obviously manufacturing, I was education myself in you, I was trying to see what you were about. You see what I mean? I was getting all sorts of notions and the effect of them was deeply depressing. And yet carrots and your presence was fine, I had no problem with that. So I am extremely keen that anything we say to day should not be capable of giving any of that sort of feeling that we have anything of importance. You never know.

K: We are discussing, aren't we, why life has become so meaningless. The tree doesn't ask that question, the tiger doesn't ask that question. Right? It says, "I am living".

RE: So?

K: So sir, if there is no conflict in living I would never ask that question. I don't know if I am conveying anything.

RE: I didn't understand the last sentence.

K: If there is no conflict in one's life, no conflict whatever, you would never ask that question.

RE: The question of the meaninglessness of life.

K: The significance of life.

RE: Because implied in it is an idea of some perfection which you ought to be having.

K: Yes.

RE: Which is another fiction. So we blunder from fiction to fiction.

K: Illusion to illusion, fancied, and so on.

RE: And I suppose the awful truth is that...

K: What makes human beings ask this question? Because in their own life it has no meaning - going to the office from nine o'clock to five o'clock, until you are sixty, responsibilities, house, mortgage, insurance and the conflict in relationships and so on and so on. And at sixty five, seventy, eighty, you pop off. And then you say, what is the meaning of this?

RE: What is it about?

K: Then there is death. And then you say, "I am going to die, I hope I will live next life" - you follow. That whole cycle begins. Hope, despair, depression, fear, I achieved so much this life. What does it mean, coming to the end of it all? I was told of a man who was enormously rich, enormously. His cupboards were filled with gold, paper money of every description, specially Swiss. And he

was dying, he said, "As I can't take it with me, keep it all open, keep all the cupboards open so that I can look at them as I am dying". Just think of it.

RE: Wonderful. What a wonderful last thought. I just have a feeling, when you talk about it, death - we know it is the obscenity, we know it is the thing that you may not talk about, the last century it was sex, we can't talk about death this century. I have got a feeling the absence of really living with it, sitting with it, just makes our situation so impossible.

K: I am not sure, sir. After all death means total ending - all the memories, all the experiences, the knowledge, the attachments, the fears, the sorrows, the anxieties. It is like somebody cutting all the thread which you have gathered to pieces, ending. We ought to discuss what is ending. Do we ever end? Or in the ending there is another continuity?

RE: It seems unnecessary. I haven't ever had much sense of starting, or much sense of the time going on, and I have not much sense of my ending either. So I have every reason to believe what is around - am I making sense?

K: Oh, yes. What is ending? That is death. Right? I may believe I shall be born next life.

RE: Death is something observed by somebody else, surely.

K: Not only by somebody else. I want to believe it, it is comforting. I want to believe it. It gives me great comfort to say, at least I have another chance.

RE: I see what you mean.

K: I mean the whole Asiatic world believes in reincarnation. And some of that is accepted here now, books are written, people

say, I believe in it, and all the rest of it.

RE: I mean the after life, which is well generally believed, I think, in this country, in this tradition.

K: In the Christian world they believe in a different form, resurrection and so on.

RE: This is a subtle way of keeping you quiet about what is going on now.

K: Yes. So there is death, ending, and there is living. The living has become so - we don't have to go into it, we know it very well. And there is that waiting - not waiting, it is there. We are all going to pop off, die. That's the question. Right? There is an time interval. The time interval may be a hundred years, or five years, or fifty years, it is a time interval. And during that time interval I am living. I am acting, living, suffering, despair, all the rest of it. I haven't solved this problem, this way of living, if there is a way of living in which there is no pain, there is no suffering. And there is also the other, which is the ending of all this. Now if there was no time interval, they go together.

RE: Yes.

K: Therefore which means ending everything everyday.

RE: Yes, yes.

K: Your attachment: this is my school, my... you follow. That makes the brain so small, limited.

RE: But our means of attachment are so extraordinary. I mean one can congratulate oneself on getting rid of attachment A while B - Z line up to take over.

K: Yes, sir.

RE: It is an extraordinary killing problem.

K: So is it possible to live that way?

RE: What do you think?

K: Oh yes, I think so. That is the only way to live otherwise you go through hell.

RE: Sure.

K: So that life is not - or rather life contains death, living is death. So everyday what you have collected, put it aside. If I am attached to this house, I know death says, "Old boy, you can't, it is the end of you", so I say, "All right, I will be free of attachment to this house." Be not attached.

RE: Unattached, yes.

K: You are completely free of it.

RE: And yet use it. This is the problem, non-attachment can frequently go into forms of resistance.

K: So I am living in this house, I am responsible for this house, I am responsible for what is happening here, but also I am going to die. So while I am living that day I am fully responsible.

RE: And you are not responsible for the day when you are not here.

K: Yes.

RE: There must be something in us that thinks that life will hurt if we live it.

K: Life hurts?

RE: If we live it. We must have a feeling - you see while the mind will say, oh yes, I know that it is stupid to believe in whatever it is, relationships, or drink, or the job, or whatever it is, to be a little haven, while the mind is saying that it must also subtly, with a quiet voice be saying, the alternative is more

terrifying.

K: Yes. You see that's why one has to enquire, is there a becoming and therefore the ending of becoming is fear.

RE: The ending of becoming is fear - yes.

K: And is there psychological becoming at all? But there is a becoming in the world. I mean one is apprenticed to a master carpenter and you gradually work with him until you become as good as he is.

RE: Sure.

K: That same attitude, or that same activity is spilled over, or extended into the other field, the psychological, the inner field, I must become something. If I don't I am lost, I am failure, I am depressed, look you have become something, I am nobody.

RE: That implies somehow that the later stage is preferable to the earlier, that the master is preferable to the apprentice. I have a sort of feeling that the people I admire as well as having their calendar age have also stuck at another age. The people I really like are about three years old.

K: Children.

RE: Yes, but also people who have got that curious sort of wide eyed thing. I am always a bit suspicious at the thought of building up to anything, or a growth to something. I have a feeling that it has already been neglected. Does that make sense, that it has already been here - reclaiming one's childhood, in some way. And any way that one tries to device to break out of one's little prisons, whatever it is, because it is an idea, because it is an idea has the fear written into itself as an idea.

K: Quite. So idea becomes fear.

RE: That's right. So the idea of liberation is fear. So we wait.

K: No.

RE: What do we do then?

K: Whether it is possible to end fear.

RE: To end fear.

K: To end fear.

RE: Yes.

K: Not of a particular fear, but end fear, the whole tree of fear.

And we are trying to trim the fears.

RE: What is the axe? How do you get at it?

K: I'll show you. We will go into it. What is time?

RE: What is time.

K: Not by the watch, the clock, sun rising, sun setting.

RE: I think I can only understand time from something that is past.

K: Sir, you have said it. So time is that which has happened yesterday.

RE: That gives me the idea of time.

K: Yes. That which has happened yesterday, or a thousand yesterdays, or forty five thousand years that man has supposed to have been on earth, that is the whole duration of forty five thousand years, which is in the present.

RE: Our thought is in the present and everything we know of it is in the present.

K: Yes, all that is in the present. And the future is the present.

RE: We assume there is going to be one and we make it into a projection.

K: The future, tomorrow.

RE: Yes, sure, you can't have it tomorrow, you have got to have now.

K: No, no. The past, as we say, is now, in the present.

RE: That is how we must take it, yes.

K: That's so, an actuality.

RE: Sure.

K: I remember meeting you last year, so there is that duration of time, the recognition, if I recognize it, and the future is the same as now because I will meet you again next year and say, "Hello, old boy". So the future is also now. So the present contains the past, the present and the future. So there is no future. I don't know if you see this.

RE: Yes, I do see what you mean.

K: The future is what you are now.

RE: It is amazing how we inhabit this future, this invented future with ill possibilities, and lord knows what. Yes.

K: So the future is now. And if there is no breaking down of the 'me' now I will be tomorrow exactly the same. So one questions, I question whether there is any psychological evolution at all. You understand?

RE: Yes, I do.

K: There isn't any.

RE: There doesn't seem to be able to be, except some fiction, again that somebody has invented in observing you.

K: So I see for me there is no 'more' or 'better'. The better is future. Better is measurement, what I should be. And so what I should be is an avoidance of what I am. So that creates a conflict. So if I see actually, not theoretically or sentimentally, the actual

fact that the whole of time is now and therefore there is no becoming, no ideal to be reached.

RE: That is such a radical thought. The feeling about it that one has kind of heard it, it is not an unfamiliar thought but it is desperately unfamiliar, it challenging everything that one lives by. Tell me about this axe as well.

K: I am coming to that.

RE: Because I want to take it away!

K: Sir, what is change? If I change according to the future ideal, that ideal is projected by thought, in which is also implied time, thought is time. So if one really grasps the depth of this statement, or the feeling of time is all now, and so therefore there is no tomorrow, in the sense, I will be something tomorrow. So there is an ending to conflict.

RE: Yes.

K: Which is an enormous factor. We have accepted conflict as a way of life. There is no conflict at all. That is, I have to understand change, I am this but if I don't change I will be exactly tomorrow what I am now. So what is change? Is there psychological change at all? I don't know if you understand?

RE: Yes.

K: Or only 'what is', and the giving attention to 'what is' is the ending of 'what is'.

RE: Yes.

K: But one can't give total attention to 'what is' when you have got an ideal.

RE: That's right.

K: I was asked to speak at the United Nations. It is a

contradiction in terms, United Nations, first of all. And they say we must gather together, become friends, and all that blah, and it does not take place. Because the principle is wrong - my country and your country, my god and your god. The Russians have their ideal and... So if one really realizes, feels the depth of this all time is now, the whole, it is like a light that changes.

RE: When you say, all time is now, is 'now' always joyous?

K: What?

RE: Is 'now' always happy?

K: Don't use the word happy.

RE: All right. You see...

K: Why should it be happy?

RE: Quite. That's my point.

K: Why should it be anything?

RE: Anything. Indeed.

K: You know sir, there is something which we should go into, if we have time. What is to be nothing? Because we want to be something. The wanting is a sense of lacking. I haven't got a good house, I want a better house. I don't know all the knowledge in books, I must read. So there is this tremendous craving. And what is the craving for? I am not a philosopher.

RE: No, no, I know.

K: To me, what are we craving for? We want peace. We crave for peace, and we live violently.

RE: We always look for the sources of the violence outside ourselves.

K: That's it. And therefore we say, non-violence. While a human being is violent, living violently, fighting, quarrelling, in

conflict, and he is working for peace.

RE: I'll tell you actually where my happy came in - I wasn't really talking about happy in the sense that I think would cause a problem. It was just that I remember there was a thing at a big exhibition at Olympia, Mind, Spirit and something or other. And there were many little booths with various religious persuasions, and they were all smiling. And they were selling this sort of smile, this 'blissed out' quality - you know. And I ached to have one booth where everybody in it had a splitting headache! I just wanted to go to them and be there. Not because it was either bad or good, but also one mustn't be kind of... there is very great difficulty. I mean anything you say can so easily be associated with extremely destructive thoughts too.

K: Quite.

RE: I mean this is your burden.

K: So sir, the word change implies, I am this, I must be that. We are conditioned from childhood to that.

RE: To expect.

K: So heavily conditioned. I see a small car, I must have a bigger car. I see you on the television, and by god, why am I not there?!

RE: We should be there together, you see.

K: You know this tremendous craving, not just for publicity, but the inner craving for god, for illumination, for living a right life, that we must all be together. Why do we have such craving?

RE: I don't know. There is a great unlovedness about it, the feeling of actually that you are not loved, and that possibly the larger car will put its arms round you in a way that the smaller car

doesn't, will make up for it. It is a displaced feeling, of lack of affection, I would have thought.

K: Partly. Is it in oneself the sense of insufficiency? I am not loved.

RE: That feels to me very real.

K: I am not loved. I am not loved by that woman or by that man. And I must be loved by that man, or by that woman. But that leads to another very complex question: what is love?

RE: I would tend to say, possessiveness.

K: Of course it is. Attachment, possessiveness, jealousy, sexual pleasure, desire for more.

RE: It is also self love.

K: We call all that area love. Some person said to me, how can there be love without jealousy?! Which means without hate - you follow.

RE: Yes, true. Well in a sense of possession there can't.

K: And therefore one asks: what is the relationship between love and death?

RE: Love in the sense we are talking about?

K: Possession, all that, the whole idea, in that one word so many things are contained.

RE: But if you say, perfect love casteth out fear, it is not perfect, is it?

K: No, I don't know.

RE: Exactly, I know, I know, it's a killer!

K: If you ask that question, sir, what is love, and what is that state of love with death? - the love in the ordinary sense of that word. Is there any relationship at all? And if it has a relationship

how does that show itself? How does that manifest itself?

RE: I can see love in the sense we are talking about it as a series of faulty insurance schemes against death, where the insurance house is really bound to collapse. But you still take out the insurance.

K: First of all we never ask that question.

RE: The connection between death and love, no. As we are plunging into love we certainly don't.

K: Now if you ask that question, I put to you that question, if I may, what is your response to it?

RE: The connection?

K: Yes, what is the connection, what is relationship? Is there any relationship? If there is, what is its nature?

RE: Well it feels like an attempt to ward it off, to have it not happen. Possession in the terms we are talking about, it is an attempt to have a permanence where there can be no permanence. Therefore it is an attempt to contradict the fact that things die.

K: That's it. Death is impermanent.

RE: Death is impermanent. Death is a permanent word to describe an impermanent happening.

K: Death is impermanent. And possessiveness, hoping for permanence.

RE: Absolutely. An attempt to make it go on for ever.

K: To go on for ever, yes.

RE: It is curious how love poetry, at least cheap love poetry, has always got a doing everything for ever. Good love poetry is usually about things collapsing.

K: What is the relationship? What is the relationship between

darkness and light?

RE: You can't have one without the other.

K: No. To ask that... but I am asking the relationship between the two.

RE: Could you tell me?

K: That is, darkness, we know when there is no moonlight, no stars, nothing, dark in a forest. I have been like that. Dark, absolute impenetrable darkness. And the sun comes up and everything is light. What is the relationship between that and that?

RE: You tell me.

K: I don't think there is any.

RE: Really?

K: Light is light. Let me put it the other way. What is the relationship between good and bad? Is there a relationship at all?

RE: Before we do good and bad if I could do dark and light. If I am asked to describe something, if I am asked to describe it then I do need the presence of one before I can do the other. For instance if I am describing this forest in which I can't see a tree, that's darkness, then of course when the light comes up the trees become visible.

K: So you are judging light and darkness according to your perception.

RE: Yes. That's right.

K: That's obvious.

RE: Yes, that's right. But it is only when I have to come to describe it that the relationship exists because of that.

K: But move a little further, deeper. What is the relationship between that which is good, and that which is so-called evil, or

bad? Is the good born out of the bad? Because I know what is bad, or experience that which is painful, bad and all the rest of it, and so I am moving, or trying to get away from the bad to the good.

RE: I would use good or bad to describe very temporary things.

K: No, is good temporary? That which is good, that which is beautiful, it is not temporary.

RE: Why not?

K: I'll show it. Let's look at it for a minute. If the good, or any other word you like to use, is the outcome of the bad, has its roots in the bad, then it is not good, it is part of the bad. So every opposite has its roots in its own opposite.

RE: Good. I get that.

K: So is there a good which is not born out of the bad?

RE: Not something that I could give that word to. I couldn't give that word to it because we have already used it.

K: Give another word, it doesn't matter. It is a good old fashioned word, the good, the beautiful, the true. Now I question altogether whether there is an opposite at all.

RE: To good?

K: To opposite.

RE: To any opposite?

K: Any opposite. Of course there is man, woman, tall, short. I am not talking about that.

RE: These are conveniences.

K: Yes. Apart from the conveniences, is there something so absolute and not related to the relevant?

RE: I would be always conditional myself about handling it. I couldn't do it in any way. I would be very frightened of people who

do because they become murderers.

K: No, no, on the contrary.

RE: What do you mean?

K: I mean the freedom of goodness, not the misuse of freedom. The misuse of freedom is what is happening in the world. But freedom is good, it has the goodness quality in it. I don't like to use the word moral, virtue, that has no meaning, but that sense of depth in it.

RE: We are somehow alongside fear again, and absence of fear.

K: That's what - of course. That's why we said, is it possible to be free of fear totally? Not what might happen, of which I might be afraid, or that which has happened of which I am afraid, but these two elements, the past and the future, is now. Right? So can the now, which is fear, be completely wiped away?

RE: Always the presence of now, as you would handle it, is dependent on having these fictions of past and future with one.

K: That's right.

RE: So even to talk about now is risky.

K: But one has to use that word present, now. You are sitting there, I am sitting here, that's now.

RE: But you have got to get the scalpel further.

K: Of course, of course. I mean you have to have a little bit of subtlety in this.

RE: Yes, that's right. But the fear remains until the knife has gone much further.

K: That's it.

RE: Than now.

K: Of course. So what is fear? Not theoretically, actually in

one's heart, in one's brain, what is fear, how does it come? What is the source of it, the root of it, the beginning of it?

RE: Roughly, off the top of my head, it is a feeling of not being in the right place, of not feeling where you should be. An 'ought' is involved in fear, the ought to be.

K: We have said that. The ought to be, I ought to be.

RE: Yes, we are talking about another fear.

K: Fear. All this is fear. What is the root of it? We said fear is like a vast tree. There is a marvellous tree here, an oak, it covers the ground, an acre. Now our fear is like that. But the root of that oak is there, in the centre, the branches are enormous.

RE: What is the root? How would you describe the root? Or are you asking me to describe it?

K: Not describe. The fact of it is time and thought.

RE: We can play with thought.

K: No, time and thought are the root of fear. We are trying to understand whether it is possible to be free of fear, totally, completely, psychologically we are talking about. And the root of that, the beginning from which the oak tree grows, becomes enormous, the root of it is time and thought - time being, I will be, if I am not I am frightened. Thought says, "I have been, and my god, I hope I will be".

RE: Is there a sort of fear that is not connected with thought? Or is all fear connected with thought?

K: It is all connected with thought.

RE: All connected with thought.

K: Of course.

RE: If suddenly something happens to you which terrifies the

organism...

K: At that second there is no fear. Then thought comes in.

RE: The intervention of thought, however rapidly, beyond the speed of light, and then the reactive fear. Yes. Yes.

K: Then the question arises: can thought in certain areas be active, writing a letter and so on, talking, active, fully active, and in other areas not at all, which is in the psychological world, not at all?

RE: Discursive thought I have never understood at all. I have never had any feeling for actually even putting sentences together. I have always felt that things that have ever made sense to me have always come like that, sudden flashes of things.

K: Our thought is linear.

RE: Well we are trained in a linear way, but I have never felt comfortable.

K: We are trained, like the Chinese, it is still linear.

RE: Yes. It is still linear. That's the schooling, isn't it, that's where you pass or fail your exams.

K: Thinking is a series of connections, associations, always.

RE: So you are running a school based on thought to stop thinking.

K: No. Thought is necessary in certain areas, absolutely. That requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of knowledge, a great deal of capacity, skill, and ingenuity, invention. And is it that same activity has spilled over, extended into the other area?

RE: Very good, that's excellent. To know where it is useful, to have it as a useful tool.

K: Of course. If I understand, really see the depth of it, the

seriousness of it, then I would question why is it that thought is always moving, active, in the psychological world. In the psychological world is the 'me' - my consciousness, my failure, my success, my reputation, my 'I must be', 'I must not be', my faith, my belief, my dogma, my religious attitude, politics, fear, pain, pleasure, suffering, all that is me. All that is memory. So all that is memory, me is memory.

RE: And the 'me', if you are brought up like a lot of us in this country...

K: All over the world.

RE: All over the world may be, in a sort of Bunyan tradition of you hold your own, you are responsible for yourself, I mean there is an element again in which that makes sense. There is also an element again in which it is quite, quite destructive. I remember hearing, somebody told me a story, I think in Japan, they said it was a possible way of life, a man running away from his own shadow, who then realized that all he had to do was to hop under a tree and the shadow disappeared. And I remember feeling immediately very methodistical about that, you may not get away from your shadow. But obviously you may and must.

K: So thought and time are the root of fear, why does thought come into this area, the realm of the psyche?

RE: I wonder. It appears to stop danger. When you have a thought it is like asbestos to hold something hot, you have the illusion that with the thought you can control something which in an uncontrolled state might be overwhelming.

K: That is, there is the thinker who holds something hot and the thought that says, don't hold it.

RE: Yes. Beware.

K: So there are two separate entities. The thinker and the object of which you think. Now what is the thinker?

RE: A thought.

K: Right. Thought says, I am the thinker separate from...

RE: Yes.

K: But to realize the observer, the thinker, the experiencer, is the experience, is the object, are one, they are not separate, sir that means a tremendous revolution, inwardly, psychologically. Which means when there is no division, there is no conflict, there is only that fact. And when you give attention to the fact the fact is burnt away. But thought is kept to plant a tree, bring that flower into being.

RE: That makes sense, yes.

K: So if you give attention to that then that will never create problems.

RE: Yes, I understand. You see everything we are saying is bringing something to a T junction. Because we can't conceive, it is uncomfortable for us to think that you have to shed various ways of handling this.

K: The other day somebody said, you have to burn your icons.

RE: Burn you icons, indeed. Yes. And that's uncomfortable, and there is no way past it.

K: So when you burn your icons, death is - you understand?

RE: Yes.

K: And also sir, I don't know if you have gone into this, not theoretically but actually, what is creation then? Not invention, I am not talking about invention. Invention is born out of

knowledge, the scientist can invent more atom bombs, or something new, but it is always born out of knowledge.

RE: What is creation in what sense?

K: Creation which is not born out of knowledge. Because knowledge is limited.

RE: Limited, yes indeed.

K: Now or in the future.

RE: And it is pre-limited.

K: It is limited. If creation is born of knowledge it is not creation, it is invention, it is all kinds of things.

RE: Certainly even in whatever I have done, in my humdrum way, there have been odd moments, writing something where certainly it was not any form of pre-knowledge which created it. My boundaries seemed to be almost illusory, and that I was not as confined for some reason, and then something else was fed in, and then you write something or you do something which has a muscle which is not yours.

K: No, let's be clear. Must creation always be expressed? You understand?

RE: Sorry?

K: Must it always be expressed? Put into writing, in a sculpture, in painting - you follow?

RE: Yes. I don't see why it should at all have to be expressed.

K: So if both of us see the fact that creation cannot be born out of knowledge...

RE: Yes, for sure.

K: Born out of knowledge is vast invention, of various kinds, at various levels and so on, and so on. But is there a state of mind,

brain, or mind, where knowledge is not?

RE: Where creation is?

K: Where creation is. You understand what we are saying? It is dangerous!

RE: Well I think there must be - I am sure there is. Well why should one have to write it, that seems awfully...

K: I mean, I don't know, first of all, am I, who have been writing, talking, or inventing, and call my invention creation, I paint a picture and say it is a marvellous creation. Leonardo paints something and I say, "What a marvellous creation that is". We have used that word both as an invention and also...

RE: We do, it is an end stop, a product.

K: A product.

RE: We use it as a product. Thus when you get sketches by say a master, because we may as well use their example, a sketch, an incomplete thing, part of a process, somehow makes you tingle in a way that may be the finished thing doesn't.

K: Of course, of course.

RE: The patron, the man who has paid for the picture, somehow comes into it, frequently at the stage when it has to be completed. Whereas the energy, whatever was going on in the making of it, didn't have to push it to that conclusion, and it is present in an early stage.

K: You see this has been one of the questions that have been asked by the most ancient people, that is, is there a state of mind, brain, mind, where knowledge ends? Though it is useful in other directions, don't let's confuse. Complete ending of it, then only there is something new. And that thing is creation. That is creation.

You understand?

RE: The end of knowledge is creation itself, yes.

K: That requires not a discipline of conformity but tremendous alertness involved in it, a sense of deep watchfulness that the other doesn't slip in.

RE: You have to shed everything then. You wouldn't be who you are. It is a scary thought.

K: We had better stop because it is a quarter to one.

RE: Yes, we have done well. Thank you very much indeed.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 25TH AUGUST 1984

Good Lord there are so many people, aren't there?

There are going to be four talks and a couple of question and answer meetings during these ten days. I would like to remind you, if I may, that this is not an entertainment. It is not something you come for a day, or spend an hour, listening to some talk, or talks and questions, but rather this is a very, very serious affair. And if you have come here out of curiosity, or because you have seen something on the TV and you feel like listening to this chap, that isn't good enough. You are here at a Gathering of very serious people, at least one hopes so. And we are not trying in any way to convince you of anything, of any new theories, new conclusions, new concepts or ideals. To the speaker all those things are really an abomination, they have no meaning in daily life. And this is not something popular. Popularity is the last thing that is desired. What is important, it seems to us, is that we consider together both objectively and subjectively all the problems, all the conflicts, struggles, pains, sorrow, fear and so on while we are here during these talks and question and answers. Please bear in mind that if one may remind you, and we shall keep on reminding you, that the speaker has no authority as a person. This is not a personality cult, or something that you agree or disagree. Because we have to exercise our brains, reason, logic, sanity. Not say, "I like you therefore I agree with you", or, "You are some strange person therefore I disagree with you", but rather that we are going to think over together. Not agree, or disagree but observe together the

whole phenomenon of existence, our daily life, our way of living, our thoughts or emotions or reactions.

And to enquire deeply into the whole process of living, what is happening outwardly in the world, objectively, and what is happening inwardly, subjectively. That is psychologically, or if you do not like that word subjective, or psychological state, inside the skin, not the bones and the blood and sinews and so on but the whole unexplored, by each one of us, though specialists may have explored it superficially. But together, and the speaker means together, not that he is going to talk and put forth certain ideas but rather together we are going to observe these extraordinary events in our life, the conflicts, the many, many human problems, the problems of relationship, why human beings get hurt, psychologically wounded. But we are also going to talk over together the whole question of fear: whether it is possible ever to be free of fear, first, not outwardly, objectively, but subjectively, inwardly, to be entirely free of fear. And we are going to talk over together the question of pleasure which human beings in different ways pursue. And also the enormous burden of sorrow, not only of one's own but the sorrow of humankind.

And also we are going to talk over together the question of religion. Not that which is organized, not that which you believe in, or don't believe in but the question of what is religion, what is the state of the brain that is free and is able to perceive that which is sacred, true. And also we are going to talk over together, death, which is the lot of every human being in the world. That is one thing that is absolutely certain. And also we are going to talk over together meditation and so on.

So we are concerned with the whole of life, not one aspect of it. Nor one particular form but the whole of our existence on this earth. And we will also talk over together what is beauty. If there is no beauty there is no truth. Not only the beauty externally, environmentally, but also the sense of what is really beautiful. So we are going together, without any kind of persuasion or enticement, or reward or punishment, think together, observe together, take a very long journey into ourselves, long journey objectively in the world and also subjectively, inwardly. And to do this very carefully and minutely, precisely there must be the quality of doubt, scepticism, questioning, never accepting anything, neither one's own experience or another's or any philosophical, theoretical, ideological concept. If we are prepared for this, each one of us, then we see for ourselves how important it is, how serious it is, not something one comes for a weekend, and it is a long holiday I believe, Bank Holiday, but rather we give our energies and we have leisure. At least for an hour or two this morning. And talk over together these problems.

Which means: one must put aside for the time being, if you will, or completely, one's own prejudices, one's own bias, one's own obstinate or light opinions because they distort, prevent, block when the accurate perception is to take place. Can we go together on this journey? Not with tremendous effort, but rather hesitantly, tentatively, not following anybody. There is no guru and all that nonsense. In so-called psychological, subjective matters there is no authority. Either the authority of one's own experience, the authority of one's own knowledge, and all knowledge is limited. We will go into all this. Or obeying some concept. All this prevents

naturally clear perception. Is this possible at all? To be free of one's own conclusions, the concepts and images that one has built for oneself as a guide, or some ideals projected by thought in opposition or with the connivance of the present so the brain becomes very clear, active so that we can observe, think and take this exploration into the world outside and into ourselves.

That is the concern, the - of all these talks and question and answers. There is no authority in this matter. Each one of us is responsible for his actions, for his thoughts, for the way he lives and so on. And if we want to blame others, or the environment or the society, the society is what we have made of it, the social structure is what human beings have put together through centuries. Through their ambitions, through their competition, their aggressiveness, their fear, their pleasure and so on. So the society in which we live is corrupt, preparing for wars, is the consequence, the result of the way we live, the way we think and feel and so on.

In considering all this, are we wasting our life? The wastage is conflict. The conflict in which we live perpetually from the moment we are born until we die. That is a fact. And human beings have never been able to solve their problems. Which is a very complex affair, whether human beings throughout the world, including all of us here, can ever be free from every kind of conflict. Or is it natural for human beings, both historically and actually, that we must live not only in inward conflict but also externally through perpetual wars, killing each other. Perhaps in the old days five or six thousand people were killed; now you can vaporize a million human beings with one bomb. And this is called progress. And every nation in the world is gathering armaments, of

which you all know, supplied by this contract - 80% of it goes abroad, for armaments, America, Russia, Germany and so on.

We have accepted this as a natural way of life: conflict, butchery, maiming each other, terrorism, and all that is happening in the world. And apparently we don't seem to mind. We say everything is in struggle, nature. There is struggle in nature, conflict, killing - the tiger, the deer and so on, so it is natural for human beings to kill each other, though their religion, their so-called religion, their belief says live peacefully, love one another, which has been said thousands and thousands of years before, not just Christianity. Christianity has killed probably more people than any other religious organization.

So we have accepted as natural, inevitable, conflict. Conflict between each other - man, woman. And one asks through all this long fifty thousand years of evolution we are now at the apex of so-called sophisticated human beings, is this natural, is this inevitable? That we must live in conflict - right?

Can we go into this together? And see if we can really deeply understand it, not verbally or intellectually, but see the fact, the fact that one is in conflict. And whether it can possibly end. What is conflict? Do ideals bring about conflict? Do every form of the future and the present, are they responsible for our conflict. The future one does not know and the present is the past. The past is in conflict with the present. And with the future. I hope one is following all this. Is conflict the duality of like and dislike, the good and the bad, what should be and what is. Does conflict arise from these factors? It is an obvious fact if one is at all serious and aware that one lives in conflict. From childhood, the long years or

short years of one's existence, conflict seems to be one of the major factors of life. Unless one discovers for oneself the causation of this conflict, merely trimming the outward expressions of conflict will have very little significance. What is the cause of conflict? Wherever there is a cause with its effect, when the cause is understood deeply, not merely verbally, theoretically or intellectually, but as a fact in one's life, understand it profoundly then the cause can come to an end. And therefore conflict can come to an end.

So we are together going to find out what is the cause of conflict. The cause, the root of it. And of course if you admit that conflict is inevitable, it is natural for human beings for the last millenia have lived in conflict, so why shouldn't we also? That kind of argument is rather, if I may say, is rather silly and inept. But if one could go into it, examine, perceive, have an insight into the causation of conflict and then perhaps that will end. The - to discover the cause it is not a process of analysis. Analysis implies, doesn't it, the analyser and the analysed. Right? The one who says, "I must find the cause of this conflict" and then he begins to investigate as though it were something outside of him, then he analyses that. Is not the analyser the analysed? Please go into this a little bit if you will.

We are asking: is not the analyser - or put it differently: is the analyser different from that which he analyses? Who is the analyser? Apart from the professional psychologist, psychiatrist and so on, in this, what we are doing now, is to understand the causation of conflict. Is that conflict, the cause, is that to be analysed? Then if you are analysing the cause, then who is the

analyser? Right? Is the analyser different from that which he analyses? Do you understand my question? Am I talking to myself? Are you really interested in all this?

Audience: Yes.

K: Don't please, don't encourage the speaker. He is not worth it. (Laughter) Are you really interested in all this?

Audience: Yes.

K: No, please, this is very serious, you understand. It is not just something for an hour. It is your life. It is your way of living, the whole question of love, tenderness, care, affection, all that is involved in this. It isn't just agreement with the speaker which becomes rather absurd. If you are really deeply interested in this, which is to find out for oneself, not from the speaker, but for oneself, to find out the cause of conflict. And when there is the discovery of the cause then the effect disappears because all - any cause can be changed. If one has a toothache or a headache it has a cause. And when you find the cause that disease disappears. Similarly if we can find out the cause, or the causes of why we live in perpetual conflict, and to delve deeply into that it is not a process of analysis because analysis implies a division between the analyser and the analysed. And therefore in that process of analysis there is still conflict. I hope you understand all this. But if we could observe the fact, or come upon the fact of the cause, which demands attention, care, deep urge to find out, passion to step out of this conflict, that requires energy. And analysis is a process of wastage of energy.

So is it possible to observe clearly, perceive, have an insight into the causation of conflict? If we can find out the causation then

this thing disappears altogether, the effect which is conflict.

So we are trying - asking - not trying - we are asking is the cause thought? Thought itself. Let me first - I am putting - the speaker is putting out these things, don't agree or disagree, we are going to examine. Is the cause this sense of duality we have, division between what I am, what I should be? The 'should be' is a projection of thought. That is one does not like the way one is living, or it is painful, therefore one projects a concept of a better way of living, an ideal, and conforming oneself to that ideal, and therefore conflict. The actual and the ideal. Is that the cause - one of the causes of conflict? Which means we never face actually what is - right? Always moving away or escaping, from actually observing the actuality, the pettiness of our life, the idiosyncrasies and so on.

To observe without any prejudices, opinion, without the background of one's own culture, conditioning. Is that possible? Or is it given only to the few, to the elite and therefore it is not something that each person can be free of? Do you understand all these questions?

So is one of the causes of conflict, is it time? Which is the future, the present and the past. Do you understand? All right? Are we going together a little bit at least? That is, the past, all our experience, knowledge, tradition, all the things we have learnt, which is knowledge, all that background which is the past, the tradition, which is acting now, which is the present, and the future will be what we are now. Right? Tomorrow is what I am today, modified perhaps slightly on the edges, on the frill, but tomorrow will be what I am actually now. And of course unless there is a

radical change tomorrow then is totally different. That is, all time is contained in the present. The past, the present and the future. All that is now - right? So future is now. The tomorrow is now. And is thought one of the factors of conflict? Right? We are examining, we are looking into it, we are not stating a dogmatic statement. We are asking whether thought, the whole process of thinking, is that one of the basic causes of conflict, which is also war ultimately? Right? Therefore one has to enquire, as we did, into what is time. Time is the past, the present and the future. It is a continuous series of movements associated. So that time is the past, the present and the future. And that time is contained in the now. Is that one of the factors of conflict? Time?

And also we are asking: is thought, the whole process of thinking, both objectively and subjectively, thinking, is that also one of the major causes of conflict? And to go into that we have to ask: what is thinking? We spend our days and nights and years in thinking. All our actions are based on thinking. In our relationship with each other thinking plays an immense part. Thinking is part of recognition, knowledge. Thinking has done extraordinary things objectively, from the latest bomb, the atom bomb, to the most complicated ceramic structure, the great battleships, submarines, computers. And also thinking has given mankind great medicines, surgery and so on.

So we have to enquire: what is thinking? When the question is asked: what is thinking? - are you thinking or listening to the question, what is thinking, and observe thinking? You have understood? No. Someone is asking you: what is thinking? Do you immediately find what is thinking, work at it, or enquire, search, or

do you listen to the question - you understand? Listen, which means there must be a quality of silence when you are listening - right?

We are asking: what is thinking? Probably you have never asked this question of yourself. Or perhaps the professionals have not written about it. Perhaps you are used to being told by the professionals what is thinking and then you will repeat. But that is not - that prevents enquiry into what is thinking, you are just merely repeating, that is not thinking. So what is thinking? What is the origin of thought? The thought that has put man on the moon, the thought that has divided the world into nationalities, the thought that has made wars, the thought between you and your wife, and husband, girl, boy and so on, what is this enormous energy of thought? Is not thinking a process of the - or a process of memory? Right? Process of memory. Memory is stored in the brain, memory comes with knowledge, knowledge is based on experience - right? All scientific knowledge is based on experiment, theories, hypothesis, knowledge. Always adding more and more and more. In any field, whether it be in the mathematical world, biological or aerodynamics and so on, in every field knowledge is based on experience. When there is knowledge it is being added all the time, accumulated, therefore experience is limited, so knowledge is limited - right? Both now and in the future. Because knowledge is always limited. And so memory is limited, and thus thought is limited. Anything that is limited must cause conflict - right? If one is thinking about oneself from morning until night, as most people do, their worries, their problems, their like and dislike, they are perpetually concerned

with their own self, that is a very, very limited way of living and therefore that which is limited must inevitably cause conflict. When Britain says, "We are British", it is very limited and therefore they are perpetually at war, they have lost empires - you know all that business. France is limited, and so every country wanting security creates boundaries of thought, culture, then language and therefore it is limited. So every form of limitation must inevitably cause conflict. And one finds security in this limitation - right? Because the brain is seeking all the time in some form of security, whether the security is illusory or actual. And most of us want security, in some form of illusion. These are facts. And so thought being always limited, it can think expansively, it can imagine the limitless horizon, limitless universe, but because it thinks, it imagines, therefore that is limited.

So wherever there is a limitation there must be war, there must be conflict because that limitation divides, separates. Are we together in this, a little bit at least? So when you see that will you cease to be British, will you cease to be German, French, Indian, and all that nonsense? Because then your brain is extraordinarily free from limitations and it has got tremendous energy then. So limitation is the wastage of life. You understand this? When one is thinking about oneself, that is how to meditate, how to become religious, how to be happy, how to be... you know. How to be free of problems, which is all thinking about oneself. That thinking about oneself is very limited and therefore in our relationship there is always conflict. Therefore thought and time we said is the causation of one of the major reasons of conflict. If one understands that deeply, not verbally, not merely repeating

something somebody has said but actually your own perception, seeing the truth of it, that very perception frees the brain from conflict.

Then the question arises from that: is it possible in our relationship with each other, man, woman, boy and girl, you know, all the rest of it, can we live in a relationship in which there is no shadow of conflict? Are you getting tired? Can we go on?

To understand that, we have to examine actually what our relationships are, actually, not what we think should be. The actual fact of our relationship with another, whether it be a man or woman, man and man, and so on, what is your relationship? We cannot possibly exist by ourselves. One may go to a monastery, or go off to some Asiatic country, including India and disappear into the mountains in search of some truth, or some guru, all that business, nonsense. One cannot live on earth without relationship. Relationship is the most important thing in life. And in that relationship there is conflict, marriage or no marriage, divorce and no divorce, the whole thing. And in that relationship what is actually taking place? - apart from sexual demands of each other, are we using each other? Exploiting each other, trying to fulfil our own desires, our own urges in each other? And what is the relationship of this conflict with love? In relationship? Can the two exist together? Can jealousy, antagonism, each one pursuing his own way, each one pursuing his ambitions, his fulfilments, his urges? And sexually meeting and having children, but the conflict goes on. And in relationship can there be an end to all this?

So what - again what is the cause of this conflict in relationship? Is it desire? Is it the obsession of possessing each

other, depending on each other, "I can't live without him or her"? And so this dependence implies possession, possessiveness, and where there is possessiveness there is weakness - right?

Is the speaker telling a fairy story? Or is he describing, or stating facts? And those facts are: there is no love. One may talk about love, "Oh I love her so much" - you know all that business very well. And in that there is dependence, attachment, fear, antagonism, gradually jealousy - you follow? - the whole machinery of human relationship with all its agony, fear, loss, gain, despair, depression, you know all this. Don't you know all this? How extraordinarily silent you are when it comes to actual facts. And how can all this end so that we have real relationship with each other, between man and woman. Is it knowledge of each other? Do look at it, please consider it. I know my wife, which is what? When you say, "I know her, she is my wife", what does that mean? Or it is my girl friend, or whatever it is, actually. Is it all the pleasure, the pain, the anxiety, the jealousy, the struggle with occasional flashes of tenderness. Is all that part of love? Is attachment love? Sir, I am asking these questions, go into it, find out Sirs. One is attached to one's wife, tremendous attachment. What is implied in that attachment? One cannot stand by oneself, therefore I must depend on somebody, whether it is a husband or some psychiatrist, or some - you know, guru, and all that tommy rot! Where there is attachment there is fear of loss. Where there is attachment there is a sense of deep possessiveness and therefore it breeds fear, you know all this.

So can we look at the fact of our relationship and discover for ourselves the place of thought in relationship. As we said, thought

is limited, which is a fact. And if in our relationship thought plays a prominent factor, then in that relationship, that factor is limiting, so our relationship with each other is limited and therefore inevitably must breed conflict. There is the conflict between the Arab and the Israeli, because each is clinging to his own conditioning, which is, he is being programmed, each human being is programmed like a computer. I know it sounds cruel but it is a fact. When one is told that you are an Indian, from childhood, belonging to a certain type, or certain category socially, religiously, and you are conditioned, and for the rest of one's life one is an Indian, or British, or French, or German, or whatever it is. Would you like to be included Russia in this? Yes. So there it is.

So our relationship which should be the most extraordinary thing in life, is one of the causes of wastage of our life. We are wasting our life in our relationships. And when you really see the fact of it, give your attention to it, that is, to understand very deeply the nature of thought and time, which has nothing whatsoever to do with love. Thought and time is a movement in the brain. And love is outside of the brain. Please go into this very carefully because what is inside the skull is very important, how it functions, what are its blockages, why it is limited, why there is this perpetual sense of chattering, thought after thought, a series of associations, reactions, responses, the whole storehouse of memory, and memory obviously is not love. Therefore love cannot - is not inside the brain, inside the skull. And when we are merely living inside the skull all the time, all the days of our life, thinking, thinking, thinking, problem after problem, which is to live inside the limitation, that must inevitably breed conflict and misery.

One has heard all this, if you have listened at all, and what are we going to do about it? Do we carry on the old way? Or seeing the actuality of our life, our daily life, and see the various classifications, division, limitations, and enquire into them, pursue them day after day, never letting one thought escape without understanding it? Or we have become so used to everything, used to our religion, used to our way of living, accepting everything. What we really want is an easy life! What we want is comfort, some kind of security, both outwardly and inwardly, biologically and objectively. We never ask is there security at all? Is there security outwardly in any nation? If when there is security in community, in a co-operative state, or under dictatorship, totalitarian, or different kinds of dictators, is there security when there is war? Every other day they are perpetuating wars. Is there security outwardly? There is the threat. And inwardly, psychologically, is there security? Which is far more important to discover first: whether there is inward, deep security, safety, protection, is there? What is security? Outwardly you may have insurance, mortgage, you know, all the rest, I won't go into that. One must have outwardly security - a house, flat, tent, some kind of roof under which one sleeps and lives, clothes and all that. That one must have. Every human being in the world must have that. That is being denied through nationalities - you understand? Through division, Britain, France, India, Russia, America, etc. So inwardly is there security? One can invent an illusion - God, the ultimate illusion. And one can cling, one can hold on to that. And we have lived historically for millenia upon millenia in this illusion - with priests, rituals and all that business, power - right? Power,

position, status, outwardly, that is very important for the people who want power. And power is strangely destructive, whether it is a political power, religious power, or the power over your wife or husband, or the power of the guru - my God, just think of it! Which is the priest and so on.

So where is there security for human beings? Please ask this question of yourself. Where have you, as a human being living on this earth, which is so marvellous, which is being destroyed slowly, where is there our security? Security means something permanent, something that doesn't change, that has no disappearance, that is firm, solid, immovable. Is there such security? Because the brain needs security, otherwise it cannot function at its highest level. But it has found various forms of security, illusions, ideologies, families, nations, tribalism, various forms of outward security but never has a human being found an inward sense of deep abiding, unchangeable security. And is there such security? If there is one has - if one has come upon it then there is no fear of any kind. That is timeless.

So is there such security? Thought cannot possibly provide that security because thought, as we said, is limited. Whatever it has invented is still limited. And we have lived in the field of limitation of thought. And in that there is no possibility of ever having security, and therefore our brain is always searching, asking, questioning, demanding, fearful, uncertain, depressed - do you follow? - the whole process of our activity. And security, there is such a thing as security. But that demands a great enquiry. Security in freedom. Freedom is not from something, freedom from fear, freedom from anxiety and so on. Those are all partial, limited. That

freedom is not limited. Is there such freedom? And who is asking that question? The man in prison asking, "Is there such freedom?" he can only find out such freedom if he leaves the prison. But we want to live in the prison and yet we are asking for freedom. Right? This is an obvious fact. We love our prison, or we are unaware of it. And when it is pointed out, the prison, all one does is try to accept the words, you know all that business, but one never breaks the prison, never shatters the prison. And when there is freedom there is intelligence. It is that intelligence which we will talk about as we go along. That intelligence in itself is absolute security, unshakable. For it depends on nothing, not environment, on a person, or on any kind of ideology.

So: we began this morning talking over together the enormous problem of living, which is becoming very, very complex. And that which is very complex must be approached very simply. Not a simple mind but the quality of humility and simplicity. Not the simplicity of clothes and all that but the simplicity of a brain that starts a journey and must go on until it finds the end of it.

We have talked for an hour and a quarter. I think that is enough for this morning. We shall meet tomorrow morning if you will, and we will continue where we left off.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 26TH AUGUST 1984

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning?

I think it is important to remind you if I may, if one may, that this is not an entertainment, it is not a weekend amusement in a nice place. Sorry for the bad weather, but there it is! You are in England! And we are not trying to convince you of any ideology, of any concept, or a series of programmed investigations. But rather that we are all thinking together if we can, over our problems, not only human, psychological, physic problems, but also the problems outside of us, outside in the world which is so full of danger, terrorists, ideological commitments - the Communists and the so-called Democrats, the totalitarians and the dictatorships, and also all the great inventions that are going on in the world. Tremendous inventions, not only to destroy man and destroy the earth but also great inventions to distort the brain of the human beings. There are the computers, which is an extraordinarily important thing - we have been talking about it to some specialists who are building and who are concerned with the computers - in America and so on, and here. Computers probably can do almost anything that human beings can: think much faster, calculate much quicker, in seconds. Carry a million memories on a small chip. And also what is going to happen to the human brain when the computer, which can do almost anything, will the human brain wither? Please consider all these problems. Will the human brain, our brain, which has striven, struggled, aggressive, competitive,

calculating, working endlessly to earn money, or to achieve some ideological concepts and pursuits. And the computer can do all this much better than any of us can. And then what happens to the human brain which now is so occupied with itself, will it wither away? Or will it be caught in the vast entertaining world, in the entertaining industry, not only the cinema, televisions, all the religious entertainments that are going on in the world in the name of God, which is another form of entertainment, whether it is done in the temples in India, or in Rome, or in some mosques, it is still entertainment. Or the brain will occupy itself with something much vaster, greater and deeper. That is, to turn, not selfishly, not self-centred, inward look but rather turn to something beyond all that which man has accumulated through millenia upon millenia. To find something vast, immeasurable, not to be measured by words, by thought and so on.

So we are not only at a crisis in the world psychologically, a crisis in our consciousness, but also there is a crisis going on at the present time in the world. And we were talking about yesterday morning, and we are talking over together, we are talking over our problems, not mathematical problems, or geographical or other kinds of problems, but human problems with all our fears, anxieties, sorrows, pain depressions, long enduring conflicts. We are talking about those things because it is our life.

And we also talked about yesterday wasting our life. We mean by wasting doing things that are practically becoming meaningless, apart from earning a livelihood, and so on. And we were talking yesterday also about time, thought and security. The brain can only function excellently, at its highest capacity and energy when it is

completely secure, when it is not living or holding on to some illusions, some concepts, beliefs, faith, some fantastic ideas or the ideals of Marx and Lenin and so on, or our own democratic ideals and holding on to them. We were talking about time and what relationship has time to security? Time being tomorrow, time being the thousand tomorrows following each other. Is there security in that tomorrow? Do we understand each other? The speaker is asking a question whether there is security in the pursuit of tomorrow, in the pursuit of the future, which is time. Right? Are we... please, we are talking things over together, I am not talking to myself, and this is important to understand if we want to go into ourselves and understand our whole... what we call the psyche, which is our being. And to understand that very deeply one must go into this question of security. We seek security in the family, in the community, in a commune, or in a particular sect whether it be the sect of Catholicism, or Protestantism and so on. Or Hinduism and so on. Is there security in time? Do you understand my question? Is there security in the future? And what is the future? The future is what we are now, what one is now, with all the turmoil, anxiety, depression, violence, self-centred activity, sorrow, affection and the pain of separation and the fear of death, is what is now, what we are now. That is our psyche, that is our consciousness, that is our being. And has that, which is the result of vast experiences, knowledge, of that which we have accumulated during thousands and thousands of years, that is what we are now. The tradition, our conditioning, both linguistically and, which is another matter, we won't go into the question of whether the brain can be conditioned linguistically. Are you

interested in all this? A Sunday morning? This is not a sermon. If you are really interested in your own life, not in what the speaker is talking about, if one is interested to understand this enormous complex society in which we live, with all the immorality, with all the corruption, and the great sorrow every society brings to every human being, and that society which we have created, that society is not different from us, we have created it through our greed, through our violence, through our aggression, through our competitiveness and so on. We have made it. And we are caught in that which we have made. So we are fighting not only society externally, trying to adjust ourselves to it, and also rejecting it, and withdrawing ourselves from that society, it is all part of this self-centred projected activity of every human being in the world, whether he lives in the most smallest hamlet, village or in the great cities of the world. We have made this mess. And we are asking as what we are now, what is the future of us now? And has the future, that is tomorrow, and the thousand million tomorrows, is there security in that? We hope and in that hope we try to find some kind of security in hope. Hope implies the future. So as we were pointing out yesterday, we should understand this very seriously because it may totally bring about a psychic revolution. We may look at the world and ourselves totally differently if we understand the nature of time. Time is not only to cover a distance from one point to another. Time is necessary to learn a language, to learn a skill, to build a house, to acquire a skill, to drive a car and so on, time is necessary. But is time, that is, movement of becoming - you understand? Are we together in all this? Are you getting mesmerized? Please, the person is not important at all. The speaker

is not important in any way. But what he says is important. Either we see the truth of it or the falseness of it, the logic, the sanity, the reason of it. That's what matters, not the personal, personality cult. The speaker is merely a telephone and the speaker means it, it is not just a word.

And so we are trying to understand whether there is security in time. That is, we are the past, there is no question about it. And that past is operating, modifying itself, in the present. The present, if there is no fundamental change, not some superficial scratching, but fundamental change, the future is what we are now. So all time, the past, the future, the present is in the now. Right? And that if we can really capture the significance of this, then we begin to see the implication of what it means to change. I wish I could discuss this matter with somebody who is following this intimately, closely, not just listening casually, because it is really very important because it really will alter the whole way of looking at life. If you accept that there is no tomorrow, how do you look at the world, how do you look at yourself, how do you consider God? How do you consider becoming something? You understand? Becoming something implies time. And you see all time is contained in the now - you understand? - then what is becoming? Is there psychological becoming at all? I wonder if you follow this.

And what does then - if you understand this - relationship mean? To be related to somebody in which there is no time, no becoming - do you understand? Are we following this a little bit? Or would you like to see the video? (Laughter) Because these are really important questions, fundamental questions one must ask oneself. What is it - what does it mean to change if there is no

tomorrow, because tomorrow is now. And if change implies gradualness, then you admit time. And that time, the future, is now. So is it possible to change instantly, not allowing time to interfere at all. So can the brain, which has been accustomed to gradualness, and gradually become good, gradually end violence, gradually get over my idiocy and so on. The brain is accustomed to that. We are educated that way. You will gradually learn how to write properly at school, how to learn mathematics gradually, take two years and you have to take several years to become a doctor, but we have extended that same feeling, that same movement into the whole psychological world. So we say, "I will gradually become something", - gradually learn how to meditate - good God - you understand? Gradually learn how to live peacefully. All that implies the - our conditioning to the concept of becoming. And if time is - if all time is in the now, which is a fact, it is a statement of a fact, that statement may not be true, so you have to find out for yourself if that statement is a fact or not, not merely influenced or coerced, or encouraged by the speaker. Therefore one must have doubt, question, there must be scepticism to say "Is it true?" So that your own brain is active, you yourself see things as they are.

As we were saying, if all time, the past, the present and the future, is contained in the now, what is our relationship to each other? That relationship with man or woman who are in conflict, each wanting to fulfil, each helping the other to sustain themselves, if one is weak he will depend on somebody strong and so on. That is the present relationship of conflict. And can that conflict end instantly, not gradually - you understand my question?

And then what is action? Action is according to a memory,

conditioned by the past, or action of tomorrow. "I will do this", "I will try to understand", "I will try to listen to what you are saying". So what is action when there is no - when all time is now? You understand the question? I wonder! One is greedy, or one is violent. Violence has many aspects: conformity, imitation, adaptation, adjustment, or physical gestures, and action physically, hating somebody and so on, throwing a bomb. Those are all based on concepts, ideas, memories, ideals and so on. So if there is no tomorrow - you understand? - what then is action?

All right Sir, put it the other way, perhaps we will get at it better. Most of the people in the world believe in God - right? I don't know why but they do! The ancient literature, the very ancient literature there is no mention of God at all. God is only a recent invention. And that God, whom we worship, whom we pray to, who has built the world, created the world, he is the essence of all that and so on and so on and so on. And all of us, most people in the world, are trying to achieve, or realize that sense of godliness. But if there is no tomorrow - you understand what is implied? - there is no sense of achievement at all, except you do achieve a job, do achieve a certain status, or you have - work hard to accumulate a lot of money, or power, for that there is plenty of tomorrows, specially for money and power. I wonder if you have ever gone into the question of power. Power over people, power of the few over the many, or the power of one, whether he be a guru, or a dictator, or the power of the few representing an ideal, holding this immense power to control, shape the human brain - the professors, the scientists, and every human being wants power in some form or another. The man over the woman, or the woman

over the man, sexual power, the power of thought - you understand all this? Power of the man who says, "I know, and you don't know. I will tell you all about it." The power of knowledge.

So power is evil in any form, whether it is the power of the pope, or the man over his servant. And all of us want some kind of power. We have never tasted the essence of humility, and innocence. The word 'innocence' means not to hurt another, or be hurt. May I go on? Or do you want to see the video? Are you actually listening to what the speaker is saying? Listening not only with the ear, but listening beyond the word, grasping the significance instantly, not demanding explanation after explanation, description after description. Do we listen at all? Or we are always interpreting what is being said to suit our own conditioning, our own like and dislike and so on? If we could listen very seriously to this fact that all time is now, the past, the present and the future, then the truth of it becomes extraordinarily vital. It is a living thing, not just a series of words, concepts and beliefs. Then relationship, change and action have totally a different meaning.

We ought also to consider this morning the question of fear. Fear of the future, what might happen, fear of insecurity, fear of death, fear of what has happened in the past. There are so many fears that human beings carry with them. Or one dominant fear. Most human beings have fear, not only physical fears, of getting hurt, not only physically getting hurt but inwardly getting hurt. We have fear of that. We have fear of oppression, fear of losing a job, fear of unemployment in this country, there are people between 18 and 30 who have never known what work is. And so they become

rowdy and you know all the rest of it, what is happening in this country and in the other parts of the world. We are not talking of a particular form of fear, not your particular form, or my particular form. I might be afraid of public opinion - I am not but suppose one is - what somebody else might say. And there is the fear of not achieving, not achieving enlightenment - you know, whatever that might mean. Not - so many things we are frightened of. Agree? At least do we see this? As we said, we are not talking about a particular form of fear, but what is fear? You understand my question? One may be frightened of the dark. Or frightened of what one's wife might say and so on. Those are all expressions of - multiple expressions of the central fact of fear - right? So we are talking about the central fact of fear, the root of fear, not the various forms of fear. And what is the root of all this? And fear has been one of the major factors of our life, not only now but in the past millenia, centuries upon centuries ago. The most primitive people were frightened of thunder, lightening, so they made that into God. You understand? Anything that we are frightened of we make it into God, or into something to be worshipped or something to be killed. Probably that is what we are doing now. So we are frightened people. Frightened of a pain of yesterday recurring again today or tomorrow. Pain of losing one's eyesight, hearing and ultimately dying. And we are asking: what is the cause of all this fear? What is the origin, the beginning of fear? And can that fear first psychologically, inwardly, not the fear of outward things, but first the inward, inside the brain, inside the very hidden part of the brain, the very recesses of the brain, what is fear? Why have we not solved it? If there is no fear at all, at all, inwardly, would we

have gods? Yes Sirs, it is fear that is making, creating gods all over the world. So it is very important to understand and find out for oneself whether it is possible to be totally free of fear. First psychologically, inwardly, subjectively.

If you ask the speaker: "Are you talking this as a fact, or are you free of it subjectively?" - what if he answered, "Yes", and then where are you? Do you understand my question? So it is not important to ask whether the speaker is free or not but whether one is free or not. And how important, how essential it is to be free of fear.

So what is fear? What is the origin, the beginning deeply? Not only in the deep levels of the brain, the so-called unconscious fears. The speaker doesn't like to divide consciousness into the unconscious and conscious, it is all consciousness. You can play around with those words but consciousness is whole, you can divide it. Either for profit, for amusement, or for various other subjective reasons. But consciousness is whole. It is really indivisible, but we like to divide, break it up.

So let's go into this question: what is the root of fear? Is it thought? Thought being the accumulated memories born of knowledge, experience, and thought born of knowledge and knowledge being limited, so thought is limited. Is fear subjectively first, inwardly first, is that fear born of thought? Thinking about tomorrow, thinking about what might happen. One's wife may run away. Thinking in terms of not the actual present, but in terms of the future, or the past. Is that the cause of fear, thought? If it is the cause of fear, which the speaker says it is and please don't accept it, then what will you do with thought? You understand the question?

If I am afraid of you because you might not get tomorrow a larger audience, a small audience, if I am frightened, I want to find out the cause of it. And the cause is I want to have a large audience to make myself - you know - I am glad you understand that. And so on. And I want to find out the cause, the origin of fear, how it comes. As we said the other day one is not analysing, one is watching, one is perceptive, which requires sensitivity, not a conclusion, not saying "I must get rid of it, I must do something about it, I must escape from it" and so on, but watch it. To watch very clearly without any direction, without any motive, to see, to find out for oneself if thought is the origin of this fear. Then I say to myself what shall I do with thought, if that is the cause of fear how can I stop thought? You understand? Are we following each other? Please come on. Then I have to ask who is the entity that stops thought? Right? You are following this? That entity is also thought that wants to be free of fear - right? So one thought is battling with another thought - right? Do I see that clearly? That this is a battle between two thoughts. The thought that is saying I must be free from fear, and the thought that says what is the origin of thought. The origin of thought, thought says, is very thinking itself. And then the other thought says, how can I stop thinking? You understand? So there is conflict. Are we following each other? So there is conflict. Then I assume how can I end that conflict? So I build this thing, one thing after another, one association after another and I am far away from fear. And I started trying to solve fear and ended up with such confusion, such conflict, such misery and still fear remains. Just hold on a minute.

And then I ask - one asks: is there another cause of fear? Time.

Time is a movement, a series of movements and time, which is tomorrow, I might lose my job, I might become blind, I might - all the rest of it - tomorrow. So time is a factor of fear - right? So time and thought are the roots of fear. Time is thought. So that is the root of fear. I understand this, one understands this intellectually, verbally, it has been explained very carefully. Time as tomorrow, time as the past, time as the present, and tomorrow is all important to me. A thousand tomorrows, tomorrow is all important because I want to get rid of it gradually. So I see - one sees very clearly that time and thought are the root of fear, time, thought is the root of fear. Do I see it as an idea, or do I see it as a concept, or do I see it as something actual, factual, not an idea and then work that idea into a fact? Are we following each other, a little bit at least?

What generally happens is that one hears a statement, like, all time is now. I don't quite understand it but I make an idea of it, a concept of it, and then I try to follow that concept. That concept is not the actual, so again I enter into the field of conflict. So can I, can one listen completely to this fact? That time and thought are the root of fear. Time, thought, is the root, the beginning of fear. Just to perceive it, not what to do about it. You understand? We want - unfortunately we want to achieve that so we are making an effort. But if you listen quietly, silently, not be mesmerized, but listen to it quietly, deeply, then you see, then the very perception of that silence and watching without any effort, fear has no place at all. This is not a romantic illusion. This is a fact. When you hold something without movement you see the beauty, or the ugliness of that jewel completely. But we never look at the jewel. We say, "How beautiful" and pass it on. But when we hold it in our hands,

the most extraordinary jewel in the world, and look at it carefully, how extraordinarily complex, how delicate, subtle, its capacity so great. One begins to learn what it is. Learning is different from memorizing - right? My lord! Are we saying too much in one talk?

Audience: Yes.

K: Yes? Quite right. You are right. Saying too much in one talk. It can't be helped. Sorry!

Have you ever held fear? Hold it. Not move away from it. Not try to suppress it, run away from it, or transcend it, or do all kinds of things with it, just to see the depth of the fear, the extraordinary subtleties of fear. And you can only be aware of all that when one is looking at it without any motive, without trying to do a thing about it, just watch it.

One can do the same thing with pain, of course not extreme pain. When you watch pain carefully, not trying to rush to the dentist immediately, when you watch it, stay with it, not morbidly but see the - all that is happening. How you react to it and so on and so on. If you do that the pain lessens naturally. In the same way if you hold this jewel. Fear is an extraordinary jewel, extraordinary something which has dominated human beings for forty thousand years and more. And if you can hold it and look at it, then one begins to see the ending of it. Not the gradually, the ending of it completely. Which means fear is part of our self-centred, egotistic activity. Fear is when the ego, the me, is isolated, when the me, the self, this self-centred movement because it is separative, because it is the very essence of conflict and all the rest of it, that is the root of fear. But when you hear this, "How can one live" you will say, "In the world without being self-centred?"

Right? This is natural, healthy question. But first be free and then you will find out, not the other way round. You understand what I am saying? It is like saying, "What is on the other side of the mountain?" You have to climb the mountain to find out. But the description of what is on the other side of the mountain is still a description. But if you walked up the mountain then you will find out. You see what we want is guarantees. If I give this up will you assure me of that?! And there is no assurance. Actually there is no giving up.

So we are asking now: if thought and time, or thought/time is the fact of fear? And we see it is. And the brain has been conditioned, shaped, moulded, has accepted fear as the way of life. And the brain is reluctant to let go. It has lived for thousands of years in the realm of fear, it has got used to it, all the cells, you know all that is going on inside, it says that is natural, that is part of our life. And either one learns through a tremendous shock, which is bad for the brain, or you see the fact instantly. And therefore action takes place instantly.

And we were talking about security. Obviously there is no security in the future - right? I wonder if we see that. The future is when you say, "I will be safe the day after tomorrow", or "There is God in whom I find security", or in some form of illusions. Is there security in time? Please go into it. Or there is only security, complete security in the understanding the truth that all time is in the now. The now is the ultimate security. Come on Sirs! Do you understand? The now is that which you are now. What you are is your consciousness - right? Your consciousness is what you are. Your consciousness - the consciousness contains your fears, your

aspirations, your longings, your desires, your fulfilments, your depressions, your anxieties, sorrow, pain, all the rest of it, your gods, all that is your consciousness. And in that consciousness is this whole movement of time and thought - right? I wonder if you understand all this? You are your consciousness, aren't you? No? Of course. No? So your consciousness is your faith, your belief, your nationality, your fears, your gods, your British, French, German, Indian, Sikh, and all this divisions which thought has divided the world and human beings. So all that consciousness is you. The selfish activities and trying not to be selfish and so on and so on. The whole of that consciousness is you. And this consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind because every human being in the world, everyone from the most primitive, from the most uneducated, to the most highly sophisticated, educated, they go through all this - faith, fear, longing, depression, anxiety, sorrow, pain, every human being in the world goes through it, whether he is a Communist, Socialist, Capitalist, or Democrat, or doesn't belong to any group. So this consciousness is shared by all human beings. Right? I am afraid you won't accept that. Quite right. Because you have been trained, educated, religiously and in other ways, that your consciousness is yours and nobody else's. And somebody comes along and says, look at it carefully, what you are inwardly - the outward trimmings may be different - but inwardly your consciousness is like the man in a far away village, primitive, ugly, uneducated. He is just like you, almost similar to you. And so you are not individual at all. I know all this is very difficult to accept. You are the rest of mankind, you are humanity. And when you separate yourself then begins all the

problems. The separation causes conflict, fear, isolation. And your heaven is filled with isolated spirits.

So is this a fact, or not? Or just a romantic concept? That every human being suffers, either physically, or psychologically, inwardly. Every human being is anxious about something or rather. Every human being is frightened. He wants some comfort, hope, God, a father figure, or a mother figure, or whatever you like. So your consciousness is shared by all of us, by all of us, by all humanity, therefore you are humanity, not some separate British, French - for God's sake! You understand all this?

Then one begins to realize the immense responsibility one has. Then one begins to realize the nature of love. Though you may love another, but that love is not restricted to one because you are the entire humanity. You are the world, and the world is you.

May I get up please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 28TH AUGUST 1984

A lot of questions have been asked, a whole sheaf of them. Some of them are letters and some very short questions. And we can't answer all of them. That would be impossible. It would take many, many days. And some questions have been chosen out of that lot.

Before we go into these questions we ought to talk over together if we can ask a question from a state of mind, or brain, that is holistic, that sees, comprehends, or perceives the whole human problem. Not just one particular problem but all problems are related to each other. There is no one separate problem disassociated from the others. If that is so then to ask a question, or to face a problem from an integrated outlook. You understand what I mean? Most of us are fragmented, broken up - business, religious, family life, sexual life, religious life and so on and so on. We are all not a holistic whole human being, which is a fact. We look at life from a particular point of view, from a conclusion, or from some idealistic concepts. These are all fragmentations, fragmented outlook on life - right? We are talking things over together. And can we ask a - or face a problem from a wholly different outlook, which is not fragmented at all? Do you understand? Are we meeting each other in this? We have just thought of it as we came across the lawn here. Whether we ask any question, or face any problem holistically. I hope you don't mind using that word. Though it is a so-called scientific word - I hope the scientists will forgive us if we use that word. From a point of total integration, integrity and ask questions. It is rather interesting if we go into it.

Is it possible, recognizing that we are fragmented, broken up, divided in ourselves, contradictory, opposing one desire against another desire and so on, knowing all that, being aware of all that, could we face a problem, which is from a different focus? Why do we have problems? We have got so many problems - political, religious, sexual and so on - we have multiple problems in life. And problems are increasing. In a society that is so sophisticated, so complex, over population, bad governments and so on. And in the resolution of one problem we seem to increase many other problems - right? Why? In answering these questions that is going to raise - the answer is going to awaken similar problems. Why do we have problems and is it possible to meet a problem without a brain that is already conditioned to solve problems? Do you understand my question? Eh? You don't understand it. Neither do I for the moment! (Laughter)

So let's look at it. We go to school, very young, almost five or seven and so on. And children are faced with a problem - mathematical problem, how to write, how to read, how to learn mathematics, you know, it becomes a problem. So from childhood our brain is conditioned to solving problems. Right? This is a fact. It is not some fantastic theory of the speaker. So one goes to college, there are again problems. And university, jobs, various functions, vocations and so on, problem after problem. Our brain is full of problems - right? And we are always seeking from a brain that is conditioned to solve problems, we are always seeking a solution to problems - right? Is this clear? We are together in this? Now how can the brain solve problems if it is not free from problems? Right? Are we together a bit in this? It is rather an

interesting question this, please let's go into this.

Our brains are conditioned to the resolution of problems, the solution of problems from childhood. And as the brain is conditioned to solve problems it is always seeking a solution, and it is not understanding the problem itself but the solution of the problem - right? Are we together a little bit in this? Good! And is it possible not to have a brain - to have a brain that is not conditioned to problems? You understand my question? I am asking you Sirs, and Ladies, your brain is conditioned now to the solution of problems, and we have never solved the problems. They are increasing more and more and more - why? Is it because a conditioned brain, which is embedded in problems can never solve problems? Right? You have understood this? Have I put the question? Oh, come on Sirs! Is it possible to have a brain that is not conditioned to the solution of problems but to the understanding of problems? Isn't there a difference between the solution of problems and the understanding of the problem? In the understanding of the problem the solution may lie in the problem. Not away from the problem - right?

Take a very ordinary example: we have never stopped wars. Human beings on this earth since they came on this earth have had wars, and we have never solved the problem of war. But we decided to reorganise how to kill man better. And this reorganization, how to kill man better, is called progress. I don't know if you are following all this. This is not a joke. So we move from organization to organization, we had first the League of Nations, and now we have the United Nations, but wars go on. They have different organisations - you understand? So we move

from one organization to another hoping thereby to solve problems and multiply problems. So we never stop wars. And the cause of wars is nationalism, economic division, local division and so on and so on and so on - division - linguistic, racial, religious, economic, cultural and so on. These divide man. We are all human beings, we all suffer, we all have pain and anxiety, boredom, loneliness, despair. We don't tackle that but we want to solve the problems that seem to have external causes - right?

So we are asking: can the brain, recognizing, seeing that it is conditioned to the solution of problems from childhood, be free of it and then face problems? Right? All right Sirs? Will you do it? That is the question. To be conscious, to be aware that our brain, that we as human beings, from the beginning of life, we are always struggling with problems and trying to find the right answer to them. The right answer can only be when we recognize the brain is conditioned and as long as that brain is conditioned to solving problems we will never find the right answer - clear?

So do I recognize that fact, not the idea but the fact? There is a difference between idea and the fact - right? I hear this statement and from that statement I draw a conclusion - quite right, this is so, and from that statement I abstract an idea and then pursue the idea, not the fact that my brain is conditioned to solve problems. That is the fact, not that I should be free of this conditioning. That is non-fact. You understand? So the brain is conditioned and as long as that condition exists, multiplications of problems will go on, reorganization of the problems will go on and changing from one Capitalist society to Totalitarian society or this or that, will always bring about enormous problems - right? Can you and I be free of

the brain that is conditioned? That is to be aware of it and see the depth of it, the truth of it, the logic, the sanity, the reason of it, and not move away from that, not find some abstract explanations. Right.

Is this all right? I am asking if it is all right, perhaps it is all wrong! (Laughter) No, it is not all wrong. This is a fact. If one cannot get on with one's wife, quarrels, contentions, you know, all the rest of it, and I divorce, one divorces, then choose another person. And keep on repeating this - right? If one has the money! (Laughter) If one has plenty of time and energy this is the game that is going on in the world, on a small or a bigger scale. But the problem is not divorce or - and all the complications of relationship, but to understand the depth of relationship, the meaning of relationship. Relationship, as we pointed out, is one of the most important things in life. Not the emotional expressions of it, the tantrums, the neuroticism of relationship, but what is important, significant, has depth in relationship. And we never ask that question. We want to solve the problem of relationship. You understand? And so we never solve them. The psychiatrists, psychotherapists and so on and so on, are multiplying in the world, like mushrooms. And they are not solving problems. They are not solving the depth of all this.

So we should consider together what is the art of living. Do you understand? Oh come on Sirs. It is a nice morning.

Audience: Are you saying that if we have a system for solving problems then every time we approach a problem we use our system instead of understanding?

K: That's right. The lady is saying if we have a system, a

pattern, of solving a problem then the system is operating, not the understanding and the depth of the problem. It is the same thing. We were talking about the art of living - sorry these are the questions but they - You don't mind! (Laughter) We will come to them. There are many of them so we have chosen six of them. That will be enough for this morning. But we are asking what is the art of living? We have the art of poetry, painting, the art of so many - are of cooking, specially now, and so on. But we have never asked ourselves, perhaps which is the greatest art, what is the art of living? Is there an art? Or is it all just chance, or is it all some genes, a biological chance and so on? If one answers it, don't make a problem of it. Then the art is thrown out of the window.

So, let's look at it together to find out what is the art of living? - art in the widest and the depth of that word, not just all the contents of a museum. If you are asked that question, what is the art of living, what would be your answer? Not calculated answer, personal answer, or emotional, or romantic answer, which are meaningless - right? If I answer that question emotionally - oh, it is - the art of living is the highest aspiration - which is sheer nonsense. The art of living is the most exalted, intellectual, activity - right? That is only very partial. Or the art of living is to have an holistic outlook on life. It sounds excellent but factually it isn't. So what is the art of living? Obviously no conflict whatsoever - right? A brain that is in conflict all the time, having problems all the time, this tremendous self concern, such a brain must inevitably be limited - right? If one is thinking about oneself - how to meditate, whether you can - all the rest of it - your very meditation is self-centredness. So the art of living it appears - you can add to it more

- is to live without conflict. Is that possible at all? That is, to understand the opposing elements in one's life - right? Desiring one thing, opposed to that desire another thing. You know this corridor of dualities. And the self-centredness, as long as that self-centredness exists there must be conflict because self-centredness is limited, small, petty. But you listen to all this but carry on. Right? And you say that is not possible in modern society to live without self-centredness, at least a little bit of it. (Laughter) Have you ever tried? Have you ever done, lived without self-centredness for one day, not to think about oneself? Just even for an hour! (Laughter) And see what happens. You haven't committed to anything! You can go back to your self-centredness, nobody is going to say how wrong it is, or right it is, that is the normal state of human beings apparently. So if one really tries for an hour, actually do it, not try it, do it, and see what happens. And if you do it one hour you can extend it. (Laughter) And it gives you tremendous energy. It gives you great sense of passion, not lust and all that business, but passion to pursue something profoundly to the very end of things. Right? Is that enough for this morning? We had better come back.

I haven't read these questions first. I haven't - this is the first time I am looking at them. So you are also looking at them for the first time.

1st QUESTION: What is attention if it has nothing to do with thought? Is it an activity of the brain? Is it a physical process? How does it come into being? You say we cannot bring about attention by an act of will? What must one not do in order to allow attention to exist?

Do nothing! Sorry, I must answer it.

What is attention if it has nothing to do with thought? Is it an activity of the brain? Is it a physical process? How does it come into being? You say we cannot bring about attention by an act of will? What must one not do in order to allow attention to come into being? Right? You have got the question?

He is asking what is attention, is it a physical act? Is it the movement of thought? Is it an action of desire, which is the essence of will? Desire is the essence of will - right? How does this attention come about? Which is, can it come naturally, easily, without making tremendous effort - going to colleges, or attending some guru, being trained, can it all come about, this attention, naturally? We are going to talk over together - right? We are going to look at the question, not the answer. The question is: what is attention? In which is implied, not only the hearing of the ear but hearing without the ear. You understand? And also attention implies seeing, perceiving - right? Seeing visually, but also seeing with the inner eye, as it were - right? And attention also means learning - right? Agree? Seeing, hearing, and learning. Those three things are implied. Which means what is learning? Is it memorizing? You are following this? Somebody say, "Yes" - I don't want to go on talking to myself. So is it memorizing as we do when we go to the school, college, university, memorizing, storing up knowledge from books, from professors, from teachers, from house-masters and so on and so on? Which is always accumulating as knowledge and using that knowledge skilfully or not. Right? A carpenter - an apprentice to a master carpenter is learning the nature of the wood, what kind of wood, the grain, the beauty of the

wood, the feeling of the wood, and the instruments which he is employing and so on, he is learning. And that learning is through experience, day after day, month after month, accumulating knowledge about carpentry, making a master cabinet maker - right? That is what we call learning. That kind of learning is limited, obviously because all knowledge is limited, now or in the past or in the future - right? Because all the scientists, biologists, etc. and so on are accumulating. They killed a man with an arrow, or a club, at the beginning of time, now you can blast the whole, millions and millions of human beings with one blow. That is tremendous accumulation of knowledge, to do that. Whether for good or for bad.

So - and that knowledge is always limited - right? So is there a learning which is not limited? It's fun, go on. I am just discovering something myself. Is there a learning that is not an accumulative process of knowledge, learning? In which is implied, hearing, not only the words, the significance of the words, your reactions to the words, your responses to certain favourite words, like love and hate, you know, and all the rest of it, and also seeing without any prejudice, seeing without the word - you understand? Can you look at a tree without the word? You understand? Have you ever done all this? That means seeing without direction, without motive, without any network of thought or blocking the seeing. And learning, which is a limitless process. So attention implies all that plus, or the beginning of it is to be aware - right? Are we aware as we sit here, the extent of this tent, the great number of people accumulated here, and the number of posts along there, and to look at all that without a single word. To be aware. But in that

awareness you begin to choose. I like that blue shirt better than what I am wearing - right? I like the way your hair is done, better than mine. Right? You are always comparing, judging, evaluating, which is choice and to be aware without choice - you understand? As we are talking will you do all this? Or you are just listening to words? If we are doing this, then you begin to discover awareness is entirely different from concentration. Concentration implies focusing all thought on a particular subject, on a particular page, on a particular word. Which implies cutting off all other thoughts, building resistance to every other thought, which then becomes narrow, limited - right? So concentration is limited. But you have to concentrate when you are doing something, washing dishes. You have to wash the dishes very carefully - the right kind of soap, the right kind of water. You know all this. And awareness without choice, which means without concentration, to be aware of all this without judging, evaluating, condemning, comparing and from that move, which is attention, which is natural. That is, I want to listen to the story you are telling me, a very exciting thriller. And I listen to you very carefully. Or you are telling me something very, very serious and I pay, I am so eager, so attentive to understand what you are saying. I understand what I am thinking about, that is irrelevant, but I am tremendously concerned with what you are saying. Therefore I am all attention - all my nerves, my whole being says what are you talking about, I want to understand. In that attention there is no me - right? Get it? When there is this tremendous attention, which means all your energy is given to understand what you are saying, I am not thinking about myself, therefore there is no centre in me that says "I must attend" - right? I

wonder if you get all this?

Audience: Is that the right question?

K: What Sir?

Audience: Is that the right question?

K: What is the right question here, the gentleman asks, if I understand rightly. Sorry if you ask questions from the audience we can never get through this. Not that we must get through it, but there are too many people, if you don't mind. What is the right question here and what is the right answer? If it is a right question you will never ask it! (Laughter) This is not just cleverness. A right question, if you put it you have the answer. But the right question is - doesn't - is not put because you want an answer, you are concerned, you are worried, you are biased - you follow? The right question, when you put it, the right question is the right answer.

2nd QUESTION: If the whole of life is one movement, with its own order, why is man so disorderly?

If the whole of life is one movement, with its own order, why is man so disorderly?

Why do we assume that the whole of life is one movement, with its own order? You first state a fact, it is supposed to be a fact, and then try and say why is there disorder. You understand? First you assume, one assumes that life is a vast movement, and in that vast movement, that very movement is order. You state that first: if. And then you say why is man so disorderly? Right? You understand? Wouldn't it be the right question to ask: why is man disorderly? Not assume that life is perfect order - right? The fact is we live disorderly, why? That is the question. Why do we live disorderly? What is disorder? What is disorder to you? Disorder is

the activity of thought which is in itself limited. Right? Whatever the limited activity of thought does, it will bring about disorder. Because thought in itself is limited, because thought is born of knowledge, and knowledge is limited. Right? Oh God! This is not an epigrammatical statement. What is - I mistook it, sorry. What is order and what is disorder? How will you find order? Is order a definite pattern which you have set, which thought has set? You say, "I must get up at 6 o'clock in the morning, do this, this, this and go to the office" - or factory - is that a determined, planned, day after day, is that order? So we must first ask not what is order, but what is the cause of disorder - agree?

What is the cause of disorder in our life? First of all we must admit, whether we like it or not that we live a very, very disordered life. That is a fact, isn't it. Would you agree to that one thing at least? No? What is disorder? And then you have to ask, if it is lack of order, then what is order. How can a mind, brain, which is so disorderly find out what is order? Why don't we be a little bit logical, rational - though reason, logic are limited, you must begin with that and then go beyond it. But if you say order is this, then it becomes military - right? It becomes a tremendous discipline - agree? This is all so simple. All right.

So, we have to go into this carefully. First let us enquire what is discipline? The soldiers are trained day after day, month after month, haven't you seen them. The beating of the drum, the sergeant and all that, order, discipline, obey. And the obedience to an Abbot, to a Pope, to a... and so on - is called order. There is order according to the policeman. In Europe you drive on the right hand side, in this country you drive on the left hand side. That is

order. And the man who is used to driving on the left hand side, goes over there and says that is disorder. Follow all this. So what is the cause of disorder. If I can understand that and be free of that cause there is naturally order. I don't have to find out what is order. So I have to first enquire why this enormous importance is given to discipline - in the schools, in our whole way of life, what is discipline? The word 'discipline' comes from the root disciple. A disciple is one who is learning from the master, learning - right? If you are learning in the sense we are talking about, not accumulating knowledge but learning without accumulation then discipline - the very learning is its own discipline - you understand? I wonder if you understand all this?

Audience: I still don't understand what learning is in your terms.

K: What?

Audience: I still don't understand what learning is because if one watches one's thoughts surely one is watching with one's thoughts. So I don't quite understand how you use learning.

K: I have tried to explain it. Must I go into it again? First of all are we aware, or do we see the fact, accumulating knowledge all our life is very limited. That's a fact because knowledge is limited whether now or in the eternal future it is still limited. And therefore if we act on that knowledge our action will always be limited. And therefore that is one of the causes of disorder - right? If I act always with the previous knowledge which I have accumulated and I know that knowledge is limited, and whatever I do is limited, and any limitation must produce disorder. That is, the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu and the Muslim, the Buddhist and the Catholic - you follow? - they are all limited. They are all functioning within

the field of knowledge which is limited, or tradition. Right? We are following all this? So their activity of limited activity is bound to create disorder. If the wife or the husband, or the girl or the boy is thinking about himself - his ambitions, his progress, his fulfilment, and the other man or the woman is also thinking of his progress - right? - they are in conflict obviously. They may talk about love, they may talk about all kinds of things, but each woman and man is pursuing his own particular direction, his own ambition, which is all very self-centred, limited. Right? And so in the relationship that limitation creates disorder. Naturally. Are we meeting this?

So we are beginning to discover the disorder comes where there is limitation - right? Where I am thinking about myself and you are thinking about yourself, and we have a lovely relationship! We hold hands, we sleep together, we walk together, look at - but we both are going in different directions. Right? And therefore those directions are designed by thought, by desire. Is there time to go into desire here, now? No, that's too complicated.

So we begin to learn, to see, to have an insight - we are using the word 'insight' which is to observe something without time, without motive. To have an insight is not remembering, calculating and so on, it is to have instant insight into disorder, which is ultimately any limited action. Are we getting together on this a little bit? A fraction? And if it is a fraction, keep it and move with it, then you will see the thing begins to break up this self-centred process of living.

May I ask a question? Are you, all of us here, are we putting equal energy, as the speaker is putting it? (Laughter) Or are you just sitting and listening, listening to the aeroplane and listening to

your own thoughts going on, or - you understand? - you are passionate to find out.

3rd QUESTION: How can our listening be adequate to the depth of what you are saying? What is the quality of mind that will allow the fullness of what you are saying to act in us?

I am afraid that is a wrong question but I will read it.

How can our listening be adequate to the depth of what you are saying? What is the quality of mind that will allow the fullness of what you are saying to act in us?

The speaker is saying something which you haven't, you yourself have not discovered. He is not talking about what he has discovered. That is totally irrelevant. But the words, what the telephone is saying, what the words, the content of the words, all that you are listening to. And the listening is watching your own thoughts, your own feelings, your own reactions - right? The speaker is merely acting as a mirror in which you, by listening, you are discovering yourself. You understand what I am saying? The speaker, as a person, as he has oft repeated, has no importance whatsoever. And he means this. And what he is saying is not something that is foreign, that you have to understand, that has to act upon you. Then if that is so, that it is something foreign that must act upon you, you might just as well take a drug. But if you are listening to what he is saying and saying, "What do I feel to what he is saying, what is my reaction to what he is saying?", there is a communication between what he is saying and yourself. Right? Communication ceases when you are merely listening to what he is saying. But what he is saying, and your relationship to what he is saying, and to discover your reaction to what he is saying, and your

responses to his subtleties, or stupidities, or intelligence, you are then moving together. Then it is yours not his. I wonder if you understand.

Audience: No, you...

K: Please Madam, just I understand. Take a little time with what I am saying. Don't immediately - if I may ask most politely - don't immediately answer. But see what he is saying.

First of all he says he is not your guru, absolutely not. That is an anathema to him. And you are not his followers - right? And you haven't got to live what he is talking about. What he is saying is what your own deep undiscovered life - that's all - right? He is talking about you, not himself. He is talking about your life, your daily, monotonous, boredom, tiresome, fearful, sorrowful, lonely life. The violence, the chicanery, the dishonesty, the lack of integrity. Where there is integrity there is strength. But that's another matter. Then you can stand by yourself. Then nothing affects you, then you are not influenced by anybody because you are then discovering what is true for yourself. Not according to - truth according to you, or according to somebody else - truth, which is not his, or yours, it is something entirely not outside the activity of brain. I won't go into that for the moment.

So we are together finding what is truth. We are together finding out what is the art of living, what is the way to listen, what is the way to learn, what is the way of seeing. And if you see, it is yours, then you need no guru, no leader, no book - you understand? We are living on other people's knowledge. We have no insight into ourself, into our own existence. Right? Can I go on to the next question?

4th QUESTION: Is there such a thing as good or evil in the world - sorry I must read it again. Is there such a thing as good or evil in the world, or are these human concepts, values, projections? Is there such a thing as good and evil in the world? Or, are these human concepts, values, and suppositions and projections?

What is good? And what is so-called not good? If we use the word 'evil' that has got such connotations behind that word. Let's forget the word evil for the moment. The good and the bad. The badies and the goodies! - according to the cinemas. (Laughter)

What is good? Now please, try, look at it for a minute. The speaker is asking the question, what is good? How do you listen to the word? How do you receive that word? It doesn't matter who says it. How do you listen to it, receive it? What is your taste of that word? What is your feeling, instinctive feeling to that word? Instinct - I don't mean - your immediate feeling for that word. And when you say the bad, what is your response to it? A repulsion? A thing that you see some bad thing being done? So to discover for oneself the reaction to these two words. Not what philosophers say. Not what other people, the bishops, the priests, the popes - I don't mean merely the Roman popes but the popes of all over the world of different religious organizations, with their heads, with their tails and all the rest of it. When one listens to these two words, which have had tremendous effect on mankind historically, right from the beginning, the Christians have said, "This is good, if you go against it we will burn you" - they have - heretics, tortured them, burnt them for what they have done. And that is considered good. And you go to India to be burnt for your belief is considered a horror. You understand? So what - apart from all this - what is

good and what is bad?

Now, I will go on, may I? Is the good related to the bad? And is the good in conflict with the bad? Novels are written about it. The good always conquering at the end! Even in the thrillers! And the bad is always being destroyed and the bad always coming up. The battle has been going on. You see it in Lescaux and other caves in France and other parts of the world, the battle - right? Good and the bad. The evil - I don't like that word evil, it stinks! Forgive me if I use that word. (Laughter) Sorry! (Laughter) So what is good and what is bad? Are they related to each other? Is goodness born out of that which is bad? Because I know that which is bad, tradition, conditioning, that which has - people have said, written, and that evil, that bad, that which is bad, is fighting that which is good. And the good is fighting that which is bad - right? So I am asking is that which is good born out of that which is bad? You understand my question? It is a simple question. If goodness is born out of that which is bad it is not good - right? Then they are related to each other. Therefore it is not good. Are you following? So they are two entirely different things, the one cannot become the other. If it can become the other it is already recognized by the other - you understand all this? - therefore it is not good. Goodness is something totally divorced from that which is bad - right? But we have mixed the two together and we say we must fight - each thing must be fought. You must resist, fight, put away evil, bad in order to be good - you understand? So the goodness is always in terms of the bad. And we are saying something entirely different. Goodness has no relationship whatsoever with that which is bad. For the goodness to exist the bad must cease. That's all. Not a battle

between the two. This is simply logic, sanity.

Now to come very near home: in us there are these two opposing elements, this duality. Duality of wanting, aspire - I don't like, sorry, aspiration is a wrong word. Aspiration is something romantic and idealistic and rather stupid. Forgive me if I use that word. We are all aspiring for something. You are aspiring to become a manager of a good corporation. And you are also aspiring for God. It is the same thing. You understand? God is another form of good corporation! I am not being blasphemous but this is all so obvious. So goodness cannot exist where that which is bad. From the bad you cannot possibly go to the good. It is not a movement from this to that. It is not a process of time, from that which is bad to achieve that which is good - right?

Now the question arises from that: what is bad? You understand? I will know what is good only when that which is bad is not. So let's put away the good, don't let's say, "Tell me what it is secretly" - or tell me openly. Then I will follow that. But to understand that which is bad. Is it bad to be nationalistic? Come on Sirs, answer it. Say I am a Frenchman, I am British, or I am a Hindu, or a Sikh, or a Muslim - you know. Is that bad?

Audience: It might not be to some, but to us.

K: To other people, we are including all of us Sir, I am not saying, to me it is bad and to you it is not bad. That's rather... we are asking: what is bad, not according to me or according to somebody else. As long as there is division - right? - racial division, class division, religious division - right? Political, economic and so on, divisions, those divisions create conflict, war ultimately, killing each other. You understand? Isn't that bad? No?

Audience: Yes, yes.

K: Good, I am glad. (Laughter) And yet religions have supported it, you support it - you understand? You know all the rest of it. Can we be free of all that first? Not belong to any country, to any group, to any guru, to any religious organization because they are all divisive. That brings about another question: authority. Political authority, religious authority, the totalitarian authority - you understand? Is authority evil? Not authority in the hands of the wise is good. Do you understand? We have said that: authority of the wise is the salvation of the foolish! (Laughter)

So authority of the policeman, the authority of law. You have to pay tax - not for myself but... you have to pay tax. If you don't pay it you are punished in some way or another. So there is authority outwardly - right? Authority of keeping to the left side of the road, the authority of keeping to the right side in France and Europe. And there must be authority in a school, in a college, otherwise you can't - you follow? But we are talking about authority, the feeling of authority, the power of authority, to slaughter people. So authority, spiritual, authority in the deepest sense of that word is bad, is evil.

So, then the question is: the bad. The bad we said is any kind of division. Don't misunderstand. The religious division - right? The division that says "We are closed, you can't come in here" - psychologically. But the door is open if you want to come in. You understand? That is not closed. So go into all this. It all comes down to any form of psychological, individualistic division - the Arab, the Jew, the Muslim and so on. Any psychological organizational division in that sense of that word. That's bad.

Right? And can one be free of all that? And not just say, "Yes, I see your point, but it's all right but we will go on with our war. It is nice. We are violent people, that is part of our expression of violence, the ultimate expression of violence to kill a million people at one blow." Or do we end all that in ourselves? In ourselves first not organizational thing. You know that story which the speaker thought out? There were two men walking along - you know it some of you, heard this? If you have forgive me. Don't get bored with it. Two men were walking along on a street talking about various things of life. And one of them sees something on the pavement, picks it up. The moment he looks at it his whole face changes, something tremendous has taken place in him. And he puts it in his pocket very carefully, in his inner pocket. And the friend says to him, "What is it you have picked up? Why have you become so extraordinarily... your face has changed." He said, "I have picked up truth". And his friend says, "By Jove, is that really so? I can see by how you look. So what shall we do about it?" And the friend says, "Let's go and organize it" (laughter) This is an old story which the speaker invented about forty or fifty years ago.

So can we, each one of us, not join an organization that will help us to be free from war. That's another form of organization. You follow? We don't begin with ourselves first. Can we, each of us, end this division in ourselves? Then you can use organisations - you understand? But if you use organizations to change the inner you will never succeed.

So can we, each of us, put anything that divides us from another? Of course you must have your own house, your own garden, your own - you follow? - not psychologically, inwardly,

subjectively. Then you don't have to search for the good. Then the good flourishes. Then goodness flowers. The beauty of that is endless. It never can be destroyed by anything.

Audience: Sir, in the animal kingdom...

K: Sorry I have to stop now.

Audience: In the animal kingdom the tiger eats the goat. Doesn't the goat look upon the tiger as a badie?

K: Of course not. The tiger kills the beautiful deer. And the tiger too is very beautiful. Have you been very close to a tiger, any of you? Of course not. You have seen them in zoos. I have been very close, about ten feet away from them. Don't bother. I am not inviting you to go and meet them. (Laughter) The tiger eats the deer. The big things eat the little things. And the bigger things eat the bigger - follow? Up and up. Is that evil? The tiger killing the deer? Of course not. You follow? That's nature. Why do we say the tiger is cruel? The cat playing with a mouse - you understand? Haven't you known that. That's rather ugly - you know. Our whole civilization is so monstrous - right? So we must begin with ourselves, not tigers, elephants and rats and snakes. I am afraid we all do this. We want to escape from ourselves. And ourselves is the most important thing. And to penetrate this sheathe, this outward appearance, outward show, outward thing, deeply to go inwards, that journey is endless, it has got such extraordinary beauty.

We will stop now. We will go into it another time.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 30TH AUGUST 1984

I am sorry the weather is breaking up.

Before we begin to enquire into the question, or questions, we should talk over together what is peace and its relationship to intelligence. You don't mind if I talk? In a world that is disintegrating with wars, and nationalism, and sectarianism, idealism and every form of division, opinion against opinion, data against data, judgement against judgement and so on, can we have peace in the world first? Or can we live peacefully? What does it mean to live together, man, woman and so on, or a group of people, not committed to any belief or faith and so on, can we live together peacefully? Apparently this is one of the most difficult things in the world. Here too, there is a great deal of disturbance going on, in England, strike after strike, and all the travails of human beings. And in the search for peace one goes off to a monastery, shaving one's head, putting on some kind of garb and taking vows. This has been tried for generations upon generations, both in India and in the West and in the Far East, a group of people committed to live peacefully, and to subjugate all their opinions, conforming to a certain pattern of idealism, certain dogmas, a way of monastic life and so on. One heard the other day rather an extraordinary fact, thing; there was a man who was very good at writing, literary, he was doing quite well, newspapers, magazines and all the rest of it, and he gave up all that one day and he went off to some kind of retreat, ashrama, a guru collects round himself. And there what do you think he is doing? Pulling old nails out of

old wood and he is perfectly happy. You understand? And he is living peacefully, he says. Is that peace? To completely forget the world, what is happening in the world. Forget any kind of responsibility, put aside any kind of relationship with another and disappear into a commune, into a community, or enter into a monastery - which is highly organized, with the abbot whom he must obey utterly and so on.

How does one find peace in the world, and in oneself? I am sure one has asked this question of oneself: to live completely peacefully in relationship to others, not isolate oneself, that is fairly simple and also it has its own dangers. The dangers are that you become more and more self-centred, or commit yourself to some symbol, a figure, or to some doctrinaire concept, and devote all one's energy to that, keeping that to oneself and working in a garden, or in a vineyard. Champagne and the good wines of France were produced by the monks. (Laughter) And the monks have also fought, killed people. This has been going on for centuries. And one is living in a world that is really monstrously destructive, divisive, every form of brutality and so on. Where does one find peace? Can a group of people live together peacefully? Whether they are teachers, educators, or man, woman and so on? Does one look for peace? Or does one bring about peace? You understand? Does peace lie externally, outside the skin, as it were; or does one really want peace? If one sets aside all the things that desire, will, thought, has conceived what is peace, wanting peace, and committed to some form of regulation, whether it is so-called spiritual or otherwise. Lots of people have disappeared in the army because they have no responsibility there, governments look after

you, like in a monastery, but you work, march, ready to kill and so on.

So can one bring about peace within oneself and is it possible, living in this world, knowing what the world is becoming more and more, both scientifically and so-called nationally, can one live, or bring, create peace? You understand my question? Can we wait a few minutes for that? (Noise of aeroplane). To live in peace implies no act of divisiveness - right? No act of separation, no sense of me first and you second, both in a queue (laughter) and at home. Is that possible at all? - not only for oneself but living with a group of people. The speaker has been for many, many years, sixty or more years (noise of plane) - the speaker has been living for over sixty years with a group of people. In India, in America, here, all over the world, part of the world rather. And there there is always contention, always dissension, opinion against opinion, why shouldn't I think this way, you think your way, and so on. This process has been going on, not only now, always perhaps. And one wonders if it is at all possible to create peace. One is using the word 'create' in the ordinary sense of the word, not creation - that's another matter. Can one, in a group of people, create peace, in your house, perhaps four of you, or two of you, in a family? Can we bring peace about? Or is that impossible? Do you understand my question? Does one really want to live in peace? And if one does, what price do you pay for it? - not in coins, not in bank notes and so on, but what are you willing or desirous, or saying as we must live in peace, and it is only in peace that one can really flower, what will you do, what will you put aside, what gesture will you make? You understand? It is very easy to superficially say, "Yes, I

am willing to live in peace. I will join your beastly little community, or your commune, or I will follow a guru and come and live in that community". that is very easy and rather slack. Forgive that word. Rather indifferent to what is happening to the rest of the world. It is a form of exclusiveness, not one is against elite but the exclusive way of looking at life - you understand?

Now are we willing to give up, put aside our own particular opinions, particular judgements, not that one must not have objections, discussions, stating what one thinks and if one sees what one thinks is not correct, yield, change. Is all that possible? Or we are all so obstinate - you understand my question? - that we never under any circumstances yield, unless we are forced? So we come to a point, if one wants really peace in oneself and in one's family, or in one's group of people, to be highly sensitive, not only to one's own particular desires. That is fairly simple. To one's own self-centred images, but to be sensitive to nature, to other people's ideas, other people's way of looking, their difficulties, the whole process of living together, which requires an enormous sense of yielding and watching, and observing, and highly not interpretative but seeing what the other is: he may be brutal, he may be insensitive but help him to be sensitive, help him not to be... you follow? It is a constant sense of movement, not taking a stand at any time. Is that at all possible? Not only in a family, or in a group of people, like in a school - and we are very close to a school here and we are having a lot of trouble there too. So this is a great problem which not only we who are responsible here at the school at Brockwood but also responsible to ourselves and to our environment, to the way we live. Because peace requires a great

deal of intelligence. You can't just say, "I must live peacefully. I must leave the place where there is conflict." and go somewhere else hoping to find where there is inward - where there is no conflict. Such a place doesn't exist unless one becomes completely dull, completely insensitive and doesn't care a damn what is happening - sorry, you don't mind? (laughter) - and so on.

So one has to enquire also what is intelligence? Because peace requires tremendous intelligence. It isn't a thing you buy in the market, or in books, or repeating some chants, or some words, or pray for peace - good God! Humanity has prayed for peace from the beginning of days, and there has been no peace in the world, or in oneself. And to have that quality of peace which is unshakable, which has no shadow of disturbance in it, requires great intelligence. So we must ask ourselves: what is that intelligence? Is that intelligence born of books? Is that intelligence the outcome of complicated subtle thought? Or is it a projection of an ideal and conforming to that pattern? Thought with its limitation has a certain quality of intelligence, otherwise we couldn't be sitting here. You need intelligence to travel, to go to the moon; to go to the moon there must have been thousands of people co-operating together to produce that rocket that went up there. That is a form of intelligence. And a scientist, a surgeon, to operate requires great skill, requires some form of intelligence. So is all that born of knowledge, born of experience, accumulated skills with their high discipline, all the result and the product, the movement of thought? And thought being limited, as we talked about it the other days, can thought bring about peace? Which has its own limited intelligence. Right? Or is intelligence nothing whatsoever to do with the activity

of thought? You are following all this? Not only verbally but see the logic of it, the reason. Thought with its limitation has created the most extraordinary things in the modern world - the rapid communication, one does not know if you have been on a battleship or on a submarine, the complications of it, the extraordinary energy that has gone to build those things. And the dynamo, motors and so on. Immense energy, a great deal of thought, knowledge, has gone into all this and therefore there is that quality of limited intelligence because it is based essentially on thought, or knowledge. And is there an intelligence which is not limited? One must ask these questions if one wants peace. One must ask these essential questions. Not only peace, a way of living with great depth, with great beauty and it is only that quality of intelligence that can bring this about.

That is, can there be peace without love? Do you understand my question? Can there be peace without a sense of compassion? Can there be compassion if one belongs to a certain sect, religion, group and so on? You understand my question? If I am attached to my particular conditioning - as a Hindu, Muslim, Christian or Buddhist - I can read the books that talk about compassion as being essential. There is no end to making of books - right? Are we all together? Or am I talking? So where do I find - where does one find this intelligence, or come upon it? One cannot possibly cultivate that intelligence. You can cultivate the limited intelligence in the world of science, biology, mathematics, art and so on, that can be cultivated carefully, day after day, until you have that extraordinary skill. But is compassion, with its extraordinary intelligence, is that cultivable?

Then, as it is not, you cannot cultivate day by day love - right? So what will you do? If you want to live peacefully, deeply, without a single shadow of conflict between each other, what shall we do? Or, not do?

One has to go really very deeply into the question of desire, will and love. We have talked for half an hour. I am not answering the questions. So perhaps we can do this on Saturday and Sunday. We have a lot to talk about, not only that, intelligence, love and the whole problem of pain and sorrow and death and meditation, religion, and all that we have to talk about. So the speaker had better pick up the questions!

1st QUESTION: You spoke on Tuesday about goodness. But I am still not quite clear about whether the quality of goodness or evil is outside - is an outside agency, or forces existing in the world, or only a projection of our thinking.

You spoke of Tuesday about goodness. But I am still not quite clear about whether the quality of goodness or evil is an outside agency, or force existing in the world, or only a projection of our own thinking.

Right? The question is clear? The questioner, as we understand it, wants to know is goodness and evil something outside, nothing to do with ourselves, but putting ourselves aside does this goodness exist in the air, as it were, and the evil outside? Is it totally independent of our human beings? You understand it? This is what the questioner is asking, if we understand it rightly.

There have been wars - sorry to talk about wars - there have been wars for thousands upon thousands of years. There has been killing of human beings by the million and that killing has created

immense sorrow. Is that sorrow outside, separated from us? We have our own sorrow, our own pain, our own anxiety, our own sense of goodness and badness - or if you like to use the word 'evil'. Apart from that does evil and goodness exist - exist? You understand? What do you think? As the questioner asks: is it our projection, our prejudice, our sense of the good and the bad? Or is there evil, something separate altogether from human endeavour, human existence?

This is a very serious question this. It is not just a flippant question.

People have talked about goodness for years. Aristotle, I believe, talked about it, Plato and before Aristotle, Plato there was the ancient Hindus. And before them there was somebody else talking about it, enquiring. The same thing as we are doing now. The evil that man has created. The goodness that man has pursued, the ideals and the conformity and something that exists outside of us. There are people in the world, like the terrorists, like the Imperialists, the great conquerors of the world from Ghengis Khan, Napoleon, you know all the rest of it, they wanted power, power by hoping to unify Europe. The church, the Catholic Church has hoped to unify all Europe by dogma, rituals, belief, torture and all the rest of it. Wars. And those exist still, that feeling - right? Or do you object to that? And there have been a great many people who pursued goodness, not, not people didn't know them, they were not famous people, they were people who said, "I will live a good life." - not the good life in the modern world with good meals and good drinks and all the rest of it, but the good life of austerity, not just putting on a loincloth, or one robe. Austerity is something entirely

different. And they have pursued that and the building of that goodness, though those people have died and gone, must exist. Haven't you found when you enter a house, a strange house, the atmosphere of it, no? One can feel if there have been quarrels in the house, there has been violence, there has been perpetual conflict in that house. One can feel it. So it is outside - right? Do you object to that? So there is goodness and that which is called evil or bad, it exists in the world part from our own contribution to it. And one can become highly sensitive to all that and put an end to our own conflicts, divisions, holding on to opinions, and saying, "My opinion is a fact" - you know the regular process of holding on to something and battling for it.

All this requires a very careful observation, perception of oneself, perception of one's own activities, behaviour. Either one contributes to goodness or to the so-called that which is bad.

This is rather a close question this, near the bone!

2nd QUESTION: Do your schools, here, or elsewhere, give the students an understanding of the total human problem, the immensity of human life and its possibilities?

Do your schools (underlined) (laughter) - here or elsewhere give the students an understanding of the total human problem, the immensity of human life and its possibilities?

The question has been put to the speaker, so take a rest!
(Laughter) First of all the speaker helped in various countries, in India there are five schools and there are going to be other schools, and there is one school here at Brockwood, and one in California, at Ojai. They are not the speaker's schools. They are the schools where not only the speaker and others have helped to bring it

about. So it cannot be called your school. I know K's name is used but it is not his personal school. And that wouldn't be correct or true. It is a school - all the schools in different parts of the world have been built or come together with hundreds of people working for it. You understand? It is not just one person. That would be terrible, you couldn't do it. There are schools in India that have existed for over sixty years, which we helped - the speaker helped to bring it about with the help of others. One in the North near Benares, and the other in the South near Madras, and so on. And there is one here. And one in California.

Teachers, educators are like you and me. They are human, they have their own personal problems, their own difficulties, and the students come already conditioned by their parents, by their neighbours, by other children, and come to these various schools. And the teachers are also conditioned, unfortunately. And you are asking a question if the total human understanding of life, the immensity of human existence and its vast possibilities. First of all do the parents want this? Do you understand my question? Generally the parents want their children to have some kind of degree, technological degree or human degrees, you know, various degrees, so that they can get a good job, settle down in life and marry, children, carry on. Generally that is what the parents want. And the children feel certain responsibility towards their parents, so they are more or less, especially in the Asiatic world, they conform. Do you want to go into all this?

Parents, the speaker has met them all, most of them - California, here - some of them don't care a damn. Whether they pass examinations or not, so long as the parents are relieved of their

children. They send them off to boarding houses - you know all that - in England too. And they hardly have any relationship except - with their children except in the summer holidays, or winter holidays. And the responsibility of the educator becomes immense. And to teach them, to help them to understand the immense - the immensity of human life, the vastness of existence, not only one's own personal existence but existence, nature, the animals, the whole universe. That requires not only a capable mind, brain and enquiring into that, and also teaching a particular subject - you understand? Because as society now is if you are a good engineer you get a better, good job. So the students also wants a good job, they don't want to become a saleswoman or salesman in a shop. So they want a good job. So their whole concentration, if one can use that world, is to getting a good degree, A level, O level and all the rest of it. And there is the pressure of society which you all have created. And there is the pressure of the parents and so on. You understand the difficulties of all this? And if you understand it very clearly and deeply, will you join us? No, careful, you can't just join because you want to join. You have to do something. You have to be a good cook, good gardener, oh yes, good teacher, good parent. You want this. Don't leave it to us. The educator needs educating, as the parents need educating, so do the students. It is a process of living, working, co-operating, feeling together, not battling with opinions. And this requires a great deal of energy, and which parent - and there are many parents - at Brockwood School, I believe there are fifteen to nineteen nationalities - and that school is not what it should be, but it will be. We are working for it. Help us - you understand? I am not asking you for money. That is easy

stuff! But join together to create something together.

3rd QUESTION: Would you enlarge on what you mean by saying that the future is now? Is it that the seeds of the future - seeds underlined - of the future are contained in the present? Or that the future already fully exists on a different time scale?

Would you enlarge on what you mean by saying that the future is now? Is it that the seeds - underlined - of the future are contained in the present? Or that the future already fully exists on a different time scale?

We certainly vary our questions, don't we! This is a very complicated, like all human problems, question. Apart from scientific fiction and the theories which the scientists have about time as a series of movements and so on, apart from the demand that the future be comfortable, safe and happy and all the rest of it, what is time? Can we go into this together? Together. Not just I speak, the speaker says something and you agree or throw it out. This requires really very serious enquiry.

What is time? You can see time as a movement from point to point - right? To go from here to your house, to your home, there is a distance to be covered which will take time. That's obvious. And also time is the whole movement of the past - right? - in which is implied all the traditions, accumulated traditions handed down from one generation to another - their knowledge, their books, how to play the violin and so on, the whole movement of this enormous past is there, of which we are - right? We are the past. The past being memories, you are the whole movement of memory now. Right? That's a fact. So you are a bundle of memories, whether you like it or not, that is a fact. Without those memories, pleasant,

unpleasant, remarkable, satisfying, fulfilling, all those memories are in the present. And without those memories you would not exist. You may exist as a vegetable - no, probably trees have their own way of responding, we won't go into that. So you are - we are, each one of us, memories. Which is, the whole process of accumulation of knowledge, responses, reactions, judgements, condemnations, acceptance, and so on, this whole process which has brought about, not only biologically, subjectively, is what we are now. We are after forty, fifty thousand years, all those centuries, that vast sense of time, is now. Because you are that. That is clear, isn't it? And that is the future if there is no break. That's simple surely.

A very simple example: tribalism has existed from the beginning of time. I belong to that tribe. It still exists in Africa, and which exists in every country, glorified as nationalism. It is still tribalism. Right? And that tribalism is dividing people, holding on to one's beliefs and all the rest of it. So that is the whole accumulation of a group, or a tribe, or a nation, a community, is the past. Right Sirs? And if you consider after fifty thousand years of human existence on this marvellous earth we are about the same - right? Psychologically, subjectively, inwardly, we are still very, very, very primitive. You may pick up a telephone and talk to the other end of the world but what you say is still rather primitive. (Laughter) Either it is business, or cursing somebody, or talking to somebody and saying, "Darling how are you?" It is the same process that has been going on, much more difficult in past centuries, now it can be done in a second. So the past is now, is what we are, and what we are after forty thousand years - you

understand? How extraordinarily - time has not changed us - right? Be honest to oneself. We have made so-called progress technologically. Immense progress, incredible but inwardly we are somewhat very, very little, on the frills perhaps, at the core we are barbarous, primitive - right? Killing each other, all the rest of it.

So time - please listen - time has not changed us. Right? Do we see this? So evolution has not changed the psyche. On the contrary it is making it more and more strong. The psyche being the whole accumulation of memories - racial, national, tribal, religious divisions. The ancient Sumerians, the ancient Hindus, they never called them Hindus, but it doesn't matter, and the Egyptians and from those forty, fifty thousand years we are still, after evolving we are still primitive. Time is going on. Time is a movement. So the future is what we are now - right? We will have wars, now we know how to kill millions of people at one drop, we hate each other, we compete with each other, we are angry with each other, seeking sexual fulfilment, or different forms of fulfilment. They have done this - you understand? - and we are still at it. And the future is still what we are now. So the future is now, not the seeds of it, the actuality of it. So is it possible to radically change all that? Not allowing time at all - you understand? You understand my question? Time has not changed us, evolution has not changed us, different organizations have not changed us, different religions have not changed us, suffering has not changed us. And we said time will help us to change. I am coming to that Sirs. Give me a little time! (Laughter) A little time!

So we are saying, if one looks to time, that is tomorrow, to bring about a change then it is futile hope - right? That's clear.

Therefore you have to enquire: what is change? Is change in terms of the future? Is change something from that which is to something else? Please go into it, don't... I am this, I will be that. I will be that means future, brought about by desire which is the essence of will, desire is the essence of will. So you say, "I will do something later", "I will change gradually" - right? "I hope to become noble", "I will get rid of my opinions" - you follow? All that implies that you are looking to time to change. So we are asking what is change in which there is no time? Do you understand Sirs? The moment I say to myself, "I will change", you have already admitted the future. Right? "I will become", "I will change", "I will flower", "I will love" - all that admits time and time has not changed us - right? Because we have evolved for fifty thousand years and that vast space and experience has no deep effect on us at all.

So is there a totally - please understand this - totally ending of something which has been, now. You understand? Wait! Suppose I am greedy - you know what that means, of course everybody does - greedy, envious - perhaps envy is a better word. I am envious. I can rationalize it, say it is natural, it is cultural, it is part of commercial process of gaining and losing - production, and all that stuff. So I can say, "I am greedy", and man has been greedy from the beginning of time - right? And time has not changed me at all. Because through greed we have created this appalling society, both commercially and through envy, which is comparison, we have destroyed each other. This is a fact. And can that envy end instantly, not "I will gradually" - you understand my question? Have I made the question clear? Is there an ending - ending - and not a continuity? A continuity implies time - right? Oh, come on

Sirs.

So can one not allow time at all to enter into the world of change? That change means ending. Ending not knowing what will happen because what might happen is still hope, time and so on. Is it possible to end envy, instantly, completely, so that it never exists any more? Yes, Sir! That's why it is very important to understand the nature of time. Time is a movement, like thought. And time is necessary to learn a language, to acquire a skill, time is necessary to go to the moon, time is necessary to put a warship together, or a dynamo, or a motor. But psychologically, subjectively, if we think in terms of time and change there will be never change. See what is happening. You have had United Nations at one time - no, League of Nations, now you have United Nations, another blow up will be another kind of... another United Nations. But it is the same process - you understand? Reordering the same misery in different forms.

So is it possible not to have tomorrow? To look at life, to live with that life which has no tomorrow at all.

May I go on to the next question? You see that implies enormous things. You are not really understanding this thing, time. A drum is tuned carefully, and because it is tuned, because inwardly, inside it is empty, and when you strike on it it gives the right note. And to have that inward quality of nothingness but highly sensitive, then you have something extraordinary. The speaker is not enticing you into something. He is not persuading you, rewarding. There is no reward or punishment.

4th QUESTION: Why do you not find value in prayer?

Why do you not find value in prayer? Do you find value in

prayer? Would you kindly... would you. I don't know why you accuse me of not having any value in prayer. Why do we pray? You know that there are a whole group of community, or monks who are perpetually praying. One group finishes praying, another group takes it up. And we also pray when we are in difficulties. When there is a great crisis in our life we want to pray, or say, "Somebody help me, please". You know that joke of a man hanging onto a cliff? He says, "Please, God, save me" and God says, "Have faith and jump!" (Laughter) And the man who is hanging on to the cliff says, "Isn't there somebody above that still?" (Laughter) Sorry!

Why do we pray at all? This has been going on, praying in the Christian world, in the Islamic world, and in a different way in the Buddhist and Hindu world, praying. To whom are you praying? To an outside agency? Outside agency being God, or the Lord. The Lord according to different countries and cultures and traditions. The Almighty of different concepts? To whom are we praying? And why do we pray? Does prayer answer our difficulties? In some cases when you are praying, not merely using certain words, chanting and so on, but praying silently without words, you understand what I am saying? - perhaps you might get an answer because your whole brain has become quiet. And in that quietness, in that stillness of the brain without the movement of thought, you find an answer. And then you say "I must pray more and more". Which is, you have achieved, you have gathered some experience and that experience has brought certain result and you like those results and so you keep this going! Then it becomes a habit and you have lost everything.

Why do we pray at all? We are not condemning or saying it is all right, but we are questioning the whole thing, with certain scepticism, with certain quality of brain that says give me the reason, not just emotional reactions. And one is in great difficulties. There is great crisis, pain, sorrow, insoluble. And at that moment we look to somebody to help. And the somebody is not my husband, wife, children, and my neighbour, or somebody across the street, because I know them too well, they are also in the same position as myself. And so I turn to some outside agency. Outside agency means not something that is organized by thought, God, Christ and in India it is another deity and so on. I pray on my knees because I can't solve this problem at all. I cannot resolve my sorrow, my pain, my loneliness, and so I gradually begin to depend on something externally. Either it is the doctor, psychiatrist or God. They are all the same, the moment I want to be helped. One may call saintly prayer, the other he says, "Well, that's mundane" - you pay ten pounds and you get, you know what happens. I don't have to go into all that. So they are both the same, all the same. So why do I do this? Because I want to be helped. I am not able to solve the problem. Or I think I am not able to solve the problem. It is very painful, devastating, it disturbs my whole life and I want someone to calm my being, to help me to overcome this. And this has been done for forty, fifty and more thousands years. It was the thunder, lightening before, then it was the worship of trees, then it is now the worship of symbols and images. Not much difference.

So I have to ask: why do I want help? Is it not possible - it may sound rather cruel, but it is not, the person who is always asking for help becomes weaker and weaker and weaker, duller. Then he

becomes - he then becomes utterly dependent on something, either on drugs, or on people, or on ideals, ultimately his concept of God. Whether it is a drug or God it is still along the same lines because you want to be helped.

Now we are asking ourselves: is it possible for me to solve my own problems without a single aid from another? Which requires a great deal of stamina, energy, to go and say, "Now this problem of envy, what is envy, it is always comparison, and a little more than comparison". The craving, the want. And can that end without time? Then I don't have to pray. Then the person who is like that is totally free from all contamination of thought. So it requires the understanding of fear to be able to stand completely on your feet. And that is now slowly being denied. Drugs, cocaine, heroine and all that is spreading in the world. We are bored with life and we want substitutions for life. And so prayer is your own desire to achieve something which will be most gratifying. An easy way to live without any understanding. It is much more complicated than merely the statements of the speaker. You see we are all so petty, small minded. And if we could step out of that, not tomorrow, now, then life is something that is endless, immense.

It is now ten to one. Ah, here is a good question!

5th QUESTION: When you are no longer physically with us (laughter) - what a pity! - what are those of us who understand your message, even if only intellectually, to do? Do we continue working on ourselves and forget the rest of the world? Or try to spread your teachings as we see it?

When you are no longer physically with us - why add 'physically'? - among us what are those of us who understand your

message, even if only intellectually, to do? Do we continue working on ourselves and forget the rest of the world? Or try to spread your teachings as we see it?

(Laughter) Need I answer this question? (Laughter)

Sir, it is your message, not mine. It is your book, not mine. If the way you live is the message, if you live in the way we are talking about, timelessly, that's - your very living is the life. That doesn't depend on anybody. K - it is one fact in life, we are all going to die. That is an absolute, irrevocable fact. And the future is now, death is now. You understand? That is the ending is now, not in ten years time, or fifty years time. And if one lives that way your very living is the message, it is not K's message, it is yours. Then your life is spreading. The very living, the way you live, you then spread that which you are living. Not spread that which someone else has said. You understand? So very, very simple, this. Beauty is yours, not somebody else's. We had better stop now.

May I get up?

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1984

May we go on where we left off last Sunday? We were talking about various problems of life, not technological problems but human problems. Our psychological hurts, the wounds that one receives from childhood which we carry throughout life. And these hurts prevent us from having real relationship with others. And these hurts bring about fear. We resist every form of further hurts, therefore we have to build a wall round ourselves and thereby become more and more isolated, neurotic and so on. We talked about that. That we have created an image for ourselves about ourselves and these images whether they are political, religious or one's own psychological images, that is subjective images, are the cause of these hurts. They are also the images that are hurt. And we talked about relationship. How important it is to have really good, healthy, rational, without any conflict between man and woman and so on. And we went into that fairly deeply.

We talked about fear last Sunday and the whole problem of time. We said time is the movement of the past, modifying itself in the present, and the future is what is now. So we said all time is contained in the present. If one could really deeply go into that question, the nature of time, the nature of thought and time is thought, we talked about that quite considerably. And if all the present, if all time is contained in the now, then what is change, is there any change then at all? And what is action? And what is also relationship when there is no tomorrow? Tomorrow and the further thousand tomorrows are contained in the present. And if there is no

radical change in the present the future is what we are now. We are, as we said, a whole accumulation of memories, we are memories, gathered through thousands of experiences, knowledge, from experience, and that knowledge is limited and therefore all knowledge, whether in the past, the present, or in the future, is always limited. And thought, which is also the response of memory, that thought is also limited. So we are going to enquire this morning, several things like morality, justice, whether it is possible completely to end sorrow. And if there is time we will also talk over together what is the nature, what does it mean to die? And also we would like to point out this is not an entertainment, intellectual, romantic, sentimental. This is not a propaganda by the speaker. He is not inviting you to any theory, to any ideology, to any form of persuasion. And also we would like to point out that he is not a guru and all that nonsense.

So we should talk over together, that is, you and the speaker investigate together. And therefore when that investigation is true, deep and continuous, then it is your own, then it is nothing to do with the speaker. As we pointed out quite often, the speaker is merely a telephone, and what he says is important - important in the sense that it covers the whole of our human existence psychologically, subjectively, inwardly, and therefore if we could think together, explore together, take a long journey together, then that journey, that investigation is yours, therefore it is your own understanding, not the understanding of what K is talking about. That is very clear.

Then we should talk about morality. The word 'morality' means behaviour, manner, habit according to any kind of culture,

environment, and is there a morality that is not time-binding? Can we go along with this together? A morality that is not within the field of time. Our morality is relative. Our morality, which is habit, custom, manners, behaviour, all that is either born of thought and thought being limited, therefore morality is limited, relative, or it is brought about through various cultures, environment and so on. All that is relative and therefore in the field of time and thought. Are we together in this? And we are asking: is there a morality which is action, manner, that is not within the area of time and thought? One thinks this is important to discover because on that is freedom. Freedom per se, for itself, not freedom from something.

So we ought to talk over that first perhaps. What is freedom? Is freedom a reaction from bondage, from loneliness, from every form of depression, anxiety, loneliness, despair and so on? If there is a reaction from those and you call that freedom then that is not freedom, it is merely a response to a condition. Freedom implies also, as we understand it now, is choice. We can choose to come here, or go there, choose between various jobs, functions and vocations. Choose whom you will marry or not marry and so on. Choice implies confusion. And choice is not freedom. Freedom is not a reaction to a condition. So is there such freedom? Are we together in this? I hope the tent is not too hot, or you are comfortably hot.

So this is really a very serious question one must ask of oneself: whether freedom is from bondage, or from the prison which we have created for ourselves, away from the prison, and therefore it is still within the area of the prison. If one is in a prison, both physically and inwardly, subjectively, then the physical control

being enclosed within a certain area, and to escape from that one calls freedom. And psychologically one has built a prison for oneself by one's own desires, one's own anxieties, loneliness and so on. And freedom from that is still within the area of that prison, psychological prison. Are we together? Therefore it is not freedom at all. So is there a freedom that is not a reaction, a freedom per se, for itself, not away from something, or from something?

So one must understand for oneself why we are always trying to escape or to rationalize, or to go beyond that which is. If one understands that which is, understand not merely intellectually, verbally, but see the depth of it, see the truth of it, the substance of it, the vitality of it, then observe, perceiving that and remaining with that and explore into that movement, learning, not memorizing, from that, if one goes very deeply, then there is freedom per se.

Now morality is still within the area of time and thought. I think you will agree to that. Depending on the countries, cultures, religious conditioning, national bondage and so on. So that is a relative morality. Is there a morality that is totally free from all time and thought? Are we following this? Or is the speaker talking to himself? And to find such - or to discover it, or to live with that sense of timeless morality, morality not put together by thought and therefore limited, relative, passing, and to go into that very deeply, as we said, time must be understood, the nature of time. Time is a series of events and movements. Now time is also the whole accumulation of forty thousand years, or fifty thousand years of human existence on this earth with all their experiences, racial, tribal, religious fears and so on, all that is the past, the

tradition. And that past is now operating, working, which is the past is conditioning us. And the future, the tomorrow is the continuation of the past, modified but it still has its roots in the past. And if there is no radical, fundamental change now, the tomorrows will still be what is now. So the tomorrow is now. The future is now - right? I think it is fairly simple to understand this. We have lived on this earth, according to the biologists and scientists, for fifty thousand years, more or less. We have supposed to have evolved through that time, through that long duration of time. Both physically, biologically, and also all the content of our consciousness. And during this long period of time we still remain very primitive, barbarous, cruel, destructive, wars. So we have changed very, very little because we are still violent, appallingly violent - terrorists, wars, all the things that are going on in the world today. And this has been going on for fifty thousand years, more or less. Perhaps we didn't kill a million people with one bomb. We killed another with a cudgel, an arrow but still the killing instinct of other human beings is still with us. So after all this long evolution we are still barbarians. And we shall remain barbarians - I am using that word, one is using that word in the real sense, not in the Roman sense. The Roman sense was anybody in the ancient Rome who does not belong to the Roman Empire, or who didn't speak Latin and so on. We are using that word 'barbarous' in the sense that we are extraordinarily primitive, self-centred, amazingly violent, incredibly violent and brutal. In our gesture, in our words and so on. We are still tribalists - the British, the French, the Indian with their division of Sikh and all the rest of it. And if we are that now after centuries of evolution we will be

still that in the tomorrows. So the future is now. Right?

And is it possible to change now, completely, without the concept, the idea of tomorrow? And if there is such fundamental timeless change that is true freedom. And when there is freedom of such a kind there is no fear and therefore there is no all the invention of gods and rituals and all that disappears.

And we ought also to talk over together: what is suffering? Why human beings, who are technologically so vastly advanced, so capable, both intellectually and physically, why after all these years and centuries, why we have not ended sorrow. We all suffer from the most highly sophisticated individual to the most primitive person, uneducated and so on. We all suffer. For various reasons - suffering from lack of food, from lack of clothes and so on, in that physical sense. And there are thousands and millions of people in India and elsewhere who have very little to eat. And also there is the suffering of millions of people through wars, what is happening in North Ireland, Lebanon and so on, Afghanistan and India. And that suffering of wars, of thousands and thousands of years ago wars continue. And those wars have created immense suffering for mankind. And also there is suffering if one loses one's friend, one's - with whom one has lived for many years. And also there is suffering of not fulfilling, not achieving, not becoming and so on. So there is the vast human suffering of which we are. That suffering has existed for thousands of years. And also there is personal suffering, the limited suffering. We don't think that is limited suffering because it is ours, my suffering. So what is the cause of suffering? Why haven't we resolved it after such a long duration of time? Are we at all aware of this great suffering of

humanity? And also this suffering of each one of us? And when we become aware it is a great shock, something that nearly paralyses one. All suffering makes one's own outlook narrow, petty, very destructive. And why is it that we have not solved this question?

Christians have avoided this question. The Hindus, including the Sikhs and all those tribal divisions, or religious divisions, they have explanations as Karma, that is what you do you sow and so on. Everyone has some kind of explanation for suffering. But the explanations, the causes of suffering, if we merely explain it, put it into words, as we shall presently, knowing that the words are not the feeling, the actuality of pain, so the word is not the thing. The explanation, the descriptions are not the actual. So if we are caught in the words then we shall not be able to understand the substance, the quality, the depth of suffering. So first can we be free of words? This is important because words condition our thinking. Words like Communist, or Socialist and so on, they have already - those words have certain significance and we accept those significances and thus we are conditioned by words.

Audience: (Interrupts)

K: Sir, would you kindly let me finish the talk. We asked last Tuesday and Thursday, we answered many of the questions that have been given, not all the questions because that would be impossible. There were two or three hundred questions. That would take perhaps several weeks. We can't sit here for several weeks. At least we can't.

Audience: But you were talking about suffering and being irritated. It is suffering, isn't it?

K: What Sir?

Audience: Talking about suffering and getting annoyed, irritated about suffering.

K: Would you mind Sir, you ought to have put this question the other day. So if you will kindly forgive me I will go on with what I wanted to say. I hope you don't mind.

There is this suffering. Is the word like fear brings fear? The word itself. Or is fear free from the word? Like love. That is a word, but that word is not the actual. So the word suffering does it shape our thinking? Therefore one has to be very careful, if one may point out, that we are not a slave to words, which is quite difficult. Father, mother, wife, husband. Those words have tremendous significance. And we are - those words shape our thinking. Words have immense power, either destructive, or words that have to be understood, the depth of it, the meaning of it, the quality of it, the tonality of it.

So we are not dealing with explanations, descriptions, or the words that can entangle us. We are trying - we are, not trying, actually, we are endeavouring, going into the question of what is suffering.

When we suffer there is intense pain, not only physical pain, but the subjective, psychic, inward pain. That pain acts on the nerves, our whole thinking is a process of shrinking. And it awakens us to a sense of desperate loneliness. We are saying facts not imaginative statements, facts. What is. And that sense of shock, sense of loneliness, brings the urge to find some comfort, a sense of wanting to be helped. Don't you go through all this? And the desire to be helped is one of the causes of suffering. You understand? We are always seeking help. That is why most of you

probably are here. We want to be helped with our problems, with our secret desires conflicting, with our secret longings and so on, which causes pain, discomfort, a sense of annoyance and so on. And we want to be helped. When we want to be helped from another, whether it be the priest, the psychiatrist, and so on, we then become dependent, we then become attached to that dependence. And that is one of the basic causes of suffering. Right? Please this is important to understand because all our gods, our prayers and so on are the demands of every human being throughout the world seeking help. And therefore when one is being helped one becomes weak. If you are constantly depending on some kind of drug, pill, to escape from suffering, pain, then you become more and more dependent on those drugs, pills, doctors. I hope there are no doctors here. (Laughter) If there are, we need doctors but we are talking about dependence. And we are saying that where there is dependence there is attachment. And attachment is one of the causes of sorrow. When I am attached to my wife, to a building, to some ideological concepts, I am attached to it, I cannot live without them. They mean so much to me. My God, my faith, my belief, my ritual. If I depend on all those, and when they are questioned - like they should be questioned - when somebody becomes sceptical about all that then you suffer. So can there be total freedom, not a reaction from all kinds of attachments? Attachment is to the memories of pleasure - are you following? - sexual pleasure, attachment to it, holding on to it. And the pleasure of power and the pleasure of knowledge, and being attached, holding on to that as though there were something concrete. And where there is this attachment there must be sorrow.

And why are we attached? We are questioning. We are enquiring into this. We are not saying you must not, or you must. The speaker has no 'must' or 'don't' - it is up to you. And we are asking: in attachment there is desire, and what is desire in all that? Perhaps if we have time we will go into it. So can we, knowing the nature of time, that is tomorrow is now, and if we - there is no ending of attachment tomorrow will be still - we will still be attached, therefore we will still be suffering - you understand?

So is there an instant ending of attachment? Not allowing time to enter into the ending of it. Time is continuity. Right? And the gradual process of time is, "I will gradually get rid of attachment, gradually become non-violent" - all that stuff is nonsense. So suffering is synonymous with attachment. And we are attached because we are so lonely, we are nothing in ourselves. We depend on books, paintings, on other people's knowledge. The whole religious world is based on other people's experience, and experience is always limited, but they have become sacred. One doesn't know why but they have become sacred. A printed thing is never sacred! What you - and so on one won't go into all that.

And suffering also, suffering comes when there is self-centred pursuit - right? Self-centredness, egotism, selfishness, is very, very limited. It is always living in a small little area of one's brain. The brain has extraordinary capacity, as you see it in the technological world. Immense capacity, limitless capacity. And when we are self-concerned, as most people are (coughs) sorry - the self-concern is very limited and therefore it brings conflict. Anything that is limited must inevitably bring conflict. When we say, British, French, Indian, American, Russian, it is all just very limited

geographically, nationally it is a form of tribalism. And that is why wars - one of the reasons of wars is this limitation. So attachment to a person, to a concept, to an image, to some form of knowledge, must inevitably bring trouble, disturbance, sorrow with its pain. And also where there is this self-centred outlook on life, life being so extraordinarily vast, that limited outlook, that limited way of living must inevitably bring sorrow. And is there an ending to sorrow? Completely ending. Because without ending sorrow there is no love. So we should consider, go into the question of what is to end. The finality, the ending of something, not the continuation in a modified form of what has been, or what is.

So what is ending? Ending immediately a habit, a manner, ending. Not "If I end this what will I get from that?" - you understand? Are you interested in all this? Really? Or is it just a form of amusement?

Have you ever really enquired what it is to end? Have you gone into that question of terminating something and discovering what happens after if you end? Isn't that death? We will come to that presently.

So we are saying where there is suffering there is no love. And is it possible to end all sorrow? You might say what effect has that ending of sorrow, if one is free from that sorrow completely, then what effect has that on the world, on the majority of people? That is the usual question one asks. Isn't that rather an unreasonable question? First end it and see what happens. Not say, "If I do this what effect will it bring about?" One feels that is a way of escape. One person has affected the world. Right? One leader in a war, from the most ancient of times until now, they have affected the

world. One or two propagandists in Christianity have affected the world. Peter and Paul. One person, like the Buddha, has affected the whole of the Asiatic world. He didn't ask the question: "If I do this will it affect mankind?" - such an absurd question. Forgive me if I use that word. So when there is an ending of sorrow there is love. And then we have to ask: what is love? That word, like every other good word, has been spoilt. Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love a movement of thought? And time? One can ask these questions, the speaker is asking that question but the asking of that question if one doesn't remain with the question, with the words, then we can go into it very deeply. We asked if love is desire? To us it is, love is pleasure, love is something possessive, power, position, status. So we ought to consider together first what is desire. Perhaps some of you, if you will kindly accept what the speaker is saying, have heard this word - the explanation of what is desire and perhaps you say, 'Yes, get on with it.' But to find out for oneself very deeply the nature and the structure of desire, and see its relationship in life, and find out why human beings throughout the world are driven by that, in various ways, for power, for position, for - you know, all the rest of it. Desire, that extraordinary energy. The desire to go to the moon and how they worked at it, 300,000 people probably worked at that one project, to go to the moon. And then put a silly flag up there. (Laughter) If the British put their flag up there it would be still silly.

So what is desire? Look at it yourself. Why is it that we are so - we are slaves to desire. The various religions in the world have said desire must be eliminated, or one must transcend it, or that desire must be concentrated on a figure, on a symbol. Suppress

every other desire except the search for God. The monks have been doing this for centuries. But desire is a flame. You can't burn it out. You can't put it out. It is there. You can have desire for something noble, and so on. It is still desire. And desire is causing havoc in the world. Each person desires his own way of living, his own way of thinking and so on. That is so obvious.

So we must understand very deeply, not intellectually, but profoundly what is desire. Not escape from it, not rationalize it, not find a substitute for it, but what is desire? Desire is born out of sensation. Physical sensation. Sensation of perception, seeing, visual seeing, the hearing, the tasting, those are all the reactions from any sensation. Those are normal healthy sensations. And we have tried to suppress those natural sensations by fasting, discipline, by attributing all that, or turning all that energy towards a particular object and so on. So out of desire - out of sensation there is desire. That's obvious. That doesn't need further explanation. One sees a thing in the window, a blue shirt, or a nice dress; the perception, going inside and touching it and sensation and then desire to own it, or not to own it. Right? It is as simple as that. And what makes - how does that desire arise out of sensation? You understand? You see something beautiful, a woman or a man, or some beautiful dress or a car, or something, and there is sensation. Then what takes place? Then thought creates out of that sensation the image of you owning that car or that shirt. When thought creates the image out of sensation, at that second desire is born - right? Can we go along with this? Do you refute that? That is, I see a beautiful thing, a beautiful picture, or a statue, or a woman, or whatever it is. We are not discussing what is beauty,

that is a different matter. And there is sensation immediately. Then thought says, "I wish I had that". Thought then says, "I will get into the car and drive" - you understand? Then desire is born.

Now, just a minute. So the question is: is it possible for sensation and thought not to immediately - for thought to immediately give shape to sensation? You understand? Do we understand what it is? That is, to have a gap. If one has - we will use the word time interval between sensation and thought creating an image out of that sensation, if there is a little space between the two then desire becomes something entirely different. You understand? So that requires extraordinary attention, extraordinary awareness of the sensation and the image immediately being formed so that there is an interval. And you can then extend the interval, not suppress it, not try to transcend it, not try to escape from it. When you understand something very deeply it becomes very simple. A mechanic, to him it is very simple the whole motor, but to us it is rather complicated. But if we see this it becomes extraordinarily simple. Then there is no conflict between desires - right?

So we are saying, asking: is love desire? You answer that question for yourself. Desire, we said, is sensation, and thought giving shape to that sensation. The remembrance of pleasure and the demand for that pleasure, more and more and more. So is love pleasure? Is love jealousy? Possessiveness, attachment, fear? Or is love something totally - please just listen to it - totally outside the brain? The brain is the response, is the centre of all response of nerves, thought, emotions, reactions. One doesn't have to go to the brain specialist. This is so obvious. And if love is within the centre

of that, which is conflict, pain, desire, anxiety, all the nervous responses, then how can love exist there? And if it - if all that is free you wouldn't even ask whether it is outside or inside. You understand? And what is the nature of compassion? The word itself, passion for all, and all that business. What is compassion? Is compassion pity, sympathy? Compassion helping the poor? We are examining the word, the meaning, the significance of that extraordinary word. Where there is suffering and the ending of that suffering is passion. You understand? Passion. And with the ending of that suffering there is passion. And is that passion part of compassion? You understand? Can there be compassion if one is attached to one's religion, one's guru, one's beliefs, anchored in a particular sect, in a particular belief? You understand? I am asking. Or is compassion something that is entirely per se, for itself, free from all that? And being free from all that, therefore it is supreme intelligence. And where there is compassion, love and intelligence then action, behaviour, morality, is entirely different, it is not then time-binding. And to live with that, not just words. To live with that extraordinary sense of depth and passion, with that intelligence.

We also ought to talk over together death. Are you tired at the end of this?

Audience: No.

K: No? Why? Please you say, no, but why? Is it that you have not expended energy? Your energy, not the speaker's energy. Your energy. Going into this so deeply. So pursue it to the very end, not stop in the middle of it. That requires tremendous energy. And we waste our energy. And to enquire into this question, which

demands a great deal of energy to go into it, the nature of death. The total ending of something. Actually to find out, not just agree, or disagree, or say that is hopeless, or saying how can I end everything in the modern world, and so on and so on. But if we understand at its greatest depth the nature and the ending of something, that brings tremendous vitality, energy. And that you need that energy to meditate, to find out what is truth, what is sacred, if there is something permanent, something that is timeless and so on. It requires not only physical energy but the energy of intelligence. Intelligence is not, as we have often repeated, the energy of thought. Thought has been tremendously intelligent, creating a computer, in putting this television, or the microphone, or the implements of war, surgery and so on. Thought has been extraordinarily intelligent, but that intelligence because it is born of thought, it is limited. As all painting, all sculpture, all books, all poems and all the gods put together, that is still limited. And that limitation causes conflict, war, conflict between us, each one. So to enquire, to explore into the nature of death, see the immensity of it, not just personal dying, or someone else dying, the immensity of death, which is the ending. And if there is an ending what is there? And so on.

So we will continue with this tomorrow morning, if you don't mind. May I get up please?

BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 2ND SEPTEMBER 1984

Next year we will have to have a bigger tent!

One hopes that you have had a pleasant week, instructive, learning and exploring into oneself the immense depth and width of life. We are going to ask several fundamental questions this morning. Perhaps some of you have not asked these questions and it may sound rather extravagant or nothing to do with our daily life or that it is merely theoretical. The speaker does not in any way indulge in theories, ideologies or any sense of - have any sense of beliefs, dogmas and all that business.

First of all what is it to be honest? Really, deeply honest. We are honest to some extent, that is conformity, which we call honesty to some fictitious belief, faith or ideologies. But honesty seems to be to one where there is total integrity. That integrity is not mediocrity. Mediocrity - the meaning of that word, according to the dictionary is one who goes half way up the hill and never goes to the top of the hill. Perhaps we go to the top of the hill in science, in all the technological world, but we never go to the very top of it, top of our own enquiry, of our own understanding and find out for ourselves the depth and the beauty of our own lives. Where there is integrity, that is a wholeness, a sense of - not completeness - but a sense of non-fragmented way of life - out of that comes great honesty, unyielding, not easily persuaded or dissuaded but living a daily life in which is this holistic way of conducting oneself - morality - and all that business.

We were going to talk over this morning, together, as we have

talked about several other factors of life, like conflict - whether conflict could ever end in our daily life, and we also talked about fear, sorrow yesterday morning, and the nature and the depth and the strength of love, compassion and intelligence. We ought to talk over this morning together what is death, what is immortality and what is continuity. In the understanding of all that we have to really delve very, very deeply into the nature of time and thought, which we have been doing from the beginning of these talks.

Time we said is the past, modifying itself in the present, and the future is the present having its roots in the past, continuing, which is the future. Right? So the future is now. That is, we have evolved according to the biologists, scientists - we have been on this earth as human beings evolving for 40, 50 thousand years. During that long interval of time, during that duration, we have accumulated a great deal of information, knowledge, experience and technologically we have advanced in the most extraordinary way but inwardly, psychologically, subjectively, we are very primitive, barbarous, and we have not fundamentally changed, are violent, brutal, competitive, terribly aggressive and so on. And unless one deeply understands, not merely theoretically, but the nature of time, when and what is time.

Is time a continuity? - I am this... I will be... When is time? You understand? Is there time in the very act of doing? Is there time in the very action of life? You plant a seed in the ground and it grows, flowers, bears fruit and dies and while that seed is growing, moving, living, there is no concept of time. It is only we human beings have the concept of time. And when we are doing something completely, holistically, without any sense of

fragmented outlook or behaviour, the doing - in that act of doing there is no time. Haven't you noticed all this? As you are sitting here and listening unfortunately, or fortunately, to the speaker, as you are listening very attentively, which I hope one is doing - this attention has no time. Right? It is only time comes into being when you say, "What is he talking about? I don't quite understand", - or make a tremendous effort to understand - then time comes into being. But when there is actual listening, seeing very clearly, then there is no time at all. And understanding this we are going to enquire together, the speaker means together, all of us together, into the nature and the depth and the beauty of death.

When one used the word beauty, what do we mean by that word? What is beauty to you? Because we are saying beauty is truth, like love is truth. What is beauty? A beautiful person, a beautiful painting, great mountain that is immovable, full of snow, valleys, shadows and the deep blue depth of a vast valley. The great paintings, the ancient sculptures and when we look at them we say how marvellously beautiful they are. Is beauty something in the beholder? - in the observer? - in the seer? Or is beauty when the observer is not? Do you understand? Are we meeting each other? Have you had enough? Enough is enough. Because in our daily life there is so little beauty. We want to have a beautiful body, beautiful face, and you do all kinds of things to bring that beauty about, exercise, so-called yoga! Can we go into that word a little bit?

In the ancient days yoga was taught only to very, very few and in doing yoga other factors entered into it, a meditation. In the ancient days, I am not talking now about what is considered yoga.

And it was an act of dedication to find out what is truth, what is the way of living according to that truth and so on. But now yoga has become a commercialized affair and if you can't do anything better you are going to teach yoga. Those people who are experts at it are accumulating money, you know the whole commercial process. So yoga is something that demands a great deal of attention - in the old days - a great deal of self observation, self-recollection and so on. Not just having a beautiful body.

So, what is beauty, we are asking. When you compare two great paintings, the comparison between that painter and that painter, or that poem or the other poem, or this book or that, what is actually going on in one's brain? You are comparing, you are judging, you are evaluating. Some have said Keats is the greatest poet who ever lived, or if he had lived longer he would have been far greater than Shakespeare, and so on. And when you put aside all the paintings in the world, in museums and in your own house and so on, and when you see the great mountains with their snow and against a blue sky in the morning light, there is a certain quality of silence, certain quality of breathless adoration and the perception of that immovable - the deep valleys, the lakes and the rivers and the forests - when you see all that the very greatness of it drives away our petty little life, may be for a minute, or for a few seconds: when the self is not beauty is. Are we together in this? When you look at all those mountains, rivers and the beautiful architecture, or read a poem, some part of the ancient literature, the Old Testament or the Upanishads and so on, to observe all that without thought, without the me interfering with your perception, then there is that quality of immense beauty which is not put together by thought.

And to come upon that beauty is to enquire whether the self, the me, the persona, all the characteristic tendencies and all the troubles, pain and anxieties, can all that be put aside, not make that which is great make you put everything aside, then that greatness becomes merely a toy. But if one can put all that aside, the very nature of the self, the psyche, then there is that immense beauty which is really timeless existence. Now let's go on to something else.

Which is: what is death? We are going to enquire together what is death? And also we are going to talk over together what is it that continues? And the continuity is a movement of time - right? Are you following? So we must ask also: is there anything permanent in us, in the world, outside of us, is there anything imperishable that cannot be destroyed, that is endlessly permanent? Man has asked this question from the most ancient of times because he sees round him everything in a flux, everything changing, gaining, losing, being destroyed and put together again. And we also see in ourselves changes, not only biologically but psychologically - we are all moving a little bit, bit by bit, moving, changing, not fundamentally changing but a little. So seeing all that, this constant change, dying and being reborn, one asks: is there anything permanent, lasting, and what is that thing that lasts? Is it a continuity of what we are? You understand? Does this all interest you? Don't just say "Yes", that's no fun! But if you are really interested in this because it has to do with one's life, one's daily life, and is there anything in one's daily life that is permanent? There is always at the end of that so-called continuity, there is death. One has lived 90 years, or 50 years or 10 years and during

those 80, 90 years there has been a long continuity of memory, continuity of activity, labour, striving, aspiring, hoping to make oneself more excellent in some skill or other, or inwardly, psychologically, to find something that is not always changing. We see all this - an ancient oak dies - everything seems to come to an end, dies, and observing all this one asks oneself, as I hope you are asking yourself, is there something permanent that will last, that will have its roots in some place, that will always grow, will always be immense, permanent? Right? Don't you ask all these questions? Or I am asking for you? And so we are asking: what is continuity? What is it that continues in our daily life? Is it not memory, a series of associations and a continuity exists also between when one thought is silent for the moment, another thought arises. There is an interval between those two thoughts and in that interval we observe a sense of timeless existence for a second, but that interval between two thoughts is still thought in absence. Thought then is absent between those two intervals but is still two thoughts. We will go into all this. Is it too complicated? Probably it is.

Is continuity immortality, because it is one of the things man has sought - immortality - that which is beyond death. And the ancient books, like the Upanishads, the Vedas and the Hebrew literature, the ancient and the Bible, Shakespeare, Keats - they are in a way immortal, they are going to last when you and I pop off, they will be there - is that immortality, the name, all the things associated with that name - so what is immortal? Mortality, we know what that means, man dying, human beings coming to an end. And human beings have asked this question: is there

immortality, a state in which there is no death at all, not a continuity but - because continuity implies time and where there is time there is death, where there is immortality, if there is such a thing, then there is no death at all, there is no ending or beginning. Are you going into all this? I'll go into it if you are interested, we'll take the journey, if you are not, it doesn't matter. I hope you are comfortably seated.

What is death, what does it mean to die? - and that is an absolute certainty that we are all going to die, and what does that mean? One has continued from childhood till the moment of death - continued with one's thoughts, with one's ideas or new set of ideas, thoughts, trouble, pain, anxieties, loneliness and all the travail of life, that is what we call continuity. And in that process time is a factor. And when we die all the Asiatic world believes, at least some of them, majority of them, including India and so on - this continuity will continue after death - which is called rebirth, reincarnation. That's a very comforting idea! What you sow you reap. If you are not good in this life then in next life you pay for it, or you pay for it now. Right? Cause and effect. Causation separate, as though it was separate from the effect. We are saying causation has in it inherently effect. It is not two separate things. I wonder if you get all this? This is not philosophy, it is not some kind of exotic nonsense. You can see one's own life, if you do something ugly it has its own reward, or its own pain. If you do something correctly, without the self, then that brings about its own goodness. So continuity is a form of causation, effect and the effect becomes the cause, and so it is a chain. And we are asking what is death? Biologically, when the brain has not sufficient blood, breath and so

on, it decays very rapidly and that is called death, physical death. Either this is brought about by some kind of disease, natural old age or some accident. We acknowledge that because that is inevitable but we think we have gathered all this experience, all my life I've worked, all my life I have tried to do this and that and what is the good of it all if I come to an end of all that? Don't you ask these questions? So we have to ask: what is it to end? - to end something in which there is no continuity. You understand? To end. All right.

One is attached. There is no question about it. Attached to an idea, to a book, to a saying, to your money, to your wife, or to some ideal and so on. One is deeply attached. We are not saying it is right or wrong. One is attached. Death comes along and says sorry! - cuts that attachment, and we want that attachment to continue, and without it - when there is freedom from attachment we feel a bit lost. So we are frightened of death because it may end everything that you have. Following? And one asks: what have you? At the end of 90 years, I am asking this of myself, and you must be asking of yourself, what is it that you have? - a house, a bank account, if you are lucky enough or unlucky enough, a wife, a husband, the pleasure of sex and all the conflict of one's life? Actually what has one in your life? What have you? And if one was very, very honest, you need to have a house, you need to have a shelter, food clothes, that is natural, normal, otherwise what have you? A series of memories - right? A bundle of memories and nothing else. In those bundles of memories there are all aspirations, wanting, not wanting, seeking God - you know all that, or not seeking God, or saying "There is only this" - that is pleasure,

money, power. The mundane activities of one's life - that is all one has and death comes along and says, "You can't carry it with you, it all has to come to an end". End of that, end of all your memories, all your experiences, all the things one has travelled through life to accumulate. When a scientist, a great scientist, not employed by the government, but free of governments, those scientists they have accumulated an extraordinary amount of knowledge, skill, great penetration into matter, questioning what is matter, what is energy and so on, they too die, like us, and at the end of their life what have they? And the Totalitarian dictators - what is going on in Russia - all the dictatorships in the world - what have they? You understand? We want what we have, which is memories, to continue - right? And when those memories come to an end, which is the fact of life, which is death, and knowing all that, one is frightened. You want to know what happens after, and you want to know what happens afterwards according to your already existing knowledge. Right? You understand? You follow this? You are adding more knowledge by asking what is there when one dies. All that one wants is more knowledge, more certainty of knowledge. And knowledge is limited. You understand? Because knowledge is based on experience which is limited and knowledge is memory and so thought is limited. So we keep going round in that circle. And is there an end to all this? And that is death. And so one asks: is it possible to live with death, not commit suicide and all that silly stuff, but to live with something, live with an absolute fact. The absolute fact is that one is going to die and that death means the ending of knowledge and memories. So can one live with death and not keep the two apart? You understand? You follow all this?

What does it mean to live with death? What does it mean to own nothing? You may have money, a wife, children but to hold and wanting that which you have held to go on, and death means you hold nothing.

Can one live a life in this world, living and death together? That means living and dying every day. Oh come on Sirs. So it means never, never becoming something, becoming something psychologically, which is so-called psychological evolution. In that there is time, a continuity and the memory held in the brain, of course. And living with death means that which has been accumulated, gathered psychologically, ending everything everyday, not at the end of the day but at the beginning and in the middle and all the time. You understand what that means? Never having roots in any place, never having a sense of ownership, possession, attachment so the brain becomes extraordinarily alive, free, and therefore no fear.

We said we would also talk about meditation: religion, meditation and what is creation. Are you interested in all this?

What is religion? What is the religious mind? What is the mind? - we must differentiate. The brain is the storehouse of all memories. It is the seat of all reaction and action, response, both neurologically, psychologically, subjectively - it is contained as consciousness in the brain. Right? It doesn't matter. I'll go on, just play with me, will you? And so the brain is limited although it has got infinite capacity because in the technological world look what they are doing. And psychologically, subjectively, we are very limited. That's part of the brain. The mind is something entirely different. The mind is outside the brain. This requires a great deal

of enquiry but perhaps we cannot go on with that because our time is limited.

Like love is not within the brain. It is outside. If it is within the brain it is a process of thought, memory, recollection, remembrance, pleasure, pain and all that, which is the brain contains all consciousness. Our consciousness is its content. There is no consciousness as we know it if the content is not. Right? The content is our pain, loneliness, beliefs, faith, hopes, aspirations, anxieties, all that is our consciousness. And that is contained within the skull. So love is not that surely. Love is not a battleground, love is not a reaction, or a remembrance, and when there is reactions, remembrance, and all that, it is still in the brain and love is, if that, love is still part of the brain, that's reaction and all that, then it is not obviously love.

So we are going to investigate together what is religion. Why has man spent such energy, great enquiry, suffered, fasted, tortured himself to find truth, to find that which is timeless? Every religion has done this. That is, every religion says: to find that which is immense, immeasurable, you must do certain things, deny the flesh, control, discipline, give your life, dedicate your life to that and only then you will find it. They put this very simple statement more complicatedly but that is what religions have said. And in the Christian world as in the Hindu and the Buddhist world, and the Islamic world, a figure, a symbol, in the mysteries of a not too light a place, cathedrals and churches with all the rituals, accepting, obeying - all that is called religion - agreed? Is that religion? Or religion is something entirely different. Now we have intermediaries, the priest - between that highest and the so-called

the lowest - he is the interpreter, like the psychiatrist, and the priest has played a great part in history from the Egyptians and before the Egyptians, the Sumerians and so on, the priests were the learned people and all that. And they have established certain laws, rules and if you are sceptical - and I hope you are - doubting, questioning, never accepting anything psychologically - except the policeman and the tax laws, otherwise to question, doubt, never psychologically obey without going into it, not belonging to any sect, to any guru, to any organized religion as Christianity, Islam, not so organized rather disorderly Hinduism and so on. If you put all that aside, if you can, because we are heavily conditioned by propaganda of 2,000 years, or propaganda has made your brain programmed to 3 to 5,000 years as in India and so on. If you can put all that aside, as one must if one wants to find that which is nameless, then what is religion? What is the quality of a mind or brain that has totally set aside all man's endeavour to find that, all his systems, methods, his systems of meditation, breathing correctly, cross-legged - you know all that. Those are all meaningless. To calm the brain, breathe properly, quietly, sit in silence, in a room or under a tree - that will not bring about that which is immense. So what is the quality of a mind, of a brain, that has set aside all this? It is untrammelled, it has not any bondage, it is free, completely free. That word freedom also has its root, etymologically - love. Freedom means love also, not sexual love, love.

So, is that possible when all the world is shouting, when all the world is being entertained by religions? Is it possible to live in this world daily with such total freedom from all tradition, from all

knowledge except where knowledge is necessary? We are asking a really very, very difficult question because knowledge prevents true perception. From that arises: what is meditation? - not how to meditate. That word meditation and all the implications with that word apart from contemplation of Christians and so on, that meditation has been brought over by the gurus into this country, also spreading all over America and so on. They have their systems, their practices, their disciplines and the guru gets a lot of money out of it and all that business goes on. There are Hindu meditations, Tibetan meditations, schools of meditation - right? - Zen - the whole lot of them. What are they offering? What is meditation? - not how to meditate, or what system to follow. That is too immature, too childish but if you ask them deeply what is it to mediate, why should one meditate. The word meditation also, etymologically and in Sanskrit, means measure, not only to ponder over, to think over which is part of meditation, but also it means understand measurement. Measurement means comparison, now I am saying, the speaker is saying: where there is comparison there is no meditation. You understand? Are we following a little bit with each other? We are always measuring, the better, the more, the less and the greater. This whole movement of measurement, which is comparison, can that completely end, both psychologically and outwardly, that is part of meditation. That is what, when you are enquiring into what is meditation, it means not only think, ponder over, look and observe, but also it means complete ending of all comparison - short, tall, broad, wide, beautiful, not beautiful, all those are a pattern of the self. Where there is measurement there is self, right? So is it possible to live a

daily life without any form of comparison? Then you will see for yourself the extraordinary quality of the brain. Then the brain itself has its own movement, apart from its own movement it has another quality, then it is extraordinarily stable, firm, it doesn't mean it doesn't yield but it yields in firmness, in strength. And meditation also means the freedom from the network of words and thought. Right? So the brain is not entangled with words, with patterns, with systems, with measurement. Then there is absolute silence. And that silence is necessary. Silence has its own sound. Have you ever listened to a tree? This is not some crazy question. Have you ever listened to a tree, an old tree, when the wind and the breezes have come to an end and the tree is utterly silent, no leaf is fluttering and then you listen to the sound of the tree. We were asked that question by a scientist. He accepted that, so you better accept it too - because you will love scientists, people who accumulate knowledge. But to find out the sound in silence and where there is this complete, absolute, not relative silence. The relative silence can be brought about through thought, through will, saying, I must be silent. That is not silence at all. There is silence only when there is freedom from all the things that man has accumulated. In that silence there is an enormous sense of vastness and immensity, you don't ask any questions any more. It is.

Then we ought to ask also a question: what is creation? If you say, "God created the world", then that is the end of it. That is one of the convenient statements in various books. That is no answer. But if one begins to ask, "What is creation? How has all this come into being, the tiger, the deer, the marvellous tree, and the majestic mountains and the great rivers of the world, and this vast

population, how does all this happen?" We must distinguish between creation and invention. Creation is totally different from invention. Invention is still within the field of knowledge. The man who invented the jet, he moved from knowledge to knowledge. He invented, all the new inventions in the technological world is based on knowledge. Perhaps a second of not thinking and then something comes but it is still within the area of knowledge. Creation is not invention. Creation is there only when knowledge has come to an end. You understand all this? Then that creation is, if we can use that word, 'nothing'. Nothing means not a thing. A thing in Latin and so on is thought. When there is no - when there is absolute silence of thought then there is totally a different dimension.

May we get up please.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH MARY ZIMBALIST 5TH OCTOBER 1984 'CONDITIONING'

MZ: Sir would you like to go into the basic question of conditioning, its effect on our thinking and what we can do about it?

K: I wonder what we mean by conditioning. Is it the tradition, not only the present day tradition, but centuries and centuries of tradition that has been handed down from generation to generation, and is this conditioning the whole background of civilization, culture, the social impacts and the many, many experiences that one has? Does all this contribute to the conditioning of the brain? Not only all this but also the various impressions, the propaganda, the literature, the television, all this seems to add to the background, to the conditioning of every human being, whether he is very, very, very poor, uneducated, most primitive, and to the most highly educated, sophisticated human beings. This conditioning seems to be inevitable. It has been a factor that has endured probably for a million years, or fifty thousand years. If all that is the conditioning, or the background of every human being, and that obviously shapes our thinking, controls our reactions and responses, and our way of behaviour, conduct, and the way we eat and think and feel and react, and all that. That seems to be the normal conditioning of human beings.

And that has shaped our society in which we live. The society is what we have made of it, what each individual throughout the million or fifty thousand years has according to their desires,

ambitions, conditioning to their personal tendencies, to their aggression and so on, all this has actually contributed to the society in which we live. So the society is not different from us. That is a fact we seem to forget when we talk about society. Society is something that gradually has come into being, to which we have given all our endeavour, all our struggles, all our imprints and tendencies. This is the society, and society is us. It is not two separate entities. I think this must be clearly understood. The Socialists, perhaps some of the Capitalists, and certainly the Communists, tried to change the social structure by laws, by various edicts and so on. It appears that they forgot the human quality, the human conditioning and tried to shape the outward structure without taking into deep consideration the human character, the human behaviour, the human structure, the condition of his brain which has been programmed for thousands of years. And it seems to us the conditioning of the human being is to be examined much more thoroughly, gone into very, very deeply and find out whether the human condition can ever be radically changed, and so the social structure which is born of human conditioning can also be changed. That is the real problem, not only the freedom of human beings who have been programmed - we are using the word programmed in the sense that a computer is being programmed by experts, by specialists and so on, so we human beings, whether we live in the most primitive, brutal state, or the highest educated, scientific community, we seem to neglect, or even forget that this psychological structure, the subjective entity, who has brought about this really rather insane world, whether that human condition can ever be radically changed. That

is the chief concern in your question surely.

So we must go into that, not only superficially, the outward signs of it, but also the human brain, which has evolved through thousands upon thousands of years, that brain itself, through tradition, through religious propaganda, through the propaganda of the politicians and the leaders, the leaders of religious hierarchy, the philosophers of India and Asia, all that has to be taken into account. Which basically means the brain of human beings has been shaped by experience, by knowledge, by propaganda and so on. If we are clear on that then we must inevitably ask, naturally, whether the brain can ever be cleansed - if we can use that word - of all the process of time?

MZ: Sir, am I correct in understanding that this conditioning of which you speak goes into the human consciousness before the birth of the human being? In other words he is born with a certain loading of condition, a certain content in his very brain that you would call conditioning. It is not only what happens to him in his actual life as he grows up?

K: Not only that. We have used the word consciousness, which is, if we can examine that for a while, that consciousness is all our reactions, responses, all our idiosyncrasies and tendencies, both biological as well as psychological, and all the beliefs, faith, the gods man has invented, the rituals, the daily routine of work with its boredom, with its mechanical responses; and also the fears, the anxieties, the pain, the depression, the elation, the intense sorrow, the loneliness, the uncertainty of the future, all that, and the fear of death and the continuity and all that is our consciousness. That consciousness, with its content, is the conditioning. And that

conditioning is centuries old.

So the brain itself is the centre of all this. Though the speaker is not a specialist in the brain and all that, he wouldn't even claim that, it would be absurd, but he has watched very carefully, not only the way his own behaviour and other people's and so on, and has acutely observed, and one can see for oneself that the brain is the centre of all action, all thought, all our fears, all our tendencies, propaganda, the innumerable, subtle impressions, and all that. The brain is that. And can that brain, which has evolved through millenia upon millenia, can that brain ever be cleansed of all the time-binding quality? That is the real, the deep question.

Probably one never asked this question because the biologists and the others are really interested in research, in the quality of the brain, how the brain works, how the electrical responses and so on, but they never ask, not that they have not asked, some may have, but we human beings who are not professionals, who really live, ordinary, intelligent human beings, we never said, asked, or even enquired deeply, this brain which has evolved through a long duration of time, whether that brain can ever be free of its content? And that is the question we are asking now. Can the brain itself, which has been programmed, conditioned, ever ask that question? Or one really watches, very diligently, acutely, how the brain works in our daily life, how it reacts, how quickly its responses are according to its background, according to its knowledge, according to its tradition. And in watching these quick responses one discovers how conditioned those responses are.

MZ: Sir, would you include instinct in this area?

K: Instinct is part of our...

MZ: Is that conditioning?

K: Instinct is part of our conditioning, is part of our brain which has been programmed. My instinct sees a dangerous animal and it says, run, or kill or do something about it. I hope you are not killing. To kill that beautiful animal like the tiger, or the cobra in the field. One has watched these animals fairly closely in the wild and the most extraordinary things they are, not to be killed but to establish a relationship with them so that there is no fear in looking at them. That is a different matter.

Instinct, that is really quick response, is coloured, naturally by our past knowledge. That knowledge may be very, very hidden, subtle but without that knowledge instinct is not possible surely? Like intuition is another word which is used very often, again intuition may be the background of our desire, of our longing, of our hidden, deep recesses of one's own brain, which has hidden fears, hidden longings, hidden loneliness and so on.

So really what we should concern ourselves with, during this morning dialogue, is to see whether the brain, which has evolved endlessly through time, whether that time can ever free the brain? Or must the brain struggle endlessly in the field of knowledge, trying to ascend through knowledge to freedom? Of course it is so obvious knowledge can never bring freedom.

MZ: Could you say, sir, briefly at least, why this is so necessary? What is so terribly wrong with knowledge and conditioning? Why should the human being seek to change himself in that respect?

K: I don't know if we have time this morning to go into this question of knowledge. After all knowledge, to put it very briefly,

knowledge is the result of experience, whether very limited experience, or experience from which you gather knowledge more and more and more, as in the scientific world. That knowledge is always limited. Anything more, or anything better is always limited because it is measurable, both psychologically as well as objectively. Anything that is measurable is limited. And knowledge must always be limited. I think this is so obvious. There can never be complete knowledge about anything. There may be complete knowledge about some dead thing, but a living thing, it is living, moving, changing and you cannot have knowledge completely about a thing that is constantly changing, moving. Knowledge is limited.

MZ: But that knowledge and that conditioning...

K: Knowledge is conditioning.

MZ: Yes, but still they play a very vital part in the life of everybody.

K: Of course, of course. Technologically and so on it is a tremendously important thing. It is there you must have measurement, comparison, evolving certain facts and moving, constantly moving. You can see what is happening in the technological world, you invent something one day and a few months later somebody changes it and adds more and so on, it is constantly being added to, where there is invention and so on and so on. That is quite clear that. And perhaps that same movement is carried over to the psychological realm where we consider knowledge is necessary. That is, in the subjective world we consider knowledge is essential to know oneself. To know oneself is really a very limited comprehension, because knowledge is

limited. But knowing is a movement, not to know. I don't know if there is a difference between knowing and something which we know.

MZ: Could you enlarge a little bit upon that please?

K: The something which you know is static, to which you can be adding. And what you add to what is already, it becomes static, mechanical. But the constant knowing that is learning, not accumulating knowledge, but constant learning, moving, enquiring, exploring, pushing, pushing, pushing. That is not based on knowledge, it is a movement. Like life is a movement, whether it is the movement in a tree, in a small blade of grass, or in the most amazing animals like the tiger, the lion, and the giraffe, or the small insect. And it is the same life as in us. Therefore one has to respect life, not kill life.

So we must come back to our beginning, which is, can the brain be ever free from all the programmes we have received? And the speaker, K, says it is possible. It is possible only through watching, not condemning or accepting, but just watching the whole movement of your thought, watching the very activity of thought, watching the origin, the beginning of thought. And so in this watching the brain then becomes much more sensitive, not only to its own responses but sensitive to nature, to everything around one, to the world that is becoming more and more dangerous, and to the world of one's own psyche, so that there is a constant objective and subjective relationship, an interchange, never coming to a final decision. That is, never taking a position from which you move. And this requires not only a great deal of leisure in the sense, not doing it as a hobby, but it is part of life. One must have leisure to

look at life. One must have this time to see what is actually happening, not what you wish or desire to happen, but what is actually in our daily life going on. And that watchfulness makes the brain extraordinarily acute, sharp, clear. And this clarity is really, if we can go into this very, very deeply, is total freedom.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION WITH MARY ZIMBALIST 5TH OCTOBER 1984 'FEAR'

MZ: Sir, there is a subject you have talked about so many, many times but it keeps coming back and back in people's questions and preoccupations, and that is the subject of fear. Do you want to talk about that?

K: It is a rather complicated subject. It really requires a great deal of enquiry because it is so subtle, so varied and so abstract. And also it is actual too, though we make it into an abstraction. The actuality of fear and the idea of fear, which is the abstraction of fear into an idea. So we must be very clear what we are talking about. The abstraction as an idea of fear, or the actuality of fear. You and I sitting, and all of us sitting here, at this present moment we are not afraid. There is no sense of apprehension, or danger. At this instant there is no fear.

So fear is both an abstraction, as an idea, as a word, and also the fact. First of all let's deal with these two. Why do we generally make an abstraction of things? Why do we see something actual and then turn it into an idea? Is it because the idea is easier to pursue? Or the ideal is our conditioning? Or we are educated to ideas, or in ideas, not educated to deal with facts? Why is this? Why is it that human beings throughout the world deal with abstractions - what should be, what must be, what will happen, and so on, the whole world of ideation and the ideologies, whether it be the communist ideology based on Marx and Lenin, or the capitalists ideas of so-called free enterprise and so on, or the whole

world of religious concepts, beliefs, ideas, and the theologians working these ideas out. Why is it that ideas, ideals, have become so extraordinarily important? From the ancient Greeks, even before the Greeks and so on, ideas prevailed. And even now ideas, ideals, separate man and they bring wars, all kinds. Why do the brains of human beings operate this way? Is it because they cannot deal with facts directly and so escape subtly into ideations? If one sees ideas are really very divisive factors, they bring friction, they divide communities, nations, sects, religions, and so on, which is, ideas, beliefs, faith, all that is based on thought. And facts, what are facts? What exactly is a fact, not an opinion about a fact, or opinion made into facts.

MZ: What is the fact of fear, sir?

K: I am coming to that. First we must establish the distinction between the idea of fear, the abstraction as the word fear, and the actual fear. The actual fear is the fact, not the abstraction of it. If one can move away from the abstraction then we can deal with fact. But if they are both running parallel all the time then there is a conflict between the two. That is, the idea, the ideology dominating the fact and the fact sometimes dominating the idea.

MZ: Most people would say that the fact of fear is the very painful emotion of fear.

K: Now let us look at that, not the idea of fear. So let us look at the fact - that is what I am coming to - the fact of actual fear, and to remain with that fact, which requires a great deal of inward discipline.

MZ: Can you describe what remaining with the fact of fear actually is?

K: It is like holding a jewel, an intricate pattern by an artist, who has brought this extraordinary jewel. You look at it, you don't condemn it, you don't say, "How beautiful" and run away with words, but you are looking at this extraordinary thing put together by hand, by cunning fingers and the brain that has brought this. You are watching it, you are looking at it. Turn it round, look at the various sides, the back and the front and the side, and you never let it go.

MZ: Do you mean that you just feel it very acutely, very sensitively, with great care.

K: With care, that is what happens.

MZ: But you feel it because it is an emotion.

K: Of course. You have the feeling of beauty, the feeling of the intricate pattern, and the sparkle, the brightness, and the sparkle of the jewels and so on. So can we deal with the fact of fear and look at it that way, not escape, not say, "Well I don't like fear", get nervous, apprehensive and suppress it, or control it, or deny it, or move it into another field. If we can do all that, just remain with that fear. So fear then becomes an actual fact, which is there, whether you are conscious of it or not, whether you have hidden it very, very deeply, it is still there.

So then we can ask very carefully and hesitantly, what is this fear? Why human beings, after this tremendous evolution, still live with fear? Is it something that can be, like a surgeon, operated upon and removed, like a disease, like cancer, or any other dreadful, painful disease? Is it something that can be operated upon? Which means there is an entity who can operate upon it, but that very entity is an abstraction of trying to do something about

fear, that entity is unreal. What is factual is fear. And this requires very careful attention not to be caught in this abstraction of the one, who says, "I am observing fear", or one who says, "I must put away fear, or control fear", and so on. It is we are watching fear, not who is watching. The one who watches is also the outcome of fear. If this is clear, that the observer, to go back to our old saying, the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, the doer is the entity who is doing, there is no division. And so if there is no division, which is an extraordinary fact to realize, a fact, not an idea I must realize, it is an extraordinary fact that there is no division between the observer and the observed, and therefore there is no conflict. Conflict exists when there is the observer different from the observed, which is what most of us do and therefore live with perpetual conflict. That is another matter.

So can we look at that fear, and in the very act of looking, watching fear, one begins to discover the origin of fear, the beginning, what is the causation of fear. Because the very fact of looking at it is to see how it came about, not analyse fear because the analyser is the analysed. Not analyse, dissect fear but that very close, delicate watching reveals the content of fear, the content being the origin, the beginning, the causation because where there is a cause there is an end. Right? The cause can never be different from the result. So the discovery, or in the observation, in the watching, the causation is revealed.

MZ: Sir, the causation that you are speaking of is presumably not an individual fear, a particular fear? You are speaking of the causation of fear itself.

K: Fear itself, not the various forms of fear. See how we break

up fear.

MZ: Yes.

K: That's part of our tradition, to bring about a fragmentation of fear, therefore be concerned only with one type of fear, not the whole tree of fear; not a particular branch, or a particular leaf of fear but the whole nature, the structure, the quality of fear. And in observing that very closely, watching it, in the very watching there is the revelation of the causation - not you analyse to find out the cause but the very watching is showing the causation, which is time and thought. Of course. That is simple when you put it that way. Everybody would accept it is time and thought. If there was no time and thought there would be no fear.

MZ: Well, could you enlarge a little bit on that because most people think that there is something. That there is - how can I put it - they don't see that there is no future, they think "I am afraid now" from a cause, they don't see the factor of time involved.

K: I think it is fairly simple. If there was no time, or if there was no saying "I am afraid because I have done something in the past," or I have had pain in the past, or somebody has hurt me, and I don't want to be hurt anymore - all that is the past, the background, which is time. And the future, that is, I am this now, I will die. Or I might lose my job, or my wife will be angry with me and so on. So there is this past and the future, and we are caught in between the two. That is, the past has its relationship with the future, the future is not something separate from the past, it is a movement of modification from the past to the future, to tomorrow. So that is time: this movement of the past, which is the past as I have been, and the future, I will be, which is this constant becoming. And that

too is another complex problem which we won't touch for the moment. That may be the causation of fear, the becoming.

So time is a factor, is a basic factor of fear. There is no question about it. I have a job now, I have money now, I have a shelter over my head, but tomorrow or many hundred tomorrows might deprive me of all that, some accident, some fire, some lack of insurance and so on, as it has happened in this house. All that is a time factor. Not the ending of time, but see the factor that fear is part of time, not say, "Can I end time?" - that is a silly question. Sorry to use the word 'silly'. And also thought is a factor of fear. Thought. I have been, I am but I may not. The factor of thought, which is limited, which is another matter. Thought is limited because it is based on knowledge, knowledge is always accumulative and that which is being added to is always limited, so knowledge is limited, so thought is limited, because thought is based on knowledge, memory and so on.

So thought and time are the central factors of fear. Thought is not separate from time. They are one, they are not divorced, they are not separate. So these are the facts. This is the causation of fear. Now that is a fact, not an idea, not an abstraction, that thought and time is the cause of fear, not are. It is singular.

So a man then asks: how do I stop time and thought? Because his intention, his desire, his longing, is to be free from fear. And so he is caught in his own desire to be free but he is not watching very carefully the causation. When you are watching very carefully without any movement watching implies a state of the brain in which there is no movement, it is like watching a bird. And if you watch the bird very closely as we watched this morning that dove

on the window sill, you watched all the feathers, the red eyes, the sparkle in the eyes, the beak, the shape of its head, the wings and so on, you watched very carefully, and that which you watch very carefully reveals not only the causation but the ending of the thing that you are watching. So this watching is really most extraordinarily important, not how to end thought, or can I be free from fear, or what do you mean by time, and all the complications of it, which is complex, But when we are watching fear without any abstraction, which is the actual now, and in that quality of the now, because the now contains all time, which is the present holds the past, the future and the present. So if we can listen to this very carefully, not only with the hearing of the ear, but listen to the word and go beyond the word, and see the actual nature of fear, not read about fear, but how watching becomes so extraordinarily beautiful, sensitive, alive.

All this requires an extraordinary quality of attention, because in attention there is no activity of the self. The self-interest in our life is the cause of fear. This sense of me and my concern, my happiness, my success, my failure, my achievement, I am this, I am not: this whole self-centred observation with all its expressions of fear, agonies, depression, pain, anxiety, aspiration and sorrow, all that is self-interest, whether in the name of god, in the name of prayer, in the name of faith, it is self-interest. Where there is self-interest there must be fear, and all the consequences of fear. Then one asks again: Is it possible to live in this world where self-interest is predominant, whether it is in the totalitarian world, with its search for power, and holding power, the capitalist world with its own power, self-interest is dominant, whether it is in the

religious hierarchical catholic world or in every religious world self-interest is dominant and therefore they are perpetuating fear, though they talk about living with pacem in terris, which is peace on earth, they really don't mean it because self-interest with the desire for power, position, for its fulfilment and so on, is the factor that is destroying not only the world but destroying our own extraordinary capacity of the brain. The brain has extraordinary capacity, as is shown in the technological world, the extraordinary things they are doing. And we never apply that same immense capacity inwardly to be free of fear, to end sorrow, to know what love is, and compassion with its intelligence. We never search, explore that field, we are caught by the world with all its misery.

IN CONVERSATION WITH MARY ZIMBALIST AND RAY MCCOY BROCKWOOD PARK 14TH OCTOBER 1984 'RELIGION'

MZ: Sir, if you were willing, we would like to ask what to you is religion? You differ so fundamentally from most people's concepts of religion, we would like you to go into that, if you will.

RMc: You often speak of religion and the religious life but it seems not to be in the way that people generally speak or think of religion.

K: First of all it is really rather a beautiful day today, especially in the middle of October to have such a marvellous clear blue sky, with all the trees gradually turning into marvellous colours. It is really a very beautiful day. And I think religion is concerned with that too.

RMc: With beauty?

K: With beauty. I don't know what we mean by the word religion. There are so many interpretations of that word. There is the Catholic religion, the Christian, the Protestant and the innumerable divisions of Protestantism, and there is Buddhism, Hinduism, Sikhs and so on. So many religions in the world, organized, some are brutal, the Islamic world and so on. So what do you consider is religion, the word? Is it the search for human beings something outside of their own daily life, something other than their petty self-centred activity, beyond their cruelty, bestiality and their vulgarity and all the rest of that? Is it that human beings have always sought from the most ancient of times something beyond themselves? If we consider that, something beyond

themselves, beyond their daily life, then that becomes a religion of escape, which probably most religions are, as they are now. It is not connected with their daily existence. It is based on belief, on a book, or on faith, or on some dogma, rituals, the repetition of daily rituals which goes on practically all over the world - incense, dressing up, fancy dress and all that. All that, prayer included, is called leading a religious life, going, as they do in India at one time three times a day to the temple, and the Islamic world five times prayer, and the Sunday mass and so on. So this is considered religious, or rather a religious attitude. We are questioning that.

I would like rather to question the whole nature and the structure of present day religion. There are so many sects. They have found that Christianity is very limited, so they go off to Buddhism, or to some kind of sectarian gurus and so on, the multiplication of this search for something other than the daily boredom, daily loneliness, the constant conflict and so on. This has been the pattern. Would you agree to that?

RMc: But underlying this that goes on in the name of religion, still it seems to be aimed at something that we need, that we want.

K: Yes, we said that. There is something that man is seeking, and gets caught in all this nonsense really, invented by various priests from the beginning, between god and man and they were the interpreters. At one time they were, they were the scholars, they were the people who wrote, who studied, who invented the language and so on. And there has been all the interpreters in between. If one rejects all that, as I do personally because it seems to me rather immature, rather trying to play, or pacify, or gratify human demand for something or other than this mundane life, so-

called spiritual life.

MZ: Sir, are you saying that the fundamental search, the fundamental moving towards something, is a real one, it is not...

K: ...a real one, it is natural.

MZ: ...just an escape from the difficulties and the pains and miseries of life. It is something real in the human psyche?

K: I think really it is something in the human psyche, which is in constant conflict, facing constant problems and their solutions, the pressures, the poverty, the unemployment, the whole human modern existence. In spite of all this any thoughtful person wants to find out if there is something more. And he turns to parapsychology, miracles, you know, all that becomes extraneous as far as I am concerned. So if one discards all this, if it is possible, discard rituals, discard totally faith, belief, altogether put aside the spiritual hierarchal system.

RMc: Any authority.

K: The authority, which to me is a criminal act, to have in the world of so-called spirit an authority. That seems to be an anathema to me. So if we can put aside all that, if it is possible, and I think it is possible, not only possible, it is actual, then we have to enquire what is religion? What is the religious mind, or the religious activity of a human being, not away from daily life, not something outside our activity from morning until night? If it is concerned with life then we have to enquire: is it possible living in this modern world, with all the noise that is going on, preparation for wars, violence, and so on, we all know that, living in this world, in this state, wherever you are, is it possible to find out, not through others, not through some book, whether it be the Koran, or the

Bible, or some ancient Hindu literature, sacred literature, but for oneself. And the enquiry into that is not a selfish activity. The enquiry, or the exploration, or if you like to use the word research, to find out if there is something beyond man's process of thought. Because after all thought has put all this together - the robes, the rituals, the demand for faith, the dogma, the whole thing has been built up carefully, with great deliberation, the whole structure of so-called religious way. Would you agree to that?

RMc: Yes, but religion seems to say in its commonly accepted sense that thought must be used to approach whatever it is that man is trying to find.

K: That is what we are asking. That we are saying, and also questioning whether thought, which has built this whole so-called religious structure, and also thought has built the extraordinary world of technology. It is the same thought. Thought in one direction, the technological direction, and thought seeking out something other than the daily boredom of existence, or the loneliness of existence, or the suffering of existence. Is thought the instrument? Because thought, perhaps you will disagree with this, but thought is essentially limited because thought is based on knowledge, memory and experience. So experience is limited, knowledge is limited now or in the future, as you can see in the scientific world it is always gathering more and more and more, and therefore when there is more it is limited. I hope I am making myself clear on this point.

RMc: Yes. Whatever there can be more of...

K: ...obviously. So thought is limited. And thought is trying to find out the limitless. It can invent, it can imagine and build on that

imagination. Or say there is something and have faith about that.

MZ: So many people turn to, or come up with what they would consider perhaps revelation.

K: A revelation.

MZ: Which is what in your view?

K: These are words which have to be very carefully considered. What do we mean by revelation? Revealing what? Either a conditioned experience and therefore limited experience. And if I am devout Catholic and believe in what they say, dogmas, and all that, saviour, my thought is limited with regard to religion, being a Catholic - or a Protestant or whatever you will. And that limited thought, limited enquiry can never put, understand, or grasp the immense significance of that which is immense, immeasurable.

MZ: Then what can a person who wants to make this very fundamental enquiry, what is a person to do?

K: That is what I would like to discuss. Suppose I am one of those who has put aside completely all the religious structure, and hierarchical authority and all spiritual authority - they have no meaning to me personally - and so if a man like me says, now I want to find out, I want to really find out if there is something which thought has not put together. Thought has put together the computer, thought has put together the whole church, the books, the rituals. They are all limited. So a man like me says is there something that is not measured by words, first. Right? Because words are an expression of thought.

RMc: And are limited.

K: And so words have themselves become very limited. So one has to be greatly aware of the limitation of thought, of the

limitation of words. And is the brain free from all this? Or it is still conditioned by the tradition, by the past, the background, as a Christian, a Hindu, Buddhist, Islam and so on, is one free of all that? If one is not free from all that then your enquiry has no meaning. You are going round and round in circles.

MZ: How can that be determined by the person?

K: That requires another enquiry which is, to do something per se, for itself, not with a motive. I do something in order to get something else. That is a very limited attitude or activity. So can the brain of an enquirer who has put aside all this, not because of a reward or punishment, but sees the futility of all this, the utter meaninglessness of all this, if he puts that aside, deeply, not just verbally or intellectually, or be caught emotionally, hooked up, as they say, in a belief and pretend that he is free. That has no meaning.

MZ: But that is a very dangerous moment for the enquirer, it seems to me, because he is apparently giving up certainties and beliefs, etc. and yet the subtle danger of something else still in that category coming in is very great.

K: No, you are saying something that he has given up, which is a certainty. But belief isn't a certainty.

MZ: People think of it as so.

K: Look, if you face Islamic religion, Hindu, Tibetan, Christianity and so on, it is now being shattered. People are running away from all this. And there is no certainty in all this, no security in all this, one may pretend, one may hope for, but in actuality there is no security, certainty. So the urge for security, psychically, subjectively, is one of the most dangerous things

because one wants security, one wants to be certain, and that is the pitfall because you can find something and stick to it and say, "I am certain. I have had marvellous experiences and I am quite sure it is so."

So one has to have this quality of doubt. Doubt everything, your own experience, your own thinking and all the inhibitions, all the aspirations, all the imagination, doubt all that because it is one of the strange factors in certain religions, like Buddhism and Hinduism, doubt is encouraged, doubt. They say you must doubt, you must question. In Christianity that is taboo altogether. If you doubted the whole thing would collapse. The heretics, those who doubted were burnt, destroyed and so on. We won't go into all the past.

So can a human being, who has been nurtured in all this, educated, conditioned in all this, put aside all that? That is the first question, to me. To have a brain that has no problems, because a problem that is not resolved totally creates other problems, so the brain is constantly faced with problems, and so it is in travail, it is in conflict, it is perpetually battling with itself. So not to have conflict, then the brain begins to be free, and then begin to enquire. Otherwise you can't enquire. If you are a student, or a research professor, or enquirer into any material thing, you enquire, you research, you don't cling to anything. You don't cling to a former knowledge, or former experience, that is limited, you move on. But we don't do that.

So religion then is an enquiry and that enquiry has no path, no direction - you follow - it becomes extraordinary subtle. There must be no motive. If you have a motive you have already set the

course.

MZ: Sir, are you also saying that the enquiry must continue, that you don't arrive at a point where you stop enquiring, or where you have an answer, so-called, but that spirit of continuing the enquiry?

K: This is rather a difficult question to answer. Do you enquire further if you come to something that has no space, no time? Do you understand? When we talk about enquiry, who is the enquirer? We come back to that old thing. The enquirer is the enquired. I don't know if I am making myself clear on that point. That is, I enquire into matter, through telescopes, through all kinds of experiments, I enquire. But the person who enquires is different from the thing he is enquiring. Right? That's clear. But here, in the subjective world, in the world of the psyche, the enquirer is part of the psyche, he is not separate from the psyche. If that is clear, then the enquirer has quite a different meaning.

MZ: Are you saying that then there is only enquiry, there is no enquired, or enquirer?

K: No, I would say there is only infinite watching. There is no watcher in watching, but the extraordinary vitality, and the energy in watching, because you have watched the whole psychological world, subjective world before you come to that point. And now when you are watching there is no background which is watching, there is only watching 'as is'. I don't know if I am making myself clear? Because you see that means in great attention, in that attention there is no entity who is attending, there is only the attention that has space, the attention that is totally quiet, silent, attention that has tremendous gathering of energy, and therefore there is total absence of the self-interest. And is that possible for a

human being to reach that point? And human beings find this is terribly difficult, therefore you come along and say, "Look my friend, do this, do this, do this and you get that. I am your guru," - you are my spiritual authority and I am lost, I am caught in again. This has been the process, you can see it wherever there are the saints, the spiritual hierarchy which recognizes the saint, and this process goes on all the time. So man has been incapable of standing on his own feet, he wants to rely on something, whether it is his wife, or in a job, or belief, or on some extraordinary experience that he may have had.

So we are saying, I am saying, there must be complete freedom. That freedom is not so complicated. There is that freedom when there is no self-interest at all. Because self-interest is very small, very petty, very narrow and unless there is complete freedom of that, truth becomes impossible. And truth cannot be through any path, it is a pathless land. You can't go through any system, through any method, through any form of meditation to reach that. There is really no reaching, it is.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH IRIS MURDOCH 18TH OCTOBER 1984

K: How are we going to start? Will you please ask?

IM: Well I have a lot of questions, I have got notes of them here which I will consult if I may from time to time.

K: I think you had better speak a little louder.

IM: All right. And I will just start with one that interests me and we will see where we go because there is a lot that I would like to ask.

It is about the word 'experience' which you sometimes use in your writings as representing something which you think we should in some sense overcome. And you seem to connect the idea of experience with the notion of preconceived attitudes or dogmas or beliefs, which impede a kind of being which you would connect with a creative present existence. I don't entirely understand this. It seems to me that it is impossible entirely to...

K: ...wipe out experience...

IM: ...discount or escape from experience. But I would like just to stick to the term experience because it is such a very general word, perhaps there is a particular sense you want to attach to it, it seems to describe the continuity of consciousness which is simply characteristic of being human. Perhaps you could say something about that.

K: I don't know quite what you mean by experience. One can experience what one desires.

IM: You mean imagining it?

K: Yes. And also one can experience according to your

conditioning. If I am a Buddhist, and a devout Buddhist, I can experience the state of that consciousness which was supposed to have been Buddha's.

IM: Well this is a rather special sort of experience isn't it?

K: Yes. So I am just questioning what we mean by experience. I can experience anger. Is there a difference between the experience and the experiencer?

IM: Well this is a difficult question about how one is going to use the concept because the word experience in English describes something fairly vague. It can mean either, I had a strange experience yesterday, or it can mean the continuity of your conscious life and your relationship to your past. Or it can mean something momentarily. But I think what you are wanting to mean by it is something which connects your past as it were, and at one point I think you describe desire as experience, whereas love is not experience.

K: Love cannot be experienced.

IM: Could you just explain what the distinction is.

K: Could we go into the question of who experiences the whole thing, anything, whether it is the experience of something imagined, or experience your past tradition and images, past figures and so on? You understand?

IM: You say, who is the experiencer?

K: Who is experiencing?

IM: Well this is a difficult question too, isn't it? If one were to ask a passer-by in the street he would say the individual.

K: Yes, I am experiencing.

IM: Yes these experiences belong to me.

K: I had an experience of an accident this morning in a car. I experience so many things.

IM: But then, I mean, if one were to pursue the matter beyond that kind of answer, one might say well of course one must distinguish between different kinds of experience, and one would then, I think, I mean let's say I can think of say three kinds immediately: there is the experience of my past life, you say of somebody, "He is an experienced man" meaning he has lot of experiences of some kind perhaps, and then you would say that experience is just the continuity of my consciousness, going away into the past.

K: Or continuity of one's consciousness. What do you mean by the word 'consciousness'?

IM: Well then let's pursue the matter in this way, in that one would say consciousness differs at different times. And the word experience I would think would differ whether you were talking about just ordinary life. Let's put it this way: partly you were sort of imposing yourself on the world and you say "I am doing this", "I am doing that", and this would be perhaps experience. But also there could be an experience where you aren't really present.

K: That's it, that's just it. Where the experiencer is not is there an experience, which you can then remember and say "This is it"?

IM: Well I would think that people have what I would call selfless experience when - well for instance when they are looking at a great work of art.

K: Yes.

IM: I am not sure about whether if they are with somebody they loved very much, whether one could say this, perhaps. I think these

two cases are very different. But what do you think?

K: I would like to go into this question, if I may, who is experiencing all this? Whether it is the ordinary things, or the most complicated forms of experiences, or so-called spiritual experiences. Right? Who is it that is always experiencing? Is the experiencer different from the experience?

IM: Well we would normally say so wouldn't we because one may believe in the continuity of an individual person.

K: Yes, that is what is commonly held. Now we are going to question that. That is, is the experiencer, or the thinker different from his thoughts?

IM: Well again we would usually say so because one could say. "I order my thoughts". This assumes that I am deciding, I collect my thoughts.

K: Yes. But is that I, who orders his thoughts, different from his thoughts? He may order them, he may discipline them, he may control them, he might say, "This is right", "This is wrong", "This must be done", "That must not be done", but is the controller, the person who disciplines, brings order, is he different from the things which he is ordering about?

IM: Well, let's make a distinction here between ordinary language where one speaks about, I mean in a Law Court, or something, somebody is responsible for something they have done. They can't say, "Well I am a different person now" or something. In the ordinary sense of the continuity of the individual and somebody being the subject. But leaving that aside, I mean one doesn't have to be philosopher or hold a religious view to think that one is divided, one is a divided person.

K: That's it.

IM: And there are times when one part of you disapproves of another part.

K: This dualistic process, is there a difference between - we come back to the old question - the good and the bad?

IM: Well nothing could be more fundamental, yes.

K: It comes to that.

IM: I mean this seems to me the nature of the real world.

K: I know. The real world is we have divided the good and the bad, and the thinker, the experiencer from the experience.

IM: Yes, this would follow in that if you condemn yourself for doing something then you are divided.

K: I should not, I must, I will become, and all the rest of it, it breeds division in oneself. I would like to ask, if I may, is that experiencer, or the thinker different from the thing he is experiencing or the thinker different from his thoughts?

IM: Well if this is an appeal - the word experience comes up to my mind - if this is an appeal to how I think about myself, I would say, leaving aside the common sense, the ordinary language, sometimes yes, and sometimes no. I mean that sometimes one is consciously judging oneself, dividing oneself, sometimes there is nothing except a single something or other.

K: A single movement.

IM: A single being or something.

K: So is not the experiencer the same as the experience?

IM: Well it sometimes seems so.

K: So when we say. "I am envious", then there is a division.

IM: Yes.

K: Then I try to control my envy, or rationalize my envy, or justify, or suppress and so on, but the 'I' is envy not separate from it.

IM: Well I would have thought it is and it isn't. There are two things that you say in what I have read and what I understood from our last conversation, perhaps I can put it this way. There are two things which you seem to me to say which I don't understand how they connect or harmonize. I mean one of the things is I think, which I liked very much, you said that if I think that I am - if I condemn myself - well put it this way: if I think that I am envious, say, now the word 'envy' suggests something which is bad so one wants not to be envious perhaps. If I see this I must start, not in a kind of ideal selfish way that doesn't exist but in my real being which is the envious person. I feel great sympathy with this. But then you also say that there is no process, I must be good, not become good, the idea of becoming good is in some way an illusion.

K: That's right.

IM: Perhaps you could explain, I mean it seems to me that in the one case you are suggesting that I must start from a goal which is a long way from my conclusion, my conclusion would be to become non-envious. The other way you are saying that there is no process of becoming.

K: For me there is no psychological becoming at all.

IM: Yes, well this is what I don't understand because... go on.

K: Go into it. First of all let's come to this point: we have divided the world, and in myself, the good and the bad - right?

IM: But you don't dispute this. You don't object to this?

K: I don't refute, I am just looking at it. Is the bad related to the good? Or is the good totally divorced from the bad? They are not related at all. If they are related the good is still part of the bad.

IM: Well if you are asking me would I agree with that, I am not sure. I mean I think we think about good and bad in several different ways, don't we? We think of bad weaving into good as if it were a spectrum, with goodness is here say and badness here.

K: Yes, a continuity of the bad.

IM: A continuity of the bad. We also think, I think, of good, if we think of it as perfection, of being really outside the world altogether.

K: I don't know perfection - being good, whole, good health, good man, good - you know the word 'good'.

IM: Well let's say good man then.

K: Is that good part of the bad? Does the good know the bad? Or the good is the outcome of the bad? Then if it is the outcome then it is still part of the bad. It's like a child being born, it is still part of the mother.

IM: Yes, some people would say that they are opposites which exist in relation to each other, yes.

K: Yes, now I say, are they opposite? Or they are totally, they have no relation?

IM: Well, there is a very clear different between a bad man and a good man. So in that sense they are very different. On the other hand in a human being good and bad grade into each other, and sometimes you don't know which is which.

K: No, that's what I am questioning. That is what I would like to discuss with you. I feel, I mean to me the good is totally divorced

from the bad, like love is not related to hate.

IM: Yes, yes. I mean in ordinary fallen human conditions of course love often occasions hate.

K: Of course, of course.

IM: Whereas you say love is not related to hate, you mean that it is an entirely different kind of concept?

K: Love has no feeling about hate, it has no relation to hate, it is not encompassing or embracing hate.

IM: Wait a minute. Let me ask a supplementary question. Would you say the same about love and desire? If we took those two words.

K: Yes, I would.

IM: You say yes. You regard desire as something connected with psychological becoming?

K: Yes.

IM: Love is...

K: ...entirely something different.

IM: Well now, how does this different thing come to one? I might say now why should it concern me? What am I to do about it?

K: It is simple enough. There is conflict. If there is conflict, desire always brings conflict, but love can never bring conflict. Love has no conflict, it has no sense of conflict.

IM: Yes, you are using the word 'love' in an ideal sense, which is unusual.

K: No, I am using it, say for instance, I don't know if you want to go into it. The brain is the entire centre of desire, feeling, anxiety, pain, loneliness - you follow? The consciousness is all

that. The belief, the fears, the sorrow, the loneliness, the anxiety, the whole - you know.

IM: The sort of psychological.

K: Yes. The psychological structure, confusion. That's the brain. And therefore love is not part of the brain because it is something outside.

IM: So yes, but this comes back to your saying you don't experience love in the way in which you experience desire.

K: I can't experience something which is so.

IM: I mean if I am loving, I mean again let's put this aside that in ordinary parlance you speak of jealous love or something, that is not what we are talking about. One's talking about some sort of absolute or, I can't think of the right word here. But then if I say I dearly love somebody as one might say in not a bad way but in a good way, as it were, would you want to say this is not part of any psychological process?

K: No. I would say: I say I love you, if I love somebody in that way. If there is any tinge of attachment, any tinge of jealousy, any shadow of conflict, then it is not the real thing.

IM: Yes, yes. All right. Yes. I mean I was brought up as a Christian so there is a lot of the Christian way of looking in me, although I don't believe in god or the divinity of Christ, but I can see in Christianity there would be an idea of divine love, or perfect love, which is something that we don't normally achieve at all perhaps.

K: I don't see why not. Because if I am not jealous, I won't be jealous. There is no sense of attachment to another person, which doesn't mean lack of love.

IM: Attachment and desire - well I think what in ordinary parlance we would call a virtuous love, not hurting anybody else by loving this person, and you are not possessive, unreasonable and so on, there is attachment. I mean particularly if the person dies...

K: Wait a minute. Now that is a different question. Why are we attached to anything? Attached. If I am attached to this house...

IM: I would take a different view I think of the notion of desire. I mean it seems to me I would think that becoming good, to use this phrase that perhaps you would want to exclude, is a matter of purifying one's desires, having good desires, desiring something which is good. Now in loving somebody I would have felt that the element of desire was present.

K: Let's look at desire. What is desire?

IM: Well, there again one would say well there are low desires and there are high desires.

K: No, I am asking, what is the origin, the beginning of desire? Why has desire become such an extraordinary important part of our life?

IM: Well desire is certainly connected with the future.

K: With the future.

IM: It is connected with time.

K: Of course, with time.

IM: Because I desire something which is absent. I mean let's take examples. I might desire to be frightfully rich, or I might desire to study a subject and become good at it.

K: Good at the piano.

IM: Well let's say good at mathematics, to acquire knowledge.

K: Yes, of course.

IM: Well wouldn't this - and I might say I love my subject, I love what I am studying.

K: No, what I am asking is: what is desire? How does it come? Why does it control us so strongly? I mean after all a monk, or one of the Indian sannyasis, their whole idea is to suppress desire, or transmute desire.

IM: Well transmute, yes. I would rather use the word 'transmute'.

K: That is, transmute, there is an entity who transmutes it.

IM: Yes. And there is a process of transmuting, a discipline or a training, or something like that.

K: Yes, which is not only a subtle form of suppression, subtle form of organizing desire, or saying desire for god is good.

IM: Desire for riches is bad.

K: And desire for possessions is bad. So we are not discussing the objects of desire, whether it is god, whether it is power, whether it is to become a rich man or a prime minister, but what is desire? How does it take shape in us?

IM: Well, whether there can be love without desire I am not sure. If one thinks perhaps of some kind of perfect love the notion of desire would have changed so much that perhaps you would have to exclude it. At a more ordinary but good level I mean if I desire to become well educated or something...

K: Yes, that is a different matter.

IM: ...then this is a tension between a condition which exists and a condition which does not exist.

K: But I am asking not desire to become a good human being, or desire to be a good scholar, and so on, but desire itself.

IM: Well I would, I think I would evade or reject this question because I don't see how one could explain what desire was without thinking of different kinds of desire.

K: I say I desire for a house, I desire for this and this, so many desires. But the movement of desire, the origin of it. Because we have either suppressed it, transmuted it, or escaped from it, or totally controlled it. But again who is the controller? Who says this is good desire, this is bad desire, this must be pursued because it is helpful, the other is not and so on. It is still desire. Desire for god, or desire for money, it is still desire.

IM: And if someone says one is good and the other is bad, you would come back to saying, all the same it is desire?

K: Yes. Desire is important to understand, not good desire and bad desire.

IM: Yes, I am not sure that I would be able to understand it without using that distinction. But let's shift our ground slightly, there is something behind what you are saying.

K: You just now said desire involves time.

IM: Yes. Well, all right. I am going to withdraw that now and modify it by saying that I think that there might be some kind of desire which does not involve time but where you are completely united with the object of your desire. I think this again is something in Christian mysticism, you might say, that if you desire god and if you are united with god, I mean I don't know what this would mean, then your desire is fulfilled and becomes perfect love.

K: Yes, but the man who says, "I must become a very rich man", powerful man, it is still desire.

IM: Yes.

K: One is for god and the unification with god, it is still desire.

IM: But you speak of desire as if it were something which you want to overcome or set aside.

K: No. I want to understand the movement of it, the process of it, the intolerable burden of it, or the pleasure of it.

IM: Yes, it is not always a burden, is it? I mean if you desire something, for instance if you are hungry and you know that you are going to have a good meal shortly, the intention of desire is pleasurable.

K: Yes, that's understood.

IM: But there is something behind what you are saying which I can't get.

K: I will go into it. Desire exists only when there is identification with sensation.

IM: By sensation you don't mean...

K: I see a lovely house, I want it, there is a desire for it.

IM: You don't mean that there is an actual physical concomitant but that there is a kind of imagery.

K: Both.

IM: You image yourself in the house, something like that.

K: Sensation, then thought creating the image of my owning the house, then desire begins.

IM: Yes, well all right, yes. There is a kind of sensory aspect.

K: Sensory aspect which thought then gives that sensory aspect an image.

IM: This doesn't mean of course - well one says one desires to be educated, it doesn't mean you are thinking about it all the time, or having sensations about it.

K: Of course not.

IM: It means you are carrying on your life. There would be moments when you have a sensory experience of desire, perhaps. You imagine what it would be like when your education is better.

K: The moment when sensation has given shape by thought, then it becomes desire. That is all I am saying.

IM: Yes but then...

K: I am not saying good, bad and all the rest of it, but desire, per se.

IM: But you say that love is different from desire.

K: Love is desire from pleasure.

IM: Sorry. Say it again.

K: Love is different. Love is not pleasure, love is not desire.

IM: Yes, all right. I would want to think that purified desire - sorry, this introduces another topic which I will just mention it and put it aside. I am also concerned with what you feel about motivation and energy. I think desire is a source of energy. Good desire is a source of good energy, but let's take this idea of love being different. There seems to me a contrast between a process and something which is not a process.

K: It is not a process.

IM: It is not a process, not. And you distinguish, you say something like, you used some word like creative being, which is to do with the present. And you would connect this with the possibility of love and truth.

K: Yes.

IM: Whereas desire is something restless which is outside.

K: Restless. But love doesn't mean it is static.

IM: No, static is probably the wrong word here. What would you say?

K: It's alive, it isn't just a...

IM: It is creative and...

K: It is not exclusive. I may love you but I also have this feeling of love. It is not just identified with one person.

IM: But the feeling of love is quite a different feeling from the feeling of desire.

K: Naturally.

IM: So you are not excluding the sensory aspect of course?

K: No wait a minute. Let's go into it slowly.

IM: Yes.

K: As we said just now, the brain is part of the senses, part of reactions, action, responses, beliefs, faith, fear, all that is the centre here, which is my consciousness. The content of my consciousness is all that, god, no god, my knowledge, my failure, my depression, my anxiety, all that is that. Now in that there is a great deal of confusion, contradiction, fears, and all the rest of it. Is love part of that?

IM: I don't know. You tell me.

K: To me, personally, it is not.

IM: But then if love is a condition, is a human condition, I mean it is, there is a state of being which is love, or creative being which is love and so a person is sometimes in this condition, are you suggesting that at that moment all the psychological stuff which that person consists of and has collected, is somehow absent?

K: Absent. Yes.

IM: But still he must know what the object of his love is.

K: No. Just a minute. I might love you. And it is not exclusive, it is not universal, or any of that. It is not exclusive, it is not limited.

IM: Yes, though in a sense it is and it isn't because I mean if one loves a person, you love that person and not another one. But it doesn't mean that you exclude anybody.

K: Anybody, no. Love is not exclusive.

IM: No, but it is selective, if one can put it that way.

K: No, that word selective, who then becomes the...

IM: One doesn't love everybody. Perhaps god does...

K: No, I don't want to add love to god or to somebody...

IM: I am using god as a figure of speech. There is an ideal love perhaps.

K: No, I wouldn't even use the word ideal. I don't know. I strongly object to ideas, ideals and all that nonsense. I see definitely love has no relationship to hate. Love has no relationship to jealousy, it is not attached. It is not desire, it is not pleasure.

IM: To ask very, very simple minded questions, I mean let's say that you are interested in another person. I mean after all people come to you.

K: I care. I care.

IM: Yes. But I ask, do you think there are certain times in one's life when one is - it is difficult - when one is expressing or being love? Should this be every moment of one's life?

K: I am not sure. I am not at all sure that it can be all the time there.

IM: Yes, good, good. Yes. And you think...

K: Can love exist where there is self-centred interest? That is

the real question.

IM: No, it would be imperfect love. Let's leave out imperfect love which is not love.

K: All right. When there is self interest can the other exist? It obviously cannot because self interest is very, very small.

IM: You won't let me use the word perfect or ideal, but I'll use love in your sense then. All right. Love then excludes self interest.

K: Where there is self interest the other is not.

IM: Yes. Well you see something that I very much want to find out, and everybody wants to find out, is how to change.

K: Ah, well!

IM: How to become, well it is connected.

K: No, wait a minute. This is really an interesting question.

IM: How to move out of the situation, of being envious.

K: I am envious. There is no difference between I and envy. I am envious, envy is me.

IM: Yes. As we were saying earlier, the person is...

K: I mean envy is me. I cannot act on envy because it is me.

IM: Yes but you can become less envious.

K: But it is still me.

IM: Yes. Go on. Go on.

K: So there is no question of suppression, transmutation, or escaping from it, it is me.

IM: What do I do next?

K: Wait. Wait a minute. I will go into it. If it is me I watch it. I watch it very, very carefully, watch it, not try to act upon it.

IM: So there is a you who is watching the envy?

K: No, watching, there is no you. When you are watching a bird

there is no you, you are just watching the bird.

IM: Well watching a bird is quite different from other kinds of watching.

K: That's just it.

IM: There are other kind of watching.

K: Of course. Is there a watching without the word, watching without condemnation, just watching, or agreeing, or rejecting, or resisting.

IM: Well there can be such watching, yes, it is difficult. Wait a minute. We have got this envious person, oneself, one is envious. Then one is aware of the envy, one watches it, but just watching.

K: Watching.

IM: Or being it if you like, put it in another way. Consciously being your envy. Would you accept that form of words?

K: You are envy.

IM: But you are consciously - when you enviously do something thoughtlessly you are not watching. But then for a moment perhaps...

K: That is what I am saying. Look, you are watching a precious, intricate jewel. Then you are looking at the extraordinary delicacy, the bright light and the beauty of the jewel.

IM: Yes, yes. In this care you are looking at envy.

K: Envy. I am doing exactly the same thing. Then I see the whole movement of envy, which is comparison and so on and so on.

IM: Yes, yes.

K: So I watch it without any thought interfering with my watching. That requires a great deal of attention, not concentration,

real attention in which the self is not.

IM: But are you not making a judgement?

K: No.

IM: You are watching without judgement.

K: Oh no, I have no value. I don't say you must or must not have envy, it is immoral, or anything of that kind. Human beings have lived with envy for thousands of years.

IM: But then is not the result of this attention that envy disappears?

K: Watching with attention. Watching is attention.

IM: Yes. I like the word attention. You attend in you would say in some non-evaluating way, you are not making a moral judgement. You are not saying. "I ought not to be envious".

K: Oh no. That would be too...

IM: But is not, I wouldn't say the purpose, but certainly the result of this attention that the envy dissolves?

K: Yes, because in attention there is no self at all.

IM: Yes, good, good. OK. I mean I understand this state of being.

K: You can watch it, you know.

IM: But then...

K: It is great fun.

IM: I mean this connects with my question about how do I change? Is not this...

K: This is what we are saying.

IM: Then this is, if you like to use old fashioned language, a spiritual discipline. No, you don't like the word discipline.

K: I don't quite like the word discipline because discipline

means really to learn. Not to compartmentalize, pursue. To learn watching, not memorize watching, but to see the whole implications of envy, comparison, and all the rest of it.

IM: And this state of attention would be something which - supposing somebody says, or I say, why not me, but does this happen only when you are meditating, for instance, to use a word which you yourself use? Or should it happen all the time?

K: All the time, if you are watching. That is, you don't let a single thought slip by without knowing what it is.

IM: Yes and this would co-exist with one being a ticket collector or whatever one's job in life is, that you could in fact - the idea of living at different levels, or different states, must I think come in. There would be a state of your being which was this constant attention.

K: Yes but you see also you introduce the word meditation.

IM: It is a word that you use yourself.

K: I know. I use that word but you see meditation is a very complex business. It is not - how shall we put it? In meditation there is no meditator at all.

IM: Yes.

K: But now what we do is, "I must mediate", "I must follow a system to mediate". "There must be practice", which is all exactly desire, which wants to achieve a certain state.

IM: Yes, this seems to me in a sense unavoidable. I mean I have been taught a system of meditation, a long time ago, and I have practised it to some extent, one practises something like meditation only in a very feeble sort of way. But it does seem to me that there is something which is trying to do it better.

K: Now when you use the word 'better' that means more, therefore measurable, more and more.

IM: More like when you say in meditation there is no duality, there is no subject.

K: Absolutely not.

IM: And I would say that something like this happens in the experience of art.

K: The moment you say experience you are already...

IM: All right. OK. Well I mean if I am looking at a great picture, if I am really looking I am not there.

K: Yes.

IM: The picture is there, yes.

K: That's all. When you are really looking at something there is the absence of the self.

IM: And this would be an image of love too, wouldn't it?

K: There is no image in it.

IM: No. There is no?

K: There is no image in love. Image is put together by thought.

IM: Yes. I think that in a certain way of loving, I mean unselfish love - this is difficult to talk about because love happens in time and you have to struggle and think and plan and do things for somebody you love, but you would be really selfless in all that you are doing, I mean there would be somebody there doing...

K: Of course. Of course.

IM: But the self would not be present, the object of attention would be absent. But it seems to me you have to try. You have given me the end but not the means.

K: Let's look at it.

IM: Go on.

K: The means is the end. The two are not different.

IM: May I just quote a remark made by Kafka to the effect that there is no way, there is only the end. What we call the way is just messing about.

K: Yes.

IM: Yes, I see and I don't see as it were.

K: Let's try something else. You see change implies future, as you pointed out - right? From this to that.

IM: Yes and imagining the future.

K: Yes, yes, the future. What is the future? The future is a continuity of the past, modified through the present, it is a movement.

IM: Yes, all right.

K: Right? So the future is in the present.

IM: Well, go on.

K: The future in the sense, I mean if I am learning a language...

IM: Yes, that's a good example.

K: ...if I am learning a language I need the future, I need time, I need...

IM: Yes, yes. Training, discipline.

K: Discipline, etc. etc. I have to learn a language. Now there it is all right, but psychologically, inwardly, subjectively, the past, which is me, my memories, my experiences, all the past, is being modified in the present and proceeds to the future - right? This is the whole movement of our evolution, of our psychological well being, or not well being, and so on. So the present is in the future because what I am now will be what I am tomorrow, unless I

change now - right? So the present contains the past, the future is now. Right? The present. Now the present is what I am.

IM: Yes, in a sense there isn't anything else, but go on.

K: That's what I am. My memories, all that. And there is no future unless I continue. Is there an end to that?

IM: You mean is there an alternative state of being?

K: Yes. Ending this whole movement of becoming, struggling, achieving.

IM: Yes of course philosophers have always been worrying about the difference between being and becoming, and in Platonism, and in Christian theology, being is real and becoming is unreal. And I feel something of this in what you say. But I don't want to mislead myself by thinking about anything else. I mean I am trying to picture what you are speaking of would be like. Let's say you are spending your time learning a language and you don't know the irregular verbs today, next week you will know the irregular verbs. And this is human life and unavoidable and proper and quite right.

K: Quite right.

IM: However during this time you are also attending to everything that you do.

K: Of course. I am paying attention to everything I do now.

IM: Yes. Now...

K: So the now contains...

IM: ...in a particular manner.

K: The now contains all time.

IM: I mean you are picturing a possible human state...

K: No, I am not picturing. I am just saying see what has

happened to the human psyche: it has moved in this direction always, past, modifying the present and the future. This is the chain - right? - in which we are caught. I won't even use the word 'caught'. This is what we are.

IM: Yes, the word 'caught' though suggests there is freedom, which is another word you use. Freedom which is connected with truth and with love.

K: Yes.

IM: And so somebody comes to you saying, "Well I am in a trap, how do I get out of the trap?"

K: If you are in a trap let's look at what is the trap first before you want to get out of it.

IM: Well I mean perhaps this is irrelevant to ask. I mean I don't want to get out of the trap in the sense that I don't want to stop wanting next week to know the irregular verbs.

K: That of course, next week...

IM: That goes on. But what I also want say, to achieve a state of being which is selfless.

K: Yes, which means what? Be careful. You desire for it. You have a concept of the future.

IM: Yes. I mean I know that now I am not selfless but I would like to become selfless.

K: Therefore let's understand what the self is. You can't change - or rather break down the self, or whatever it is, without understanding the movement of the self, not invent a goal.

IM: But in the situation where one was looking at one's envy, for instance, we agreed that one result of this attention would be that the envy would disappear. So the self is changing.

K: It matters not the ending of envy but attention matters.

IM: Well supposing I just attended to my envy but went on behaving enviously but with complete consciousness of what I was doing. Would that be a good state?

K: Then you see you being conscious - that is still part of the self.

IM: Well one is not postulating a kind of condition which is totally unlike the human condition. One is imagining a state in which human beings might be.

K: Yes, we are human beings. We live in this constant conflict, pain, sorrow and all that - right? This is our life. This is our condition. But somebody comes along, you come along and tell me, look, there is a different way of living, not be everlastingly in this business. And you listen to him, find out. You may say it is rubbish and drop it, but there must be a relationship to the speaker and yourself.

IM: Like now, I am asking you, of course.

K: Which means you tell me envy is not love, envy cannot be put aside, watch it, look at it, see it and let it unfold. Don't condemn it, transmute it or deny it or so on, escape. Just watch it, which means give your whole attention to it.

IM: But would this not result actually in my inhibiting it?

K: No.

IM: Well why not? All right, put it another way.

K: I am bringing it out.

IM: Wouldn't it be good for me to inhibit my envy?

K: No, it will come up again some other time if I inhibit.

IM: Yes, all right. But just meanwhile it might be better.

K: Ah, I don't want meanwhile!

IM: Ah well yes but you seem to me to exclude the element of training oneself. I mean you don't like the word discipline.

K: Discipline, Madame, as you know, comes from the word disciple who is learning. Learning. Learning, not memorizing. Learning to see the beauty of that jewel. I haven't looked at the jewel. I have always condemned it, rationalized, etc., but now there is only watching that jewel.

IM: Yes but what you are watching in this case is something precious, it doesn't matter if it costs a million pounds it is something which is pictured as absolutely precious. Now if I am looking at my envy it is the opposite of a jewel, it is something bad.

K: No, I don't condemn it. There is no spirit of condemnation, or judgement, or evaluation, just watch it. I watch my son. I don't say, "By Jove, he shouldn't be this", "He shouldn't be that". I just watch him. Don't you, say for instance when you look at a picture, I watch it. I see all the light, the proportions, the darkness...

IM: Looking at a picture is a good example for me at any rate in trying to understand what your fundamental idea is here. But it still troubles me that you are suggesting what I would, if I understand you, think was a kind of ideal mode of being, real mode of being in which you are connected with reality. But there remains the fact that one is not in this state, one is sunk in illusion, one is full of illusion.

K: That's all. Now I am an illusion. I am illusion. I live in illusion. My thinking, this is my belief, faith, is illusion. Now why does the word illusion, you know ludere is to play, ludere, to play.

I am playing with illusions.

IM: Why should I bother? Put it in another way. Why shouldn't I just watch my... if I am a clever person I can watch my envy and be amused by it and continue to behave enviously?

K: All right. Carry on. There is conflict in it. There is a certain sense of agony in it, there is pain.

IM: Wouldn't you wish, if you saw somebody that you loved in a state of illusion, wouldn't you wish for that person that they should change?

K: I would go and talk to him.

IM: Well then you are suggesting that he should change. You are suggesting moral values.

K: No, no. I would say to him, look, why do you have these illusions?

IM: Well to call them illusions is already to make them...

K: Don't even call it illusion. You believe in god, somebody believes, or some other thing.

IM: Yes, well let's stick to the case of envy because that's fairly straight forward. Somebody is consumed with envy, the way some people are you know absolutely, "Oh, he's got that, he's better than me", and so on.

K: I know all that.

IM: You watch somebody like that and say, "Look why waste your energy and your anxiety on something which is not deeply really important. And you should not be doing it."

K: That is if they are willing to listen to it.

IM: All right, yes.

K: The moment they are willing to listen to you you have

already...

IM: But then you have taught them something.

K: Ah, no. No, no pressure. I don't want him to change.

IM: Well I know all good teachers refuse to call themselves teachers.

K: Conflict is the real root of all this.

IM: But supposing somebody was in a completely harmonious state, with lots and lots of vices, what we call vices, supposing they are envious, jealous, violent, angry, couldn't they be such an harmoniously connected person. Supposing they are very successful in everything that they do, would you say that this was impossible?

K: No, you can't be harmonious while with your right hand you are kicking Ireland and with the other hand you are being harmonious.

IM: Well, yes, I agree with you. I mean think people assume rightly that an evil man is in a state of conflict and that a good man is harmonious.

K: A good man has no conflict.

IM: Yes, and an evil man has conflict. Well this then suggests that there is something that the evil man has made a kind of mistake, there is something unreal about what he believes about the world. So then in making the distinction between good and bad one is making a distinction between...

K: No, you can see for instance a man who is a terrorist, a man who kills for the fun of killing, there is something wrong with the man.

IM: Yes.

K: I don't call him evil or good, there is some kind of aberration going on in the poor chap.

IM: So what you want to produce is an harmonious personality?

K: No, is it possible to end all conflict within oneself? That is the real root of the question. All conflict.

IM: And you would be prepared to drop the words 'good' and 'bad' then, and use the words 'harmony' and 'disharmony'.

K: In that sense, in that sense.

IM: Yes.

K: I wouldn't use harmony, or disharmony, because the moment when there is no conflict you are whole. There is an holistic way of living.

IM: Yes, but you are still talking about good and evil in the sense in which we normally understand them. You speak of the terrorist, let's picture a very bad man not just an envious man, but a very evil man, somebody who is cruel.

K: Yes, somebody who kills.

IM: Then one would want this person to...

K: If you will listen, if you will change, so much the better. But they generally don't listen.

IM: I think we are reaching the end of our reel.

K: Yes, we have.

IM: Perhaps we have reached it.

IM: Well I think I would like to go on with this.

K: Would you like to after lunch?

IM: Yes, perhaps we have to stop now.

K: Yes.

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION WITH IRIS MURDOCH 18TH OCTOBER 1984

K: You start.

IM: Well I am still trying to formulate some fundamental question which I can't grip or entirely see at the moment. Perhaps I could sort of walk round it a bit and ask one or two different sort of questions for a moment.

You feel - the idea of duty is a fundamental one in most moral systems, philosophers argue about it but there it is. People are taught when they are growing up they are taught duties that they ought to tell the truth for instance, and other things being equal, perhaps if they don't always tell the truth. You shy away from the idea of duty.

K: I feel responsibility is better than duty.

IM: Well, all right, then a sense of responsibility would be a sense of duty, under some circumstances, one could extend the two ideas in different directions, but you would rather call it a sense of responsibility?

K: Yes, responsibility because responsibility implies care, affection, a sense of communication with the other person, not doing something because you are obliged to do, or disciplined to do, or told to do, but be responsible. If I undertake to build a house, I am responsible for building a house. If I am responsible for my children, I would be responsible completely, not only until they pass out of my house, but I would see that they live properly, brought up, no killing, you follow?

IM: There would be no limits to responsibility.

K: No limits to responsibility.

IM: Yes, I mean perhaps one connects duty with very definite things which have to be done. On the other hand, if you take something like a duty to tell the truth, that's something so fundamental.

K: Telling the truth is part of my responsibility. I wouldn't be dishonest to myself.

IM: Well don't let's worry then about the word duty. But this is a case where one's dealing with an aspect of human life which belongs to the continuity of life. Would you say that just by that being so that it is an everyday notion, which is part of the decent moral continuity of a society's life, would you regard it as being essentially different from what we were talking about this morning, from the real thing, and from love?

K: Yes, yes. I would consider it different.

IM: But I don't see quite where the division comes. I mean I am always trying to build up structures, I want to see where the division comes between ordinary what we would call goodness, or moral behaviour and this fundamental thing.

K: Could we start: why are we fragmented? Why do we look at life and all our actions and our business, whatever it is, always this fragment, business, religion, love, hate, you follow? It is all so broken up. Why do we do this?

IM: Well life has to be dealt with every day.

K: Yes, but why should I accept life to be dealt with in this way?

IM: I think because to unify it, I mean to have a unitary. You seem to feel that we should have some kind of completely unitary

selflessness, which then isn't divisible.

K: Yes, that's it.

IM: But then I mean let's say the words like truth and love...

K: ...are one. If there is love there is truth, there is beauty.

IM: Yes. This is so, if one is looking at it in a philosophical sense. But somebody...

K: No, in actual sense, I mean if I really love there is beauty in it. One can't be dishonest.

IM: Yes, beauty is a more difficult concept for this purpose, at least I feel. What worries me is the point of connection between the truth which is love, the fundamental truth, and ordinary conceptions of truth as in tell the truth.

K: Suppose I have lied. And I record that I have lied. I record if I have been angry. That is honesty. That is the truth in the ordinary sense of the word. I don't cover up my lie with lots of phoney stuff. I say I have lied, I have been angry, sorry I have been brutal. I think we are so trained to cover up all this kind of thing, to escape from all this, not being terribly honest to oneself.

IM: Yes, well how does this connect with - one of the things which I think you are very much concerned with, is overcoming conflict, and overcoming separatist, and so on, this then does suggest that you make these distinctions between desire and love, for instance, and you then bring truth into the centre by saying that love is truth.

K: Yes of course.

IM: But this doesn't seem to me to connect very easily, and this is where the idea of my idea of purifying desire, or something, would come in. This doesn't connect very easily with ordinary

moral life. It looks as if one would have two judgements of morality, you would say he is a good man in the ordinary sense of the word, but is an imperfect man in your sense of the word. And isn't it important, I can't think of a way of putting this, for you, I am thinking of you as someone wishing well to men, isn't it important for you to make connections?

K: Yes, I see this. Look: I would ask myself, or I would ask my friend, why are we fragmented first.

IM: Oh, you want to go back to a metaphysical question first.

K: Of course, from there you have to start.

IM: This is your feeling that we must be right at the beginning all the time.

K: Yes, all the time.

IM: Yes, I like this too, in a way, what you say about new, what you want is something new, you used the word new, that is not the acquired collection of what one has but something new.

K: I mean I have asked the students in many of our discussions: why is it we are fragmented like this, broken up, what has gone wrong with us? After millions of years we are still fighting each other, killing each other, we are angry - you follow what I mean? What is wrong?

IM: Well there is a sense of conflict or fragmented, which is bad, which means fighting, but there is also ordinary discursive reason and how we set about getting to know things, which isn't necessarily bad.

K: Yes, yes, I use my reasons to see why the world is divided into these kind of things, like nationality, religion. You know what is happening in India, the Sikhs, and the Jews, the Arabs, why?

Why do we accept this way of living?

IM: Well, yes but I think there is a kind of empirical, ordinary answer to this that we can try and stop it by doing all sorts of things, like people do when they talk to other people.

K: But we don't madame, the fact is we have never done it, we haven't stopped this division. I mean if I had a son, or a woman had a son, a Jew with an Israeli woman, what am I to do, they are fighting?

IM: Yes, Part - you wouldn't deny this, would you - that part of what you want to communicate is something which would have practical effects in politics.

K: It has practical effects, yes. Politics, religion, daily life.

IM: Yes.

K: Which is, I would say look, don't let's start with theories and all that, let's start with why we human beings right throughout the world are so broken up, so divided now, so...

IM: But it seems to me it is partly an empirical question in that you could say we could find out why a certain religion held certain views at a certain time and separated off. One could study Christianity in this way, but there is a sort of metaphysical question, which I would think is partly unanswerable. I mean it is like saying why are there human beings? One must say, well I don't know. I mean people who believe in God would say that God created the world.

K: And the scientists have different reasons.

IM: If you exclude the empirical answer, you are asking a kind of metaphysical question which in a way can't be answered.

K: I think it is fairly simple. I would like to ask: is it that

thought itself is fragmented?

IM: Well I think thought itself is fragmented. And it seems to me in a sense unavoidably so. I mean what we are doing now, using a natural language and concepts and using words, which we have learnt to understand and so on, this is something which depends on spreading out of interest to the world in many, many different ways. I mean the word discursive sort of covers this kind of notion that the intellect has to spread itself out, it has to emerge into language and so on. It can't be a compact, it can't be one, which many philosophers want. They want this one. But in your objection - you don't seem to me to allow... put it this way, the redemption of the world, I mean the bringing of the world into the centre, into goodness, into truth, love.

K: I say, yes it must be.

IM: Well yes, but then one can't get rid of all fragmentation. One has got to redeem it, if you see what I mean, to get rid of fragmentation.

K: All right, let's redeem it. Now human beings, why are they like this? Let's redeem that. Not intellectually explaining, but the fact, daily fact, why is it that there is such conflict, such violence?

IM: Well again there are many reasons. Take Ireland, for instance, I mean there are many reasons.

K: Of course.

IM: Historical reasons why there is a conflict in Ireland. But you are thinking of much deeper things.

K: Much deeper things, naturally.

IM: It seems to me, well if somebody asks me that I would say I can't answer the metaphysical question but what I can say is why

ought it not to be so. And this uses the word 'ought' which you don't want. We have a conception of goodness from which we spread, as it were, all kinds of thought and action into the world - this is putting it very badly.

K: I understand.

IM: Hoping that gradually we can make the world better and remove conflict in the superficial sense, and in the deeper sense too.

K: We have lived on this earth, according to the scientists and all the rest of it, at least two or three million years, evolved. We are still at it.

IM: Yes, we are.

K: I mean just look what is happening.

IM: And who can say what the future holds?

K: The future is what we are now. If we don't do something now we will be exactly the same tomorrow.

IM: Yes but what we can do now is something very limited really. We can do something to ourselves and we can do something to a small number of people.

K: Yes, but ourselves is the world.

IM: And we can also take part in politics, which is a way of doing something in the world.

K: But I am the rest of the world, because my consciousness is like the rest of mankind.

IM: Yes, you mean that if you can do it other people can do it.

K: If I change I affect the rest.

IM: Yes, well there is also the fact that one has a very limited amount of time in which to achieve this insight.

K: That's why don't let time interfere with this question. I am a human being. My way of life, my way of thinking, my action, is comparatively like the rest of mankind. They may have outward differences, but deeply I am the rest of mankind. I am mankind.

IM: Well except that you are a very unusual person. But leaving that aside.

K: No, no. I am mankind because we all suffer, we all go through a hell of a time. So I am the rest of mankind, so I am humanity. That is real love.

IM: Yes but how does this...

K: Therefore, you see I will show you.

IM: If somebody says all right, you are just you, you are by yourself, I mean you may be showing what is a human potential.

K: Come and join me, come and join me.

IM: Yes, well.

K: Let go your petty little nationalisms and all the rest of it, and join me, let's be free and look at the world differently, and not always keep in conflict with each other. Every husband, wife, madame, this is happening every day of one's existence.

IM: Yes, but I can't help putting the problem in terms of how much influence...

K: Quite.

IM: ...can one have. And if one is going to teach people, don't let's think of you and me now, but if anybody wants to influence people in order to bring about the end of this period of conflict, they have to involve themselves in persuasion, in politics. And many people would say, many people do say now to worry about your own soul and whether you are selfless or not is a waste of

time, you must simply go and help other people, go and stop them suffering.

K: Help other people. See what is happening with those people who are helping and those people who are helped.

IM: Well...

K: You can see it, there is very little. Hitler wanted to help. Buddha said too, mankind suffers, there must be an end to suffering. And look what they have done: suffering is going on.

IM: Yes. When you think... sorry I keep wanting to turn it round a bit so that I can get a bit more light. When you speak of overcoming conflict, overcoming suffering...

K: ...not overcoming, ending...

IM: ...ending, yes, are you thinking of a kind of - I mean is this anything like what a Buddhist would think of as Nirvana?

K: Apparently Nirvana means, from what I have discussed with people, a state in which the self is not. The self in the sense of... Come to that point, don't discuss what Nirvana is, you will find out.

IM: I would understand something like this as meaning that one is in a selfless condition and the denial of the world is the meaningless of all these other things.

K: That is what they have done. Deny the world. But I don't say deny the world. On the contrary, you have to live here.

IM: Yes. I mean if one thinks of Plato's image of the cave that you are in the darkness and then gradually you move out into the light. He also speaks about coming back into the cave, by which I think he means that you find some kind of liberation for yourself but then you have to liberate everybody else as well.

K: That's the point. You know the whole sense of Bodhisattva and all that, I won't go into all that, but if you change fundamentally, won't it affect the mankind?

IM: You will affect a certain number of people.

K: No. Look: Christianity has affected, how many, millions.

IM: Yes certainly. I was about to say there are cases, like the life of Christ, whether Christ really existed as an historical man or not, the image of Christ has changed people's lives.

K: Therefore I am saying through propaganda they have changed - right? They have etc. Now Buddhism has affected the whole of Asia.

IM: Yes, all right, but you would go on to say well nevertheless...

K: I say let a few of us work at this, then we will change the world.

IM: But I think we have had great teachers who have had a great deal of influence, who have, as far as I can see, advocated a kind of selflessness which is not unlike what you are speaking of.

K: Yes, freedom. Freedom from the self.

IM: What is one to do? It doesn't seem to me...

K: Oh no. What is one to do requires sitting down, talking about it, going into it - right? Naturally. And breaking down barriers between us.

IM: We have come perhaps onto a slightly different kind of question: a question about influence and...

K: I don't want to influence anybody. That is the worst thing to happen because if I influence you somebody else can come along and influence you too in another direction. But if you see

something for yourself it is clear.

IM: Ah well yes, that again is something which we agree about, that you have to do the thing yourself. It is no good being told by somebody else.

K: Therefore no propaganda, no programming.

IM: This is some thing which I think theologians are realizing now that you can't have God thrust upon you. I mean whatever the spiritual life is it is something you have to discover for yourself.

K: In the spiritual world there is no authority.

IM: Yes, I...

K: But now everything is that. They want authority, people want some kind of security in authority.

IM: Yes, well I don't myself see any answer to the problem of how the discovery of spiritual truth, or whatever this may be, can change the world. You perhaps have more hope for the world than I have.

K: No, I am neither pessimistic nor optimistic, but I see that unless there are a few of us radically change the psychological structure we are going down the hill all the time. That's all.

IM: Well I agree with that too. If the world lost people who are concerned with what you are concerned with I think that it would lose its centre.

K: Yes, that is what I mean. There are very few people who are concerned to be totally free from all this.

IM: But then you want, to put it sort of bluntly as it were, you want there to be more of such people, but at the same time you reject traditional methods, for instance ideas of duty, ideas of asceticism and so on, which have been, as it were, part of the

training of people who achieve perhaps this state.

K: No. Why should I be trained? If I see something to be true I stick to it. Why should I be trained?

IM: Yes, but I think you have probably had a gift of grace, of what a Christian would call grace, which a lot of people haven't had. What you achieve easily would be very, very difficult to achieve for the majority of people.

K: Perhaps that might be. But I mean after all there must be... all right, if you use the word grace, all right. Be in a state to receive that, which means don't be selfish, don't have conflict, have some kind of inward silence.

IM: Yes, I agree entirely, entirely with this. Yes, I think, I mean don't let's argue about the question of influence or politics, because I understand your position there. I would think, I mean I would feel it is perhaps important to try in certain ways to influence one's surroundings, but I know that this is full of difficulties. I would rather in a way stick to the question we were worrying at this morning, though I don't quite see how to find the way of enlightening myself on this subject. It is partly to do with the question of time and fragmentation, that time is fragmentation.

K: Yes, that's it.

IM: Yes.

K: To be free of time, that means no movement forward.

IM: Free and in the truth, and love, and not to be acquiring and not to be planning. Would one, if one had this kind of insight, or however you are going to put it, would one know that one had it?

K: I think one wouldn't know but it would show in your actions, in your daily life.

IM: But you do accept then that there are two - it seems to me that you are thinking in terms of two entirely different planes. And I am wanting to connect the two.

K: No. There is the physical plane.

IM: Well there is the psychological plane also. That is what we are talking about.

K: Psychological plane, why should there be division there? Why should there be superior psychology, or lower psychology, it is whole psychology.

IM: Yes. I mean some kind of redemption - I introduced the word redemption.

K: It doesn't matter, I understand.

IM: ...of the psychological hurly burly of one's mind seems to me can happen in a quite ordinary way. I mean people wouldn't be puzzled by it, it would just be a natural function.

K: You see, to be redeemed by whom? If I look to you to be redeemed I am lost.

IM: Yes, I not thinking of being redeemed in the Christian sense. I just mean by redeemed, I just mean that something which is fragmented is drawn in - I am using an image...

K: Yes, I understand.

IM:of a centre and of outlying parts. I mean picture - I am all the time trying to discover just where this divide is, you make a divide between say the life of a very good man in the ordinary sense, an ordinary very virtuous man who is being very unselfish in the ordinary sense and done a lot of good to people and so on, between that life and the life of truth.

K: Ah, that is totally different.

IM: Well why is it totally different?

K: Of course it is.

IM: I mean it seems to be a metaphysical remark to say it is totally different.

K: I know.

IM: You don't mind?

K: I don;t mind. And after all the self is a very subtle, cunning thing. It can hide under prayers.

IM: Oh absolutely.

K: It can hide under every little action thinking it is noble, I am helping mankind, I am influencing for the good.

IM: I am really a remarkable person admired by everybody - in brackets, as it were.

K: So to understand that, what the self is, requires such observation, such daily looking at it, not just say "I am free at one moment" and that is it, but it requires such attention to everything that you are doing.

IM: So you would think that if somebody was entirely absorbed in outward action, as it were, it wouldn't be in truth.

K: That is a most dangerous thing.

IM: So a certain amount of fundamental quietness, I mean this could be compatible with leading an active life, couldn't it?

K: That silence is not the product of thought.

IM: Yes. OK that is good.

K: That silence is not to be cultivated.

IM: Yes, I think I believe in that group silence too.

K: Silence, quietness, inside there is no movement.

IM: And this would connect with what you say about living in

the present?

K: Yes.

IM: Yes, and timelessness.

K: You know meditation is an extraordinary thing if you know - I have talked to various types of people who meditate, Tibetan, Hindu, Buddhists, Zen, you know all the rest of it - it is all a conscious deliberate effect. It isn't something you do for the love of it. You can love and yet be selfish. But I mean in the sense to do meditation without conscious effort.

IM: Yes, I think any means that one adopts towards goodness is likely to become a barrier.

K: Absolutely.

IM: It is likely to because one seeks idols. I mean we are idol worshippers.

K: That is finished. That is not meditation.

IM: I mean if one seeks a consolation in the feeling that you are doing something. Yes, but nevertheless doing it could help you.

K: No, I have talked to people who have spent years - please, I mean it - twenty five years and a man came to me who was about seventy, much older than I was, and he said, "I have spent twenty five years in the jungle, wandering over and I have deceived myself all along."

IM: Well he should be congratulated, I suppose.

K: I know. That shows something.

IM: He was prepared to say something like that because people don't often admit.

K: To be really quiet is something you can't cultivate, you can't get it by practise and all the rest of it. It is your daily life you have

to be quiet.

IM: It comes by a gift perhaps.

K: No, daily life madame, otherwise what is the value of your quietness, if your daily life is not affected, if your daily life isn't without conflict?

IM: Well, of course, I am constantly wanting to say that the connection with one's daily life is a fundamental idea. I mean if somebody claimed to have this quietness but behaved badly in ordinary life I would be sceptical.

K: I know, so am I.

IM: So I think my own thoughts on this subject are influenced by Plato and I think, or I feel perhaps that something that you are insisting on, which he also insisted on, is the absolute separateness of this idea of the timeless and eternal. That it is quite separate from what we ordinarily think of as goodness, which is a kind of idolatry.

K: Yes, idolatry.

IM: And he uses the images of destroying idols. If you destroy images you destroy idols and you go on. But of course he does picture life as a pilgrimage in a way in which I think you don't.

K: No. If I have no images in myself about anything, there is no self in that.

IM: Yes. You are really picturing what many spiritual people have thought of as the end of the journey. I mean at the end, except that you want to insist that of course one is already in a sense potentially at the end, that there is only...

K: One has to be careful of that too because the Hindus believe there is god, there is atman inside and that give him a chance, peel

off your ignorance and then you will be like that! That is an assumption. I don't want to assume anything.

IM: Well I think there is a metaphysical - I wouldn't call it assumption because it is something I agree with.

K: It is an idea. It is an idea.

IM: Yes. This is a metaphysical assertion, or religious - only you wouldn't want to use the word religious because that might be misleading.

K: I am only suggesting: a concept which has been cultivated, which has been traditional, and that has no meaning, because, look, I have this concept 'the god is in me' and then I go and kill somebody.

IM: Well, yes, anything involving the idea of a god is of course already in a sense an idol.

K: That is all I am saying.

IM: Yes, yes.

K: We are idol-worshippers, whether it is handmade or mental, made by the mind.

IM: Yes. Yes, the absoluteness of the division for you, and I think I perhaps see what you mean, I am not quite sure, between the ordinary process of life and this being in the truth which is something which lives in the present in a way in which something eternal must live in the present, if you see what I mean. You must insist on it being quite separate from the worldly idols.

K: Absolutely, of course.

IM: Yes.

K: After all man's search has been for eternity. They make an idea of it...

IM: ...which is not a continuation of time. It is quite different.

K: It is the end of time.

IM: Yes. Yes. Well I think, thinking about Plato I come to some understanding of what you have been saying.

K: It is half past two.

IM: I think we must end here. Oh dear, thank you very much.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 31ST DECEMBER 1983

This is not entertainment, this is not a lecture either. A lecture is intended to convey information on a particular subject, to be informed about it. So this is not a lecture but a conversation between us, friendly, serious. And if it is possible to communicate with each other deeply and go if we can together for a long journey - a journey that covers, we hope, the entire human status, not with the view of a particular country or a particular group of people or community, nor are we concerned with any particular philosophy, and if one is waiting to be instructed, informed, told what to do, I am afraid you will be disappointed. So together we are going to take a very long journey, not only outwardly, in the physical world, but also in the psychological world, in the world that lies inside us, inside the skin, as it were. A world that few of us have taken seriously, or have gone into it very, very deeply. So together bearing in mind, that we are not giving a lecture nor a sermon, I hope, so don't get bored.

And also one would like to point out that in listening to someone, as to the speaker, one has to listen not only with the hearing of the ear, but also listen, and that is an art, to listen to somebody, freely, intelligently, but also today, without any interpretation, without any conclusion, but as two friends talking over together not only about the world situation, but also about their own problems, their own behaviour, their own ways of thinking, their prejudices, opinions, conclusions. So one hopes that you will so listen not only to the network of words, but also to the

deeper issues of life.

It seems to one religion and to have peace in the world are the two most important things in one's life. Religion, the etymological meaning of that word is not very clear. But it is generally accepted religion to be that which is going on in the world, the Christian religion, the Muslim, the Islamic, the Hindu, the Buddhist, and so on, with their temples and mosques and churches or cathedrals and all the rituals that go on inside them. And all the things that are in the temples, churches, mosques, and having certain faiths, belief, and the repetition of certain phrases, doing puja, rituals and so on, the whole structure of superstition. But generally what is understood to be religion, to the speaker that is not religion, it is all put together by thought. Thought is a material process and that which thought has created, given sanctity, tradition, then that very thought turns to worship that which it has created. This is a fact not a theory. (We wait for that aeroplane).

And also there is no peace in the world. And the preparations for war by all nations, especially the present crisis, nuclear war and the destruction of the whole of mankind. So there is no peace in the world, nor is there peace in ourselves. To be a religious human being requires a great deal of intelligence and also to live peacefully in this world, without conflict, without problems, without this divisive process, that also requires a great deal of intelligence. Not repetition of some slogans, not following some guru. All that is gone, finished because man is no longer, if he is at all aware, intelligent and conscious of what is going on, he has put aside all that rubbish. You may not agree, but please listen to the very end of it if you have the patience and if you want to face facts.

Because facts do not need opinions, they are so. How you don't translate facts depends on your background, on your prejudices, on your conditioning, but facts remain facts. Like there is war in certain parts of the world, though they are preparing both sides, right and left, one hopes there will be no war.

And religion has no longer any meaning at all, except for sentimental, sensory excitement and emotional titivation, but otherwise religion in the deeper sense of that word, which is to live a righteous life, a life of freedom, responsibility for one's own actions, independent of environment and so on, which we will go into during these four talks. So please from the very beginning of these talks, if you are willing, listen not only to what the speaker is saying, but also listen to your own interpretations of what the speaker is saying, how you receive or accept or react to what is being said. So this requires a constant communication with each other to be aware of not only the word, the significance of the word of the speaker, but also to be aware of one's own responses. So you see responsibility (noise of music) - lovely, this is modern civilization. Shall we go on? Oh, let's shout a little more than they do.

So we are going to take a long friendly, not dogmatic, journey, both outwardly and inwardly. It is far more difficult to take a journey inwardly. It is fairly easy if you are well informed of what is going on in the world. But one must have a criteria to evaluate, as in a mirror, to see things as they are, to see what is happening in the world, in the outer world. It is really not an outward world at all, it is a world which we have created. It is like a tide, going out and coming in, it is the same water. But we have unfortunately

divided the world as the outer and the inner, so it is this eternal movement of action and reaction, challenge and response, problem after problem. And these problems are increasing more and more, not only created by the politicians and also by all the religious people, but also the problems which we have created for ourselves. It is a society which we have created, it hasn't suddenly come into being. This is what we are. If our house is burning, disorderly, competitive, ruthless, we have created such a society where there is brutality, cruelty, injustice, and so on. It is our responsibility, not to change the society but to see in our journey which we are going to take together, whether in that very movement of taking that journey there is the possibility of changing ourselves fundamentally - a psychological revolution, not a physical revolution. So let us go together.

The world geographically, nationally, religiously is divided, economically, tribalism, the world is broken up, fragmented. That fragmentation has taken place through nationalism which is glorified traditionalism and each country is concerned with itself. But politicians and those people who are leaders forget that we are all human beings, we are one people, though you may call yourself a Muslim, or a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or a Christian, we are one humanity. You may belong to a certain sect, assert your own personal ambitions but behind all that we are one entity. The whole of humanity is us. But unfortunately for various reasons of security, our own search for security, through the family, through the community, through the nation, we have separated the world as the Americans, the Russians, the French, the Indian, the Arabs, the Jew and so on. This separation has been, this division, this

fragmentation has been one of the causes of war, destroying each other in the name of god, in the name of religion, in the name of ideologies. We all know this. And this process has been going on from the most ancient of times, this division of tribalism, economic division, religious division, social division, and so on, traditions. So where there is division, fragmentation, there must be conflict, that is a fact. It is not the speaker's conclusion. This is what is going on: one ideology going against another ideology, the conservation ideology against the liberal, the socialist against the communist, the fascist against everybody else. There is racial division, linguistic division and so on.

So please, we are taking a journey together. Don't merely listen to the speaker, but see the facts, not according to the speaker, but what is taking place actually, daily in our life. Unless that division ceases completely, that you are no longer a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Muslim, a Christian or belonging to different ideologies, communist, socialist, capitalist and so on, you are bound to create war, that means killing other human beings by the thousands, by the millions. If this nuclear war is to take place we will all disappear, the earth will be burnt out. Probably you know all this if you have read the newspapers or talked to certain scientists, and the argument goes on. It has been like this for a million years or actually forty five thousand years, human beings have existed on this earth according to the archaeologist and the biologist. And man has struggled, struggled, struggled, fought, killed, and as it has been before, it shall be now, and also that is the future of mankind, everlasting struggle, everlasting quarrels, destruction. This is what you are facing, not only you but your grandchildren. And we

accept it. If you are a Jew, you ascertain that you are a Jew, or a Hindu or some other stupid title. So we are sustaining, nourishing, the destruction of human beings. That is what is going on, and the politicians cannot solve this problem, on the contrary, they are adding more and more problems. In the very solution of one problem, they multiply a dozen other problems. You see all this.

And our brains are crowded with problems. And inwardly, that is the outward world, and inwardly if you have examined at all, if one is aware of what is going on, we are very primitive people. Though we have lived on this earth for 45,000 years, we are very barbarous people, cruel people. We have been more or less what we have been from the beginning of time, hating, jealous, frightened and in our fear create all kinds of horrors, and this is the world in which we live, outwardly and inwardly. No philosophy, no guru, no politicians, nobody has solved our human problems. You can escape from them by joining some monastery, by taking certain vows or joining some cult, and no authority has ever solved our human problems. We have reached a point where one does not believe in anything. We have reached a point when we are utterly confused, because those who are certain at the beginning end up with uncertainty. Do you understand all this? I wonder if you understand what the speaker is talking about. If I start believing firmly in god or in some kind of mystical affair, if I am intelligent, somewhat intelligent, as I grow up I begin to doubt everything. So one must begin with uncertainty, doubting, questioning, having a sceptical mind, then one comes to a place where there is absolute certainty. Because after all both outwardly and inwardly we are seeking security, that's why we have invented god, because that is

the ultimate security. Don't be shocked please, you are all believers in god, probably the majority of you, god or some higher principle and so on. All that is invented by thought. Thought is a material process. So anything created by thought in the world of religion is still materialistic, as technology is.

So together we are taking the journey to find out if we human beings can radically bring about a change in ourselves, not through compulsion, not through some enticement or some promise, but seeing things as they are, the frightening, the desperate state man has reached, the confusion that really thinking man is in, because he has been told so many things all his life, all contradicting. So we are confused human beings, whether you admit it or not. Confused not only consciously but deeply, in the deep layers of the consciousness, we are confused. The world has reached that point, where you believe neither in the scientists nor in politicians, nor in any of the so-called these thoughtless gurus. Man has not changed and when one has reached this stage of confusion deeply, then that very confusion demands right action, that very confusion brings a crisis in our life. The crisis is not out there but the crisis is in our consciousness, in our being.

So we are asking ourselves whether it is possible to bring about a deep psychological revolution in ourselves, not an outward revolution. The outward revolutions have failed: the recent revolutions, the French and the communist revolution, they have failed utterly. What is important is that there should be a psychological mutation, a fundamental change in the very cells of the brain. Because our brains are conditioned, that is, the cells in the brain are conditioned. The speaker is not a specialist in the

structure of the brain and so on, but he has discussed with a great many scientists and so on, it is not important. But one can watch it in oneself, much more important than talking to innumerable scientists and their authority, and their contradictions, one can see in oneself how our brains are conditioned as a Hindu, a tradition, as the Jew, as the Muslim, as the Christian. Nationally, linguistically, religiously, economically our brain is conditioned. And we are asking whether that very brain which has been conditioned through knowledge, through education, whether those very cells can bring about a mutation in themselves? You understand? Do we understand each other, the problem? Suppose the speaker has been trained as a Muslim, repeating the Koran from boyhood, and his brain naturally has adjusted itself to the words, to the content of the words, to the meaning of the words and so on, so the brain becomes conditioned by the climate, by the food, by the tradition, by your education. So knowledge itself becomes the conditioning factor. Right? I wonder if you see this. Do you see this? Are we meeting each other somewhere? Please tell me, otherwise we can't...

Knowledge is the outcome of experience and experience and knowledge are limited. Look at the scientists, what they are doing, after two hundred years they have gradually accumulated knowledge, bit by bit, through hypothesis, through various forms of experiments, acquired a great deal of knowledge about matter and so on. So knowledge is never complete, it is always limited, whether the knowledge of the Koran, or your sacred books, or the Bible because it is based on experience, and experience is always limited. When once you grasp that fact, the reality of that, then all

thinking is limited. Right? All thinking, thinking is the reaction of memory, memory is stored in the brain, in the very cells and those cells have been conditioned through centuries of human living and experience and struggle, those cells are conditioned, limited. And we are asking whether those cells themselves can undergo a fundamental mutation so that a man, a human being is entirely different, no longer conditioned? You might say, that is not possible - that would be a natural reaction, it is not possible, we have lived this way for so many centuries and you are saying, how can that change take place, that mutation. That's what we are going to enquire together. That requires a great deal of enquiry, a great deal of attention, energy, passion to find out. But if you are lethargic, as most of us are, occupied with so many things, occupied with our living, frightened with what is going to happen, frightened of the past, frightened of the future, frightened of the present, and if our brain is so clogged up, as most brains are, then the first question is, is it possible to solve problems, to have no problems. We will go into that.

Our brains are conditioned from childhood to solve problems, the child goes to the school, he has got mathematical problems, how to read, write. Right? I am not saying anything strange, so don't look so surprised, or bored. From childhood through school, through college, through university if you are lucky, or unlucky, to go through all that, your brain, the physical brain, the cells, are trained, educated to solve problems. Right? So you treat the whole of living as a problem to be solved, and you approach everything as a problem - sexual problems, problems of relationship, economic problems, religious problems, political problems, you

follow, and we are solving them with a brain that is conditioned to solve problems. So the problems are never solved. Have you realized that? These are facts. You may solve one problem happily, but in the very solution of that problem you have another problem. Look what is happening politically in the world, in the western world, in the communist world, they have got so many problems, economic problems, the political problem, the desire to be President, to be the top man, you know, they are all problems. You have problems with your wife and with your husband, you have problems with your children, you have problems with your guru. And we are not making a problem for you. The speaker is not creating a problem for you. All that he is saying is, look at things as they are, first, without any prejudice, without any conclusion, and if you have conclusions, opinions, judgements, put them aside because it is only a brain that is free that can look.

So can you put aside all those opinions, judgements, evaluation, tradition and look at things as they are? Not as a politician, not as a foreigner, not a person who has read a great deal and can speak endlessly, but as a human being. But our brains are conditioned to solve problems, so the brain itself has a problem. Do you understand this? Do understand this, please. And therefore whatever it meets turns into a problem. So our question is whether it is possible not to have a brain that is conditioned to the solution of problems. To have a brain that is free to look and not make a problem of what it looks at. Right?

So we are asking whether the brain cells themselves, without any compulsion, without any instigation, without any pressure, outwardly or inwardly, can bring about a change, a mutation in

itself? So we are going to find out in these four discussions, conversations, really a dialogue - one can't have a dialogue with so many people but one can have a dialogue with you, not with all of you, with each one of you. And we are saying, religion is the most important thing in life, not the thing (noise of crows) - the crows are going to bed, the last trumpet. We were saying, a new culture, a new civilization cannot come about through economic adjustments, political action, through various forms of institutions and foundations. Religion is the only factor and that religion is our enquiry to find out whether the human brain can be really religious. We mean by religion, absolute freedom: freedom from fear, freedom from conflict, freedom from problems, freedom from sorrow, so that it is a brain that is completely free, it is only then there is that quality of love and compassion. Then that state alone can find out what is sacred. And in the understanding of that truth or that perception of that which is true then there is peace, peace in oneself, in one's own psyche. That means no conflict whatsoever. Now is this possible? If you say, it is not possible, then that becomes a block, that prevents you from looking at the possibility, the possibility of opening the door to look. Or if you say, it is possible, then you are merely talking theoretically, then you have shut the door. So you must have the quality of a brain that is enquiring, looking, searching, asking, questioning, doubting. Not only doubting of others, of your books and so on, but doubting what your own thinking is, questioning your own responses, your own reactions, that requires an alertness of mind.

So we are now on our journey going to enquire together the first thing, which is, what is thinking. Because we live by thinking, all

our actions are based on thinking, our relationship with each other is part of thinking, the images that you have built about your wife or your husband, your guru, your leaders and so on, are put together by thought as an image. We will go into that presently. So thinking is our fundamental instrument. It may think devotionally, romantically, imaginatively, but it is still thinking, whether you are a scientist, or a philosopher, mathematician, biologist or just ordinary human beings, even the most uneducated person thinks, the villager. So our first enquiry on the journey is to find out what is thinking, why thinking has become so extraordinarily important, knowing that thinking is a material process because knowledge and memory and experience is stored up in the brain cells and that knowledge, experience, memory and so thought is limited. This is a fact. There is no complete knowledge about anything. You may think god is complete knowledge, or some extra principle, outside agency, and you all like to believe that in all of us there is something of that quality, which is again thought.

So we must understand very clearly the nature of our thinking. Please observe your own thinking, not what the speaker is telling you, but observe your own thoughts, how they arise, how limited they are. Each one of us is concerned about himself basically, self-centred and you may try to hide it behind all kinds of words, but it is still there. And that self-centred thinking is limited. When you think about yourself, your achievements, your desires, your purposes, your wanting to build temples in the west and temples here, it is still limited. Right? Whatever is limited must bring about conflict, must bring about division. That's a law. If I am divided against you, thinking about myself all day long, it is a very limited

process. That's what we are all doing, happily, miserably, successfully, but that's what we are doing. So thinking being limited has made our whole outlook limited. Right? I wonder if you get all this? Are you getting tired? Or are you asleep? I don't mind if you go to sleep, it's your affair. And this thinking has created, because of its very limitation, nationalities, hoping to find security in nationalities, in tribalism, in tribal gods, and you haven't found security. And one thought there would be security in communities, there has been no security there either. So where is security? You follow? Where is security for us? Not through division, not through calling yourself a Hindu, Muslim and all the rest of it.

So when you see danger - you understand what I am talking about, for god's sake move, I don't mean get up and go; perhaps you want to get up and go, but I am talking of your outlook, your way of looking. What will make you change? You have had sorrow, you have had pain, you have had wars, you have had every kind of toil and travail, and yet we go on as we are. What will make us change? Reward? Reward in heaven, reward on this earth? When you are seeking for a reward there is always the other side of it, punishment. Reward and punishment is one of our principles. So it becomes very important to find out if thought is the only instrument that we have, and it has created such havoc in the world. Do you realized that? Look what the scientists have produced, not only medicine and surgery and fast communication, and those happy, convenient things, but also that produced most diabolical things, the nuclear war, nuclear instruments, the atom bomb, the submarine, you follow, the whole technological world of

warfare is the product of thought - going to the moon is a product of thought, and putting a flag up there is a product of thought. And our relationship with each other is based on thought. So let's for the moment talk over together the question of relationship. Don't be nervous. I'm not going to attack you.

You are related, life is a process of relationship, living is relationship. You cannot possibly live by yourself even though you may retire for the rest of your life to the Himalayas or to a community or to a monastery you are still in contact with humanity, you are related. You may not be related to a person but you are related to a tradition, related to knowledge, related to all kinds of things. So relationship is one of the basic factors of life. The husband and the wife and the children. And in that relationship with their conflicts, with their sexual demands, with their pleasures, with their pains, with their flattery, with their insults, with their nagging, you know all that goes on in relationship. Don't you know all that? Or you pretend it doesn't exist? You are all so silent, aren't you? In that relationship you have created - thought has created the image about your wife and the wife has created an image about you. That's a fact. And the relationship is between these two images: I know my wife, and the wife says, 'I know my husband', you really don't know each other, all that you know is the image you have about her and she has an image about you. That is built through time. Right? These are facts, sir, don't dodge the issue. And where there is a relationship between two images there is actually no relationship at all. That's again a fact. And that's why there is such conflict in relationship. There are very, very, very few people living together who are really related, happy, not adjusting

to each other, or tolerating each other, or exploiting each other.

So the question is whether it is possible to live without a single image, and who is it that creates the images? There you are, you are sitting there, all of you, and you have an image about the speaker, haven't you? Otherwise you wouldn't be here. That's a fact. Right? The image that you have built about the speaker is not the speaker. Right? But you worship that image. Or you may not worship it, or you might kick it, or disregard it but still you have created an image about the speaker and so your relationship is with the image and not with the speaker at all. Because to have a relationship with the speaker we must meet each other at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity. Right? You understand my point? Isn't that love? When you meet somebody at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, not sexually, I am not talking of that, but with all your human being, with your whole being, then that is love. And there is no love if you have the images about each other. And where there is love there is no time. Where there is love there is no conflict. And to understand that extraordinary thing called love you must have great intelligence, and not fear, not ambition, not greed, not jealous, hatred.

So we are asking: why has thought become so important in our lives, realizing what thought has done, technologically what it has done, immense things, both appalling, fearful, dangerous, diabolical things and also thought has created medicine, surgery, communication, and also thought has created war, divided people as the Hindu, the Buddhist, and all that nonsense. Unless thought has been totally understood, and thought has its place, and thought

may not have any place at all psychologically. Do you understand what I am saying? As we said, thought is limited because knowledge is limited, experience is limited, and in relationship if thought is the means of communication with each other there must be conflict. And also thought is necessary for you to get home, to take the bus, to go to your office, not tomorrow, Sunday, but Monday, and to go to the office for the rest of your life, day after day, day after day. This is all the product of thought. I know you have to go, one knows you have to go to your office, to your factory, to your business and so on, there thought is necessary, but is thought necessary in relationship? Enquire into it, go into it, and you will find out.

So as our brains are conditioned by thought, through thought, is it possible - please listen to this - is it possible to find a totally different movement which is not of thought, which is not put together by thought, thought being the activity of time, a material process? Don't go off into meditations and all that kind of stuff, we will deal with that presently. But to find out, if thought is the only instrument we have then we are condemned for ever. You understand this? Because then all our action becomes limited, then whatever we do, religiously, politically, economically, will always be limited and therefore perpetual conflict and more problems. But thought is necessary, if I want to write a letter to you I must employ thought, to go from here to your house you need thought and so on. So we are asking, is thought necessary in relationship with each other? And to discover for oneself, not be told everlastingly, but to discover for oneself an instrument - not an instrument - a process of living in which thought doesn't come in.

This requires enormous enquiry. This requires a great deal of your attention because knowledge has become so important to you - knowledge about the Gita, about the Upanishads, and all the Commentaries - you worship knowledge. You have goddesses of knowledge, don't you? But knowledge has its place. Truth isn't knowledge, it isn't something put together by thought, it is something that comes into being when the brain is totally free, uncontaminated, pristine, original. And to discover that is part of meditation, not this stupid repetition.

So we must stop now, we will continue. But please we are not talking about something theoretically, hypothetically but we are dealing with facts. Facts are that which is happening now, that which has happened before, not that which is going to happen, that is not a fact. The fact is what you are thinking, doing, now. And the fact of what you have done before. Those are facts. But ideals are not facts. But you all have ideals therefore you live in illusory worlds. When a brain lives in an illusory world you are bound to create conflict for yourself and for others. But when you are dealing with facts day after day, not supposition of facts, not saying, because to me my opinion is a fact and I stick to that fact - it's so obvious, your opinion like any other opinion is not a fact. But what you do out of that opinion, out of that conclusion, out of that theory is a fact. You understand? If you have an illusion and act according to that illusion that becomes a fact, and your illusion is a fact too. You understand?

So one has to be aware, look, question, doubt to find out. The other day in California, a few months ago when I was there, a car in front of us had on the bumper a sticker which said, `Question all

authority'. Will you question all authority? Your own authority first and the authority of your religion, of your gods, of your temples, question the politicians, everything question, doubt so that your own brain begins to be active. But most of us don't question because we are frightened. We would rather be told what to do - you know better than I do so please tell me. And where there is authority, power, position, status, there is evil. It leads to such misery. But to have humility, that humility can only come naturally, uninvited, easily when you begin to question your own thoughts, your own relationship, your own desires, your own achievements, then out of that comes this quality of humility. When there is humility you are then learning. Learning is infinite, knowledge is limited. And that humility - not bowing down to somebody, that's not humility, not touching somebody's feet, that's not humility, going to the temple, all that is rubbish - to have humility, saying I don't know, let's find out. To be so free to look and to have that great simplicity, not the simplicity of a loin cloth but the simplicity of a clear mind and clear heart. Then only that which is beyond time comes into being.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST JANUARY 1984

There are a lot of people, aren't there, large audience. I wonder why you come. It's very good of you to come but I wonder why. Do you take what is being said by the speaker seriously, or is it something that you attend for a weekend and forget the rest of the week? It would be rather interesting to find out why human beings are lectured to, why they attend meetings, why hearing so many things, contradictory, very learned, and full of information and knowledge, at the end of it all you remain more or less what you were before, with our own problems, with our own petty little lives, unhappy, and struggle from the moment we are born until we die, constant strife, conflict, struggle. I wonder if you come here just to pass the time of the day, or you come because of the reputation, or you are really serious people? Serious not in the sense, not easily convinced, for we are not doing any kind of propaganda, not trying to convince you of anything whatsoever. Nor is the speaker your guru. Thank god! Nor are you his followers. You are both the teacher and the person who learns. When we are learning that very act of learning makes you into a teacher. So you are both the disciple and the guru.

If you listen very seriously you should consider, if one may point out, we are going to talk about many things together this evening, and the next two meetings that are to follow next weekend, and you may hear so many things which probably you have not heard before, and if you have heard or read what the speaker has said, merely to repeat what he has said has very little

meaning. But in the very act of listening, that very act helps one to understand and live, apply, not, 'I will try to apply', but one applies, as you do if you are a student in a college or university, you work. If you want to learn mathematics, history and so on, you have to study, you have to enquire, you have to have a good brain. But most unfortunately so-called religious people never use their brains. Am I saying something extravagant? They never enquire, they accept so easily, gullible, and specially when the world is in such a mess, so much destructive activity going on, we try to find someone who will help us to understand all this mess and so get entangled.

Whereas here, this evening and the following two evenings, we are going to talk over together, a conversation, to converse about the things that are quite common to mankind, quite accepted, which we are struggling to understand, to resolve and perhaps go beyond. So this evening we are going to talk over together why human beings right throughout the world are what they are actually after such a long duration of evolution, why we are so primitive psychologically, though technologically we may be marvellous, you may have excellent degrees and so on, but psychologically, inwardly, we are rather barbarous primitive people, brutal, violent, cruel, lacking any sense of great beauty, moral rectitude and so on. One wonders why we have become like this. Why we look to others to help. Why we want leaders. We have had leaders galore, and they have lead us to all kinds of troubles. So we are always looking for the best leader, for the super leader, both in the political, economic world and also in the religious world. And unfortunately we never find them, unless you have found your own

particular little guru round the corner.

So this evening we are going to talk over together many problems. And one of the problems is, why human beings have ideals at all? This is really a quite important question: why human beings right throughout the world cling to some form of ideals. The ideals are not facts, they are not actuality. What is actuality is what is happening now. The `now' contains all the past, the present and the future. We will go into that.

So we are asking why we have become like this, so narrow, selfish, brutal, concerned with ourselves, you know all the rest of it, what we are. And we never seem to be free to look at the world and our own little world afresh, anew, unless we have the capacity to wipe out all the past, to have a clean slate and start from there. It would be a marvellous world but unfortunately we can't wipe out the past, and the past is a very complicated process of time. Time is one of the factors of our life, daily life: the time that has past, the time as the present, and the time as the future, both biologically as well as physically. All the remembrances, the remorse, the guilt, all that is a movement of time, which is the past. And the time of the past is the present in which - or the now - all time is contained.

This is going to be rather difficult, we will go into it step by step.

Because we live by time: I hope to see you tomorrow, I hope to achieve, I want to be better than I am, in my job, in my way of living and so on. There is always a becoming, a growing, and that which is always growing is always ending. Are we together in all this? And the future is now. You understand? What we are now we will be tomorrow, and a thousand tomorrows. That's a fact. But if we change radically now, psychologically, inwardly, then the

future is now. Do you understand? We will go into it presently, in much more detail. You all look so puzzled, it's not so very complex, but we make everything terribly complex. We are not simple people, we are full of knowledge, and perhaps that's one of our difficulties. Knowledge conditions the brain, and knowledge is time. And to understand something like violence, which most human beings are, violent human beings, and to understand this whole process of violence the knowledge which you have acquired about violence and the knowledge - not knowledge - the theory of non-violence that is also part of knowledge and so we are never free from violence. Let me go into it a little bit more.

Let's take an example of violence. We are violent people. We may have a quiet life, you may not quarrel with your wife and husband, which is rather rare, but deeply we are violent people, anger, aggression. Violence isn't merely physical action, violence is part of imitation, conformity. And we have these opposites, non-violence. And in this country they are talking a lot about non-violence, and in the recent war which you have had in this country, there isn't one person, I was told, who stood up against war. But that's irrelevant. What is important is, is it possible to understand the whole nature of violence and be free of it, and not pursue non-violence? You understand? Are we meeting each other? Yes? I am violent, suppose. The speaker has only once been angry. It sounds rather strange. And at that moment when he was angry it seemed so absurd, so silly to be angry about something, and when you see the stupidity of anger it is gone, you don't try to control it, you don't try to suppress it, you say, yes, it's absurd getting angry about anything. And that's the end of it. You think about it. To observe,

to be aware, to give your full attention that you are angry, at that moment you see the whole nature of anger.

So violence, for example, what is violence? It's a fact. The non-fact is non-violence. Right? Would you agree to that? The pursuit of non-violence which may take all your life, and in the pursuit of that ideal you are all the time being violent, you try to control it, you try to suppress it, you act upon it. But you are part of that violence. Aren't you? You, when you get angry, you are that, you are part of that anger, you are the anger. When you are greedy, that feeling is not separate from you. Right? You are that. But when we try to suppress or analyse or control, you separate yourself from the fact and then try to dominate it, or suppress it and all the rest of it. But one realizes you are that. I wonder if you see. When I realize completely that I am violent, then I remain with that fact, I don't pursue stupidly the idea of non-violence. It's a fact I am violent, mad, angry, brutal. And that's a fact and I realize there is no violence separate from me. I am violence, because I am angry, I am competitive, ambitious, brutal and so on. And also I imitate, I conform, that's part of anger, violence. So the observer who says, 'I am violent', the observer is part of that. So there is no contradiction. Where there is contradiction there must be conflict.

I wonder if you have ever gone into the question, not a problem, the question whether one can live in this world normally, healthily, sanely, not neurotically or in other directions, without a single shadow of conflict. I wonder if you have ever questioned to find out if you can live actually, whatever the circumstances are, whatever the environment, whatever the pressures, the limitations, whether one can live a life in which there is not a single conflict.

Have you ever questioned it? Oh, come on! Or it has never occurred to you, you accept conflict as the way of life, as corruption in this country, and other countries, is a way of life. So we accept it, it is past, we get on with it. So conflict makes the mind, the brain dull. The brain is a machine. Like a good car you must keep it in perfect condition, tuned, give proper oil and change the oil every two thousand miles, if you are lucky, to make the engine last long; so the brain is matter, a material thing, a machine, with all its extraordinary capacities, which is really quite infinite. But if that brain is in constant struggle, conflict, going round and round with its own problems, with its own miseries, that very conflict degenerates the brain. It's worn out. And so we are incapable of meeting life afresh.

I wonder if you get this? Are we together when the speaker is talking about all this? Are you taking an interest in it, or is it just another meeting you go to and you are being lectured at? Not understanding, investigating yourself, your own life, the way your live?

So it is possible to be free of total violence, not in the future, which is the ideal, and the pursuit of the ideal has lead people nowhere, but if one is taking violence and going into it, not analytically - that's another question: who is the analyser? Who is the entity that analyses any reaction that you have, like violence? Violence is a reaction, and who is the entity that analyses violence? Because you are violence, but when you separate yourself from violence then you can analyse it. Right? So the separation by the analyser away from the analysed creates a division and therefore in that division there must be conflict. Whereas - please listen to this,

just even for fun, just listen to it - whereas the analyser is the analysed. Right? I am violent, the analyser is also part of me, who is also violent. And one violence examines, analyses another violence. So there is always this contradiction. There is no contradiction if there is no division. So the analyser is the analysed; like the thinker is the thought, the thought is not separate from the thinker. I wonder if you see this. The experiencer is not different from the experience, but we are always seeking experience as though experience is something different from me. So there is no duality at all. I wonder if you understand this, in spite of your adwaita and all that kind of business, in spite of all your philosophy and all your teachers about adwaita, is it, that's good enough that word. They have all theorized about duality, only the enlightened escape from all duality and all that kind of stuff. But the actual fact is if you go into it, there is only 'what is', there is only violence, there is no opposite to it. You understand? But our brains are conditioned to the opposite, therefore our brain is struggling to achieve the opposite. And therefore in that there is conflict, suppression and so on. But whereas the fact is there is only this, that is 'what is', which is violence. Right? And if you give your attention to the fact of violence and look at it without any analytical process then you will see it's like a map that is being slowly revealed, then you see the whole content of that word. Are we meeting each other? Are we together in this? All right, we'll go on.

Sir, we ought to talk over together fear because that is part of our life, probably the major part of our life. Fear, what's the cause of fear? Not the object which creates fear, not something the word

evokes. You understand? The word may bring about fear, the word 'fear' may arouse fear, but when you have no word, but only observe the reaction which you call fear, what is the root of it? This requires a great deal of exploration, and one hopes that you are willing to go into this with the speaker. Fear is time. I am going to go into it. Fear is a movement in time. So first let us examine carefully what is time. Time as rising and setting, the sun rises and sets, the interval between the sun rising and the sun setting is time. There is time to cover a distance from point to point; there is time which is for you from here to go to your home, it takes time, whether an instant or an hour. So there is physical time, which is, to learn a language takes time, to learn to drive a car takes time, if you want to be a pilot, it takes months and so on. So there is physical time. Right? You understand? And also there is psychological time: I will be, I will become, I am a clerk but I will become the manager one day, I am ignorant but one day I will be enlightened. That is, I am this, I will be that. That is psychological time.

There is physical time, the sun rises and the sun setting, covering, moving from one point to another point, and there is psychological time, which is, I am, I will not be. I am living, but I will die. That's a tremendous interval. I am fifteen - I am not - I am fifteen but I will die one day when I am eighty, that is the movement of that long interval which is psychological time. Right? And also there is time as the future. I have a job now, I might lose that job; I am quarrelling with my wife but one day we will all be happy together. So there is time as the past, time as the present - please listen carefully, if you don't mind, if you are interested -

there is the time as the past, time as the present, now, and time as the future. Right? But the time now is the future. Right? The time now is what I am now, but the future is what is present. Right? Got it? So in the now all the past and the future are contained. Right? So the future and the past exist now. I am the result of all the past, modifying itself in the present, and the future is the present. Right? Unless I radically bring about - or rather, there is a mutation in my brain cells, I will be what I am now, unless there is tremendous psychological revolution. Right? So the present is the past and the future, contained now. Right? That is time. Right?

What relationship has time to fear? Because that's what we are going to discuss, talk over together. Because most human beings are frightened, have innumerable forms of fear: fear of darkness, which is neurotic, psychopathic and so on, fear of dying, fear of living, fear that you might lose what you have, fear of your wife and your husband - is that rare in this country? I wonder if you are all saints! You don't seem to react to anything. If there is fear of what you possess, you might lose, fear of growing old and dying. So human beings right throughout the world have tremendous anxiety, which is part of fear: anxiety of not fulfilling, anxiety of not being yourself, anxiety what other people might do to you, and so on. All that is a form of fear. So what is the relationship between fear and time? And shall we in our conversation trim the branches of fear, take one branch after another, or shall we deal with the root of fear? Have you understood my question? I may be frightened of my wife, or I may be frightened of darkness, and I want that particular problem solved. But also I have other problems of fear, it is not just only one I have, fear of dying, fear of growing old, fear

that my brain will degenerate, fear that god won't give me what I want unless I go to a particular temple. You know we were told the other day, there is a temple nearby, two hundred or one hundred and fifty miles away, where every three days they have a million dollars. God is very profitable! Yes, sir, you laugh at it. But your gods are very demanding of your pocket. That is, you give him something and he gives you something in return. Reward and punishment. And that's what you call worshipping god. You are a strange crowd all right.

So what is the relationship between fear and time? And also what is the relationship of fear with thought? You understand? I am afraid, afraid of so many things but I want to understand the root of it, because if I can understand, see the quality, the nature, the structure of fear then it is finished. But if I merely trim the branches then fear will continue. So our concern is not how to be rid of fear, that's one of our fallacies, but if one can go, delve deeply into the nature of fear then we shall be able to be free of it entirely. And we are going to talk about it this evening, and if you apply your brains, not the explanation which the speaker is going to give but the actual investigation on your part, not just listen or hear and forget all about it, but if you actually listen, apply as you are sitting there, and go with the speaker investigating it, not accepting what he is saying, but investigate it, question, asking yourself, then you might get up so utterly free of fear and then there will be no gods. When man is free of all fear he needs no comfort, he needs no reward, he doesn't seek something that will help him. This is the burden which mankind has carried for a million years, fear. So let's go into it.

We said time is a factor of fear. Time, again the remembrance of an incident which caused fear - please follow this if you don't mind, if you are interested in it - remembrance of an incident that caused fear which is registered or recorded in the brain, and that record is still there and I now have fear. So the record remembers the fact of fear. So from the past I recognize the fear. You understand? Am I making myself clear? The knowledge of a past incident which caused fear is registered in the brain, as on a tape. So the brain has knowledge of fear. Right? Knowledge of fear. So knowledge is fear. You understand this? Go into it, sir, see the beauty of it and then you will see what it means. So when fear arises now memory steps in and says, 'Yes, I know that is fear'. Right? Which means the knowledge which you have had with regard to fear, that knowledge says, 'That is fear'. So knowledge itself becomes fear. Right? You understand this? And the word, the word 'fear' may also contribute to fear. So knowledge is the word and the word may cause fear. So can you look - please listen to it - is there an observation of fear without the knowledge of other fears so that there is perception of fear without the movement of knowledge? You understand?

So fear is the movement of knowledge as the past, and that knowledge is time. Right? So fear is also part of thought: I might die tomorrow, I might lose my job, I am this but I will become that - it's all the movement of thought. Right? No? I have a job now, I work in a factory, or I am a cook, a carpenter, not your big top people, I am just an ordinary person, even the top people have a great deal of fears I assure you, and I am a carpenter and I might lose my job tomorrow. The 'tomorrow' is time and thought says, 'I

might lose it, lose my job'. So thought, time are movements, movements of knowledge. I am discovering this myself as I am going along. Which is, can the brain not record? You understand? I'll show you. Listen to it. You flatter me, the brain immediately records it and you insult me, the brain again records. It's a machine that is recording all the time. Right? And that becomes our knowledge and from that knowledge we act. Now if you do not record, you flatter me the brain doesn't record, I don't say, you are a great friend of mine, or you insult me, neither insult nor flattery is recorded. You understand? Then knowledge is not necessary which might create fear. But I must have knowledge, how to write a letter, how do to do business, if I am crooked or otherwise, I must have knowledge. If I am an accountant I must have knowledge. I don't know if you are following all this? But the psychological knowledge which is recorded, is it possible not to record psychologically? You understand? Find out, sir, don't agree with me. Find out whether it is possible psychologically not to record. Which means the brain has seen the fact of it therefore it is unconditioning itself.

So fear is a movement of time and thought. Right? Now don't please ask, how am I to stop thinking. Now if the speaker is silly enough to give you a system, in that very system there is inherent decay, whether it is bureaucratic system or a particular system of meditation, system of thought. You understand? In the very structure of a system, inherent in it there is decay, it's called entropy, but I won't go into all that. The physicists know this, wastage of energy which can be measured. And the brain is now burdened with a great deal of knowledge and that knowledge has

become our conditioning. And therefore that very knowledge prevents us from seeing something new, fresh. Whereas if you can look at fear as it arises for the first time, then it is something entirely different, it's a reaction, a physical reaction and a psychological reaction. So fear, the root of fear, is the movement of time and thought. But if you understand the nature of time, not intellectually but actually, the nature and the structure of time, and also understand the nature and the structure of thought - understand, that means investigate it, be completely familiar with the thing, the movement of time and the movement of thought, which are the basis of fear, then fear, because you are so completely holding this thing in your hands, as it were, it requires your attention, that very attention burns away fear. I wonder if you understand this?

Now how can you love if you have fear? You are all frightened of your gods, aren't you? You are all asking rewards of your god, you pray, you do puja, some rituals, all that indicates, doesn't it, I am just asking most respectfully, doesn't it indicate that you are frightened? Frightened of living, frightened of your problems and so you are asking the gods, which you have invented - right, do you agree to that? Your thought has invented these gods - would you agree to that? Or you are too holy to admit such a thing? You understand, sirs? Thought - please understand this thing for yourself, I am not dictating, I am not doing propaganda, it's your life - and out of this fear thought has created the most marvellous churches, cathedrals, marvellous, architecturally, great beauty, great weight and strength of a building, but thought has created the cathedrals, the temples, the mosques, and also thought has created

all the things that are in it, the rituals, the dresses, the incense, the words, those are all the result of thought. And thought is a material process, isn't it? Because memory, the cells in the brain hold memory, that's a fact, and that memory is based on knowledge and experience, so this whole movement is a movement of matter. So thought has invented the god, or the goddesses, gods - I believe there are over three hundred thousand gods in India and only one or two in Europe, they are unfortunate people because you can choose any number of them because there are so many of them. You can have a great deal of fun going from one god to another. Don't think I am sacrilegious. Those gods that thought has created are not sacred, though we worship them. What is sacred is not in the temples, not in the mosques, or in the churches. What is sacred exists only in a mind that is free from fear, free from conflict, free from violence. But having violence, fear, anxiety, we only have a multiplication of these gods.

So thought and time are the same. Right? Because knowledge, to have knowledge, scientific knowledge or any kind of knowledge, requires time. And time and thought are the root of fear, and time and thought are now, are in the present. And out of this arises a very serious question, whether there is a time which does not belong to thought or the movement known as time. You understand?

So if one has listened, not merely heard what we have talked about for an hour, if you actually have listened, absorbed, as you absorb on a hot day a cold drink, if you have absorbed what has been said or listened to what has been said and seen the truth of it, that very perception - and perception is not of time. I wonder if you

understand this. No, we must also talk over briefly - it is time to stop - perception, to see. You see that tree. Do you really see the tree at all ever? Do you really ever see the beauty of a sunrise? Or the sunset? Or you are too occupied with yourself that you never see the beauty of the earth? When you see that tree, what takes place? The word `tree' interferes so that you don't actually look at it. Have you noticed? All right, come much nearer: when you say, it is my wife, have you ever looked at your wife? You look at her, or your husband, your girl friend, whatever you have, you look with the word, with the image, with the pictures that you have about her or him, so this acts as a barrier, you never look. So you never become sensitive. Right? There is dirt and squalor all around Madras, you never look, do you? Or you are so accustomed to it you put up with anything, any government, any bureaucracy, any gods, anything goes. Sir, one has to have great sensitivity, that sensitivity is not to be cultivated, it comes into being when you look at the beauty of a single star in the sky, when you see the new moon, when you see the sea. But when you only employ one or two sensory responses, that very limitation creates narrow outlook. But if you look with all your senses, at a tree, at a sky, at a cloud of an evening full of light and great beauty, with all your senses, then in that observation there is no self, the `me'. It's only when there are partial responses of the senses, then that very partiality, limitation, creates the `me'.

So fear can come to an end completely when you understand the nature of time and thought.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 7TH JANUARY 1984

We ought to talk over together a great many things this evening. We should talk over why human beings get hurt, not biologically but psychologically, and that hurt they carry all through their life. And also we ought to talk over together the question of sorrow, whether that sorrow can ever end, and the implications that are involved in the ending of sorrow. And also as it is the last but one talk we ought to go into the question of what is death, because tomorrow if you are here, and I probably will be here too, we should talk about meditation and if there is anything that's really sacred in life. We will talk about that tomorrow, but today, this evening, it is rather lovely, marvellous clouds, I don't know if you have noticed it, we ought to talk over together, as I said, why human beings from their childhood until they die carry this burden, this pain of hurt, psychologically, inwardly. And whether it is possible never to be hurt, to have a brain that has never known hurt. You understand?

And as we also said in the last two talks, if you don't mind it being repeated, this is not a lecture, this is not a meeting, a gathering where one speaker instructs others or informs others; we are having a conversation, two friends sitting under a tree quietly, happily, relaxed, talking about their daily life, talking about the art of living, which is the greatest art. And neither of them is convincing the other, not doing any kind of propaganda of conviction or make the other yield to a certain argument, but two friends who have known each other for sometime, are talking about

their lives, as you and the speaker are doing now. It's a form of dialogue. It's a very complex question, the word 'dialogue', a conversation between two people. I pose you a question, put you a question and you reply to that question, and to that reply the speaker challenges that reply, so this process of two people talking together and in the process of talking together both of them disappear but only the question and answer remains. You understand? Probably you have never done that kind of conversation, you have never had such a dialogue. We are going to try it. That is, you put a question, to that the speaker replies, and you respond to that reply, back and forth till you have exhausted your prejudices and the speaker also exhausts his convictions, so that both of us are free and therefore there is no you and the speaker remaining, but only the question remains. Have you understood a little bit of this? Probably you have never tried this kind of thing, because we are all so full of ready answers.

So we are going into first the art of living. The word 'art' means etymologically, join together, join things together, but I think we ought to give a totally different meaning to it. Art is to put everything where it belongs, to put things in their right place. So there is the art of listening, there is the art of learning, there is the art of perception. We are going to go into that briefly.

The art of listening, not merely hearing words. The hearing of the words is quite a different process than the art of listening. The art of listening implies you are actually listening, not interpreting, not agreeing, not putting up resistance but listening to what another has to say, so that you are not the translator of what is being said. You don't project your own conclusions, prejudices, opinions,

judgements, you are actually listening. And that requires certain attention, and in that attention you as the listener disappear, there is just listening. If you are listening to those crows, to those birds, you are listening, you don't say, 'That's the noise of the crow calling', you just listen. And when we do so listen attentively there is neither agreement or non-agreement, you are just in a state of attention, not only to what the speaker is saying but also listen to your wife and husband, which is much more difficult because you have got used to each other. But fortunately you don't know the speaker, the speaker doesn't know you, so we can both listen without any prejudices. Which implies great sensitivity, to have your senses active so that you are listening so completely. And if one listens so attentively there is a certain miracle taking place. It's not a listening of one opinion against another opinion, or argument against another argument, however reasonable, however crooked, illusory, but a listening in which there is silence.

And there is an art of learning. You don't mind my talking like this? Don't so easily, if I may point out, agree so quickly. As the speaker is talking, do it. Listen to that crow, so you listen with your senses naturally, not just with the hearing of the ear but with all your senses awakened listening to that, then you don't exist, only the sound. Sound has an extraordinary importance in life. May I go on like this? You don't mind? The sound of the sea, the sound of the voice of your wife or husband, the sound among the leaves, the sound of the waves, the sound of a tree which is very still. Sound has extraordinary importance. And the art of learning is not the accumulation of memory. You go to school, there you are cultivating memory, mathematics, biology, physics and so on, you

are being informed, your brain is gathering information, storing knowledge about mathematics or geography, history, whatever you like, and that knowledge remains stored in the brain to be used skilfully or not skilfully in earning a livelihood. So knowledge is static, you can add to it, you can take away from it but the core of it is static, it's not dynamic. That which is dynamic cannot be added to or taken away from, inherently it is dynamic, but knowledge is not. Knowledge is mere accumulation of information, of the result of many experiences stored. That which is kept is not dynamic, that which is moving like a river, that is dynamic.

So there is an art of learning. That is, to put everything in its right place. One has to learn mathematics, if you want to be an engineer, flier, or a physicist, you must accumulate knowledge, that is necessary; but he is adding to what he already knows. So knowledge gradually becomes static, whereas the act of learning you are moving, never remaining or holding in the same place. Am I conveying something? Are we understanding each other? Do work with me please, will you? We are working together, you are not just listening to the speaker, you and the speaker are working together, learning together, not learning, accumulating what the speaker has said and going home and saying, 'This is what he said'. That's not learning. Learning is the application now of what is being said and discovering for yourself whether it is true or false. If it is true, act.

In the world theory and action or life have nothing to do with each other. In this country specially you are full of theories, full of probabilities, possibilities. And say one thing, do another. You know the game you play. So learning is something that is whole,

not fragmented as knowledge is. I wonder if you understand all this. It's a movement as a river, with tremendous volume moving, learning. That is the art of learning.

Then there is the art of perception. Perception is different from seeing. Perception is not of time, but the seeing and the translating what has been seen into action involves a certain period of time. Right? I see what I should do, and I will do it. The seeing and the doing, there is a gap, an interval which is time. Right? That's simple, right? The speaker is not saying something mysterious, this is what is happening. You see something that should be done and you think about it, you argue, probe, whether it is convenient, not convenient, profitable, not profitable and so on, all that implies an interval of time before action. Right? Whereas perception is seeing and the doing so that there is no interval between action and perception. I see, I perceive that I should not be a Hindu because one of the reasons for being a Hindu is for security purposes, and also it is one of the causes of war. Nationalism, tribalism is one of the causes of war. So I see that, I perceive it, sorry, I perceive it to be the truth and therefore I am no longer a Hindu. But whereas if I say, 'Why shouldn't I be a Hindu, it is convenient, it gives me a certain sense of security, I must go with the current, I am rather too weak to stand by myself' and so on, in those arguments and escapes you still remain at the end of it a Hindu. Whereas if you see the danger of being a Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and so on, the seeing the danger of it, you act instantly. You act instantly when you see a cobra. If a cobra was amongst you now - my goodness how you would act! So see what is implied in perceiving which requires attention, care, watching things to find out.

So there is the art of listening, the art of learning and the art of perception. If one lives with this art then life becomes an extraordinary thing, because that requires great sensitivity, care, attention. So having said all that, let's enquire - enquire, because in enquiry you must be free to enquire, but if you are attached to your particular conclusions, it is not possible to enquire. Your conclusion then directs your enquiry. So to enquire there must be freedom.

We are going to enquire together why human beings throughout the world get hurt psychologically, get wounded, carry this burden of pain all their life. And when the brain is hurt it becomes neurotic, psychopathic, lives in all kinds of illusions, superstitions. And most human beings from their childhood are psychologically wounded. Aren't you all wounded? Do be a little honest to yourself. Aren't you wounded? In the school the teacher says, 'You are not as good as that boy', that hurts you, doesn't it. And the mother and the father says, 'You are not as good as your elder brother', you awaken jealousy, competition, hurt. Right? And those who are hurt deeply, psychologically, inwardly, all their life they have fear not to be hurt any more. And so they build a wall round themselves, isolate themselves. Don't you all do this? Are you all people who have never been hurt? Your husband, or the wife, says something cruel, a passing word, stinging and that remains, recorded in the brain, and that hurt breeds all kinds of fears, anxieties, pain. Most people are not aware of all these hurts. If one becomes aware that one is hurt, and one sees the consequences of that hurt, then what is it, we are asking, that is hurt? Who is it that is hurt? You are listening, I hope, learning. When I say, 'I am hurt

by what you said yesterday', who is the 'I' that is hurt? Please, kindly listen to this because it's your life, not the speaker's life, but it's your personal life, and we are learning the art of living in which human beings are not hurt at all, so that they have a brain which has no hurt at all, therefore no resistance. You understand the consequences of not being hurt? So who is hurt? You say, 'I am hurt', the 'I' is the image that I have built about myself. Right? Are we together in this? You have images, haven't you, about yourself, that you are a Christian, that you are a Buddhist, you are a Hindu, or Muslim, you must be a great man, you are a great man - you have all kinds of images. If you are a professor you have got an image about yourself, if you are a scientist you have an image about yourself, if you are a housekeeper and so on, you have images. And it those images that get hurt, and the image is you. Right? Are we clear on this matter? You get hurt because you are the image that you have built about yourself. I sit on a platform - I have sat on a platform all my life, unfortunately - and somebody comes along and says, 'You are an ass, and you think you are a great man, you have got a reputation, you are rather a silly old man', if I have an image about myself as a great man that image is going to get hurt, and I say, I am hurt. So is it possible - please listen to this - is it possible not to create images at all? Not to have an image about yourself at all, that you are great and all that, that you are rather a shady politician, or that you are a religious man - not to have a single image. Have you ever tried it? Because the brain creates, thought creates these images because in those images there is security, at least thought thinks there is security in those images. Right? And these images get hurt therefore there is no

security at all.

So is it possible not to have a single image? The image is the recording process in the brain: you say something to me which is pleasant, it is recorded, and when you say something very friendly you become my friend, recorded; but if you say something not pleasant you are my enemy. Right? That's recorded. So the recording process goes on all the time in the brain because if you don't record and depend on that record for security, where are you? You understand my question? Are you following all these questions? If you have no image, where are you? You are nothing. Right? You are absolutely nothing and because of that fear of being nothing you create images, because all of us want to be something. And so we create images, hoping that in those images there is security, and one finds those images get hurt and therefore security is gone. Now you have listened to this, listened, and in the listening you are becoming sensitive to the fact, and you see the truth of it, not the description, not the explanation, but you see the fact that you are hurt, and you are hurt because you have an image about yourself, and as long as you have an image it must inevitably get hurt. If you listen to this carefully, attentively, there will be no building of an image at all because you see the truth of it. It's up to you.

We ought to talk over together, or rather listen together, whether it is possible in life, living in the modern world with all the extraordinary things that are going on, and all the brutality, the violence, the beastliness of things that we are all doing, is it possible to end sorrow. Mankind has suffered for thousands and thousands of years, we have evolved in suffering, we have had

wars for the last five to six thousand years historically - and imagine the number of people killed, wounded, maimed and all the people who have shed tears. And in our daily life we suffer a great deal. Suffering isn't merely physical. One has a disease, either it gets cured or it doesn't and you put up with it, if you can. But sorrow is much deeper than that. Sorrow is remorse, regret, guilt, feeling of guilt, pain, and the feeling of desperate loneliness. Sorrow isn't something that you casually put aside, like physical pain, if you can; but sorrow is something that is extraordinary. So we are together going to investigate it. It is not the speaker is going to investigate it and you just listen to it, but together so that both of us understand the depth, the extraordinary vitality of sorrow, the shock of sorrow. (Noise of engine) Do you listen to that noise, to the roar of that engine, or do you resist it? If you listen to the roar of that engine you will also listen carefully to the speaker because both are sounds.

So sorrow is a very, very complex affair. Sorrow that exists between a man and a woman; though they may be married and so on, there is a certain intimidation, certain fears. Where there is possession there must be fear. If the wife possesses her husband, and the husband possesses the wife, or the woman and the man, in that possession there is fear, there is sorrow. Sorrow isn't just a passing intermittent shadow on life, but it is there always in all of us. And is that sorrow, the pain, the loneliness - please you are not listening to me taking notes on a pad in your brain, we are examining together, so you are entirely involved in it, because we are talking about your sorrow, not my sorrow. And this burden, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the despair, the depression, the

guilt, the remorse, all that, all those feelings, all those reactions, contained, held in that one word. The pain that you can never become the head of something, the pain of your own incapacity, the pain of not being able to do certain things which you want to do, the pain of ignorance, not the ignorance of books but the pain of ignorance of oneself. All this is sorrow. And also the sorrow when the husband leaves the wife and has left the children, the sorrow of divorce, and the sorrow of loneliness.

Do you know loneliness? Or is that a strange reaction? You all know what loneliness is, you may be head of some institution, or you may have a great many friends, and when you are walking by yourself on the beach or in the wood you suddenly feel utterly unrelated to anything, alone, solitude, lonely. All this is contained in that word `sorrow: the pain, the grief, the tears, and the laughter too. And man has lived with it, he is conditioned by it. And after these fifty thousand years since man has come into being, man, which means woman too, man has carried this burden. He may go to temples, he may try to escape from it, pray, worship, but that sorrow is always there. My son dies, and I shed tears for the rest of my life. The wife has left me, or the husband, or my lover, if you know what love means, and that is enormous pain.

So we are asking, not casually, not merely verbally, but we are asking a question out of our heart, whether that sorrow can ever end. It can end completely, with the ending of sorrow there is passion. That very word `sorrow' contains that word `passion'. Where there is sorrow there cannot be passion, where there is sorrow there cannot be love, where there is sorrow there is cunning evasion, escape; with the ending of sorrow there is passion. And

that passion is love. Where there is suffering you cannot love another, you may pity another, that sorrow is self-pity, self-concern, but the ending of it. Then you will ask, naturally: how is it to end? That's a wrong question because then you are asking - the word `how' means, show me a method, show me a practice, show what to do. But if we are investigating together, learning together about the whole phenomenon of sorrow, not escaping, not trying to find comfort, when that thing happens, sorrow when a friend with whom you have been very friendly dies of cancer, and there is the feeling that he is gone. Now sorrow is a challenge and it is a shock, both biologically and psychologically: my son is gone, it's a shock, and the fact is he is gone, and to hold that sorrow in your hands as you hold a beautiful flower so that the whole depth and significance and the strength and the beauty of that by holding it, not escaping from it, then you will see out of that holding in your hand, as it were, the whole movement, the reaction, then you will see that sorrow becomes something totally different.

And then there is love, then there is compassion. And love and compassion have their own intelligence. Not the intelligence of cunning thought, not the intelligence of human beings who can put machinery together to go to the moon, that intelligence is something entirely different, it is outside of the brain because love is not in the brain, love is not thought - we will talk of that later.

And also we ought to talk over together death. Some of us are getting old, aren't we, including the speaker. There are a lot of young people here: death is common to all of us, the old, the young, the about to be born, at the end of a journey death is there, you can't avoid it. That's one definite fact. Think if all the people

who have lived on this earth had not died! You understand what I am saying. If all the people who existed before us had lived what kind of earth would it be?

It's a very complex question. Are you interested in it? Or you say, please, don't go into a morbid subject? You and the speaker are going to die, some day, through accident, through disease, through wearing the organism out. And slowly the decaying of the brain, gaga-ism, forgetting, becoming senile. We are using the word `senile' scientifically, not as an insult. So death is waiting. And why is it that all human beings are frightened of it? Please, this is a conversation between you and me and the speaker. Aren't you frightened, scared? If you are honest, and if you say, look, we are all getting old, terrible war may happen, nuclear war, if there is such a thing - one hopes there will be no such thing - the earth might cease to exist. The scientists have written about it. If there is a nuclear war that's the end of the earth. No demonstrations, nothing, if the politicians have their way, and if you are all nationalists, tribalists, broken up, you are helping that war to come into being, you are responsible for it. Don't escape from that fact. As long as you are a nationalist, belong to different religions you are inviting this war.

So death is a great phenomenon, like birth. So one asks, why have we, living, put death far from us? Right? You are asking that question. We are living, active, if you call acting going to the office every day, struggling, fighting, angry, bitter, cynical, and why is it that we have separated life as a thing and death as something else? Why is there this gap, long years? What is important, the ending or what? The ending, which is death. Which

is important? Isn't the living more important than dying, isn't it? No? Right? You don't seem to react to anything. A most extraordinary phenomenon! We are asking seriously, not flippantly, not cynically, or just for argument: which is important living or dying? If you could reply, you would say, living, naturally. So what is living? What is your living, what's your life? Don't go off and say, what is living and make a theory of it, speculate and quote somebody or other, what's your life? That's what you call living. Your sensory responses, your sexual responses, your theories, going to the office from 9.0 o'clock until 5.0 o'clock for the rest of your life, the next sixty years - think of the horror of it. And you say, yes, that's my responsibility because I have got children, wife, uncle and aunt I must support, you know what you all say. Struggle, pain, sorrow, pleasure, laughter occasionally, joy occasionally, concern with yourself. Right? Accumulating knowledge, nothing new, nothing fresh, alive. This is your life. And to you that is far more important than dying. Face it, sirs, look at it.

So death comes to you, to us, to every living thing, even these marvellous trees will die some day. There is, in California, a tree, sequoia, which is over five thousand years, a marvellous tree, full of age, history and the beauty of it. That also comes to an end. We are always beginning and ending. Right? So death is something that's final and ending. But we don't want to end so drastically, finally, so we believe in reincarnation: I will live next life, a better chance, I will become the prime minister next life, I will be the guru of gurus next life, I will attain enlightenment next life. Right? So the organism, biologically there is an ending to it, the physical

organism, and also biologically as a matter of fact the brain, matter, is also being worn out by constant struggle, constant conflict, degenerating. Knowledge is one of the factors of this deterioration of the brain because we depend so much on knowledge. We said the art of living is to put things in their right place. You need knowledge to write a letter, to do your business, you need knowledge to go to the temples, the knowledge has created the gods inside the temple and the mosques and churches. So one of the factors of the brain becoming old is the accumulation of knowledge. Take it sir, listen to it, find out. When you say, I know my wife, what have you done, you have never looked at her, you have already created images about her.

So there is death and there is living. The living is also becoming more and more dangerous, more and more painful, more and more uncertain, confused. This is our life - quarrelling, struggling, anxious, sorrow, pain, remorse, guilt and so on, this is what we call living. And we say, look, dying is the ending of all this. And we say, I, there is in me something permanent that will go on next life. But you never examine what is the 'me', what is the self. Actually, if you examine it, explore it, question it, doubt it, not accept the old tradition, what are you actually? Face it, sir, don't be nervous. You are your name, your body, your knowledge, your job, your anxiety, your pain, you are all that. You are the words, the picture, the images, and these words, the accumulation of this bundle, you want to carry on next life. Is there a next life, as you want it? Or is there no death at all? Oh, you don't understand this. I'll show you, we'll talk about it.

To live with death, not commit suicide, I am not talking about

that, silly stuff - to live with death. Death means the ending, you can't take your money with you, you can't take your family with you, you can't take all your wealth with you, your house, your property, your knowledge, death is coming and wipes away all that because your brain, because it has not enough oxygen, withers. So is it possible - please listen to this - is it possible to live always ending? That is, you are attached: you are attached to your wife, you are attached to your money, you are attached to your ideas, conclusions, your ideals, you are terribly attached. And death comes along and says, wipe out all that my friend, you are dead. You have to wipe all that out unless you believe in next life. If you believe actually in next life you have to live correctly now. Right? Right, sirs? Because you are going to pay for it next life if you don't do it properly now. But you don't believe in reincarnation actually, it's just a lovely conceptual idea. But if you really believed in it you would be living a life of tremendous integrity, saying exactly what you mean and doing exactly what you think. But you don't believe in reincarnation, it's just a theory, as so many theories you have. You might ask the speaker, do you believe in it, as inevitably you are going to ask. I have no belief, the speaker has no belief about anything. Because where there is no fear, where there is no sorrow, there is something totally different, and that has no death. Compassion is not, my compassion, love is not, my love - love is love. Intelligence is not mine or yours, it is intelligence.

So where there is the ending of all this there is the other. So you are attached - not to your bank account, don't take that - you are attached to your wife, can you tell her or him, 'I am no longer attached to you'? What would happen if you told her or him this?

Do it, sir, find out. What would happen? Both of you would get terribly angry, or terribly jealous, or you are attached to somebody else. But death is going to free you from attachment. So while living daily to end attachment. You understand what I am saying? I am attached to this house, if I am, I am attached to my reputation, if I am, and to live is to end attachment. So I am living and at the same time dying. You understand that? So that the two are never separate. So that implies a movement which is not of time. Love is not of time, love isn't something put together by thought. Thought is of time. Love is not in the brain, love is something outside of the brain. And to live means also the ending. If you see the truth of this, not say, 'I will die, I will get unattached' - that means nothing - but if you see the truth of it, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the strength of it, then the brain becomes unconditioned, it's not conditioned then through attachment; it is conditioned as it is, as your brain is conditioned to be a Hindu, to be a Muslim, to be a Christian and so on, your brain is conditioned, a conditioned brain cannot possibly know what love is. You may have sympathy, you may have pity, you may have various expressions of communication, of affection. Love is not sentiment, love is not emotion. It is as strong as death.

And so to live at the highest level which is freedom, freedom from all the petty things of life, but I have to earn a livelihood. As society is put together, structured, I have to earn a livelihood, I will do it, but that's not the end as you make it, earning money, power, position. Have you ever considered whether power is evil, power of the politicians, your power over your children, your wife or husband, power in any form. The temples have power over you, so

the temples are evil, or the churches because they have enormous power over your mind, over your brain, it's like a dictator, like those totalitarian states where you are not allowed to think and act and be a free human being.

So when you understand the whole way of living, the art of living, actually, daily, the art of living, not the theory of living, not the speculation, not the theories and all that, but the actual living of your daily life; not to be hurt, to end all sorrow and to understand and live with death, then life is something of an extraordinary thing that you can never imagine or think up. Life then is something eternal, which has no time, no beginning and no end.

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH JANUARY 1984

I suppose one must talk. We began these talks with the enquiry: religion and peace on earth require a great deal of intelligence. Peace on earth has not been possible for man for thousands and thousands of years, nor has religion, what is accepted as religion, brought peace to man. There have been religious wars, religions have killed people, blessed canons, war ships, religions have tortured, burnt people, humanity, and all religions talk about peace on earth. And apparently we never seem to have peace on earth. This is a fact. Neither in society nor in the environment, which we are slowly, carefully destroying, nor is there peace in ourselves. And we began these talks with enquiry into these two subjects.

And if one may again point out, without boring you, that this is not a lecture about religion, or philosophy or what is peace and so on. It is not how you should think or what you should think, but rather together you and the speaker enquire into this very complex question of what is religion and if it is possible not only to have peace in the world but primarily in oneself. If there is not peace in us, inwardly, psychologically, then we create a society which has no peace whatsoever. It is becoming more and more diabolical, more and more destructive. We human beings have become more and more cruel, more and more careless, indifferent. And religions have tried to tame man. There have been various commandments, various sanctions, the so-called religious books throughout the world have said, do this, don't do that. And fortunately, or unfortunately, we have never obeyed them, we just quote them,

they become nice slogans for political or religious purposes and we carry on as we are, thoughtless, indifferent, callous and rather brutal in our own activities and thoughts. And the speaker has put religion and peace at the end of the talks, generally, because we have been through the whole complex problem of living, daily living; relationship we talked about, how important it is, without right relationship there will be perpetual conflict between man and woman, between society and each one of us, because society has been built together, put together, structured according to our desires, we have made it. And we have been through fear, whether it is at all possible for human beings to be utterly free of fear, and we said it is possible. And also we talked a great deal yesterday evening about suffering, the enormous suffering that man has borne throughout his life and past generations, and perhaps the future generations.

And we should talk over together as two friends, not trying to convince each other of anything, not trying to do any kind of propaganda, trying to convert one to one's own point of view, but together, sitting down under a tree, talking about not only their daily travail, their daily toil, their daily misfortunes and incidents and unhappiness and depression, but also the two friends are talking about their religion, what is religion, and whether it is possible for human beings who have lived so long on this beautiful earth, whether it is possible to have peace at all, not only in themselves, in their lives, in their attitudes, in their way of daily living, whether it is possible to have peace, quietness, without any conflict, without any problems. And we are together this nice evening going into all this.

Please bear in mind that the speaker most respectfully points it out to you that he is not investigating, together you and he are exploring into this very complex problem of what is religion and if there can be peace in the world. Because you are the world, the world is not separate from you. What you are the world is, what you are in daily life the world is. That is, whether you are an American, Russian, Chinese, or Indian or Muslim or whatever you are, each human being suffers, goes through a great deal of anxiety, always seeking security, both psychologically and outwardly. And that security is being gradually denied through wars, through terrorism, through all kinds of unspeakable things that are going on in the world. And fundamentally if we as human beings do not change our whole way of living, our attitudes and expressions and outlook, we are going to create a world that is going to be destroyed. I do not know if you have not read or talked to some top scientists, many of them are saying, the speaker has talked to some of them, if there is a nuclear war the whole earth will be destroyed, the whole earth, including your favourite country - India, Russia, America, the world will be totally destroyed. This is not a threat, this is what is taking place between politicians, how to juggle this. And there have been books and articles, in America specially, and I believe in Russia also, what would happen to man if a bomb fell in a particular city ten million people will disappear altogether, vaporized, a hundred million round the centre will be hopelessly ill, their eyes melting and so on, all the horrible things.

So we should as human beings, living in this world, controlled by scientists and politicians, shaped by our thinking, by newspapers, magazines, and by the owners of temples, whether it

is government owned or individually owned, we ought to talk about all this together, and one believes that you are here for that purpose, not just to listen, just to hear a few words and go home and pursue the same thing that you have been doing, but rather thinking things out together, not intellectually or romantically or imaginatively, or theoretically, but actually find out.

So first what is religion? The root meaning of that word is not very clear. But we know, we have some perception of what religion is, as it is now; rituals, meaningless utterances, prayers, asking god to help you, and you pay in return something, either in coin or through some kind of sacrifice, take vows and so on - quid pro quo, you give me this and I'll give you that. And religions, as they are now, most of them believe in god, probably you all do. Right? Would the speaker be accurate if he asked you if you believe in god, most of you? Silence! Most of you believe in god, you never ask why. If there is no fear in your heart, absolutely no fear, would you have gods? And gods are created by thought. Go to any temple, any mosque, or any cathedral, and all the things apart from architecture - the great cathedrals of Europe have marvellous architecture, structures so enormous and so marvellous, great dignity, like some of the Indian temples and mosques, all those external things are created by thought, good architects - anonymous. You don't know who built the ancient temples of India, or the most beautiful mosques in the world or the cathedrals, but what is inside these temples of the world is put together by thought - their rituals, their costumes, their idols, are all put together by hand or by thought. And thought, as we said, is a material process. I do not know if you have gone into it, if you

have you must have perceived for yourself. That thought is contained in the brain cells as memory, knowledge, experience. We went into that very carefully. And whatever thought has created, which is your gods, your rituals, your prayers, and all the books, religious books of the world have been put together by thought. You might say, they are divine revelations, straight from the horse's mouth, but it is still thought that has put those words in the book.

Thought is a material process because it is the result of experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain. The cells of the brain carry these memories. So god, prayers, all the things that are contained in churches, temples and mosques are put together by thought, whether that thought be ancient or modern it is still thought. So what has thought done? Invented the image then worships the image. You understand? Through imagination, through fear, through longing, through this search for some eternity where there might be peace. Thought has done all this. So thought creating the images, whether by the hand or by the brain, then worships the very thing which it has created. Obvious. So you are playing a game, which doesn't affect your daily life at all.

So what has religion to do with your daily life? If religion is something in the temple and all that and your life is entirely different, what takes place? Theories, concepts, conclusions, which are entirely divorced from one's activities, business, science and so on. Naturally one becomes hypocritical. May I use that word without insulting? This is what we have become, say one thing, which is to prayer or worship, and do exactly the opposite. And such people call themselves religious, idealists, and they miss the

enormous quality of straight thinking and acting.

So what is religion? Please ask yourselves as two friends talking over together this question, what is religion. Man from time immemorial has sought something beyond all this, beyond the daily travail, beyond his loneliness and despair, his conflicts and anxieties, his everlasting suffering, he sought to put outside all this to find something which is not put together by thought. The ancient Sumerians, the ancient Egyptians, and the five thousand, seven thousand years of Hurafba, you know Pakistan and so on, all sought something beyond. Because pain, suffering, one cannot endure too long, it dulls the mind, the brain, it dulls the quality of love. But man has sought that. And the priests come along, all over the world they are coming, to translate that into daily life. He becomes the interpreter, he becomes the guide, the guru, because we don't know what that is, but somebody says, I know, and we are so gullible - and I hope you are not gullible now - we are so gullible because we are suffering, we want comfort, we want safety, we want certainty, and we are caught by that. And this is what is happening throughout the world. If you are dissatisfied with one structure of religion you turn to the other, if you are a Christian you are fed up with it, if you are sufficiently intellectual - no, sorry, it's very romantic and sentimental, but go to India, there you will find light. You know what is happening here.

So this has been the long struggle throughout the centuries to find something which is not of time, which is not of thought, which is not put together by thought, something totally immeasurable. And you have imagined it, said there is heaven and hell, in heaven there is peace, not on earth, not in our daily life, but in heaven

there is peace. So you have postponed or put away peace from daily life.

So together we ought to investigate this, if you are serious and interested because it's your life. Is there something beyond all this? Is there something that is sacred? We are going to investigate that very carefully. And also we ought to consider together what is peace. The obvious meaning is not to have conflict, not to have pain, not to suffer, not to have everlasting struggle from the moment you are born until you die. That is to have no problems at all, and no conflict. Is that possible? Is it possible to live in this world, not run away from the world, is it possible to live a life, a daily life without a single shadow of conflict? If you say it is not possible, then you have shut the door, or if you say, yes, it is possible, you have also shut the door. But if you begin to enquire, if you begin to explore, neither saying it is possible or not possible, to learn, to go very deeply into this question, whether man, you, living in this town, married or unmarried, family, and so on, job, responsibilities, whether you can live completely at peace with yourself. Of course you can if you are neurotic, psychopathic, you can imagine you are in heaven or believe in some fantastic thing and you live with that, and so you have closed yourself in a belief and imagine in that belief you are living in peace. But all that is rather childish, immature and mediocre.

The word `mediocre' means, the root meaning of that word is never going to the top of the hill but always part of the hill. That's the meaning of the word mediocre. You may be good at your business, as a great scientist, as a philosopher, as a professor, as a good carpenter, but your life may be mediocre. We are not talking

of good professional careers, which you are all good at, but we are talking about mediocrity, a mediocre brain. And not to have a mediocre brain, which is to live at your highest capacity, not your capacity expressed in some business or in some profession, but to live inwardly a life of great austerity, integrity. The word 'austerity' comes from the Greek, which means to have a dry mouth. Which is, those people who are austere generally are very dry, hard, stern, one or two loin cloths, that is not austerity. Austerity is the quality of a brain that is whole, not broken up, that has great depth and integrity and there is no shadow of conflict.

We are going together to examine whether it is possible to live in the modern world without any conflict. What is conflict? Please bear in mind all the time that you and the speaker are having a friendly conversation. And as they are friends, talking about life. You are asking the question, not the speaker. So you are asking the question: what is conflict, why do we live in conflict, are we aware that we live in conflict, or we have become so hardened, so callous, indifferent that we accept everything, the squalor, the poverty, the misery, the confusion, and naturally conflict, we put up with it? But if you begin to enquire whether it is possible to live without conflict then you have to ask - I hope you are asking - what is contradiction? And also you have to ask, as long as there is measurement, which is comparison, there must be conflict. Right? Are we meeting each other? Our life is always based, most of our life is based on comparison; in schools, colleges, universities, you are always compared, your degrees are the result of comparison. And where there is comparison there must be conflict, measure - you are tall, I am short, or I am black and you are white, or pink. It

is always comparison. You are bright, I am not, I want to be bright like you, you look so nice and I am not nice looking. So there is this conflict of comparison. So can you live without a single movement of comparison? Do it, sirs, you will see. Then you will see that what is important is what you are, not what you should be, or what you want to become.

And also conflict arises when there is separation, when there is duality, the opposite. I am this, I will be that; I am violent but I will pursue non-violence, which is the opposite. So is there opposite at all? Are you following all this? Are you interested in all this? Or have you gone to sleep? It's a comfortable place - I hope you are all comfortable. And you have been challenged, questioned, asked, you have to respond. Of course there are so many people you can't all respond at once, there would be too much noise, but if you respond to yourself, find out: is there an opposite at all. There is the opposite, man, woman, dark, light, sun rising, sun setting, but psychologically, inwardly is there an opposite? I know - no, I don't know - people have told me there are some theories that only the enlightened have no opposites. I don't believe it, no, I question it rather, I think that is nonsense. There is only `what is'. That is, violence is the fact, non-violence is non-fact. So the brain has created the non-fact because it is incapable of dealing with the fact. Right? If you know how to put an engine right then there is no problem but if you don't know how to deal with `what is', your violence or whatever it is, then you must invariably invent its opposite, because through the opposite you hope some day to achieve or change `what is'. I hope you are following all this.

So we are saying, there is no opposite, except you are tall, I am

short and all that, physically we are different, but psychologically, inwardly there is only the fact, and how to deal with the fact. If you know how to deal with it there is no opposite. So we are going to investigate together whether we can look at the fact, the fact being violence, fear, sorrow, callousness, concern with oneself. These are all facts. Whether there is heaven, whether one day you will be enlightened - all that is non-fact, it has no meaning. But if that has a meaning and you hold on to it and you are avoiding 'what is' there must be conflict because there is duality. Right? There is conflict when you say one thing and do another, think one thing and act totally differently to what you think. It's what you are all doing. So is it possible to understand violence, fear, which is what we have, not create the opposite but comprehend, learn, investigate 'what is'? If you take any subject, any reaction, like violence, because that is fairly common to all of us, we are all rather violent people, aggressive, we may not be aggressive in one direction but in other directions we are. Now we are violent people, that's a fact. How do you look at violence? Is violence separate from you? If you say, non-violence we are pursuing, that is totally separate from you, because you have no relationship with it actually, but what you are is violence. So can you look at that violence and understand the nature and the structure and the depth of that violence? That is to perceive, apprehend, learn about the whole content of violence. Violence is not only physical but much more psychological, inward. Now what happens? I am going to go into it, if you are interested in it.

I am violent, suppose the speaker is violent, angry, irritated, imitating, conforming - all those are patterns of violence.

Conformity, comparison, anger, jealousy, and so on. That word 'violence' contains all that. Now I am violent, that's a fact. How do I look at it, how do I understand it, how do I explore it? Please do this as we are talking. First of all, is that violence different from me? You understand? Is anger, jealousy, fear, separate from me, or I am that? I know you will say, who is looking. We are going to go into that. First of all we must be very clear that violence is not something apart from me, I am violent. Right? Would you acknowledge that fact? Or you would say, who is it that is witnessing, observing violence? The observer is the past. Right? The observer who says, I am violent, and sees the nature of violence, the observer, the looker, the investigator, is the past, his memories of violence, the word 'violence' is part of memory and so on. The observer is the past. Clear? With the past you are looking at the present violence. Right? The present violence is a reaction, and that reaction you are looking from the past. The past is looking at that. So what takes place? You have used the word 'violence', which is the past, because you have been violent before, and you recognize it - please follow all this carefully - you recognize the new reaction and say, that's violence. So the past memory with its word recognizes the present reaction. So you have separated the present from the past. The observer is the past looking at the present. Right? So there is duality, and so there is conflict. And so they say, how am I to suppress violence, I'll pursue non-violence and all those tricks you play. But actually you are violent, that's a fact. Can you hold that fact, not move away from that fact, that is to observe without the observer. You understand? Therefore to observe without the knowledge of the past. Sir, don't agree, it

requires great attention, great pause, silent observation, to look at violence without a single word, without the whole operation of the past interfering with your observation. The observer is the observed. Right? This is difficult for you to accept or see because all our life we have separated: we are Hindus, you are a Muslim - those are titles, the result of propaganda, but we are human beings.

So is it possible to live without duality? That is, to say one thing and keep to that, not double talk. Remain with violence, understand its nature, look at it, which is, to observe without the past. This requires, as I said, a great deal of attention, the urge to learn, not to condemn.

So we are asking: is it possible to live without conflict? The speaker is saying, it is possible. Which means - I'll make it a little more complex - which means never recording, never recording, whether insult, or flattery, or any incident, psychological incident, never record it. You understand? Are we understanding each other, even intellectually, verbally? The brain is recording, you are now recording what the speaker is saying. You may not be aware of it, you have been recording like a tape on which this talk is being registered. So the brain is recording. Can that recording stop? The recording is knowledge and the recording of knowledge is safety, security. And we are frightened to let go, to look at things afresh. So not to record, not to record when your wife or your husband says, 'You are a fool' - I hope your husband or wife say, you are a fool - not to record that word, or the feeling of that word.

Our brains have become like the computer. The scientists and the experts who are building computers are saying - pouring millions and billions of dollars, both in Japan and America, to

create a computer which is ultra mechanical intelligence, which will think more rapidly than the human being - please follow all this. They are doing it now, India may be fifty years behind or ten years behind, but they are building a computer, computers where they take over most of man's activities, of course they cannot - probably they will - write a sonnet, an ode or a song - probably they will. So the computer is like our brain but not so dull, it's tremendously active, carrying on a small chip thousands of memories. And when the machine can do all the things that human beings do, what's going to happen to the human brain, your brain? You understand my question? For god's sake, react. On the television in America we saw a Japanese car being built: there was a computer and a robot, the computer was telling the robot how to build a car, and the robot was building a car, and the workmen were in white aprons and white gloves, and suddenly the whole machinery stopped, and then the computer says, to the robot, not verbally, that you didn't turn the screw tightly, so the robot immediately tightens the screw and the whole machine goes on. And this is what is happening in the computer world, that computer can outthink, it can invent gods, as you have invented gods, it can play chess, it can do the most extraordinary things. And what's going to happen to the human brain? You haven't thought about it; it's not worth going into because you are not interested.

The human brain requires activity, challenge, either that brain is going to be entertained, entertained when industry is going to take over that brain, as you are being taken over now, sports, cinema, magazines, temples, they are all entertainments, and football, you know, cricket and all the rest of it. Then what is going to happen.

Your brain is taken over by entertainment industry, and it is being done now though you may not be conscious of it. And gradually your brain becomes quite dull, if not already. And either you are going to be entertained, or you turn totally in a different direction, inwardly. If you turn inwardly there is immense infinite everlasting security.

So we are talking about peace. One can have complete peace within oneself, not peace of mind, which is silly, peace which is living, quality, depth, not just superficial quoting of peace. And that can only happen when there is no conflict whatsoever.

And also we ought to talk over together what is religion. And to find that out, go into it very, very deeply, we must talk over together, you and the speaker talk over, have a conversation, what is meditation. The word `meditation' means to ponder over, think over, and also that word `meditation' means measure. You understand? To think over, to ponder over, and also the capacity to measure. And religion has to be understood, not intellectually, not romantically and all that rubbish that is going on in the world, but to find out, to discover, to see the full meaning of that word, that can only take place when there is no fear, when there is no conflict. And to find out - not to find out - for that sacred, if there is anything sacred, to find that truth, not through search, not through various experiences, various gurus, going from one racket to another, but to see the truth of it there must be meditation.

What is meditation? Meditation is generally understood, whether it is Zen or any other form of meditation, Hindu, Tibetan, Buddhist, they all now have become systems, practices. Any system, any system whether it is bureaucratic, or religious, or a

system of thought, philosophy, any system has inherently in it decay, degeneration. You see that happening. So one must be free from all systems to meditate. Right? Will you be free of systems to meditate, or you have your own particular pet method to bring about tranquillity of the brain? Which is, you may have found through meditation a sedation. You understand? Putting yourself to sleep, to hypnotize yourself through repetition. Right? So we are going to find out together what is meditation. The speaker is not telling you how to meditate. The word `how' doesn't exist in spiritual matters. The word `how' implies the method. You have had a thousand methods and that has left you where you are.

So what is meditation? Ask it, find out, we will help each other. Which is, first there must be no authority, no instructor, no one to guide you, therefore you cannot possibly rely on anyone. Right? You have relied all your life and past generations have relied on leaders, on politicians, on gurus, on priests, and where has that left man at the end of it? Still in confusion, still in conflict. So to find out the true significance of meditation is total abandonment of all authority, including the authority of knowledge. You understand this? So that your brain is completely unconditioned, totally free from all tradition, from all sense of becoming. Which is, our brain is conditioned through becoming: you are becoming from a clerk to a manager, from an apprentice to a master carpenter, from a university student in engineering you are becoming head of an engineering department. Physically you have tried to become there, and that same movement is extended psychologically, there we are trying to become something: I am not good but I will be good, I will become enlightened. Enlightenment is not of time,

enlightenment isn't at the end of your life or through various practices, enlightenment is to have a clear brain, uncluttered, uncluttered by knowledge, by thought so that the brain is free. And that is meditation, so that there is no measurement.

I don't know if you have gone into the question of measurement, the whole of the West, the whole technological world of the West, which you are copying here, is based on measurement. If there was no measurement there would be no technology. And the Greeks, the ancient Greeks were concerned with measurement, and they exploded their philosophy, latest discoveries, mathematics and so on, exploded over the West. India said, the ancient people - if I have been told correctly, because the speaker doesn't read all these books, thank god! so he is not burdened with knowledge, with tradition, he can look at things as they are - India said that measurement is illusion. You cannot measure, the speaker is saying this - you cannot measure the universe, you cannot measure with words or thought the immeasurable, or that which is beyond all time. To understand the enormity of it, the grandeur, the beauty, the strength and the immense vitality of a brain that is utterly free, it's got tremendous energy, as in the technological world those who are inventing, searching, asking, exploring, they have immense energy there, but when the brain is free of the self, the 'me', which is essentially the wastage of energy, self-centred activity, when there is freedom from that the brain has got immense, incalculable energy, and there must be that energy, not put together by thought, not through various forms of awakening what you call centres in your brain, you know, kundalini and all that kind of stuff. The speaker knows something about all that. He disregards it totally.

Whereas if there is freedom from conflict, and inwardly there is great silence, and meditation is that, not contrived, manipulated, but silence which is not put together by thought. Silence implies space. The brain must have space, but it has no space when thought is operating, because thought is limited, as all knowledge is limited. So there must be absolute silence and space, which can only take place when there is no measurement, no becoming. And when there is that silence, not the silence between two noises, not the silence or peace between two wars, two conflicts, silence is something totally unrelated to noise. And when there is that silence then there is that which is sacred, which is not measurable by word. This is meditation, and this is religion which has total relationship with our daily life.

NEW YORK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 14TH APRIL 1984

If one may point out this is not an entertainment, this is not help stimulation, but rather it is a serious gathering. And we are not doing any kind of propaganda, or try to convince you of anything, new ideologies, new philosophies, new kind of esoteric nonsense. We are serious and it is important that we together think and observe together, and perhaps also listen together, not only to what the speaker is saying, but also to all the things that are happening in the world, the terrible things that are happening: the confusion, the chaos, politically and economically, and of course religiously it is just a matter of entertainment, stimulation based on belief, dogma, faith and a vast network of superstition. And there is always the threat of war. So we ought to be able together to observe these extraordinary phenomena that are taking place at the present time.

Thinking together is very important because we never meet, either intellectually at the same level, at the same time or meet, think together holistically. We are so individualistic in our opinions, in our conclusions, in our beliefs and dogmas, and so on, which prevent us from really thinking together. I do not know if you have noticed very few people think together, even a husband and wife find it impossible to think together. And even if there were a few of us who really thought together, putting aside our particular idiosyncrasies, particular reactions, and any form of repetitive reactions, if we could this morning at least for an hour or so, put aside our particular dogmatic, assertive, aggressive conclusions, then perhaps we could think together. We are not

trying to convince you of anything. Please believe it. We are not trying to force you, point out, or even try to help you. But rather if we could actually think together. It would be a marvellous thing if we could; very few people have succeeded. Either we disagree or agree. This is not required, as agreement or disagreement, when we are thinking together, thinking, actually thinking together, not being instructed about what to think, or guided, which is the function of a lecture. A lecture is intended to inform and to instruct. But this is not that kind of affair.

If we could think together, listen together, and perhaps learn together, first what is actually happening in the world. We are responsible for all the mess, the confusion, the misery, and the terrible things that are happening. And what is the responsibility of those who observe, not merely intellectually, verbally, but observe with their whole being, with their mind and their heart. Observe, feel, understand and act. What is our responsibility? Are we American looking at the whole world, British, French, German, Russian, with their nationalistic divisions, tribal glorification which is nationalism. Or are we looking at this whole phenomenon as human beings first, not as a scientist or a philosopher or psychologists, and so on, as a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and all that business, but as human beings looking at this extraordinary world which human beings have created, the society in which we live with all the uncertainties, contradictions, poverty, injustice - to look at it as human beings. Could we do that this morning, forget your particular nationalistic, patriotic nonsense, all religious conclusions with certain faith, dogma and beliefs, not be anchored at all to any of this? To look at the world we have

created, so freely, so intensely and perhaps passionately, so that we are together, not the speaker is saying something to which you agree or disagree, but together see what is happening?

As one travels around the world meeting so many people with all their different characteristics, with their superstitions, and beliefs and dogmas, and so on, one wonders why human beings, who have lived on this earth according to the archaeologists and so on for 45,000 years and more, why during all that duration of time we remain what we are. Though technologically we have advanced tremendously. But externally we have extended the capacity of the brain, which requires tremendous energy to build all the instruments of war, all the beneficial effects apart from war to help man to live more comfortably, more healthily, and so on. But when we look at ourselves after 45,000 or 50,000 years, after great evolution, not only biologically, externally, why is it that we are what we are now, worshipping tribalism which is called nationalism, frightened, insecure, killing each other in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of some ideologies, aggressive, brutal, violent, suspicious, and utterly insecure, carrying the great burden of sorrow? This is what we are now and very few have gone beyond all that, very, very few. And the vast majority of mankind lives in misery, starvation of which you know nothing about in this country. Perhaps those who are poor have a certain social security, but you go to the East there is no social security. The population is multiplying every year in India by about 15 million people. Poverty is extensive. Violence is spreading more and more. The world is becoming dangerous. And looking at all this, as probably you also look and listen, in

newspapers, magazines, news broadcasts, and soon, what is our responsibility? What shall we do together, not one individual, or try to gather those people of the same perception and form an institution, an organization? We have had a great many institutions, a great many people who will tell us what to do, leaders, political, religious leaders and so on. We have had them by the thousands and yet we remain what we are. This is a fact. This is not some fantastic opinion of a particular speaker. This is so. This is actually what is going on.

So one looks around seriously, wanting to be committed to some kind of action, not for a day or two, or a month, or a year or so, but committed continuously for the rest of one's life, undeviated, not persuaded by demagogues or people who promise you heaven and so on, all that business, but a few, perhaps many even, who are seriously concerned and dedicated, giving one's life to find out what is right action, what is our responsibility to this society which we have created. Society is not different from us. We are society, because we are aggressive, brutal, violent, frightened not only of living, but frightened of death. And realizing all this, not superficially, and listening.

There is an art to listening, not only to what the speaker is saying, but to listen to one's own responses, to one's own fears, to listen, not only to the birds, and the ripple of water, and see the beautiful landscape, but to listen so completely that there is no barrier between you and that which you are listening. The art of living is far greater than any other art. And we never have spent perhaps a days or two, or a month or so, to find out what is the art of living. There is an art of living. One has spent years and years to

become a scientist, you go to monasteries and spend all your life there, or spend one's whole life earning a livelihood, which is a vocation of imitation, to become a surgeon, a doctor, spend ten to fourteen years, and we never learn, or even spend a day to find out what is the art of living. And together, this morning, we are going to find out. Not that the speaker is going to point it out, and therefore you agree or disagree, but together find out. And we are going to talk together, not only about relationship between human beings, we are going to talk over together fear, whether there is an ending to fear, talk over together all the movement of pleasure, and whether there is an ending to sorrow. And also we are going to talk over together what is religion, and what is meditation, and to find out if there is something most sacred, which is untouched by thought, something that is infinite.

We are going to talk all these matters over together in these two talks, this morning and tomorrow morning. And merely talking about it has no value; one has written books and books and books, there have been a thousand gurus, which is the most silly form of profession! There have been thousands of priests, popes, every form of psychology, from the most ancient Sumerians to the present day. There have been a thousand gods, specially when you go to India, they have about 300,000 gods, and you can have fun with them, depending on your pleasure you can choose any one of them. And in the western world there is only one entity, which becomes rather tiresome. And we are going to talk all these matters over together. Please the speaker means together, which means you have to exercise your own brain, not just go to sleep. We are not persuading you, we are not trying to tell you what to think, or

direct. We can only think together when we have no motive, which is extraordinarily difficult. Because all of us have motives of some kind or another, which ultimately prevents a communication. There is not only a verbal communication, which is what is going on now, but also a communication non-verbal, which requires, on the part of each one of us, not only to hear the word, the content of the word, the meaning, the significance of the word, not only etymologically, but what the word conveys to each one of us. And whether the word distorts our perception. So one has to be extraordinarily aware if we are going to investigate together into all this. So please, if one may remind you again, this is not an entertainment of any kind, but you are used to being entertained - every evening on the television, that is entertainment, you sit by the hour looking at the beastly thing. And you are being influenced, coerced, consciously and unconsciously. And to be aware of all this that is going on around us, not to be shaped, not to be conditioned, which we are conditioned. And that conditioning is being more and more emphasized, given strength. We are Americans, the American way of life; so do the English say, so do the French, Italians, the Russians, and the whole of the East is imitating the West. To be conscious of all this. Not as information, not as data accumulated, but as human beings. Can we together this morning be active, not only intellectually but also active with our innermost feelings?

So, first let us look at ourselves, because we are the result of thousands upon thousand of years. Our brains have been evolving and our brains have extraordinary capacity, as is shown in the technological and scientific world. Extraordinary things are

happening, destructive, diabolical, and also helping man to live a better life. We never spend a day or even a few hours looking at ourselves actually as we are, not according to any psychologist, philosopher, or any book or any expert. I don't know if you have noticed what is happening in this country? There are so many specialists here. If you have a headache, you go to a specialist. If you have a sex problems, there are specialists. How to bring up a child, how to feed a child. I don't know if you realize all this. We are becoming slaves to specialists, experts, and so we are losing the real quality of freedom. So we are going to talk over together all this. Where shall we start, knowing that you as a human being have created this society and you are losing your relationship with nature. Where shall we begin? Something exotic, theoretical, problematical, or shall we begin with the nearest thing that we have, which is you and another, you and your relationship with another? Shall we begin there? Or do you want to begin with god? God is the invention of man - we'll go into it when we talk about religion.

So we must begin very near to go very far. The very far is not in time. Time is a very complex process. The now, the present, contains the past and the future. The future is what you are now. What we are now is the past, past memories and so on. Either we begin very near, that is me, you, and observe not in terms of time, either chronological or psychological, but observe, be sensitive, be alive to the actual fact of what you are. For if we do not bring about a mutation in the present, a mutation psychologically, so that the very brain cells themselves are deeply changed, if we do not do it now, the now being the whole of time, then the future is what we

are now. I wonder if you understand? Right? Are we seeing this together? Not agreeing. Do we see this fact? The tomorrow is the today. Either it is repetitive, going to the office every day, from nine to five, or to the factory, and so on, labouring, and if there is no mutation now, there will again be the same repetitive action tomorrow. So the future is what is now. Right? Do we see this fact together? We all want to become something, either a successful businessman making lots of money, or begin to change ourselves into what we should be, the becoming. The becoming takes time. And is there any becoming at all? There is becoming physically, externally, from a clerk to an executive, from an ordinary man into a so-called saint and so on. Outwardly, there is becoming, but inwardly is there becoming at all? The becoming implies time and this quality of time distorts our thinking. I wonder if you are following this? May I go on with it or is it all that I am talking and you are just listening?

We are trying to find out together what is change, what is a mutation in the brain cells - the biologists are going into all this. Does change, mutation, demand time? Once you think or feel according to time, then the future is what we are and therefore there is no mutation, no radical change at all. So we are asking: seeing what we are, actually, that is our consciousness, which is what we are, our consciousness is all the biological and physiological responses, all our beliefs, faith, dogmas, rituals, and so on. Also all the network of fear. Observe it for yourself please. The expert is not talking. The speaker is not an expert, thank god! But we have investigated a great deal into this matter, for over sixty years. The speaker is not a learned person, he has not

accumulated all this through books, but observing, listening.

And we are asking: I am this, my consciousness is this, fear, pain, pleasure, and all the varieties of fear, all the nationalistic, tribalistic responses, prejudices, black, white, pink and purple and all the rest of it, we are all that. Suffered, violent, cruel, bitter, cynical, and we are always trying to change that into something else like violence, trying to change violence into non-violence, which is to become. The becoming involves time. We are questioning seriously into this whole meaning of time. If there is no time at all as tomorrow or the next second, then what is change? You understand? Either that change is instantaneous or there is no change at all. That is what we are going to find out.

We said we would start with relationship between man, woman, between human beings whether they live here or far away in the Eastern world. What is relationship? Relationship is the most important thing in life. It is an art, and without relationship you cannot possibly live. The monk who goes off into a monastery is related to a belief, to a dogma, to a saviour, he is related. Or the man who is married with children, sex and all the rest of it, he is also related. The scientist is related; he specializes in one discipline that takes most of his life and all his thinking capacity, but also he is related to his wife or to his friend or his girl-friend and so on. So what is our relationship? Are we related at all? How can there be a relationship with another if you are individualistic? Go into it, sirs. If you are thinking about yourself all the time, which you are - your success, your business, your worries, your problems? And she is also doing the same thing, with ambition, greed, individualistic pursuits, individualistic fulfillments. This is what we call

relationship - the pleasure, encouragement, dependence, possessiveness, jealousy, anxiety, irritation and noise and all the rest that goes on in relationship. If one is aware of all this, which I doubt very much if one is aware, if one is really actually concerned to find out what is actual relationship, apart from this. This obviously is not relationship. You may sleep with somebody, with all the pleasure and pain of it. So is relationship the building of images between you and another? You have built an image about another, wife, or girl, or whoever it is. You have built an image. A relationship may be of one day or twenty, thirty, forty years, and gradually you have built day after day an image about her and she about you. These images have a relationship with each other, but actually there is no relationship. We have to face all this if we are going to discover for ourselves whether there is a possibility of deep mutation in the very brain cells themselves. This is what the biologists are asking; they are experimenting with all this. But if we do not discover things for ourselves, we depend on chemistry, on specialists, and therefore we become so utterly insensitive and superficial. So, is it possible to live with another - please, go into it with me, we are thinking together - is it possible to live with another without a single image, picture, thought? Then only is there a direct relationship without any barrier. To find out the art of living, you have to enquire into the whole question of thinking. Probably you have never even asked that question.

What is thinking? Why has thought dominated the world and also in our relationship, however intimate it may be? What is thinking, not thinking along a particular line, or a particular discipline, thinking about something. We are not asking to think

about something, but actually thinking per se? What is thinking? And thought has created the most extraordinary things in the world, all the great paintings, the great cathedrals, medicine, and all the destructive instruments of war. Thought has also brought about communication, surgery, and all the things that are in temples, churches and mosques. Thought has put all that together, the rituals and so on. One has to find out, not be instructed by another, which becomes so silly at the end of it, so superficial, but to find out for oneself what is thinking and why we have given such extraordinary importance to it.

Thinking, surely, is the outcome of memory; if there is no memory, there is no thinking. Memory is stored in the brain, among the cells, and memory is knowledge. Memory is born from knowledge. If you have no knowledge, you have no memory. And knowledge evolves from experience. Experience, knowledge, memory and thought are limited. Knowledge, future knowledge or knowledge expanding itself is still limited. All knowledge, whether in the infinite future, is still limited. There is no complete knowledge about anything, there never can be because knowledge is based on experience, collected, built gradually step by step. So thought is limited. I think we all agreed to that. That is obvious. You are thinking about yourself all day. Meditating is another form of thinking about yourself. I wonder if you realize all this. Thinking about yourself, your problems, your relationship, and so on, that very thinking, being limited, must inevitably create conflict. Anything that is limited is divisive. Are we thinking together, or are you saying: "No, it's not"? Thinking together, not agreeing together. So, thought in relationship is the building up of

reaction step by step, day after day, day after day. That thought has created that image about yourself and about another. That thought with its image, with its picture is the divisive factor in the relationship. This is logical. And being limited it must inevitably create conflict between man, woman, child, and so on.

Geographically, you have divided the world, human beings, into Asia, Europe and America. Thought has divided human beings as Western, Eastern. Thought has divided people as Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, Hindu, Tibetan. Thought has been responsible for all this. Thought, which is born of knowledge, memory, has its place; without thought you cannot go back to your home, you cannot write a letter. If you are a good carpenter, you must have a great deal of knowledge about wood, the quality of the wood and the grain and so on. And has thought any place in relationship with each other, knowing very clearly, logically, sanely that thought is limited and therefore divisive and separates, you and me, and hence everlasting conflict between you and another?

So we are asking, if you still awake and not gone to sleep, we are asking whether thought, being limited, producing, inventing a great many things which are beneficial to man and also inventing terrible things to destroy man - what shall we do with thought? You understand the question? Please ask this of yourself. Don't wait, please, for the speaker to tell you. Seeing what thought has done, beneficially, helpful, and so on in one direction, and also the extraordinary capacity of the brain in one direction, and also the extraordinary energy given to the destruction of man; different ideologies, communist, socialist, capitalist and so on. Ideologies,

spending enormous energy. All this is the activity of thought.

So what place has thought with regard to love? Is love the operation of thought? Is love in the brain? Or is it totally outside the brain? One can only answer that question logically, sanely when we understand whether thought has any relationship - relationship, you may recognize the woman or the man, but when thought takes over the relationship then there is everlasting battle. Not that has been the condition, trained for thousands of years, to live with conflict. You all live in conflict. Meditation is a form of conflict, to go to business, everything that you do either contradicts what you are, or the very self is the contradiction. The 'me', the self, is put together by thought. The 'me' is memory. You may invent it as super me or the extraordinary ultimate me, but it is still put together by thought. Thought, the 'me', is a network or bundle of memories. And so is love memory? Please go into all this for yourself. If it is not, then what will you do with all your memories that you have about her, about him, the insults, the pleasure, you know all that business? What will you do? Just carry on day after day, day after day until you die? What is the factor that will end thought in relationship, if you see that thought is detrimental, dangerous, destructive in relationship? Because thought, being limited, must inevitably divide, separate. If you really see that, not as a verbal statement, but as an actual fact of life, everyday life, then you will inevitably ask what place has thought? Psychologically has it any place at all? And if it has no place in relationship psychologically, then what is love? Is love the factor - please listen - is love the factor that denies totally the separative element in relationship?

Then one has to ask, if you are at all serious, committed to find out all these matters: what is love? Is love desire, pleasure? Is love remembrance? If it is desire, as for most of us it is, you see it on the television everyday, in every book, desire and pleasure, then what is love? Is it a matter to be cultivated? Is it something to be achieved? Give me time and I will learn how to love? I'll go to college, to specialists, they know all about it; that is what you are doing in different ways, somebody is going to tell you what it is.

So we have to go into this question very, very deeply, not superficially just for the day, in passing by. Because that is what the biologists are seeking, a mutation in the brain cells. The brain cells contain all memories, knowledge, experience. The brain cells are the whole content of your consciousness. There must be a mutation in that, which means the brain cells themselves bring about a mutation in themselves. Is that a matter of time? If it is a matter of time, as we have lived for 40,000 or 50,000 years, or whatever the archeologists say we are, no mutation has taken place at all, given time. Time may be the enemy. Time may be the enemy of mutation.

So we have to understand is love desire? And what is desire? Not how to suppress desire, or how to transmute desire, or how to direct it along right channels, or identify desire with some symbol so as to ennoble desire - it sounds rather nonsensical, but you have to understand what is desire, to look at it, find out, go into it. What is desire? It is important to understand this, not verbally or theoretically, but actually, because we are driven by desire. Desire has become so extraordinarily dominant in our lives, desire to be President, desire to be something or other, you know, the whole

worship of success in this country. I don't know if you have watched, know, America has become the symbol for the rest of the world; they want to be like Americans, rich, prosperous, plenty of cars, money; and so this country is the example, and if you take away the superficial layers of an affluent society, you are like the rest, full of desires, contradictions, pain, conflict, uncertainty, and all the rest.

So we must go into this question, if we have time: what is desire? You are still awake, I hope? What is desire? Do you understand how strong it is in our life; the desire for enlightenment, desire for more knowledge, desire for power, status, riches, desire to reach heaven? You know, desire, that extraordinary energy; desire to go to the moon, desire to invent the latest bomb that will destroy the whole of humanity. What relationship has desire to love? Or has it no relationship at all? What is desire? Please bear in mind we are not suppressing, we are not saying it must be translated or changed into some other thing. We are examining the very movement, the birth of desire. We are not analyzing, we are observing. Analysis is different from observation. Analysis implies there is an analyzer and the thing being analyzed. In observation, there is no analysis, just to observe how the thing is born. You understand? Are we clear on this matter? We are observing. In observation there is no observer. If there is an observer in observation, then the observer is directing, the observer is then the past - his memories, his idiosyncrasies and so on. So as long as there is the observer as the past, looking, then there is distortion taking place.

This is complex, you will understand it as we go along. So to

observe without the observer, to observe without the 'me', the 'me' being all the complex memories and so on. We are observing the nature and the structure and the birth, the origin, of desire. There is no desire without sensation. Sensation is born through visual perception, visual seeing, touching, and so on. The sensory responses create the sensation, as in seeing a beautiful woman, man, clothes, cars and so on. The seeing, the contact, then the sensation. Then what takes place? Look at it for yourself. The speaker is not instructing you, we are not telling you; you are observing for yourself. Seeing, touching, contact, sensation - then what takes place? Then thought creates the image that you are in that car, or in that dress, or in that shirt; at that moment when thought with its images takes control or dominates sensation, at that second desire is born. Right? I wonder if you have understood this? One sees a beautiful shirt - a shirt, being a man, I hope you don't mind - one sees a shirt in a shop window, goes inside, touches it, says how nice that material is, how would it look on me. At that second desire begins. Right? Do you see this? Now the question then is: sensation is necessary, it is obvious, physically. If you have no sensations, biological, physical sensations, you are paralysed. There must be sensation; the whole physical organism exists on stimulation and sensation, but when thought gives shape to sensation, at that second desire is born. Right? is this clear? If it is clear then we can ask the next question.

Can there be a gap between sensation and thought giving shape to that sensation, so that there is an interval between the sensation and thought, which is not discipline. Discipline implies, the word discipline comes from the word disciple, disciple, the one who is

learning, learning to see whether there can be a gap between sensation and thought giving shape to the sensation, a gap, and that gap extended? Do it and you will see the fun of it, and the seriousness of it, because we have completely changed the whole question of control.

So, thought giving shape to sensation is the origin of desire. That origin which is desire has nothing whatsoever to do with love. Love is not born of thought. Therefore love has its own intelligence. Thought has its own peculiar intelligence, but the intelligence of that compassion, love, is something totally outside the brain, which is not contained within the limitation of thought.

NEW YORK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 15TH APRIL 1984

It would be good if we could have a dialogue between two people, but as there is such a large audience, it would not be possible.

Because dialogue is very important, so that you ask a question and to that question there is a reply, and to that reply you ask another question and so keep that communication of question and answer going until the question remains without you or the speaker, only the question. That is really a dialogue. But that is not possible here this morning. So we are going to talk over things together, not you accept what the speaker says or disagree, but rather together, as we said yesterday morning, go into this whole problem of living our daily life, not according to any particular ideal or faith or belief, but taking things as they are and observing them very carefully. Perception without the perceiver, we talked about that yesterday morning also. So that when there is that pure perception, that which is observed undergoes a radical change.

We are going to talk over together this morning the art of living, as we said yesterday, which is to have complete freedom, not the freedom of choice, not the freedom of what one wants to do, or likes to do, for that freedom is limited by the environment, by society, by religious doctrines and so on, but freedom is something entirely different. It is not freedom about something or from something, but freedom per se. And when there is that freedom, which we are going to enquire presently, there is the supreme way of living without any conflict, without any problem, heightened intelligence when the brain is fully active, not active in a particular

direction, either scientific or business, or the problems of daily live, but when there is that freedom there is great energy, tremendous energy. And the word freedom also, etymologically means love. And that freedom implies enquiry, as we did yesterday, into the problem of relationship. In that relationship, whether it is most intimate or with your neighbour or with the neighbour of a thousand miles away, as long as there is an image about the person with whom you are related or he has an image about you, when there is that image built, which we were talking about yesterday, there must be conflict.

We have lived with conflict for generation upon generation, not only conflict in our relationship, but conflict with society, conflict with other nations. Nationalism as we pointed out, is tribal worship and that is causing enormous despair, wars, divisions: the Jew and the Arab, the Hindu and the Muslim, the Communist, the Socialist, and the so-called Democrat. There is tremendous conflict going on in the world. This is the society, as we pointed out yesterday, which human beings have built. Society is not something that comes out of the air. Society in which we live is created by every human being, and that society, which is immoral, there is a great deal of injustice, and one questions whether there is any justice at all. You can hire an excellent lawyer for your crooked way, and he will protect you. So one has to question all these problems in life. Society is what we have made of it and we are caught by that thing we have made.

Unless there is a radical mutation, change, a fundamental psychological revolution, not physical revolutions which have led man nowhere, as is shown in the communist world, they have had

many, many revolutions, physical revolutions, they have not changed the psychological quality of human beings. Unless there is fundamental, radical change society will remain as it is now. And we said yesterday too, change implies time, change from this to that, change from violence to non-violence - which is now used for political purposes, invented in India or before India by Tolstoy and others. To achieve, to change violence into non-violence is a long duration of time. Will time change human beings? That is a very basic, radical question. Has time, which is evolution, of 50,000 years or more, has man been changed during that long period psychologically? Obviously he has not. We are very primitive people, quarrelling with each other, wars, wars, endless wars, always in conflict. Psychologically, inwardly, we have not changed, we have changed very, very little. Perhaps, technologically we have advanced immensely, with the atom bomb, telecommunications, the extraordinary explosion of machinery, computers, and so on, but inwardly, deeply, we remain what we have been for ten thousand or more years. Time does not change man. Please, this is a very serious statement; don't reject it.

We are exploring this thing together. To explore deeply, there must be a great deal of scepticism, doubt, not only doubt about what you think, but doubt about your own experiences and prejudices and opinions - doubt about the whole psychological structure that human beings have built in themselves and around themselves. There must be constant questioning. Therefore out of questioning deeply comes freedom, not acceptance, not holding on to one's own prejudices and opinions. Opinions have no value. They are not facts. You can have opinion about a fact, but fact is a

fact; you cannot have an opinion about it; it is so. You are sitting there and the speaker is sitting here, that's a fact.

So, as we said, without freedom - please we are using that word very, very carefully, not the freedom that you have in this country to do what you like, fulfil, you know the whole idea of freedom, choice, movement, status, position, achievement, success, that's only a very, very small part of freedom, it may perhaps be a most destructive freedom if everyone does what he likes, as is happening throughout the world, it will bring about great chaos, which is what is going on.

What is freedom? And as we said that very word, etymologically means, love, from the Ancient Greeks and so on. Freedom implies freedom from, freedom from, let us say, fear. Is it possible for human beings who have lived with fear of various kinds to be completely free of fear psychologically, inwardly? We are asking this question. Please, you are asking this question of yourself: not I put that question to you and then answer that question. You are putting that question to your self, whether human beings, who have lived on this earth for millennia upon millennia can ever be free from fear; fear of insecurity, and seeking security, fear of death and what happens after death, fear of god (god is invented by man, by thought. We will go into that when we talk about it a little later on, about religion.) Freedom from attachment. So let us examine together what is the cause of fear, what is the root of fear. This examination is not merely intellectual, logical, rational, sane; it is not an analysis; it is perception. When you perceive something very clearly and that perception is not guided by prejudice, by a motive or a particular direction, then that

perception acts on the causes of fear. We haven't time to go into all these matters in detail, so we must briefly go into it. What is the cause of fear, the root cause? Not fear about something, or the fear of what might happen, or the fear of not succeeding, fame, you know, all the rest of it, what is the essence, the root of fear? Is it time? Is it thought? Or is there another factor which is neither thought nor time? So first let's examine together, I mean please together, not the speaker examines, then you accept or reject, but together, which has an extraordinary quality when we do things together. When we do things together there is no authority, there is no leader, there is no guru. In the matter of the psyche any kind of authority is destructive; in the field of the so-called - if I may use that rather well-worn and shoddy word, 'spiritual', in that field there is no leader and therefore there is no follower. But when there is an examination together, seeing things together, not according to your prejudice or according to the speaker's prejudice, bias and so on, but actually perceiving together, then there is no acceptance or denial, logical or illogical; it is so.

So we are asking: what is the root of fear? We said is it time? Time being not only chronological time by the watch, sun rise, sunset, but time as a movement. That is, time is the past, the present and the future. In the present all time is contained. If there is not radical change in the present, now, the future is what you are. This is logical, you can see it happening now. And time is a process of thinking also. I have had pain, I have not at present pain, but I might have pain. I am secure, but later on I might be insecure. This movement from the past through the present, modifying itself in the future, is the process of time. And is time different from

thought?

Please, this is a serious question; it is not something to play with; it is not a hobby. Life means living at the highest excellence, at the highest capacity of intelligence and that implies intelligence is born out of love, not out of calculation, design, planned.

So is time, which is a movement from the past through the present and the future, having done something wrong, or having done something pleasant, modifying itself in the present, and going on in the future, I hope to have more pleasure, I hope to have more money. The whole movement is of time. And is thought time? Thought, as we pointed out yesterday, is born out of memory. If there is no memory, there is no thought, and memory is the accumulated knowledge, whether the accumulation be 10,000 years or one day, and that knowledge is based on experience. And as experience is very limited, so knowledge is limited. That is what the scientists are doing, adding more and more and more to their knowledge. Knowledge is never complete either now or in the future; it will always be limited. That is a fact; it is not an opinion of the speaker, or a conclusion; it is a fact, irrefutable. And so thought is limited. As time is limited, thought is also limited. They are both movements, both limited; and as we live human lives in time and thought, our lives are naturally very limited. You may expand it, knowledge may expand, but that which has growth must always be limited. Are we following each other?

Is thought, time, the root of fear? Obviously it is, and man has never been able to solve this question because we have lived with fear from the ape to now. Perhaps some of us are rather ape-ish. So we are asking a very serious question: is it possible to be totally

psychologically free of fear? Do not please agree or disagree. Do not say it is possible; then it is just a theory; or, if you say it is not possible, then you have blocked yourself from further investigation. So, the very question if left untouched by thought - you understand? We have asked this question, whether fear, with which we have lived, with all its darkness, with all its pain and anxiety, fear of death and so on, is it possible to be totally psychologically free of it? It implies, do we actually perceive, not theoretically or verbally, the fact that thought and time are the same - time-thought; they are not two separate movements - to observe, to perceive the root of it which is thought-fear, perceive, not think about it, but to perceive it, which is perception without the perceiver, the perceiver being the past? So when there is the perceiver observing, he is colouring, distorting from his memory and so on. So perception is free from that which is the past as the perceiver. To perceive without the perceiver, that means giving total attention. When there is total attention, not concentration which is something different from attention - which we will go into a little later - when there is complete attention, that attention acts as a flame and destroys completely the root of fear.

Not how to stop thinking, you understand, which is causing fear. I wonder if you understand all this. I was told yesterday that perhaps about two or three per cent understand what you are talking about! I hope not! It is a waste of time on your part, and on the part of the speaker. But if we are moving together, there is an extraordinary movement. It is like a vast river with an enormous volume of water. But when you are working it out by yourself, you are like a little stream; then the river dries up very soon.

And also we ought to talk over together the question of pleasure; pleasure of possession, pleasure of status, sexual pleasure, pleasure of seeing a sunset, pleasure of seeing the beauty of land, the delight of seeing a great mountain with snow caps and the blue sky. It gives great pleasure. And also one has to look at whether beauty is pleasure. What is beauty? I hope you don't mind me talking about so many things. We have limited time therefore we have to include as briefly as possible all the things we have to talk about, yesterday and today. What is beauty? You go into any museum of the world where there is a collection of great pictures and statues, from ancient temples. You look at them, and it gives you, if you have studied art, and you know who painted it, you begin to compare, you see the proportions, the light, the shadow and the colour; all that is perceiving a sense of beauty. But that is only partial. So we are asking: what is the nature of beauty? Does beauty exist, not in the man or the woman, in a lovely face, good manners, dignity, a sense of proportion, the way he talks, the way he walks? In that also there is great beauty. Not in sloppiness - sorry! When you dig deeper, what is it? Is it a pleasure? Is it a delight? Is it something that you experience? Or has it nothing to do with experience, with pleasure? Please, we are asking this thing together, I am not asking and you listening. Because man has pursued beauty all the time, created great art, the Ancient Egyptians, the glory of Greece, and before them, the Ancient Hindus, and the Buddhists, the marvellous temples, the great cathedrals and the beauty of the Catholic mass - all that has been put together by thought. Do thought and the movement of thought show beauty? Or beauty has nothing whatsoever to do with thought

and time? Not in the eye of the beholder: beauty exists only when there is no beholder, when there is no you. Which means when there is total freedom from you, from all your problems, your worries, your anxieties, insecurities, sorrow - when all that is not, the other is. And so beauty, not being of time and thought, is not a matter of pleasure. Pleasure is remembrance of things that have happened and so on.

And also, if you are not too tired, we ought to talk over together the question of sorrow. Man, every human being on earth has carried this burden of sorrow. Sorrow that wars have produced; and these wars have been going on for 5-6,000 years, practically every year there has been a war in this world and they are still going on, with greater destruction of man; ten million can be wiped away in a second. You know all this, you have read about it. And wars have produced great sorrow, tears, people maimed for life. Sorrow of ideologies, ideologies have killed people. This is what is happening now. Wars have been produced by religion. Perhaps, if I may most gently suggest, Christianity has killed more people than any other. Don't get angry, please. And we are still going on with killing each other in the name of god, in the name of country, in the name of some ideal, so-called nationalism which is really glorified tribalism. So there is a great deal of sorrow in the world and each one suffers in various ways. If you have no money, if you are very learned, you want more - so there is the constant struggle for the more. And there is the sorrow of death. Man throughout the world, from the most primitive to the most sophisticated human being, he has sorrow, and that sorrow has never ended. We have not been able to solve that problem. We have never ended the problem.

So we ought to talk over together, briefly for the moment, what is a problem? Why do we have problems - not only business problems, technological problems, problems with man and woman and so on? We have got so many problems. Why? And problems imply solutions; from childhood we are trained, educated, to solve problems. When a boy or girl goes to school they have problems immediately; how to write, how to read, how to learn mathematics, geography - it becomes a problem. Through college, university and so on, our whole life has become a problem. Why? We are seeking out of those problems solutions. Solutions are far more important than the problem. Why? Is it because - please we are thinking together, not the speaker talking about it, we are together in this. Either we drown together, or live together - that we have reached this state in the world? Why has man not been able to resolve problems? Is it that his brain is conditioned, moulded from childhood to solve problems? His brain is conditioned that way and therefore he makes of everything a problem. How to live properly becomes a problem. What is right action becomes a problem. To understand problems one must be free from the mechanical conditioning of the brain, otherwise you are perpetually solving problems, in the solution of problems more problems, as is happening politically, economically, legislation, more problems because our whole brain is structured, conditioned to solve problems. I will leave that question with you to think about - no, not think about, to look at it.

We are asking whether sorrow can end. This question was put long before Christianity, long before any kind of organized religion. Man has always asked this question while he is suffering:

is there an end to all this pain and loneliness, despair, anxiety, remorse, guilt? When asked a question of this kind, that is, is sorrow personal, is sorrow also universal and what is the relationship of personal sorrow to the universal sorrow of man? You understand? When you ask that question: can sorrow end, can the tears of a thousand years, can all that end? That's a question. Where there is sorrow, there is also self-pity. There is sorrow also at the loss of something precious, sorrow of seeing poverty in this world, the sorrow of the politicians who are creating wars - and you are the politicians who are creating wars, not just the politicians on top, we are creating wars. And this sorrow is shared by all humanity. Please, this is a very serious thing, by all humanity it is shared, that means our consciousness with all its biological, physiological responses, with all the beliefs, dogmas, rituals, fears and sorrows, anxieties, loneliness, despair and so on, all that is our consciousness. All that is what you are. What you think, what you feel, your beliefs, your superstitions - all that, the whole content, is what you are, put there by thought, by remembrance, by fear and so on. This consciousness is universal; it is not my consciousness, because wherever you go on this earth, which is so marvellously beautiful, which you are gradually destroying, wherever you go, to the remotest corners of the world, there is sorrow, with great pain, great anxiety and so on. So this consciousness is common to all of us. It is not my consciousness separate from yours, psychologically. You may be tall, you may be short, you may be this or that, you may be a woman or a man, black, white, purple, pink or whatever colour prejudice you have, but inwardly, deeply, we are, we share, the rest of the world. So we

are humanity, not individuals psychologically, although religions have said, both Asiatic religions and Christianity have said separate souls, which is so extraordinarily unreal. The fact is we share, we are humanity, not verbally, intellectually, but in our heart and in our blood. And when there is a mutation you affect the whole of consciousness. This is what geneticists are seeking, how to effect, change man. Mutation implies, or if you don't like to use that word, radical deep psychological change, it affects, when you change radically, fundamentally, it affects the whole consciousness of man because you are humanity.

We are asking whether sorrow can end. Don't answer it, it cannot or it can. Let the question, if you put it vitally, if you put it with all your energy, not just intellectually play with it, when you put that question, with all your being, leave it alone. It's like a seed that you have planted in the earth, you don't pull it up everyday to see if it growing, you will destroy it. But if you put that question with all your seriousness, all your intensity, then that question has its own answer. But we are so eager for an answer. We want to be told how. When you put the question "How" then you are asking for a system, for a method. Then you will fall back into the old routine. Never ask how. If you ask how, then you create authority, a guru. This is very complicated. We are asking if there is an end to sorrow. There is, but not for you, do not say: "Yes, I accept that". You have to dig and leave it alone. Dig and leave it alone.

We ought to talk about death. Why are people frightened of death? Please, you are frightened, don't pass it off. As you get older, either you become a very religious, superstitious human being, or join some cult, or you begin to enquire into what is death,

and why we have separated it from living - the living and the dying. And you postpone, put it far away. Why do we human beings do all this? Is it fear - fear of losing the known, entering into the unknown? So the question is, is it possible to live with death? Careful, please, don't answer this. I am living, you have to understand what is living. Living, as far as we know, is one constant travail, with occasional pleasure, occasional comfort, and if you have money you are more or less secure, but there is always insecurity threatening; going to the office every day for the rest of your life, from nine to five, struggling, competing, quarrelling, hating, loving which is called pleasure, all that: that is our way of living, that is what we know. And we are frightened to let that go. Death means the ending of all that, not only the organism coming to an end, but also all the attachments, all the knowledge, experience. So can one live - please, this is a serious question, not something to be played with - can one live with death and life together, not separate, which means can you live with death so that there is no attachment? Death is going to wipe away all your attachments; your family, your knowledge, your becoming, your fame, all that nonsense. Can we, as we live our daily life, live with death, which is to be free of attachment, of competition, of psychologically becoming, all that, so that there is no interval between living and dying? You understand what it does? You have tremendous freedom and energy. Not to do more mischief, not to get more money, to become famous, that is rather childish - forgive me - but when you live with something that has immense meaning, that is freedom.

And also we ought to talk over together what is religion and

meditation. What is religion? Man from the most ancient of times has sought something beyond the daily existence with its monotony, with its routine, with mechanical habits both physical and inward. Man has said that there must be something beyond all this so he invented god. God - may I go into it without your getting annoyed, or being supercilious - god is invented by thought. If there is no fear of any kind psychologically, absolutely no fear, not a shadow of it, not a breath of it, then is god necessary? Then you ask, who created all this world? We can't go into creation, that requires an hour or so, we can't go into it. So man has sought this. And the priests came along and said: "We will interpret it for you; we will organize it for you; you are ignorant, but we are learned". And the process of that is to dress up, to impress, and also create a great deal of show, different costumes. The ancient Egyptians, and further back the Sumerians, 7-8,000 years ago, they had hell and heaven too. So they said you must believe, otherwise you will go to hell, and they persecuted, killed, tortured. Christianity has done this, you must believe in Jesus, or you are a heretic, doubt is not allowed in the Christian world. If you doubt, then the thing collapses. But the Asiatic world, specially in India, one of the teachings is, you must question, you must doubt, question not only your guru if you have a guru, but question yourself, have a dialogue, never accept. There is no authority except the authority of the truth; not the truth invented by books or by thought or by priests. So they always had dialogues, like the Greeks, the ancient Greeks. they discussed; but their discussion was questioning, Socrates questioned and so on. Now what is religion? If you wipe away all the nonsense and superstitions and beliefs, and that goes

for organized modern religions whether you are a Baptist, Christian and all the rest of that business, wipe away all that and not be a Hindu, a Buddhist or a Christian; it does not mean that you become an atheist; it means you are enquiring, questioning, asking, discussing, pushing, driving, flowing.

Then, is there something sacred? Is there something eternal which is beyond time? Is there something totally untouched by thought? To find out, not you find out - for it to be, there must be meditation. Meditation is not just repeating some words, whether it is Ave Maria and all the rest of it, that is all too immature.

Meditation is something extraordinary. Meditation is the understanding of the whole of life, both external and inward, the understanding of your daily life, your relationships, freeing yourself from fear, and questioning what the self is, the 'me'. Is the 'me' merely a bundle of memories and therefore no actuality?

Please enquire into this, into all this. That is all part of meditation.

The very word meditation both in Sanskrit and in the ordinary dictionary means to measure, to free the mind from all measurement, that is from becoming. I am this, I will be that; that is a measure. Measure is necessary for the whole technological world. Without measure we could not create a dynamo or the atom bomb, or build a car, but psychologically, inwardly, to be free of all comparison, which is measurement. And meditation, when there is this freedom from fear, from all the hurts that one has had from childhood until now, the psychological wounds that one keeps precious, which distort our lives - to be free of all that, to be free of sorrow, pain loneliness, depression, anxiety, all that, that is to be free of the self, the 'me', not at the end of one's life, but right from

the beginning, right from the moment you hear this to live it.

And meditation means an extraordinary activity of the brain, not silencing the brain. When the brain is at its highest quality, full of energy, there is silence, not the silence put together by thought, which is limited silence. In that silence which can only come when there is freedom, there is love and compassion with its intelligence. That intelligence is supreme, but there is no compassion or love if you are attached to some religious organization or belief in something. There must be complete freedom, and in that freedom there is a great, tremendous energy because there is an emptiness - not nothingness, emptiness. In that there is that which is beyond all time. This is meditation. This is religion.

NEW YORK UNITED NATIONS TALK 17TH APRIL 1984 'PEACE IN OUR TIME'

Probably since the beginning of man, human beings have had no peace at all. And there have been a great many organizations, including this organization, to bring about peace in the world, *pacem in terris*. But there has been no peace. For various obvious reasons: nationalism, which is glorified tribalism, various opposing religions, divisions of classes, races and so on. There have been divisions on the earth from the beginning of time: the family, the community, bigger community, the nation, and so on. And also from what one observes, religion has been one of the causes of wars. One sees the Israelis and the Arabs, the Hindus and the Muslims, the Americans and the Russians, ideas against ideas, ideologies opposing ideologies, the communist ideology and the so-called democratic ideologies. Why is it, after all these millenia upon millenia, why is it that human beings throughout the world don't live in peace? Why is it our society in which we live, whether it is the American society, the European, or Indian, or Japanese, that society has not given us peace either. That society, the culture, the tradition, is created by all human beings. We have created this society. We are responsible for this society, which is corrupt, immoral, violent, divisive, cruel and so on. We have created this, this society in which we live. We are the society.

Please the speaker is not a communist in the orthodox sense of that word. We are what we have made of the society. So we are society. That is a fact, not an exotic or stupid, irrational thought. We are society. Each one of us have made this terrible confusing,

contradictory, brutal society. And until human beings, each one of us, radically transforms himself we will have perpetual wars, there will be no peace on earth. Religions have talked about it endlessly. The popes, the priests, local parish clergyman, have talked about peace. This Institution, with all its power, with its position, with its international grasp, this Institution has not brought about peace either. Forgive me for saying this, if you don't mind. And will institutions, foundations, will they ever bring peace on earth? Or it doesn't lie in that field at all - organisations or institutions, propaganda and all the rest of it? Or do we realize, each one of us, I am asking this most respectfully, do we realize that we are responsible for this? Not intellectually, or verbally, or just accepting a theory, but we are responsible for this horror that is going on in the world; every form of violence, terrorism, wars, we are responsible for it. War is not in Beirut, it is in our hearts and minds. This has been said so often, one is rather bored by all that. And we human beings seem to be incapable of living peacefully in our relationship with each other, living peacefully without any dogmatism, ideals, concepts. Because beliefs, faith, conclusions, ideals, have separated man. And man apparently has not been able to live without any of those bondages. Man is conditioned, human beings right throughout the world are conditioned. Their brains have been moulded according to a particular tradition, various forms of superstitions called religion. And is it possible for human beings wherever they live to be free of their conditioning? The conditioning as an American, as a European, Hindu and so on, is it possible for us, who are so advanced in technology, is it possible for us to radically, fundamentally, bring about psychological

change? This is really a very, very serious question. This is what the biologists, bio-technologists are trying to do - trying to bring about a radical change in the very brain cells themselves so that human beings can live peacefully, not everlastingly fight each other.

So facing all this, not abstractly, as a human being, what is he to do actually? Form another group? Another religion? Another Institution? Or as a human being become aware of his conditioning? Be concerned with his conditioning and free the brain from that conditioning? Otherwise we are going to have perpetual wars, there will be no peace on earth in spite of all the religions, in spite of every institution. It must begin with us, not without somebody else out there. So is it possible to bring about a deep mutation in the very brain cells themselves? Why are human beings so conditioned - Germans, French, Russians, Italians, British, Americans, Hindus and so on, why? Is it because we want security, both external and inward? Is there such security inwardly, psychologically to be safe? Is there such security? Or psychological security is an illusion? We can go into all this in detail but our time is very, very limited.

So is there psychological security, either in the family, in a group, in a community, in a nation and internationalism and all that business? Is there any kind of security inwardly? And that is, if we are not sure about that, certain, clear, we try to seek security outwardly, externally, through nations, through religious organizations, through some ideologies. So it is very important, it seems to one, that we should talk over together now and discover for ourselves if there is an inner security - security in our

relationships with each other, however intimate it may be, between man and woman, security in community and so on. Is there security in our relationship with each other, man and woman, wife and husband? If there is security why is there such contention between man and woman, wife and husband, such conflict in their relationship, each one pursuing his own ambitions, his own fulfilments, his own desires and so on. Is it not important to find out for ourselves if there is such security in relationship. If there is such security in this then that security is the beginning of peace. If there is no security in our relationship with each other that is the beginning of conflict, war.

So we ought to really seriously enquire into this question. That is, become aware, conscious, of our relationship with each other because to go very far we must begin very near. And the nearest is man and woman, wife and husband. In that relationship there is conflict as there is now, then that conflict is spread, ultimately war. We have never given thought to this, that as our house is burning, which is society is burning, declining, degenerating, are we all so degenerating? To slide, slip down, implies our whole life is a routine, our whole life is a series of battles, struggles, conflicts. If we don't alter there, how can you bring about peace on earth. It seems to logical, so rational, sane, but we don't do that.

So could we, as human beings, not as Americans and all the rest of that business, could we as human beings become aware, pay attention to our intimate relationship because unless the psychological world is quiet, sane, peaceful, that psychological state will always overcome every kind of organization, whether it be communist organization, totalitarian, or so-called democratic

organization. The psyche is far more important than the external legislation, governments and so on. I wonder if one realizes all this? Do we, sitting here, peacefully, so-called peacefully, realize our responsibility as human beings? The wars that are going on in the world is our war, because our consciousness - if I can go into all this much more deeply - our human consciousness, which is made up of biological reactions, fears, hurts, pleasure, beliefs, dogmas, rituals and endless suffering, that is the content of our consciousness. If you observe this closely it is a fact that every human being throughout the world shares this, every human being suffers, every human being has fear, pleasure, sense of loneliness, despair, anxiety, confusion, every human being, whether they live in the Far East, or here, or in Russia, or in other places. We have been brought up, educated to consider ourselves as individuals. Is that so? Is that a fact? Because we share the consciousness of humanity, because we all suffer, we all go through great agonies, boredom, every form of uncertainty. You may have great talents, great capacities, but behind those capacities lies the ordinary, daily consciousness of all humanity. So each one is humanity, not separate individuals. I know you will not accept this because you have been conditioned from the beginning by religions, by society, by culture, that each one is separate individuals, separate soul. And therefore he must seek his own salvation, his own expression, his own fulfilment. And this so-called separate individuality is creating havoc in the world, which does not mean that we all become the same automatic, turned out in the same mould. On the contrary, freedom is the highest form of existence. It is the greatest art, to live freely. But we are not free. One thinks one is free to do what

one likes, specially in this country, each individual thinks he is supreme to do what he wants. His own fulfilment, the expression of his own desires and so on. But if we examine closely and seriously, we share the consciousness of the entire humanity. Because this is a fact. Individuality may be an illusion. And to that illusion we are committed. But when you travel around and observe very closely, every human being, whether he has great position, great deal of money, status, power, he is like the rest of the world psychologically, he goes through great pain, desperate loneliness and all the rest of the psychological world of uncertainty, confusion. And we are the rest of humanity. We are not Africans and Europeans and all that nonsense. We are humanity. Unless we realize that one major fact in our life, we are the rest of humanity, black, white, purple or whatever colour they be, psychologically we are one. Unless human beings deeply realize that we are going to have wars, we are going to be eternally in conflict, as we are now. And no organization in the world is going to change that fact.

We have had religions all over, various types of religions, Catholic and Protestant, and the division in Protestantism. There have been religions of various types in Asia. All invented by thought. And thought has made man separate because thought is the result of experience, knowledge, memory and so thought is always limited. It is never complete, it can never be complete because it is based on knowledge and knowledge is always finite, limited. It can expand, it can change but it is still within the field of knowledge. And knowledge is always limited. And we try to change the world through our knowledge. And this experiment to

change the world through knowledge has never succeeded.

So what is a human being to do, if you are serious, concerned, with the world, with your own life? What is a human being to do? Form innumerable organizations, with their bosses and their secretaries and so on? Or each one of us is responsible because we have created this society, we are responsible for every kind of war. So is it possible, not merely intellectually, but actually, in our daily life, radically to change, bring about a deep mutation? Unless we are capable of doing that we are going to have perpetual wars. No organization in the world has prevented any wars. For the last historical process there have been practically wars every year for the last five, six thousand years, all over the world. And man has been responsible for these wars. You may not have a war in America, in this part of the world, but you have wars in other parts of the world because we are divided, as Americans and Russians, and English and French and all the rest of it, not only nationally but religiously, Christians, Buddhists, Hindus. So there is this constant division, both outwardly and inwardly, it is bringing about great conflict. We are one human being, not separate. We don't seem to realize that. You suffer, you go through great anxieties, uncertainties, so does every other human being in the world. And we haven't been able to solve that basic issue, whether we can live with ourselves peacefully. Peace doesn't begin on the other side of the world, whether we live peacefully, without conflict.

And I think this is a very important question which we must put to ourselves: why is it that human beings who have lived on this earth perhaps fifty thousand years, we have done extraordinary things technologically, we have done practically nothing in our

relationship with each other? We are perpetually in conflict with each other, man and woman, and this conflict is extended into war.

So we are asking a most fundamental question: why do human beings who have lived on this earth for so many millenia, who have done extraordinary things technologically, who have brought about good health for people, we have done the most incredible things externally, but inwardly we are savages. Forgive me for using that word. We are fighting each other, even in our most intimate relationships. So how can one have external peace in the world, *pacem in terris*, if one is not peaceful in oneself? We never answer that question, we are always trying to bring changes in the outer, but we never ask of ourselves why we live this way, perpetually in conflict. It is fairly obvious when you ask that question seriously, not casually, we never spend a day trying to find out why we live this way, building a vast network of escapes from this basic fact. And we are still going on. We never seem to realize that unless each one of us fundamentally changes radically there will be no peace on earth as long as you are an American, Russian, different ideologies, different concepts, different gods, and so on, we will never have peace on this earth.

So it behoves us, and each one of us, to find out why we live this way. And whether it is possible radically to change our whole psyche. If there is not a revolution there, mere outward revolutions have very little meaning. We have had communist revolution, French revolution, other forms of revolution throughout the world and we remain what we are, self-centred, cruel and all the rest of it.

I have finished sirs.

(Will you answer questions?)

K: Yes sir, ask any kind of question.

(Krishnaji will be glad to answer any kind of question that you might have.)

QUESTION: I have a question. You have given us a bleak and pessimistic picture of the world in which we live and of ourselves. Do you see any positive signs around? If you look around in this present world do you see any positive developments, something which gives you any hope? - not something inside us and hidden but something visible for all.

K: I don't know why you say, sir, you have only presented a negative side. What is actually going on throughout the world is a very positive thing. You may regard it as negative but the conflicts, the wars, the brutalities, and all those kinds of things are going on. And you ask what is the positive response to all this. Who has created all this? This mess in the world, this terrible killing, war after war, who has been responsible for all this? Aren't we each of us responsible? As long as we are nationalistic, as long as we are concerned with our own fulfilments, our own desires, aren't we responsible for all this mess that is going on? Or is it merely in Beirut that it is going on, not here? We have had two terrible wars and we are preparing for other wars, unless human beings, you and I, radically change, fundamentally, we are going to have wars all the time.

So your question, sir, is, if I have understood it correctly: what is a human being to do? Right sir?

Questioner: No, I asked whether you see anything positive.

K: Yes.

Questioner: If something positive is going on, not just what we

have to do, but if you see signs that something right is being done.

K: Yes sir. Something positive. I don't know what you mean by that word 'positive'. I am not dodging the question. I am not evading it, but I would like to know if you would kindly explain what you mean by the positive.

Questioner: Well, let's assume you see some people, or even a group, I think you don't believe very much in groups, who are doing something which goes in the direction of this inner change that you deem necessary to bring peace in the world.

K: Yes sir. There are several organizations that talk about peace in the world, various groups that are talking about peace in the world - *pacem in terris*. The pope says it, other religious organizations assert it - you must have peace on earth. And you are asking, if I understand rightly, are there individuals, groups, organizations that are working for it. And that organizations, groups, people working for it may be considered positive action. I question that. Where does peace begin? In your heart, in your mind? Or in organizations? Where is there that man can live peacefully, not going to sleep like a vegetable, peacefully. To live peacefully demands tremendous intelligence in our daily life. And can organizations help each one of us to live peacefully? Or it must begin with us, each one of us?

QUESTION: How to go about the attainment of this internal security, psychological security within ourselves. I am just a common man, who hasn't been exposed to all these things, spiritual things, but I would wish to know how that is to be brought about, the basic transformation which you are hinting at - the attainment of peace within.

K: Sir, every religion has talked about it - right sir? Books have been written about it. Believe in god, you will have peace. Follow this path, you will have peace. Follow this guru, you will have peace. Follow this particular doctrine and so on. Mankind has done all this, various forms - be a Christian, be a - you know, all the rest of it. Man has not found peace.

So you are asking, if I understand rightly, how is one, a human being, to live psychologically, inwardly, peacefully. Sir that requires, not that the speaker is avoiding the question, that requires a great deal of enquiry, not just a few phrases. First of all why are we in conflict, not only in ourselves but externally? Why are we in conflict? Is it because there is this dualistic existence, the outer and the inner? Is there in each one of us opposing desires, opposing ideals, opposing sensations, opposing pursuits? Is conflict brought about by thought? Please this requires - I don't know if we have time to go into all this.

What is conflict, why do we have conflict psychologically? Is it brought about by contradictory desires? This whole concept of individuality, is that the basic cause of conflict? "I must fulfil." "I must do what I want to do." I am not advocating or suggesting that we all become communists, they have their own problems, their own misery, confusion, their own appalling - etc., I won't go into all that, you know all about it.

So why is there in the very psyche, in the very structure of our thinking, conflict? Can human beings live without conflict? And there are those who say conflict is necessary to evolve. And we have had conflicts for fifty thousand years, as human beings. Have we evolved tremendously? Perhaps externally we have but

inwardly we are pretty poor specimens. So one has to become aware of what we are, of what each one of us is - aware. To be aware choicelessly. If you want to go into all that, which is very complex: to live a life without analysis but pure observation without the observer. It leads to all kinds of issues which we haven't time to go into.

Yes sir?

QUESTION: I am a member of the religious order of Quakers. And we believe, like you, that we must start with inner peace. But we also feel that our inner peace should affect what we do outwardly, that we should also be concerned with say reconciliation between warring people. But from our point of peace within why should there be a conflict between the inner and the outer peace?

K: Yes sir. Why is there conflict between the inner peace and the outer peace? Is that right sir? Am I putting it right?

Questioner: Or why if we are trying to attain inner peace why can't we also to that inner peace try to bring about outer peace in the world too?

K: Are we seeking a psychological state where there is no conflict? Are we really seeking it? If we are seeking it where must it begin? Mustn't it begin in our relationship? Without relationship you cannot exist. So our relationship is the most important thing. If in that relationship there is no peace externally, we will project that conflict externally. This is an obvious fact. If each one of us really basically lived with complete peace, *pacem*, then would we not create a world which is peaceful?

Yes sir?

QUESTION: I wonder what proportion of humanity would be able to respond to the very good sense of your comments. I have the uneasy feeling that most of the world is suffering from intense poverty, the kind of poverty that even makes people wonder what they will eat that week, whether such circumstances will permit the kind of reflection which will be necessary to proceed with this mutation is a highly questionable idea. And therefore leads me to the notion that perhaps institutions such as are sponsored by the United Nations and other non-governmental organizations may be necessary supplementary mechanisms to make the situation somewhat easier to allow the kind of change which is so necessary. We may have to wait fifty thousand years more otherwise.

K: We know personally a great deal of poverty, we have been brought up in it. The whole of India, multiplying fifteen million people every year. A great deal of poverty. How do we change that? Obviously from what one observes, as long as there is the economy based on one particular community, nation, it is a global problem, not nationalistic or any particular organization. It is a global problem of poverty. Unless we attack that, sir, I don't see how we are going to change the world, poverty, and over population. The European population is decreasing and in Asia it is increasing at an appalling rate and governments are unable to stop that, their own local governments. They have been talking about birth control, family control and all the rest of it, but it is having very little effect in India. So isn't it, sirs, the economic problem is a global problem, not of any particular group, any particular nation. Unless we have that global feeling for humanity we are going to continue for centuries, though this particular organization may be

helpful, we are going to have poverty always.

QUESTION: Sir, you must excuse me but...

K: Would you like to come and sit here sir? I would be delighted, somebody to share the platform. Come and sit down, sir.

Questioner: I have been reporting this organization as a correspondent, unhappily an American correspondent, for thirty eight years, and during that time I have heard much about you. That was a great challenge to this organization now, happily only by ignorant people - hopefully I should have said. I went a long way to find out some answers to the questions that came up year after year in a monumental combination of minds from governments, from non governmental organizations, from scholars, educators like yourself - not too many like yourself.

K: I am not an educator.

Questioner: I am not either.

K: Thank god!

Questioner: And I wanted to find out what I can do to become educated because education in the slums where I was brought up, in New York, was a heaven to be devoutly pursued. So I got lost in a book one time and then to poetry and I pursued it further as the Colonies were breaking up and the tribes were breaking up with them, sir. It seems to me that I have made a discovery then which I am going to put to you now.

K: I am not the Delphic Oracle, sir.

Questioner: You need not apologize, sir. You have a very extraordinary audience here by past experiences. It suddenly occurred to me that the tribal man was peaceful compared to the highly civilized European who made two world wars.

K: Yes, sir. Agreed.

Questioner: And now as I listen to you I am beginning to understand why that thought came to me and that is, that in the tribe there is a psychological security, and the individual being conditioned, as you say, by the society in which he lives, is prone to be a psychologically peaceful man and that's how he was conquered by other peoples, the civilized peoples, the multi-lingual peoples. I do not suggest that we can go back to the tribal society but I am saying it only because you have deplored, rightly, the situation in which man after fifty million, or is it fifteen million, who knows, it's enough for him to have learned something, but he didn't.

K: Yes, sir.

Questioner: So I want to ask your comment on all I have said, which is quite a challenge, isn't it? May I sit for your answer?

K: The question being, sir, why hasn't man changed? Why hasn't he learned?

Questioner: That's right. The eternal question.

K: Yes, sir. Why has man remained inwardly primitive? Right sir?

Questioner: I used the word primitive in a complimentary sense.

K: Yes. Why? Is it because culturally, socially, we have looked for the outer to change the inner? You understand, the communists have done that. Change the structure, the outward structure of society, pass new laws, control thought and so on and you will then change the inner man. And it hasn't worked out. And shouldn't we, if we are educated, or even primitive in the most politest sense of that word, shouldn't we begin with understanding each one, with

ourselves what we are, and there radically, fundamentally change? Unless we do that we will go on for the next fifty thousand years.

Questioner: You and I won't.

K: You and I won't but the common current of consciousness will go on. But if you and another change radically you affect that consciousness.

Questioner: I say, yes.

K: Therefore we must find people, small groups, whether in America, in Europe, in India and so on, who are concerned completely with this inner psychological fundamental change. And I think it is possible.

Questioner: Of course it is.

K: Therefore we are working on it.

Questioner: Or you wouldn't be sitting here.

K: Quite right.

Questioner: Excuse me. Thank you, sir.

Chairman: Dear friends, let me on your behalf, thank Krishnaji for the best results, and as he always does for sharing his thoughts with us. Please.

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 19TH MAY 1984

If I may I would like to point out that this is not an entertainment. This is a serious gathering as we are going to explore together the various issues of life. And also this is not a lecture as is generally understood. A lecture is to inform, to instruct and to persuade you to think in a particular way, or be so knowledgeable and be thoroughly informed. So this is not a lecture. Nor is it propaganda to propagate certain ideas, beliefs, or some romantic or reasonable conclusions. But rather we are going to think over together the many complex problems of our daily life. And in no way is the speaker trying to convince you of anything, nor to persuade you to accept some romantic, exotic or some philosophical concepts and ideals. This must be made perfectly clear that we are not encouraging or stimulating, or trying in any way to direct, but rather together you and the speaker go into the very many issues, problems that we have. It is not merely that you are listening to the speaker but though you are listening to him you are also watching, considering your own reactions, your own conclusions, your own experiences.

And we are going to question, doubt, have a great deal of scepticism, without cynicism, because most people are very gullible. We have been made gullible by experts, whether they be experts along philosophical lines, or psychological, or scientific, or biological and so on. We never seem to question ourselves or the authorities, the people who know, who assert, specially those people who come from the Asiatic countries with their peculiar beliefs and religious dogmas and superstitions. So please from the

very beginning of these talks and question and answer meetings we are going to question everything. We are going to have a great deal of scepticism, including what the speaker is saying; question it, doubt it, find out, if one may respectfully point out, what is true, to be able to be sensitive enough so that one captures not only the verbal meaning but also what lies behind the words, the content of the words. Not only the etymological meaning of the words but also the quality, the beauty, the strength of a word. Because most of us are caught in a network of words, our whole thinking process is a verbalization, making pictures or images, and we are caught in all that, so we never actually are free from words and ready to go beyond the word, or the explanation, or the description.

If we could this morning and the following days, be very clear on these matters: that the speaker has no authority whatsoever, he is not a professional, not an expert of any kind, because to the speaker that is rather frightening, to be an expert about something. But if we could together, we mean together, take a very, very long journey, a timeless journey into the very complex structure of the human psyche, of what we are, why we are behaving the way we do, why we have all these crowding thoughts, one after the other ceaselessly chattering. If we could together amicably, as friends do, take a long walk into an area that superficially we have scratched, superficially we have had innumerable descriptions, explanations by the professionals and psychologists and psychiatrists, the biologists, the archaeologists and so on. But if we could put aside all that for the time being, though it may perhaps have a certain value at other times, but if we could this morning, like two friends talking over their problems.

We have problems, life is full of problems, from the moment we are born until we die. And we seem to be unable to resolve any of these problems. On the contrary, as a civilization, whatever that word may mean, grows we seem to be multiplying problems. And we never seem to be able to be free of all problems and to live a life that is without a single shadow of a problem. And into all this we are going to take a journey. You are responsible for taking the journey because you have come here, though it is rather hot, and I hope you will be careful not to smoke, because it is much too dangerous.

It's your responsibility as a human being to find out why after fifty thousand years or more or less we are what we are. During the long period of evolution from the most primitive brain to the highly sophisticated brain that we have, why during all this period of vast experience, knowledge, incidents, so-called revolution, why we are still what we are - primitive psychologically, violent, superstitious, killing each other, accepting one authority after another. I do not know if you have noticed in this country there are experts who tell you how to dress, how to make up your face, how to have sex, how to bring up babies, how to read. And all the politicians tell you what to do. If you have noticed, perhaps you have not noticed as you are too close to it, when you come to this country from abroad you notice all these things all over again. They are telling you, everybody, the newspapers, the magazines, the priests, the evangelists, the authorities, the specialists, the experts, all tell you what to do. And this is supposed to be a free country, you are supposed to be free people who are capable of thinking things out for themselves, capable of dealing with their

own lives, either righteously or unrighteously. One wonders why a young nation like this is so caught up in the travail of experts, so we are losing our own inward stability, clarity and a sense of behaviour. I do not know if you have noticed all these things. Perhaps the speaker may be exaggerating, but I doubt it. When he comes from abroad for a week he listens to all the television, all the channels, talking channels, newspapers, magazines, talks to some of the experts, and listens to the evangelists - my god, what a crowd! And apparently this country is bent on fun and success, money, and a way of having pleasure superficially. You must have noticed all this too.

So this is the country that is becoming dominant throughout the world, from Asia, from India, from Europe, they all want go to America, to the States; not only to earn more money, to have the capacity of invention, and so on.

So please, if one may repeat it over again, we are not experts, we are not professionals, we are in no way instructing you, or telling you what to do. But rather with great simplicity, with great affection, let us walk together. Together either we walk very fast, or very slowly. But together explore into the injustices of this world, and enquire if there is justice at all, why human beings hurt each other, kill each other; why belief, faith, ideals are dividing people throughout the world. Like the ideology of Russia and the democratic ideology are at war. The piling up of armaments throughout the world, even the smallest country. You must surely be aware of all this. So everybody throughout the world is preparing to kill each other. Demonstrations to stop a particular kind of war, neutron or atomic wars. But nobody seems to be

concerned with stopping all wars. There is no demonstration to stop wars, to kill human beings.

And after these forty, fifty thousand years, we are still what we are. What has happened? Why are we like this? Time is supposed to give us understanding, supposed to give us knowledge, supposed to give us a sense of right or true behaviour, accurate. But apparently time has not solved any of our problems. On the contrary.

So one asks, as one must, talking over together as two friends, why have we become like this? It is not only in this country, it is right throughout the world, from the most primitive village in Africa, or India, to the most highly civilized, so-called civilized people. What has happened to us? Some may be thoroughly satisfied with what we are, specially if you are rich, powerful, have status and position, then you don't question these things. But if one is thoroughly dissatisfied, not in revolt, dissatisfied - I hope one sees the difference between dissatisfaction and revolt. If you are dissatisfied and have come here observing things as they are actually, dissatisfied with all the things that man has put together, then you are beginning to enquire into it. But if you merely revolt against it, that revolt is merely a reaction. And we are full of reactions, and therefore we never get any further. But if you could, perhaps only this morning, see things as they are, not according to your particular prejudice or conclusion, or ideologies and faith, but things as they are, not only in your own particular backyard but throughout the world - the starving, the poor, the uneducated, the extraordinary rich people, tremendous power in the hands of the few, whether it is democratic or communist, totalitarian, power,

money, with all that goes with it.

So if we could as friends, not opposed to each other, not contradicting each other, nor accepting what the other fellow says, but together take this journey. Which means you, each one of us, whatever speed you would like, walk, but walk, not let the other person do all the talking, all the explanations, all the reasons and descriptions; together look at it, observe it. To observe is one of the most difficult things to do. To observe without any direction, without any motive, without any word, just to observe that tree, for example, without being caught in the word tree, and all the implications of that word. If we are so able to observe ourselves and the world in which we live without any prejudice, without any conclusions, from any point of view, whether yours or mine or somebody else's. Just to look at it first.

We see there is a great deal of misery, a great deal of poverty; or else affluent societies like this country, though there is poverty in this country, there is war, nation against nation, tribe against tribe, ideologies against ideologies - the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Muslim and so on. Two thousands years of propaganda of the Christians, and fifteen or sixteen hundred years of propaganda of the Muslims, and two or three thousand years or more of the Hindus and the Buddhists. We are slaves to this propaganda called religion, called nations, and so on. The world is at war, not only in a particular part of the mediterranean but there are wars going on - I believe forty wars are going on, I have been told, perhaps it is a mistake.

So that's observed outwardly, this competition, each one out for himself in the name of god, in the name of psychology, in the name

of science, each one is out for himself, for his success, for his fame, for his reputation, for his power, and so on.

And also in the world externally individuality is given tremendous importance, each one thinks he is the entire the world, to do exactly what he wants, to fulfil, to succeed, to compete, you know, all the rest of it. And also externally so-called religions have divided man too, the whole Christian world with all its subdivisions, and the Buddhist, the Muslim, the Hindu divide. And they are also perhaps so-called peacefully at war. Perhaps too, if you can listen, observe accurately, the Christians have killed more people than anybody else. Look at it carefully. I am not against Christians or Hindus, just observing all this.

So externally our society is in chaos. In that society we live, which is degenerating, and dangerously near. And so this is the external world in which we live. Obviously one asks, who created all this external world, the society in which we live. Surely no divine hand has moulded this society. Society is put together by each one of us, through our violence, through our pleasure, through our fears and beliefs and dogmas, through our search for security in the family, in the community, in the nation. We have created this society, each one of us, and there is no question about that. We have made the society in which we live. And there are the reformers, like the communists, who wish to alter the structure of the society externally. The socialists, the totalitarians, and also the democratic people who through legislation and all the rest of it want to alter the organization of society. When that organization fails they invent another organization. You must know all this. So organizations by re-organizing is called progress. Right? I do not

know if you have noticed all these things: politically, religiously and socially. It happens in the universities, colleges, in professional areas; but we never question deeply, seriously why we live in the society which we have made, which we have structured, put together. And this is the result of forty, fifty thousand years of evolution.

Either it is altogether hopeless, man will everlastingly live this way because for forty thousand years he has lived this way. And if we look to time to change fundamentally the structure of the psyche, the inwardness of our ways, if we rely on time another forty thousand years we will still be the same. If forty thousand years has not changed us another forty thousand years is another game.

So one asks very seriously - my friend and I are talking together, walking in a shaded lane where there are a lot of birds and flowers and the beauty of the hills - is it possible to change the human behaviour? Is it possible for a human being who is so fragmented, so broken up, so contradictory, so much in conflict, is it possible to fundamentally, not superficially, through pressure, through reward and punishment, but deeply, can there be a mutation not only in the brain cells themselves but in the whole structure of the psyche, which is self-centred, egotistic, utterly concerned with itself? This has been the problem of some of the religious people from the ancient of times. And those very, very, very few, have perhaps broken the chain of self-centredness with all its limited selfish activity. And the vast majority of people carry on.

So we are asking, my friend and I together: is it possible for us

to change? Not change to something else, that is only a becoming. When you change what you are to what you should be, that is a form of becoming. Right? So that is no change at all. I wonder if you understand this? If I am greedy, or schizophrenic, or utterly committed to some kind of amusement and fun and entertainment, to change from that particular form of entertainment to another form of entertainment is still entertainment. Right? But change implies an ending, not a continuity. Are we together in this? You are the friend walking with the speaker. If this is not clear we must go into it because it is very important to understand this.

We must enquire into what is ending. Take for example the word austerity, austere. The etymological meaning of that word is to have a dry tongue! Not take alcohol, the root meaning of that word in Greek and so on is to have a dry mouth. From that arises the word harsh, dry, a sense of cruel control, a sense of simplicity holding to a certain pattern. Now austerity, we are not talking in those terms of dryness, harsh, cruel, cruel discipline to be austere. I wonder if you understand all this. To have great simplicity inwardly, that can only happen when there is absolute clarity. And that can take place when there is an ending to constant indulgence, ending. Say for example, if you are a smoker, end it, not take a lozenge in its place, chew something else in its place. If you are greedy, violent and all the rest of it, end it, not say, "I will be something else". We will go into this much more deeply when we talk about death. You don't mind talking about death, do you? Americans are rather frightened about it, aren't they? There are books written now, recently I see - How to die happily. They are helping the people who are dying to die easily. But death is

something extraordinary which we will talk about later on.

So there is the importance of understanding ending. Go into it for yourself and you will see the extraordinary thing that we never end anything, there is always the ending and the beginning of the same thing in a different form. We took the word austere, which is really extraordinary, inward austerity, great sense of simplicity, without any complexity. But we won't go into that now because that requires a great deal of understanding. Because we have the picture of a great many saints and so-called religious people who are very, very austere, at least they pretend. And there is no austerity without love. Love and simplicity is the essence of austerity.

So my friend and the speaker are talking over together, they say, is it possible for each one of us to fundamentally end greed and violence, the search everlastingly for some kind of pleasure, end fear and so on? So we will go into it now.

From childhood our brains have been conditioned to solve problems. A child goes to the school, he has a problem how to read and write. And as he grows older, mathematical problems, geographical problems and so on. So our brain - actually this is a fact, it is not the speaker's imagination, if you have observed yourself - our brains are conditioned to solve problems. The brain is conditioned. So throughout life we are trying to solve problems. Haven't you noticed this? So to solve a problem the brain must be free to solve it. But if it is full of problems itself it cannot solve problems. That is a logical, sane, observation. You can see it in politics, how it is happening, they solve one problem and in the solution of that problem there are multiple problems. Right? You

see this - economically and so on.

So one of our first demands or first enquiry is to find out whether we can we free to investigate why we are always solving problems, why we have problems first. We have problems. Right? And you go to various places to resolve your problems. If you have never been alone in the world, wandering among the hills, they will teach you how to be alone in the woods. You pay five hundred dollars or more and they teach you. And you are willing to be taught. Right? So what we are saying is, a brain, your brain, when it is conditioned from childhood to the resolution of problems, you are only multiplying problems. But if one can understand, see the fact, not only the explanation, the reason, the logic of it, but see the fact that a brain that is trained, educated to solve problems, as you have been from childhood, you are bound to increase more and more problems. Right? This is logic, sane. So is it possible for us, for you, to approach a problem with a brain that has no problems? You understand? You understand this? I am afraid you don't.

See the fact first that if you have problems and your brain is trained to solve problems, as it is now, then you can't solve the problem. Right? It is only when the brain is free then it can resolve problems. This is logic, reason. And the lawyers and the professionals increase our problems. They are paid to do that! Whereas if you want to solve a problem one must look at the problem and how you approach the problem. How you approach it. To approach means to come near. How do you come near to a problem? You can't come near to a problem if your mind is seeking the solution of the problem. Right? You can only come near it, look at it, observe it when you are not wasting your energy

searching for a solution. I wonder if you understand all this. It is very simple, don't get complicated.

I have a problem, suppose I have, with a friend, or with a wife or husband, how do I approach it? Freely, or with a conclusion which I would like to bring about? Or I have a motive? So a motive, a conclusion, a preconceived solution is a distorting factor, so I never solve the problem. Right? So our first enquiry into this is: can we look at problems in the world and in ourselves, and the world is not different from you, the world is what we have made of it, the society is not different from you, you are the society, you are the world and the world is you, and can we look at that? That is, to look, observe freely without any direction of a problem, whatever the problem be. Then in the observation you come very, very close to it. Then the problem itself becomes important not the answer. You understand? And therefore there is no problem. Oh, I can't go on into it; if you have understood it, so much the better.

So: which means why is it that our brains - because that is the centre of all our activity, all our thought, all our emotions, it is the centre of all our reactions, that brain is conditioned through long years, forty thousand years, it is conditioned as Christian, Buddhist, as a philosopher, as a scientist, as a psychologist, psychiatrist, you know the whole business of it. It is conditioned. That conditioning not only distorts action but also creates a great many problems in relationship, in communication, in looking at things without freedom. So we ought to enquire into that first. That is, why our consciousness - our consciousness is the whole content of our brain, it is what we are, what you think, what you feel, what your beliefs are, your pleasures, your faith, your prejudices, your

experiences, your memories, your pleasures and so on, all that is what you are. All that is your consciousness with all its reactions. Right? It's nothing strange, it is very simple. You don't need to go to a professional to find all this out. You can look at yourself, you can know it, if you are capable of observing yourself very clearly, you will find this out much more deeply, truly than from a book or from a professional.

So this is what you are. And we are asking a very serious and fundamental question: this self-centred consciousness is the consciousness of the entire world because every human being throughout the world is self-centred, like you. He has pleasure, he has pain, he has sorrow, he has various superstitions, beliefs, he has invented gods, as you have invented gods. So this consciousness which you have, which you think is yours, personal, mine, is the consciousness of the entire world. They are trying to prove this in different ways scientifically. I won't go into all that. Then when science says so you will all say, yes! Because we have been taught to accept what the experts say. But we are not the experts here, we are together looking at this extraordinary phenomenon which is a human being.

And religion, society, our own pleasures, have made us think we are separate individuals. I know what we are saying goes against everything that you believe. On the contrary we are saying you are not individuals; you are the rest of humanity, you are humanity because you suffer, because you have fears, you have many illusions and superstitions and beliefs, you have one god or one saviour, and in Asia they have a thousand gods, perhaps that is more fun. So you are like the rest of the world. It is a tremendous

realization, this fact. Then you will not kill another, then if you kill another you are killing yourself.

So that is the one thing, our conditioning has made us. Religions have said you have separate souls; in India too you have separate atmans and so on and so on. So can all this be radically changed, fundamentally so that we can live on this earth, which is so beautiful, only it is rather hot this morning, it is such a beautiful world, not in pictures, not in the museums but when you look around, the hills, the rivers, the valleys, there is a great sense of beauty in the world? Nature is not made by man; the tiger is not put together by thought. But apart from nature thought has put everything together, the structure of our own self. So thought is responsible, without thought and memory which is born of knowledge, you can't do a thing.

So we ought to enquire what is thought. We are going to enquire together, if you will. What is thinking? What is thought? Because thought has created the extraordinary world of technology - going to the Moon, the neutron bomb, missiles, the submarines, the computer, communication, the railways, the airports, thought has put together all that. And also thought has put together the whole business world. Thought has also put together all the cathedrals of the world, the temples, the mosques, the churches, and the magnificent, beautiful cathedrals of Europe. And also thought has put all the things that are in the churches, in the cathedrals, in the temples, in the mosques - their rituals, their garb, their clothes, their sceptres, you know all the things that show off the religious person. And also thought has invented god. So we should enquire very carefully into the nature of thought because

everything we do is based on thought. Your relationship with another, intimate or not, is structured by thought. To write a letter, to drive a car, to be a first-class scientist or carpenter you must have thought.

So we should very carefully understand the nature of thought, why thought has become so extraordinarily important in our lives. And thought may be also one of the reasons why we destroy each other. So what is thought, what is thinking? When you are asked a question, what is your name, your answer is very quick, immediate - why? Because you have repeated it a hundred times, you are very familiar with it. If you are asked a more complicated question, there is a time interval before you answer it. During that time interval you are looking, you are searching, you are asking, and you are looking into books to find out the answer. There is an interval between the question and the answer. During that interval thought is enquiring. And also when you ask something much more complicated and you say, "I don't know" - I wonder if you ever say, "I don't know"? Do you? When you say, I don't know, you are waiting for an answer, or for somebody to tell you. So these are the stages of thinking. And also what is thinking? Perhaps you have heard the speaker talk about it, explain it. Forget, if I may request you, what the speaker has said, or what you have read about it, completely put aside all that, and let us look at thinking.

Your thinking may be crooked, or straight, or rational, or subtle, or neurotic, schizophrenic, but it is still thinking. The most erudite person and the most illiterate person, the man who doesn't know how to read or write, who lives in a small village, he also thinks. So there are these extreme forms of thinking - subtle, crude, and so

on. So we should be very clear what is thinking when all our life is based on thinking - perverted, crooked, illogical, illusory, utterly stupid.

Thinking can only take place when there is memory. Without memory you cannot think. And this memory is stored in the brain cells, in the brain. Right? And memory is the accumulation of knowledge. And knowledge can only be, exist where there is experience. And experience is always limited. Right? And so knowledge can expand, be wide, but knowledge is always limited, either in the future or now, it is always limited. That's a fact. Scientists are adding more and more and more to what they already know. So knowledge has always been limited now or in the future, so thought or our memory is always limited, obviously. So thought is limited. Right? So action then born of thought will always be limited, therefore anything that is limited must create contradiction. Right? You understand all this? When you are thinking about yourself all day long, as most people do, it is very limited, isn't it? And action born of that limitation must create enormous problems, contradictions.

So to go into it more deeply which is as thought is limited, which is so, there is no complete thought about anything, there cannot be, it can think about completeness, it can think about measureless, but the thing that thought thinks about as being measureless is still limited because in itself thought is limited. Right? So thought being limited, everything it has done has created contradictions. That is, thought has created nationalities. Right? Because thought says, I must be secure. I am not secure with a family, but I will be secure with a greater community, and the

ultimate greater community is the nation, which is born out of tribalism. Nationalism is merely another form of glorified tribalism. And so therefore you have divided the world into the Christian world, the Buddhist world, the Hindu world, the Islamic world, with their separate gods, it all seems so utterly silly. Pardon my saying so. And so where there is division there must be conflict. Right? There is conflict going on in the eastern end of the mediterranean between the Jew and the Arab, Iran and Iraq, fighting about what? The ideological gods and suppositions which each group has created.

So when one realizes not verbally or logically, but the reality that thought is everlastingly limited, there is no end to the limitation of thought, thought then is a material process. Because it is stored in the brain, it is a material process. Therefore anything that thought has created can never be sacred, holy, but only limited.

So one asks: if thought is limited and creates such havoc in the world, what is the place of thought? Are you asking these questions? Do you understand? Is the speaker working, or are you also working? Are you also thinking, enquiring, groping, pushing? Or are you merely sitting under the shade of dappled shade and enjoying the mountains and the hills and the quietness of this place, which is good too, but to listen to something that is true, listen to something which you yourself have found for yourself to be true. And then be committed to it, work for it. Not just let things go by. If you hear the truth and not act, then that truth acts as a poison. It creates more trouble, more problems.

So there must be the right place for thought. You cannot go from here to your house without thought. You cannot drive your

car as soon as you leave this place, when you want to get home, you have to use thought. You have to use thought when you write a letter, you have to use thought when you do business and so on. So thought has a right place. But has thought any place at all - please listen to this - has it any place at all in the psychological area, any place at all in relationship with each other? You understand my question? Has thought in relationship a place at all? If it has then in that relationship there is a limitation, and therefore there is division, therefore there is conflict. Right? In my relationship to a wife, or to a husband, or to a girl, a boy and so on, if in that relationship thought plays a great part, thought being limited, then that very limitation creates a division between her and him; and therefore where there is division there must be conflict. As you know very well in all your relationships there is conflict, however much you may like another - I won't use the word love - however you may like the other, or have pleasure with the other, it is always limited, therefore breeding conflict. That's law, that's logic, that's truth.

So thought has its right place in the world of technology, in the ordinary world, but psychologically, inwardly, thought has no place at all. Then if there is a place that creates the self, the 'me'. And the 'me', the ego, the persona, is very limited. It can imagine that it is marvellous, it can imagine it can do extraordinary things. But that imagination, that picture is really still very, very limited, small. To see the truth of this, that's all, one has to do nothing but just see the fact of it. And that very fact, the perception of the fact, as you perceive something dangerous, like a dangerous animal, a dangerous precipice, if you see this as factually, as actually as that,

then you break the whole chain of continuity of the self. Then only it is possible to live with another without a single shadow of conflict. Because conflict is the very essence of violence. We think violence is out there: the terrorist, the kidnappers, the wars, the people who carry guns, as in this country everybody is allowed to carry guns, a most extraordinary country! You go into a shop and you can buy a gun.

So violence is not only out there, but violence in relationship exists as long as there is division, as the 'me' and the 'you'. The 'me' pursuing my ambitions, my greed, my purposes, my achievements, and she also doing the same. And therefore we are always living in conflict. And realizing the conflict you say, how am I to solve it. So we come back: the brain being conditioned to the solution of problems from childhood, so we say, all right, let's see how I can resolve, or change, or bring about the ending of conflict. That becomes a problem. Right? That's what you are doing now: how am I to end conflict? But if you saw the root of it, the cause of it, whatever has a cause, that cause can be changed, it can be removed. The cause of conflict is the sense of division brought about by thought, which is limited. And whatever is limited - religions are limited, your beliefs are limited, anything that is put together by thought is limited and therefore it must always create conflict. If you see the fact of that, the truth of it, then that very truth is the catalyst that will end conflict.

I have finished for this morning. We shall continue tomorrow morning. If one may point out you must listen to the whole - not that I am inviting you to come again tomorrow, it's up to you, I am not interested if you come or don't come, and I mean it - but if you

want to understand the whole issue, the whole totality of life, you must listen to the whole thing, it is a package, as you call it! Not just one chapter of it, it is a whole book you must read. It has got many chapters, many paragraphs. And that book is you. And as we are going to talk about all these matters during the next week, if you are willing, one must listen to the totality of it.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 20TH MAY 1984

If one may remind you again, this is not a lecture. Lectures are meant to convey or give instructions, information and guidance. So this is not a lecture, but we are going to take a journey together into an extensive field of the psyche in the psychological realm, though there have been a great many descriptions, investigations up to certain point, but in these talks, if one may remind you, we are going together as two friends to take a long journey into the area of the whole psychological states - if we have time and if we can go to the very end of it, not stop in the middle of something which you may not like, or dislike, one must take the journey to the very end of things.

We must also see that thought has done the most extraordinary things in the world, technological world: from the neutron bombs, missiles, the computers; and the whole area of communication, rapid travel and so on. Thought has been responsible for all that. Also great surgery, medicine, and health - if that is possible - and so on. But also thought has brought about great wars: in the last perhaps hundred years we have had two terrible wars, which is also the result of thought because thought has divided humanity, geographically and nationally. And also thought has divided humanity in the world as Christians, Buddhists, Hindus and Moslems. And as we were saying: where there is division as American and Russian, European and South Africans and so on there must be conflict, there must be war: people are killing by the thousands, killing has been going on for the last six thousand historical years, practically every year there is a war And man

during all these forty, fifty thousand years, this long duration of evolution, has not stopped killing each other or destroying nature, more especially now.

Thought has not created nature - the tiger, the wolf and the marvellous trees and flowers. But thought has created division between man and woman. Though biologically they are different, thought in their relationship has brought about great conflict, misunderstanding, quarrels, disputes, antagonism, hatred. So thought has bred conflict not only externally, outwardly, in the world but also inwardly in the whole psychological world, which is far more important to understand than the reorganization of outward structure of society.

Society is what we have made of it. With our greed, with our ambitions, corruption, competition and all the rest of it. So we have made the society which is disintegrating, becoming dangerous as we are, as human beings are degenerating and becoming dangerous: killing, kidnapping, terrorizing. We went into this yesterday and we said also that thought, thinking, has been responsible for the religious divisions, as Christians with all the subdivisions, thought has been responsible for the things in all the temples, churches and mosques.

Thought is the result of memory: if we had no memory there would be no thinking. Memory is based on knowledge and experience. There is no complete experience about anything, there is always the more, and where there is more there is measurement and measurement is never complete, whole. So knowledge is limited, now and always in the future, you can add to it, expand it, but that very expansion is limited, so thought is limited. And being

limited, as selfishness, egocentric activity is limited, so thought, whatever it does, must inevitably create conflict because anything that is limited, any concept whether religious or ideological, any ideal will always be limited and therefore it must breed extraordinary conflict between human beings.

We were talking about that, yesterday, and we must go on taking the journey together as two friends who are concerned with the way of life: to find out for themselves without any gurus' authority and all that rubbish; find out for themselves a way of life which is an art, an art that will bring about in human beings a great deal of quietude, affection and an art of life.

These two friends, you and the speaker, are taking a long extensive journey together, together. Please bear this in mind all the time. He is not speaking for his own pleasure, because if he does he can do that in his own room if he wants to, but as two friends exploring hesitantly without any bias, sceptically, doubting, questioning, exploring and observing objectively without any bias - together, because we are concerned with our own lives. And this enquiry into this psyche is not selfish activity, does not encourage or expand self-centred egotistic movement. On the contrary, both religiously and through education throughout the world the egocentric activity has been emphasized: Christians believe in souls, separate from the rest of humanity, so do the Hindus with their atman and so on. And this great emphasis on individuality has brought about great harm, great competition, cruelty. So one must - you and the speaker - are going to question all this: whether we are individuals at all, or we share the common humanity of sorrow, fear, pleasure, anxiety, depression, and the fear of the unknown -

death. This is the common lot of every human being on this earth. Every human being on this earth has invented their own gods, hoping thereby there could be some kind of security, a way out of fear, praying in their own way to end their own complexity, their own pain and anxiety - this is shared by all human beings. Not by you as an American or an Italian or Russian or English or an Indian, but it is shared by every human being on this earth. You may intellectually, my friend, accept the logic of it: but what is logic, reason, is merely superficial, but when actually in one's blood, in one's whole being feels the truth of this, that our consciousness is shared by all humanity. You may believe in one kind of god, or in one kind of saviour and so on but that belief - believing - is shared by every human being: to believe in something. So you are humanity. This is a great truth. It is a great something when one actually, in one's heart and in one's blood and in one's guts - realizes this, then we would think of the world totally in a different way. To kill another is to kill oneself, to hate another is to hate oneself and so on.

And, as together - you and the speaker - are taking a journey, we ought to enquire into what is discipline and what is

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 22ND MAY 1984

There have been a lot of questions sent in. And we have chosen some of those questions. We are going to examine the questions, not the answers. It's a dialogue; you ask a question, and the speaker replies to that question. Then you respond to that question. You ask a question, the speaker then responds to your question, then you respond to the speaker's response, and so keep this going till only the question remains and not the persons. You have understood this? Probably you have not gone into this question of dialogue. I think it is important to understand this because we are together going to investigate these questions. And in the process of investigation you ask a question, the speaker then replies to that question, and you respond to the reply, and then I pick up and reply to that - we go on this way - until only the question remains. You understand? So the question then has tremendous vitality, it is not tinged by any personal prejudice. Have you understood this? We are going to do it, we will see it for ourselves.

I wonder why we ask questions, and from whom do you expect a reply? It is good to ask questions, the more questions, enquiry, the better. But we expect someone else to answer the question. The question is really a problem. A problem, the root meaning of that word, is something thrown at you. The etymological meaning of the word problem means something hurled at you, thrown at you, it is a challenge. And we expect others to solve our problems - religious, economic, social, all kinds of problems that human beings have. And therefore it becomes one-sided. You ask the

question and the speaker replies to it, if he is silly enough. But if we together investigated the question, the significance of the question, and not move away from the significance of the question, then the answer is in the question. Right? Do you understand this?

Most of us put questions and then wait for somebody to answer them. So what we are interested in is the answer and not in the question itself. Whereas the importance is in the question, not in the answer. You will discover this presently. Because this is a question put to the speaker, then the speaker responds to the question, then you pick up that response and reply to that response, we keep this going until the question remains, and not anything else. And when the question becomes extraordinarily important it has its own vitality, and therefore its own answer. We will see it in a minute.

1st QUESTION: I understand that all people have a similar consciousness, but it seems a vast jump to say that all people share the same consciousness. Could we walk together slowly between these two points?

This is a question that has been put. What is the significance of that question? The questioner says, I understand that all people have a similar consciousness. What do we mean by understand? I am not being facetious, hair splitting, but I would like to know what you mean by understand. I understand the nuclear bomb will kill ten million people in one blow. I understand it. I have seen the experiment, not the ten million people blown up, but have seen the mushroom cloud and all the rest of it. Is the understanding merely intellectual, verbal, or the understanding has tremendous significance, depth, and not merely a verbal understanding. Right?

I have asked that question. Then you reply to that question: you say, no, when I use the word understand, I don't mean logically, or merely verbally, but I understand it, the meaning, the significance of people having similar consciousness. Right?

"But it seems a vast jump to say that all people share the same consciousness. Could we walk together slowly between these two points?" What do we mean by consciousness? You reply to me - there are too many people, therefore I will reply for you. We mean by consciousness to be conscious of things, conscious of the trees round here, people round here, in their various dresses and hair and so on. I am aware of it. What do we mean by being conscious, being aware? In that awareness see what is happening around us, and the happening, or mere things as they are, and in that awareness there is a certain choice - I like, I don't like. I like oak trees, I don't like palm trees, or I wish it was something else. So in this awareness there is a sense of choice. Now is there an awareness, which is part of consciousness, in which there is no choice at all? So the speaker puts that question, and the speaker representing you answers that question: which is, in our awareness there is always choice, choice being I like, I don't like, I wish it were different and so on. So where there is choice there is a conflict. Right? Do we see this? Where there is a choice between this and that, this division breeds conflict. Now is there an awareness without choice? You understand my question? As you cannot reply, I am taking your part: it seems it is very difficult to be aware without choice. And the reply to that is, why? Why is it difficult? Is the word difficult preventing, throwing a barrier? The word difficult. You understand? When I use the word impossible,

difficult, I am a failure, those words act as a barrier. So in using the word difficult you are already making it difficult.

So is it possible to be aware, conscious without any choice, just to observe? Right? And the reply to that, I will try. And to that reply the speaker says, don't try. The moment you try you are making an effort. And when you make an effort you don't understand anything. Whereas if you don't make effort, but just see, perceive the actual. Right? And then you may say, sorry, I don't understand it. So I say, let's go into it further.

I am having fun with this! I haven't read these questions before. I like to look at them first when I am speaking.

"But it is a vast jump to say that all people share the same consciousness". Is that so, or not? That all people throughout the world share the same consciousness, is that so? And you say, it is not the same, each one of us different, each one of us has his own peculiarities, his own idiosyncrasies, his different environment, different religious upbringing, or non-religious upbringing, educated in different ways, so we do not say all the same consciousness, you reply. And the speaker says, it is not like that, let's look into it, don't assert. You understand? Don't take a position, then it becomes battle. But if you are pliable, move, enquire, then we are together in this.

So I say, now let's examine this very closely, without any bias, taking up any position, that I believe in this, then you can't discuss, you can't explore. So let's examine this. You say, what do you mean examine, explore? Who is exploring? Your own attention, I am not using the word interest. Now we must go into the question of interest, and attention. I hope you are coming into this game.

Most educators are concerned with interest, to awaken the interest of children, students, be interested in mathematics, if you are not interested in mathematics be interested in history. The teacher is concerned with awakening the interest in the student. Right? Isn't that a fact? I want to play the violin. Don't play the violin, it's not worthwhile because you can't earn a good livelihood, but get interested in something else. And so on. Now where there is interest there is always a contradictory process going on within yourself. Clear? Oh no. All right, I'll explain again.

I am interested in climbing a mountain. And my teacher says, don't be interested in that, be interested in something much more serious. There is a contradiction immediately. I am interested in wanting to climb the mountain; and the educator says, don't climb the mountain, be interested in what I am saying. So in me there is already a contradiction taking place: wanting to do something else, I have been forced to do something else. Right? So don't use the word interest at all. Then what word would you use, you ask me. I say, find out what is the nature of attention. Right? Are you all so puzzled by all this? What is the nature of attention? The student is very interested in watching something very closely. And I want him to be interested in history, but he is watching the frog, or the lizard, or the bird, out of the window. He is paying much more attention to that than listening to my demand of history. So I would encourage him, or help him to watch much more carefully. You understand? Much more carefully so that his whole attention is given to his watching. When he does that then I can see and demand that he pay attention to everything slowly. Learn to pay attention, not interest. You have got it?

So let's examine, or explore, that we all share the same consciousness. Wherever we live, whether in the Far East, or in the Middle East, or here, human beings go through terrible times. There is great poverty in Africa and India, and parts of Asia. There is great suffering. People are anxious all over the world. People are afraid all over the world. And they all want security, both physical as well as psychological. Right? This is a fact. So the fact is common to all of us. Right? You suffer, the Indian in India suffers, the Russian suffers. So human beings, looking at all the inhabitants of the world, go through this extraordinary phenomenon. Right? All human beings have their own idiosyncrasies, their own way of doing things, their peculiar habits, their fears, their gods, their beliefs, right through the world this is a common factor. This is so. The speaker says so. And you say, no, it is not like that. I am different from my neighbour. The speaker then says, are you really? You may have a bigger car, a wider garden, beautifully kept, you work at that garden, you may have a bigger house, or a smaller house. Right? But the superficial difference both biologically and physically, is natural, it is there, it is a fact: you are tall, another is short, one is very, very clever, the other is not, and so on. But go beyond that, or go below that, which is in the psychological world. In the psychological world we all share the same sorrow, sorrow is common to all of us. You may have pleasure in one way but it is still pleasure. It is still fear. You may be afraid of the dark, another may be afraid of some other thing. Fear is common to all of us. Right?

So we all share the same consciousness. And you say to that, it sounds very logical, but is it true? Is it a fact, or are you making

something to be a fact, because you want to bring about a non-individual existence, which is unreal? So I say, listen to what I am saying: are you an individual at all? Factually, are you? Because you have a different complexion, different upbringing, you are a Catholic, I am a Protestant, you are a Buddhist, I am a Hindu and so on. Externally you are different, obviously. That is a fact. But inwardly, are you different? Please. You say, yes, I am quite different. What makes you say that you are different? Is it because you think you are different? Or is it a fact that you are different? You understand? Thinking is one thing, and the fact is another. Thinking about a fact is something totally different from the fact. The fact is are you different? Not that you think you are different. Psychologically, inwardly? We cheat, we lie, we want success, we want money. This is a common thing to all human beings. Right? So we are saying there is no individual consciousness, it is not your consciousness. And you say, I don't believe it. It's your invention. I say, look, when you call yourself an individual, what is the meaning of that word individual, the meaning? The root meaning of that word, it means indivisible. Right? Are you indivisible, or fragmented? You understand? If you are fragmented, as you are, you are not an individual. Don't use that word. You are a fragmented human being, like all other fragmented human beings. Individual means unique. You are not. We would like to be unique, we think we are unique because we are clever, we are this, you know, which is a form of vanity.

So when you examine it very closely, unbiased, without any sense of egotism in this, you find we are humanity. We don't share the same consciousness, we are humanity. I wonder if you

understand this? When you hear that statement, either you accept it as an idea, or hearing that statement you make an abstraction of it and say, it is a good ideal. Right? And you say, you are avoiding the fact when you make an ideal of the fact. Right? So please look at the fact that every human being in the world goes through all kinds of problems, misery, unhappiness, and if he is a clever man and wants to earn money he does all kinds of crooked things, you know, the whole game. And we all do the same thing in a different way, but the motive, the urge is the same. And you reply to all that, yes, I follow it all logically but I can't feel the depth of your statement that we are humanity, the feeling of it. Then the speaker says, why, why don't we feel this tremendous sense of wholeness in humanity? You understand? Not that we share the earth, the earth is our mother, and we are all born, etc., etc. I know that's the latest fashion, another fad in this country. Do you realize this, we move from fad to fad, the latest books we fall into.

So if one can look at the fact and not make an idea of it, or an abstraction of it as an ideal, but remain with the fact that we are really the whole of humanity, psychologically, then that feeling, when you remain with the fact, it gives a sense of tremendous energy, and there is no separation.

Let's move to the next question.

2nd QUESTION: Have you designated a special teacher, or a person, to carry on your Teachings after you have gone? Someone is claiming this position.

Have you designated a special teacher, or person, to carry on your Teachings after you have gone? - Where?! Someone is claiming this position.

I wonder why he is claiming this position. I know this is happening. I know the various people who are doing this kind of rubbish, but what are they claiming? Why do they want to follow somebody, after somebody. Suppose - not suppose - K is going to die. The speaker is going to die. That's certain, as all of us are going to die. That is one absolute, irrevocable fact, whether you like it or not. Fortunately, or unfortunately, he has said many things, written some books, and become somewhat - may I use the word notoriety - notorious, not as a criminal but some kind of freak, or religious teacher, another freak, or some kind of biological exception. And because of that, a sense of reputation in the world - which is so ugly, and it has no meaning, reputation - someone wants, or feels, or thinks himself that he is going to carry on K's work. Why? Probably it is very profitable, both financially, and you can say, well I can collect a lot of silly people. This is happening in the world. In the church there is the apostolic succession, you know, handed down. They have it too in India, in a different way.

So we all love authority. We all want to follow someone who says, I know. And you are all so gullible. We never say, look, I just want to live, I want to find out what you say, what you are, not what you represent, or your symbol, and all the rest of it. What you are. And you begin to doubt, question, what you are. And you soon discover that it is nothing very much.

So K is saying, the speaker is saying, he has designated no one, no teacher, or anyone to represent after he has gone to England, where he is going next week! It is all rather silly, isn't it?

3rd QUESTION: What do you mean by observing thought

down to its very roots? I watch my thoughts but each one leads to another in an endless chain. What is the factor that ends this? What actually brings change?

We will answer this question. We will stop this back and forth. One of the questions is: can thought be aware of itself? One is thinking about what you will do when you get home. You are thinking what you will do when you get back. And you want to find out what is the quality of that thought, and can that thought be aware of itself? You understand my question? I am thinking of my next meal. Now can thought be aware that it is thinking of the next meal? Or is there an observer who says, I am thinking about my next meal? You understand? Right? Is the observer different from the observed? You understand? Is he different? Or both are thought? Isn't it? The observer is thought, and that which he is observing as thought is still thought. So the observer is thought. The observer is all the accumulated memories of the past. Right? And the observer then says, I am going to watch my thinking. I am going to watch what I think. I want to find out the root of my thinking. Right? The observer is saying this. But the observer is also thought. So two thoughts, one thought is watching the other thought. So the common factor between the two is thought. Right?

And what is the root of thought? That is the question. What is the root of it? What is the root of all our thinking, because we all think. The greatest scholar, the great scientists, and the most ignoramus, primitive person, thinks. So what is the root of thinking? And is it possible to find the root of thinking and is it also possible not to think at all? We are going to go into all that.

If I ask you a question, what is thinking, what is your reply?

Probably you would say, I have never thought about it, I have never gone into this question. And I say, why not, because all your life is based on thought - business, everything you do is based on thought? Why aren't you interested in finding out what is thinking? What's wrong with you? You explore so many things, you go under the sea, you go in the air, you do all kinds of things, exploring, but you have never given your energy, or your urge to find out what is thought. And you say, sorry, I have never done it. And so we say: look, carefully observe what thought is first, what it does, what it has done in the technological world, and also what it is doing psychologically, what it is doing in its relationship to others. This whole movement, the technological world, what is happening psychologically, inwardly, and what is happening in your relationship through thought. The movement of thought, from the extreme technological world to the personal psychological world, and the relationship between the psychological world and the next person. It's the same movement, thought.

Now what does it do in the relationship between you and another? Right? What does it do? You say, I don't know, because I have never thought about it. Even if I thought about it I don't know how to go into it. And you leave it like that, hoping somebody will come along and explain the whole thing. Which means that you are not - forgive me for pointing out - you are not really concerned. If you are concerned you work at it. You are concerned to earn a livelihood, and you jolly well work at it. But here you say, sorry, I am used to this, or my parents, past generations upon past generations, are used to thinking, they have never gone into this question at all. And so you brush it aside and go off.

But whereas if you begin to apply, look, perceive, committed to find out, you must find out, then you say, is it that I can answer certain things very quickly, instantly, other things I take time. Right? So an instant response, taking time before response, and ultimately saying, I really don't know, I don't know. Right? These are our states of thinking: instant reply, taking time to respond to a question, thinking, looking, watching, asking, reading about it and then say, this is the answer. And the other is to say, I really don't know. So these are the states we go through. Now when you answer quickly you are familiar with it, it's everyday. You know the way to your home, you know the way to turn on the heater and so on, wash the dishes. But if one asks you something much more complex you take time. And if there is a question like, is there eternity, you say, I don't know. When you say, "I don't know", either you are waiting for somebody to tell you, or you don't accept anything from anybody, but you say, I don't know. Right?

So let's examine what is the root of thinking. Please, you must work at this, otherwise there is no fun in this, just to listen and say, yes, this is so, and walk off. But to apply, find out, go into it, then it becomes extraordinarily interesting. Thought is surely memory, or rather the response of memory. Right? If there was no memory you can't think. That's obvious. If you are in a state of amnesia you can't think. So what is memory? Please, you are working, just don't listen, you are working to find out. What is memory? One is driving a car, going along, and you look in another direction and you have an accident - I hope not you, I. I am having an accident. And that accident causes pain and all the rest of it. So that accident has been recorded in the brain, as memory of that incident. Right?

So that accident has brought certain knowledge. Right? And that accident has been an experience. Right? So that accident is an experience, which has brought knowledge, and that knowledge has been stored in the brain as memory. Right? And the response to that memory is thought. Right? That's simple. Right? So my experience is limited, my knowledge is limited, my memory is limited, so my thought is limited. Right? These are facts. So whatever thought does is limited. Whatever it does, whether it imagines there is eternity, it's limited, whether god, invented by thought, that god will still be limited. I can give him various attributes, say he is omnipotent, he is all powerful, all compassion, but he is still limited because thought has put him there.

So thought is limited. Right? Do we see this fact? Not my explanation of the fact, but the fact that thought is always limited because it is based on knowledge. Knowledge can expand, more and more and more and more. When there is more, there is still more. You understand? More is a measurement. Right? So the 'more', which is measurement, and that measurement is limited. Whenever I say, I am better, it is limited. Right?

So thought is limited. And all our actions based on thought naturally must be limited. Clear? That's a fact. Now what does limitation do? When I am thinking about myself, which is very limited, I spend all my days thinking about myself, that limitation creates trouble for somebody else - to my wife, to my husband, to my children - because I am thinking about myself which is very small. So any action that is limited must breed conflict. Right? My country, small, the country may be enormous, many thousands of miles across, but my concept of my country is very small. I can

imagine it is not, but it is still that imagination saying, it is very large, it is marvellous - it is still limited. So that limitation is creating conflict with another limitation, with a British limitation, or - which is your common enemy now? So it goes on.

So do we see this fact that limitation must create division and therefore conflict? And we have accepted conflict as inevitable, as part of our existence. And we have never asked: is it possible to live without conflict? And it is only possible if you understand the whole significance of thought. And to find out what place has thought and where thought has no place at all. You understand? Thought has a place - when you go from here to your house, drive a car, write a letter, do your business, the computer, and all the rest of it, thought there is necessary. And in the psychological world is it necessary at all, which is my relationship with another? Go into, sir, work it out. In your relationship with another, intimate or not, has thought a place, knowing that thought is limited, divisive, therefore conflict? If you see that as an actuality not just a theory, a concept, then that very perception, the seeing of it, then relationship means something entirely different. Right?

So one asks then further - perhaps this is not the moment - is love an attribute of thought? What is the relationship of love to thought? Has it any relationship, or no relationship at all? We will go into that when we talk about all this.

But the question is: what is the root of thought, and whether thought can bring about a change? Please understand, this is the question. What is the factor that ends this, the continuity, change, and what actually brings change? Can thought bring change? You understand? That which is limited thinks it can change. And

therefore when it tries to change it will still be limited. I wonder if you see all this. This is not clever, logical conclusions but actuality. There must be change in human behaviour, human endeavour, human existence. That's obvious. But when thought organizes the change, that change is still limited, therefore no change at all. When thought says, I am going to create an organization, the new world, the new box you invent, that is created by thought. Therefore that organization, that foundation, that institution, is limited, and it is going to create conflict. Right?

So what is it that brings about change? You are following all this? Somewhat at least. Thought obviously cannot. It can organize change. Organization is put together by thought. It can plan change but the planning is limited. So when one realizes, sees the fact, the truth that thought cannot possibly bring about a change, because thought itself is limited, and therefore whatever it does is limited. Right? Therefore what will bring change?

The thing is laid before you very clearly. Verbally, the description is accurate, not exaggerated, and it's left to you to answer that question: as thought cannot possibly bring about change, mutation, total psychological revolution, then what will? So thought says, "Yes, god, I'll pray". This is happening. "I'll pray". Prayer again is invented by thought, therefore very limited. So if one sees the fact, the truth, that thought is absolutely limited, then what takes place in the brain? Answer it, examine. When one realizes actually the fact, and an enormous fact it is, it is a tremendous revolution to see the fact. Already revolution has taken place when you see the fact. Because we never accept thought can do anything; it can - it has gone to the Moon, and put a silly flag on

there. It can do anything, but always limited. If you see that revolutionary fact there is already a mutation of the cells themselves in the brain. I wonder if you understand this?

One has walked all one's life north, going always north - suppose. And you come along and say, sorry, that leads nowhere, try going east or west. And I say, yes, I'll go south. The very movement, where you had been going north has now suddenly changed to going south. There is a mutation taking place, a change has taken place. You have been going north habitually day after day, so the brain is conditioned going north. Now you come and say, there is nothing there, you explain it, logically, sanely, so you say, quite right I'll go south. That movement away from the north has brought about a mutation in the very brain cells themselves. Right? You won't accept this, go into it, you will see it for yourself. The realization of a truth, that very realization brings a radical change. There is no, "I will meditate to change, I'll make an effort to change".

4th QUESTION: Please explain what you mean by saying that if one perceives truth and doesn't act, it acts as poison.

Do you need an explanation for that? All right. I have heard the truth that thought is limited. That's the truth, that's not an invention, that's not an exotic idea, something conceived by some idiot or other, it's a fact. And I listen to the fact, the truth of it. And I carry on my daily life. What takes place? I have realized something to be true and I am acting quite the opposite to that. What happens? Conflict increases more and more and more. It is much better not to hear the truth, then you can carry on in the old way. But the moment you hear something to be extraordinarily beautiful, and

that beauty not just a mere description but the actuality of that beauty, when you do something ugly, and keep on repeating doing the ugly thing, obviously it is a poison. It not only affects you physically, inwardly, and also it affects a great deal the brain that has heard something to be true and does the contrary. Therefore it's much better not to hear if you want to carry on in your old way.

There is a very good story of two robbers. And they have been robbing, and their father has been praising god for his kindness, for their benefit - you understand, thieves have also gods, not only the rich people. So one day they have been robbing somebody or other, and they are coming back. In the square, there is a man giving a sermon, and he is saying you must never steal, you must never hurt another, be kind. The other brother closes his ears, he doesn't want to hear, and the other brother hears it. And for the rest of his life he is in pain.

I think this is a fact, really a great fact, and we don't seem to realize it; that when something enormously beautiful, you see, you are sensitive enough to see that beauty, and you do something ugly, it really tortures you, if you are sensitive. And that's why truth is such a dangerous thing.

5th QUESTION: Why is the observance of silence so important for seekers of truth?

Who said this? Who said that the observance of silence is necessary to perceive truth? Has the speaker said it? Or some other person said it? Or have you searched for truth and you have discovered silence is necessary? Can truth be searched? You understand my question? Can truth be sought after? If you seek truth you have already established what truth is. Right? You are

already moving in that direction. Which means truth is something fixed, and you, in your search for truth you find it because you believe truth is already preconceived and you go after it.

Now why do you think silence is necessary? I don't know. Somebody says so. So I am not going to listen to another, however reputed, or has a great reputation and all that nonsense. I am going to find out. Can a chattering mind, brain, chattering, ever listen to anything? You are chattering, talking to your friend, and you come along and say, I want to tell you something. You don't listen because you are chattering. So can a chattering mind listen? Obviously not. So to listen you have to pay attention. Right? That's natural. To pay attention is rather difficult because we never attend to anything completely; we listen partially, partially talk, and partially do this. We never proceed to find out anything to its very end. I don't know where the end is but we will go on until we discover something. So can a chattering mind, can a mind that is occupied from morning until night, and during the night, can it ever be quiet? Not to find truth, good god! It's an ordinary question. Please answer it for oneself: can a brain that is occupied, with business, with sex, with pleasure, with fear, with its loneliness, you follow, occupied with something or other, with its hair, how it looks, how it doesn't look. You know, all the rest of it, it is occupied - with god, with Jesus, with saviours, with meditation - being occupied with meditation!

So the natural question then is: is it possible to stop this tremendous endless continuity of occupation? It would be natural to stop when you are attending to something. If you are attending to what the speaker is saying now, attend, which is listening, you

are not occupied, you are listening. Not in that listening when you say, well I don't quite agree with that, I think you are right, I think you should put it differently, I understand this differently, why do I understand it differently, and so on. But if you actually listen you are attentive, and attention is silence. Right? I wonder why we make everything so complex. Life is complex, tremendously, like the computer, it is a tremendously complex thing. But to understand it one must have a very simple mind. To have a simple clear mind, uncluttered, then attention becomes extraordinarily simple.

That's enough for today.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 24TH MAY 1984

Glancing through the questions we never seem to ask questions concerning our daily life. And there have been a lot of theoretical, ideological questions that really have no meaning at all. One wonders why one doesn't ask questions about one's own life, depression, anxiety, a sense of deep loneliness and so on. Aren't we really concerned with our daily life, or is it just that we live in a make-believe world, and try to find answers to some romantic, sentimental, idealistic, religious beliefs. I wonder why one asks, if I may, why don't we ask such questions directly, simply about oneself?

We all want to end war, at least some people do. And *pacem in terris*, that is, peace on earth, in Latin, is not possible, apparently, in this world, in spite of demonstrations, in spite of all the preaching of the priests and religious books and so on, we can never have peace in this world apparently. And we never ask if one can live peacefully in our daily life, without any violence, without all the innumerable multiplying problems, live a clear, simple, strong life. Apparently that is not possible, and we don't ask that question.

May I raise a question? Why do you come? Please, I really mean it, why are you all here? When the speaker is in India and talks to between five to eight thousand people at every meeting, they come there, most of them understand English, and most of them come to be in the presence of a religious person - at least quotes, 'religious person'. They don't quite understand what the

speaker is talking about, I am sure they don't. But they must come as it is the tradition, it is the fashion, the reputation, the image, and all that nonsense - I was going to use a strong word! And perhaps you come here out of curiosity, or to spend a nice morning under the trees, and the dappled light, or take a sun bath and listen to the poor chap. And so you go on that way. All this doesn't actually deeply, profoundly change us. What makes human beings change? This is really a very serious question. Why do we behave as we do behave? Is it possible that suffering, pain, anxiety, a sense of desperate depression, out of which one finds oneself almost impossible to get out of; and with terrible ambitions, and the competitions, and all that kind of thing that is going on, can we change all that, each one? And you will inevitably ask, does it really matter if I change, if one changes, will it in any way affect the whole human endeavour, and their mischief, and their superstitions and violence? And one thinks that is a wrong question to put. That is, you will change only if it affects the rest of the world. And if it doesn't it doesn't matter very much how one lives.

One wonders if you have ever considered how one man can change the whole human consciousness, human beings. One man. As a bad example of a neurotic and insane person like Hitler, who has done such tremendous harm to the world, he has changed or affected the rest of the world, their consciousness, their behaviour. And you might also say, has the Buddha, 2,500 years ago, has he in any way affected the world? Or the Christians believe in the saviour, in Jesus and all that, have they really changed the world, changed human minds, human behaviour, endless suffering? Or have the priests throughout the world prevented this change? You

understand my question? One has no direct - direct - teachings of the Buddha, or that of Jesus. His teachings apparently were interpreted after sixty years, so there is no direct teachings. And perhaps that has prevented human beings from acting rightly. So one wonders all along the long journey of one's life why profoundly human beings don't change their ways of life. Is more suffering necessary? Is more violence necessary? More experts and so on? Or we haven't got the energy, the drive, the passion, the intensity to change the pattern of one's deep behaviours?

Please do ask these questions of yourself. And here there are many questions given. Questions imply problems. And problems ought to be solved. Not in the resolution of one problem a dozen other problems arise. The ending of a problem of any kind. And apparently we don't seem able to do that, either politically, economically, socially and so on, or religiously. It is a perpetual reorganization. When that reorganization doesn't function properly, reorganize it, keep on reorganizing every organization. I don't know if you have not noticed this. And this is called progress. This is called bringing about order in the world. Can one put aside all organizations, spiritual specially, if one can use that word that has been so spoilt, not belong to anything at all, not be caught in any box, in any system, and work, look, observe, perceive one's own behaviour, change?

And why doesn't one do all this? Why does one depend on others? Please do ask these questions most seriously if one may request you.

1st QUESTION: There are moments of awareness in which there is great clarity, and fear, division, and the experiences are

absent. But the moments are brief. What is necessary to allow a sustained clarity, intensity, and the wholeness of being?

Whom are you asking this question? This is apparently a serious question. It looks serious. Whom are you asking? And you want a reply from somebody. That somebody is the speaker here, for the moment. If the speaker doesn't satisfy you with the answer you will trot off to somebody else. And if that somebody else isn't good enough you will go after somebody else. You keep this going. And that means, doesn't it, we depend on others to tell us what to do, what to think, how to find clarity, sanity, a wholeness of life. Always, apparently, we depend on somebody. We never look into this question, ask ourselves, and see if we can, for ourselves, totally independent of others, find out if it is possible to be absolutely unconfused, to be absolutely clear, not momentarily, not occasionally when you have nothing else to do, but is it possible? Not the continuity of clarity - you understand? Suppose one is clear for a moment, and that clarity for a second banishes away fear, experiences and all that; then that memory of that clarity is not the fact of clarity. Right? I wonder if you see this? Suppose I am walking in the woods, not in California, here, it is too strong the sun, suppose one is walking among the woods and listening to the birds, and to the spot of light, and the beauty of the foliage, and for a moment there is absolute clarity. And that clarity has left an imprint on the brain, it says, "By Jove, how clear it was." Then one wants that clarity to continue, don't we? Like pleasure, you want it to continue. The continuity is the movement of memory. Right? I must go into all that.

It involves time, doesn't it? Anything that continues must have

time, the implication of time. And time will not allow clarity. It is the freedom from time that is clarity. Let's go into this again, if we may.

Say for example one wants security, psychologically. And one for a few seconds, or for a few days, one has this feeling of being absolutely safe, protected, solidly secure. Then that disappears after a few days. But the memory of that feeling remains. And we want to continue that which has happened two days ago. Right? This is what we are all caught in. That is, the duration of an experience which has finished, and the memory of it we want - the memory wants continuity of that thing which has happened. Right? So if we could look at this question: time by the watch, by the sunset and sunrise, time as day and night, time of year and so on, that is there is time. And thought is also time. Right? You are following this? Time is a movement of thought from the past to the present and the future, which is a movement of time. This movement has its own continuity. Right? Are we together following this? And the brain, which has evolved through time, says, continuity is essential because for it to continue it is essential. Physically, biologically, it is necessary. But psychologically it wants also to continue. So the brain becomes confused when there is no continuity. Right? You are following this? Are we together somewhat in this?

And one questions whether there is psychological continuity at all. You understand my question? We are questioning, I am not stating: is there psychological continuity at all? That is, moments of clarity which banishes, puts aside all fear, all problems, and all the travail of life, it happens in a moment. And the brain says, it

must continue. Because it only thinks in terms of time, a continuity. You understand? Biologically it is necessary to continue day after day. Right? The same house, same food, same clothes, same roof over the head. Psychologically also we want in relationship security to continue. Right? Are you following all this? Is there in relationship security at all? Which is a duration of long period of time. When there is the demand for that there is conflict. I wonder if you understand this.

Relationship, as it is very important, it is a tremendously important thing in life, relationship, one cannot possibly exist in this world without relationship, whether you are a monk, a sannyasi, a wanderer, you are always related to the past, or to a person, or to a concept of the future. It isn't just a mere physical relationship. As relationship is very seriously important in life there are moments in which relationship has great depth, silence and a sense of tremendous well-being. Don't you know all this? The speaker hasn't to go through all this, but he will go through it. And that, those moments of deep sense of fullness, wholeness, is registered, recorded in the brain, and the function of the brain is to record and keep it going. And so the memory begins to play an important part.

So one questions whether there is security at all in relationship? You understand my question? We want it. We think it is absolutely necessary, but is there any? - Please ask yourself. Security means permanency, and is there anything in life permanent? Death is always there, but let's leave death alone for the moment. Is there anything permanent in life? We want to have something permanent. Apparently religious people say god is permanent.

That's a marvellous invention but it has very little meaning. So we are seeking in relationship security and permanency. That very concept - please listen to this for a minute - that very concept of demanding security and permanency is translated as attachment. Right? So there is deep attachment to another. It may be for a month, or for a week, or for fifty years. And during this state of attachment there is all the conflict of jealousy, suspicion, fear, gain and loss, you know, you know all this, don't you. So the demand in relationship to have a sense of permanent continuity in which there is security leads to attachment and all the complexity of attachment. If one sees that, perceives the fact of that, perceiving it, as you perceive the tree and you don't, unless you are blind, you don't go against it, knock yourself. So if you see this fact that the demand in relationship for permanency, security which inevitably leads to a great deal of conflict and attachment, fear and so on, then that very perception burns away the demand for security. You understand? Is this clear, this question? That at the moment when we think in terms of time, a sense of continuity, then intensity, clarity and the feeling of wholeness disappears. You have understood, captured all this?

You have listened to this, is it all nonsense? Do you say, what the devil are you talking about? Or is it sanity, reason, logical, and if you, if I may most respectfully ask, if you see this very clearly, the fact that we do demand in our life, in our daily living, psychologically a sense of continuity, a sense of security, it must inevitably bring conflict. Right? Do we see this, perceive this fact? And we are saying if we perceive the truth of this, that very perception burns away the demand for security and permanency.

Therefore then what is our relationship with each other? You understand? You understand my question? Suppose the speaker or you have not this sense of security and permanency, that doesn't mean anything, suppose, then what is relationship? You understand? What is my wife and my husband, or girl friend, or boy friend, whatever it is? Do please ask this, think it out, let's work it out. What is one's relationship with another, intimate, or otherwise? Is there just, what, a gap? Or when there is no permanency, demand for permanency and security with all its complexity, is it possible a new awakening, a new sense of what is love? Do you understand my question? Permanency and attachment, with all its pain and pleasure and anxiety and fear, is not love. And in the absence of that entirely, deeply, profoundly, the other is like a flower that blooms. Right? Is this possible? It is possible when you hear all this, is it possible in your daily life? Love is not thought, desire, sensation; love has totally a different quality. And that is totally absent when the other, security and all the rest of that, is the demand of every human being.

2nd QUESTION: What is judgement? How is one to determine the line dividing opinion, and the perception of fact?

It's a good question. What is fact, and what is opinion? And where is the dividing line between the two? Why do we have opinions? The meaning of that word, opinion, means judgement, evaluation, preconceived concepts, you know, the whole assertive, dogmatic opinions that each one has. Why do we carry so many opinions? Please enquire into this. Why do we have opinions at all? We have opinions about everything. And apparently they are so strong, and we think that is freedom, to have a thousand opinions

about everything. That gives you a sense of freedom, at least you think you are free, independence. It's my opinion, I am right. So we have a thousand opinions.

And what are facts? What is fact? Fact is that which has happened. Right? That which has happened. An incident or an accident is a fact, which took place yesterday. And fact is also what is happening now. Right? What is happening now, you and I are sitting here having a conversation, a dialogue, or a question and answer and so on, that's a fact. What is not a fact is what may happen tomorrow. Right? Are we coming together in this? What may happen when you leave this place and go off, go off to your car. So fact is that which happened, that which is happening; and fact is not what will happen. That's clear. What will happen is decided by what is happening now. Right? I wonder if you see this. The future is in the present. Right? The future, what you are now is the future, modified, but basically what you are now. So the future is in the present. Right? And the past is also in the present. Right? So the present contains all time. Please don't play with this as a theory, it is meaningless. It becomes a slogan if you repeat that, at least it loses its meaning. But if you see that the past has a continuity in the present, and the future is the past modified in the present, the past modified through the present, so the present, the now, contains all time. Right? And if you don't change now you will be exactly the same tomorrow, slightly modified. So the future is in the present. This is really quite important to understand because what is action? I mustn't go into that.

So why do human beings cling to opinions and not facts? You can conclude from a fact an opinion. Right? A fact can be made

into an opinion, but the opinion is not the fact. I may have an accident in a car and you come along and see it, and have umpteen opinions about it, but the fact is I have an accident. So why do we have opinions at all, about government, about religion, about this, and about that, about literature, about poems, you follow? Why? Is it a kind of game? Is it a kind of wastage of energy? Is it another form of chattering? Which is all a waste of time, waste of energy. Whereas if you stick to facts, which is, what has happened, what is happening, that's only facts. I am looking at the tree. That's a fact. Why do I have to have an opinion about that? If I am a lumber merchant, thank god I am not, and I say, that's a valuable tree, let's cut it down - that's a different matter. But to have constant opinions about everything seems to one such a stupid waste of energy and time, you know, it is so useless.

And judgement, the question is: what is judgement? A judge passes a sentence on somebody, criminal, or some innocent man. There was a judge once whom the speaker happened to know. He was high up in law and became a judge. And one morning after many years of judgement, he said, "What am I judging? What is truth? I am passing a judgement about everything according to precedence and so on, what is truth? Unless I find that out judgement has no meaning". So as was customary in India in those days - about 50 or 80 years ago - he called his family and said, "I am going to withdraw from the world, go off into the forest, into some distant village, meditate and find out." We are telling you the facts of it, not opinions about it.

After 20 years or 40 years - I have forgotten the exact time - somebody brought him to listen to one of the talks that K was

giving and he came to see the speaker afterwards, and he said, "You know what I have been doing these 40 years? I started out to find truth meditated, did all kinds of things and I see now that I have been mesmerizing myself. I have been living an illusion." Right? You understand all this? For an old man to acknowledge such statement and say that is a fact, that needs a great deal of perception.

So, What is judgement? What is justice? Is there justice in the world? Please ask this question of yourself. Is there justice in the world? You are born in a good family, money, education, prosperity, success, and the other lives in a small ghetto, no future except poverty, constant struggle. Right? Where is justice in that? The Indians have a very good explanation, the Hindus, which is Karma. You understand? Don't, please, that word Karma means to act. Not all these things ??? to it. To act rightly, at the now. If you act rightly now, the future is right. So, ought you act mischievously now, you pay for it next day or next life.

Now, is there justice in the world? A crook can employ a clever lawyer and get away with it. This is happening everyday. You are clever, I am not. You are beautiful, I am not. You are extraordinarily alive, I am not. This is facts. So, where is there justice? There is so called legal justice which is totally different from actual justice. Justice can only be found where there is freedom and compassion. Without that freedom and compassion which in its movement is intelligence there is justice. Otherwise, there is no justice in the world. This is, please, not an opinion, not a theory, but when you have this feeling of great compassion which is quite a deep question. Then there is, in that compassion, there is

justice.

3rd Question: There are many people who have considerable difficulty with the fact of homosexuality. Teachers, for centuries have avoided this enquiry. Could please, even briefly put some light on this question? I have travelled 2000 miles to ask this question.

Krishnamurti: There are many people who have considerable difficulties with the fact of homosexuality. Teachers, for centuries have avoided this question. I have travelled, oh, Could you please, even briefly put some, answer this question? I have travelled 2000 years, miles (laughter) to ask this question? Sorry, quite right, I have travelled 2000 years. This has been a question for thousands and thousands and thousands of years. It isn't something new. How would you, we are not taking sides in this matter. We don't condemn it or approve it or disapprove it. These are facts. Right? As heterosexuality is a fact. Homosexuality exists in the world, in different parts of the world very common, other parts of the world it is practically unknown. So how do you answer this question? What is the question? Why do we make it into such an enormous problem? Apparently we don't make heterosexuality a problem at all, but we make this into a problem, why? It is a fact. So should we enquire into this question, into heterosexuality, and homosexuality differently? Not condemn one or the other, or approve one and deny the other, but enquire why sexuality, both, has become so colossally important. Right? Why? You answer this question. On television, in magazines, every best seller, has this element in it, in detail, every day. You are following? I don't have to tell you all this. Everyday it is emphasised - sexuality, I am not

talking about homo or heterosexuality, just sexuality. Why have human beings given such great importance to this? And if it is not important you feel there is something wrong with you, that you are neurotic, that you have to fulfil, you know dozens and dozens of explanations by the psychologists, by the experts, by the sexualists. Why? Is it pleasure? Remembrance in the pictures of sexuality - you understand? Why has man given throughout the ages such extraordinary importance to this? If you are deprived of it you feel something terrible has happened. And you can voluntarily say, I won't have any, I will become a celibate, and join a monastery, or not join a monastery, or remain a celibate with all the problems of celibacy. Right?

So what is the question? Why has this thing been given such a place in life? It is part of life. Right? Part of walking, seeing, running, laughing, tears, it is part of life. But why has this one thing taken importance. And it is being encouraged very carefully. Right? By the entertaining industry. Please go into all this. And the psychologists have also encouraged this: fulfil. And some mothers feel there is something wrong with their daughter or son who doesn't have a boy or girl friend after the age of twelve, thirteen. This is all what is happening in the world, especially in this country. In the traditional countries like India, and others countries, there still they say, please wait, don't indulge, wait until you are twenty or twenty two, or whatever it is.

So seeing all this, what does one learn from all this? Learn, not morally, not morality, not celibacy and so on, but what does one learn from all this? Come on, sirs! Religions throughout the world, the ancient - I won't call them the very ancient - the Hindus, the

Buddhists, Christianity, have always said, be a celibate, if you want to follow God be a celibate. Why? And they take vows of celibacy, join monasteries, become a monk, a wandering monk, as they do in India, and go through tortures with this. Right? They have taken a vow, they must stick to it. I don't know why they take a vow first but once you have taken a vow you have to follow that which you have accepted. But psychologically, inwardly, the glands, everything is functioning, and you have a terrible time. The speaker has talked to many, many of them. They go through hell. Religion has done that. You know all this, don't you?

And one asks: why has man said to himself, to achieve the most sublime you must be a celibate? Do you understand? That is, you must torture yourself, go through agonies and then you will be nearer god. It seems so childish, the whole thing. Sorry! I have met many, many sannyasis, in India, monks. I won't go into the details of it, they have tortured themselves in every way. Because the popular opinion is that to reach god, to reach the highest, you must live a life of absolute abstinence. Which means human beings have never understood what is austerity. May we go into that? You are not bored with all this? I don't mind if you are bored. Probably you don't want to go into all this, it may disturb you very much. Please don't be disturbed because we are dealing with facts.

What is austerity? You know the root meaning of that word, as we explained the other day, to be austere means to have, in Greek, a dry mouth, not from drinks, but a dry mouth, which is to be harsh, to be sharp, to be dry. And so gradually the human being has this idea it must be austere, and has made himself into ashes. You understand? When you are forcing yourself day after day, month

after month, year after year, driving yourself you end up as dry human being. And if you indulge in the other direction you have the same problem.

So can one live a life without conflict? You understand? Neither extremes, which imply conflict, and the sensory demands and the suppression of sensory demands. Can one live without a single battle, effort, struggle between the two? You understand my question? That requires a great deal of enquiry into the whole problem of desire, will, wish, and the biological urges. Do you understand? Do you want to go on with this?

There is a very good question at the end - I just saw it! How is one to live on this earth - please listen to it - how is one to live on this earth without harm or destruction to its beauty, without bringing suffering and death to others?

But we must finish our question which we were talking about previously. Could we bear another quarter of an hour? Are you working the same as the speaker is working, or are you just listening? Is your brain as active, working, enquiring, doubting, intense to find out a way of living which is something totally different?

We were saying, to live a life without conflict requires an investigation into the whole question of desire, which is a very, very complex problem. Do you really want to go into all that? I am not asking out of encouragement, I am just asking. It is a very serious thing that we are undertaking. It is no good just merely listening and repeating, that has no meaning at all. But seeing what the facts are in this world, what is actually taking place in the world, not only in this country but in every country, in so-called

every culture, and conflict in man is increasing more and more and more, not less and less. Man means woman and man, so please don't get excited about it - why don't I talk about women. Unless one understands very deeply the movement of desire, not the description of it, not the explanation of it, but to enquire why desire becomes so extraordinarily important: desire to become successful, desire to have money, desire for sex, for excitement, for amusement, the tremendous urge and the speed of it, and the demand for its fulfillment. Again religions have said you must suppress desire, which means another battle, another conflict, another torture. You know religion has played havoc with human beings. And they are still doing it, not only in the Christian world but in the whole world, the Islamic world, look what they are doing in Iran and Iraq. Don't talk of it.

So what is desire? Please understand we are not trying to suppress it, or encourage it, but it is a fact. The fact is that we are driven by desire. And to thwart it is pain. Right? A sense of not being able to fulfil, so at any cost, at any price we want the fulfillment of desire. You may say desire for god, desire for understanding, it is still desire. Shall I go into all this?

When you look at a tree and the beauty of the tree, the light upon the leaf, and the mountains beyond it, the valleys, the shades and the dappled light, and see that enormous beauty of the earth, that is sensation. Right? I won't go into the question, is beauty sensation, I am not going into that, that's another problem. No, not a problem, that is quite another thing, very interesting if you go into it: is beauty sensation? When you see all that, the earth and its beauty, it is a sensation. Right? Seeing with the optical eyes, with

the eyes, and the seeing, the very seeing arouses the sensations. Right? Seeing a beautiful woman or a man arouses various kinds of sensations. Then that sensation is correct, isn't it, normal, healthy, natural, unless one is paralysed, blind, and deaf, dumb. That is when one is sensitive one is acutely aware of all this. And you see this. There is perception of all this. Then what takes place? You are looking at those hills. The seeing of those hills arouses certain sensations. Then what is the next step to that? Enquire, please, look at it. Does then thought come in and say, what a beautiful thing that is? Right? Thought then creates an image out of that sensation. Right? I am not saying anything that is not factual, this is not supposition or fictitious. Sensation - contact, sensation, then thought makes an image of that sensation. Right? Are you following? When thought makes an image out of that sensation then desire is born. Sensation is not desire. Sensation is sensation. But when thought comes and says, yes, what a lovely thing that is, what a lovely dress that is, nice shirt - being a man - nice shirt, or a woman says, nice dress. Goes inside, touches it, feels it, puts it on, and then thought says, how beautiful I look. That's a nice shirt on me. Then desire is born. You understand this? This is a fact. It is not something theoretical, it is a fact.

Now the question is, if you go into it much deeper, sensation, seeing a beautiful painting, beautifully framed and beautifully lit, marvellous, that is a sensation. Then the thought says, I wish I had that in my room. Then when the thought assumes the authority over sensation desire is born. Now the question is: can sensation and thought be kept apart? Go into this. Not through will, through compulsion, effort and all that, we are asking a very serious and

simple question. Sensation is natural, thought is also somewhat natural, with its image. That's what happens. Now can there be a gap, an interval, a hiatus, so that sensation and thought are separate? You understand? See what is implied in it. It requires tremendous attention, great watchfulness. Seeing, sensation. The speaker has seen some most beautiful things in the world, beautiful cars, beautiful people - please I am not using that in the common sense - beautiful people. So it is natural to look at this world, this enormous beauty, the destruction, what human beings are doing to the earth, and see some of the most beautiful gardens in the world, houses, palaces, and so on, we have lived in them and all that. And never to be identified with any of it. Oh, you don't know all this. Never ask, I wish I had it. You understand? That requires great perception, watchfulness and clarity.

And all that implies a sense of great inward learning, which is discipline. Learning is discipline, not conformity.

3rd QUESTION: How is one to live on this earth without harm or destruction to its beauty, without bringing suffering and death to others?

Have you ever asked this question? Actually? Not theoretically but actually put that question, face it. Don't run away from it, not explain, it is necessary, and all the rest of it, but look at it, confront it. Have you ever asked such a question? Not en masse, make a demonstration against some politician who wants to destroy a National Park or this or that. To ask such a question, that means you are burning with it, it is something tremendously real, not just a fanciful question to pass the time of day. To live on this earth with its extraordinary beauty, and not to destroy it, and to end

sorrow, and not kill another, not kill another human being, not kill a living human thing. There are those people in India, a certain sect: their transportation is to walk, they take no trains, no aeroplanes, no carriages, nothing but walk, and they put on a mask not to kill an insect by breathing. You understand? There is a whole group of them. Some of that group came to see the speaker and they walked 800 miles from April to January, and never taking any transportation except walking. And they won't kill.

And there are those who kill, kill for sport, kill for amusement, kill for profit - the whole meat industry. Right? Destroy the earth, to dump poisonous gas, you know all that is happening in this country, pollute the air, the waters, and pollute each other. This is what we are doing to the earth and to ourselves.

And the questioner asks: can we live on this earth with its great beauty and not bring suffering to others or death. It is a very, very serious question. To live a life without causing suffering to others, or causing death to others, that means not killing a human being, not killing any animal for sport, for your food. You understand all this? This is the question.

There were a certain class of people in India at a certain time, they never ate meat. They thought killing was wrong. They were called at the time, Brahmins. And the western civilization has never enquired into whether killing is right, whether killing any living thing is justified. The western world has destroyed whole races of people. Right? This country has destroyed the Indians of this country, wiped them out because they wanted land, and all that. So can we live on this earth without killing, without war? I can answer it, but what value has it to you, because you are killing?

I am not advocating vegetarianism. Some author wrote some time ago, a cutting was sent to me, he wrote saying: "vegetarianism is spreading like some foul disease in this country". Even if you kill a cabbage. So where do you draw the line? Do you make a problem of it? Do you understand my question? If you are against war, as certain human beings are, including myself, against war, killing other human beings for whatever reason, then you cannot post a letter. Right? The stamp you buy, the food you get, all that, part of it goes to defence, armament. If you buy petrol - gas in this country, part of that goes, your taxi, part of it goes, and so on and so on. So what will you do? If you don't pay taxes you are fined or sent to goal. If you don't buy stamps you can't write letters, you can't travel. Right? Are you following all this? It amuses you? So you drive yourself into a corner. And living in a corner seems rather futile. So what will you do? If you say, I won't travel, I won't write a letter, all this helps to maintain the army, and navy, and armaments - you follow the whole racket of it. Or would you approach it differently? Why do we kill? Religions, especially Christianity, have killed probably more people on earth, they have tortured people, called them heretics, burnt them. You know all the history of it. The Muslims have done it, the Islamic world has done it, probably the Hindus and the Buddhists are the only people - their religions forbid.

How can one live on this earth without killing another and causing suffering for another? To go into this question very deeply, really, it is a very, very serious question, is there that quality of love that answered this question? If you love another, if you love another human being, are you willing to kill that human being?

Would you then kill anything, except you need certain food, vegetables, nuts and so on, but apart from that would you kill anything? Go into all these questions, sir, and live it, for god's sake, don't talk about it.

What is dividing the world is ideals, the ideology of one group against another group. This eternal division, apparently an everlasting division, between man, woman, and so on. They have tried to bridge this through logic, through reason, through various institutions and foundations and organizations, and they have not succeeded in any way. This is a fact. Knowledge has not solved this problem either - knowledge in the sense, accumulated experience and so on. And thought has certainly not solved this problem.

So there is only one issue out of it: to discover or find out what is love. Love is not desire, love is not possession, love is not selfish, egocentric activity, me first and you second. And apparently that love has no meaning to most people. They may write books about it, but it has no meaning, so invent that quality, that perfume, that fire, that compassion, and compassion has its intelligence, that is supreme intelligence. When there is that intelligence which is born of compassion, love, then all these problems will be solved simply, quietly. But we never pursue the question to the very end. We may pursue it intellectually, verbally, but to do it with your heart, with your mind, with your passion, behind it, then the earth will remain beautiful. And then there is a great sense of beauty in oneself.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 26TH MAY 1984

What a lot of people, aren't there! I suppose we are really concerned with what we are talking about and that's why you are here. This is not, as we have often repeated, an entertainment, either intellectual, verbal twistings and innuendos, nor romantic theories and speculations and sentimental nonsense. We are dealing with facts. As we said, facts are those which have happened, and that which is happening now - those are facts. And what is happening tomorrow is not a fact, or a thousand tomorrows. We are only dealing with facts. And if we can understand those facts profoundly, not from any particular point of view, or a particular bias or direction, then perhaps we can examine the facts closely, carefully, and not only superficially but also profoundly, deeply.

As we have been saying during these talks we are taking a journey together, you and the speaker, a very long, wide journey, not into the future, but into the present. The present, as we pointed out, contains all time. The present is not only the past, all the memories, all the incidents, stored in the brain, recorded, but that past is now also. It is fairly obvious. And the future is what is now. The future will be exactly, perhaps slightly modified, as in the present, in the now. So what one is now one will be tomorrow, a thousand tomorrows. And if there is no fundamental radical psychological revolution - not evolution - a revolution, a mutation, deep fundamental change, tomorrow will be exactly what we are now. So all time, the past, the present and the future is contained in the now. This is not a theory, not a speculative philosophical

concept, but an actuality. If one looks at oneself very carefully what is happening, what is happening now is what we have carried through thousands and thousands of years, psychologically, and both biologically also. And that burden of the past with all its memories, experiences, knowledge is now, is what we are now. And we will be tomorrow what we are now. So please the now contains all time.

And in relation to that, what is action? And it is a fact that all time is in the now, in the present, what then is action? You understand? Can we go along with this for a while? Please, we are investigating together, the speaker is not instructing or informing. We are together, you and the speaker are investigating, exploring, examining, not analysing. There is a difference between analysis and perception. Analysis implies an analyser, the analyser is the past, and he is examining the present, what is happening now. What is happening now, or what is psychologically taking place, is what the observer has been, or is. Are we together in this? The observer, the analyser, is the result of a great many accumulations of information, knowledge, incidents, experiences, so the analyser is examining that which is happening now, or examining that which has happened. Right? So the analyser is the analysed, which is the present. Am I talking to myself, or are we somewhat together in this matter?

I think this is rather an important question to understand because when we divide the analyser as something separate from the analysed, then in that process of division there is contradiction, there is conflict; either there is suppression, or examination as something outside. But the analyser is the analysed. When one is

violent, when there is violence and you analyse violence, one can easily analyse violence, from the distant cousins, the apes until now, we have inherited all the violence of all the thousand years of continuity of violence. We can easily examine and analyse violence. Is violence different from the examiner, the analyser? Is not the analyser also part of that violence? Right? So the analyser is the analysed, it is not something separate from the analyser, therefore there is no division between the analysis and the analyser, they are one. And when we understand that, conflict exists only when there is division - division between your ambition and somebody else's ambition, division between you and your wife, your husband, your neighbour and so on, division brought about through nationalities, through religions and so on - not only psychologically but linguistically also, and so on.

So the analyser is the analysed, and so we said we are not analysing, we are perceiving directly. Is this somewhat clear for us, can we go on from there? I wish one could talk this over together quite simply, not you sitting there and the speaker sitting on a platform, but two friends looking at the whole problem of existence, amicably, in a sense of affection and care, looking at all this travail of man, the travail of each one, it would be very simple to do that, have a good dialogue. But when there are so many people here that is not possible, unfortunately. But you as a person and the speaker can think together, not along any particular line, or a particular point of view, or strengthen one's own opinion which becomes obstinacy, but rather as two friends who have known each other for some time, not only understand the verbal significance but go beyond the words. If we could do that together then

perception becomes very easy, to perceive. Not I perceive and the speaker is persuading you to perceive in a particular way: to perceive. In that perception you and the speaker disappear because we are only perceiving, but when there is a motive for that perception, a direction, a sense of bigotry, obstinacy, and then perception is distorted, and therefore you perceive differently from another. I hope this is clear.

So we are asking, when all time is in the present, now, which is a fact, not an abstraction or an ideology, or some ideal, but it is a fact, and when there is that fact what then is action? You understand? This is an important question to understand. We are also going to talk over together not only that but also the whole problem of becoming, psychologically. And what is action in relation to that becoming? And also if we have time we are going to talk over together suffering and perhaps, which is part of life, of our daily life, death - death not as a morbid incident but an extraordinarily important problem in one's life.

So we are going to talk over together: action, daily action, and the question of becoming. And in that becoming we all want to be secure. Security is very essential to all of us. The brain cannot function fully with all its capacity, energy and drive if the brain is not completely secure. Right? No? If one is confused, uncertain, with a thousand problems, how can the brain be secure? If you have many, many illusions, as most people do, the brain becomes then rattled, uncertain, confused. So the brain to function efficiently, not only technologically but much more seriously which is psychologically, the brain needs extraordinary stability, the brain needs to be absolutely clear, firm, unshakable. And we

are going to go into all that if you have the patience. But if you are not interested because you are interested in so many things - boating, driving, interested in reading a book, but giving attention which is totally different from interest.

Most of us, perhaps almost all of us, are attempting to become something psychologically. Outwardly, externally you can understand a student becoming an engineer. He becomes an engineer, earns a livelihood and keeps becoming more and more expert in engineering. And psychologically we have the same concept that I am this now, but I will become that. Don't agree with the speaker: question, doubt, don't follow anybody psychologically, of course you have to follow a doctor's instructions if you are ill. But psychologically, inwardly to obey any kind of authority, any kind of expert, professional, destroys the integrity of one's own perception. Psychologically we are all attempting to become something. Right? That is an obvious fact. One is greedy, or violent and one is trying not to be, that is to become. There are wars, and through United Nations and all those organizations, we are trying to unify the world, to become something in the future. I won't go into the contradictory nature of various nations becoming united, which is impossible, but that is the political activity of those who are concerned with their own ambitions, the perpetuation of particular systems. But one can see that there is always an attempt on the part of each one of us that we want to change from this to that. The 'that', the future, is in time, far away or very near but it is still a movement of becoming, gaining, losing, getting reward or punishment. This whole process of becoming, always with the intention, with the motive, the better, the more, the

gain, the fear of loss. That's clear.

Now is it a fact that to become something involves time? Right? I am this now but give me a year or two days I will be different. Which is, time is involved, but that time is now. You understand? The future is now. Is this a puzzle?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? I am glad! Then we can go more slowly into it. As we said, sir, we are the past. Right? All our memories which have been recorded in the brain, all that we have done, not only fifty years ago but yesterday, so the past is now. Right? And what is now, if there is not a radical change, will be tomorrow, which is time. The future is therefore in the now. Right? So where is becoming then? You are following? Please, this is really fascinating, very serious. We are accustomed to the idea of evolution. That is, man has reached the stage now after forty, fifty or a million years ago, our brain has evolved from the ape until we are now so-called civilized people, which I question, but that doesn't matter. And that has taken immense time. That time of forty thousand years is now, because what you are now. And the future is what you are now, perhaps slightly modified, but the future is also in the now. So unless there is a radical change now the future will be what you have been tomorrow. It is simple enough. Now don't let's beat the dead horse, it is clear. If it isn't clear think it out if you have the time and the inclination, you know all the rest of it, you can't drop it. Probably you will, which is most convenient and easy. But if you are interested, if you really want to discover for yourself a radical psychological, deep change, that change cannot have time. It must happen now. Clear?

If you have got toothache, pain, you don't say, "I'll wait until next week, it is part of evolution", and all the rest of it, there is instant action. So if we don't realize the danger of allowing time to interfere with action, then that action breeds all kinds of complications, obviously. So our question is this: the brain to function efficiently, clearly, without any kind of confusion, must understand what is security, what is stability, a sense of firmness so that it is not wishy-washy, wobbling all over the place as most brains are. Right? So we must examine if there is any security at all, psychologically. Of course we must have security physically, which is becoming more and more difficult for economic reasons; and those economic reasons are, each country thinks, my economy first, as each individual person thinks, me first. The economic situation of the world is very serious, they tell you everyday about it on the television, if you have observed, or in the newspapers, and they are trying to solve these problems, and they have not succeeded so far, and they never will because each group, each community, each nation, thinks they are something separate from the rest of the world. And therefore the economic situation becomes very limited, small, ineffectual. It is the concern of the rest of humanity, because everybody throughout the world desires to be secure physically, economically, and that is not possible when there are wars, and the threat of war, when there is division as religious divisions, national divisions, ideological differences, dialectical dissection of history, coming to a conclusion as Marx, Engles, Lenin and Stalin on one side, and on the other side Democratic, and so on. I know you will get bored with this but unless we radically change this narrow pattern we are going to

have more and more wars, economic problems, it is becoming more and more dangerous. It's up to you. And all this can end only when you drop your own particular conditioning as an American, Russian, Indian, French and British and so on, so that we are one humanity, as our consciousness is the rest of humanity. I have gone into that, I won't go into it now.

So the brain can only be stable, have complete security when we understand the whole process of becoming. Becoming implies duality, and where there is duality there must be conflict - the Arab and the Jew, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Catholic and the Protestant - you follow - the perpetual state of conflict human beings live in. So where there is becoming there is duality and therefore conflict. And the brain cannot perpetually live in conflict, it then becomes neurotic, psychotic and pursues every kind of illusion; and therefore the multiplication of psychologists, therapists and psychiatrists, you know they are multiplying all over the world. I am sorry there are psychologists here!

So to see that fact, not the idea of the fact, you understand the difference. One sees the fact and one then makes an abstraction of it which is called the idea of it, and we pursue the idea and not the fact. Right? Are we together in this? So we must be very clear in this matter, we are dealing with fact, not with idea, the symbol of the fact, or the word of the fact. When you see the fact that time is not the solution, or brings about a radical change, then you are stuck with the fact. Right? You are with the fact. And the fact is not different from you, you are the fact. You are the fact that you are violent, brutish, thoughtless, anxious, and all the rest of it, the whole content of one's consciousness which is in a turmoil,

constantly in conflict - like the consciousness of every human being in the world. So we are essentially all humanity, each one of us is all humanity. And if you change, not tomorrow, there is no time, time is the enemy of change - I wish you could realize this. Do consider it seriously please, if you are at all serious - then what is action? If there is only all time contained now, then what is action in the now? You understand my question? Are you puzzled a little bit?

Q: Yes.

K: Good! So we can explore more. What is action - every day action, going to the office, going to the factory, talking to your wife or husband, rowing, walking, jumping, chasing ideas, or chasing gurus, which is the same thing? You are acting. Life is action, as relationship is action. So what is action? Our action is based on reward and punishment, to put it very, very simply. I like life if I can get something out of it. And I will be punished if I don't act rightly, therefore I attempt to act rightly. So our action is based on reward and punishment, our action is based on some futuristic concept, on an ideal, and action according to that ideal, conforming, adjusting to that ideal therefore conflict. All our action has a motive, a direction, selfish generally, self-interest, self-concern, which is reward and punishment - a reward in the future - if I do this I will get that. Right? If I don't it I might lose, therefore the fear of losing. So our action is always in this area of gain and reward, punishment and fear. Right? Reward is always in the future. Punishment is also that it might happen in the future. So there is never action per se. You understand? Action for itself. Like a good carpenter who will make you a marvellous cabinet, the love

of it itself, not the reward, the punishment, the gain.

So action in relation to time breeds conflict. Right? Is this clear? And is there action which is for itself? Is love the action in itself? Not the love that has jealousy, hate, amusement, fun and excitement, sex, pleasure - love is not all that surely. You see when there is love there is action without conflict. And love is not a slave to time. So there it is. If you can understand that, explain and deeply grasp the truth of it, then the brain becomes extraordinarily vital, strong, not confused in any way because then you are living now completely, fear of the future and the past disappear.

We ought also to talk over together the question of suffering, which is part of our life. There isn't a single human being in the world, not a single human being, whether he is in a monastery, or a monk in the Himalayas, a man in the street, and you and every human being on earth suffers. And we make others suffer. That's our cycle. And there is the suffering brought about by war; wars have existed for six, seven or ten thousand years. And during that long duration of time, killing each other in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of gain and profit and so on, man has brought upon himself and others great sorrow, tears. There isn't one human being who has not cried, shed tears and the pain of loss. Millions maimed because we are so conditioned to stick to our own particular point of view, to our own particular religion, to our own particular ideology - I believe and I hold to that. And you believe something contrary, therefore I am willing to kill you. This is going on. The Russian ideology, the democratic ideology, and they are willing to kill each other, blow each other to smithereens. And this has been going on for thousands upon thousands of years,

protecting my country, my god, my - oh not here, there is no king here! This is very serious, sir, you may laugh it off, but if one's wife or husband, son is destroyed by war then you will know what it means. We all know what it means but yet we go on in the same old pattern.

And so there is the sorrow of mankind, the sorrow of humanity. And also what we think is our own particular sorrow - my son is dead, my wife has left me, there is the sorrow of seeing another suffer, the sorrow of those who can never read or write, those who are extraordinarily poor. All that is sorrow, not only the sorrow of mankind but also the sorrow of each one. Each one thinks, it is my sorrow, not yours. But sorrow is sorrow, not yours or mine, it is sorrow. To understand this requires freedom to observe, to perceive, but we have become so individualistic, so narrow, so small, we reduce everything to our own limited backyard. Sorrow is sorrow of all humanity, it is not yours or mine.

And one asks: can that sorrow ever end? Or it is the lot of human beings to kill nature, animals, to kill each other? Not only kill verbally, kill by gesture, kill millions with one bomb, destroy millions and millions. So all this is sorrow. And sorrow of disease, pain, sorrow of not gaining, losing - take all that in, it isn't just the sorrow of my son dying. Can this sorrow ever end? Sorrow is not sentimental, sorrow is not something romantic, it is a dreadful thing. It is something that is so directly concerned with every human being, the loneliness of sorrow, the pain of it, the anxiety and so on. Can all that end? Probably we have never asked that question, we have never faced it, we all want to escape from it, take a drug in order not to suffer, get drunk, escape because we

never actually have faced the problem, the seriousness of it, that is, to give our complete attention to sorrow. Not veil it through words, through some kind of speculative hope and so on, but actually live with it without becoming morbid. That is to give one's whole complete attention to it.

Attention is like a fire, when that attention is there that thing which is sorrow, the loneliness, the pain, the anxiety, the tears, when there is that complete attention all that goes, disappears. Attention is a flame.

Sorrow, the root meaning of that word, is also passion. The ending of sorrow is passion, not lust. And we never have passion, we want pleasure. Passion is something extraordinarily different. Where there is the ending of sorrow there is passion - it is not your passion or my passion, it is passion. And that's part of love. Where there is love there is compassion. And where there is this extraordinary passion of compassion there is intelligence, and that intelligence acts - that intelligence is not yours, or mine, or X Y Z's.

And if we have time we ought to talk over together a very serious problem, which is death. On a lovely morning like this, to talk about death seems absurd. I wonder if we can talk first about beauty. What is beauty? My friend says, "I am not interested in that, beauty doesn't much matter." Where there is love there is beauty, freedom, goodness - which has been one of the problems of humanity, freedom, justice, goodness. Where there is love, do what you will, it will be right. So let's leave beauty until tomorrow, it is too complex.

We ought to talk over together this enormous problem of death.

One thing is absolutely certain, irrevocable, that we are all going to die one day, that is a fact. And we have never gone into the question, because most people are afraid of it, what is death, what is it to die? And why have we made death something far away from life, living? Do you understand my question? We are living now, and death may come to us when we are ninety, or a hundred, or later, much, much later - I hope for you. So there is a long wide gap between the now - you understand what I am saying? - between the now and the future. Knowing the now contains the future, therefore death is the now. I wonder if you understand all this.

Let's go into it slowly. I just saw something which I have never seen before. What is it, and why is it that we are frightened of death? We are frightened of living obviously. What we call living is a fearful turmoil, conflict, struggle, pain, anxiety, economic stringency, perpetual disagreement with each other, one opinion opposed to another opinion, the everlasting, constant waking up in the morning and getting ready and rushing off to the office, or to the laboratory, or to a factory. I wonder if you realize how we spend our days and our years. One may call it a jolly life; if you are very successful, have plenty of money, and a great deal of amusement, you say, "I have had a jolly good life" - most people do when they have money, power, position, all the things they want. But those are very, very few in the world, fortunately. But the vast majority, all of us, rush off on Sundays to church, just to show up that we are there for god to look at us. And go to the office from the age of twenty until you die, work, work, work - the responsibilities, the duties, the pain, the fear, the anxiety, the

loneliness. I wonder if one is aware of all this. You may be a successful actor, a lot of money, but there is always at the end of it too, death.

So what we call living is a very painful, confused, anxious life. Right? This is what we call living, and we cling to that because that is all we know. And we want to escape from that, so we have a tremendous industry of entertainment, sports, entertainment, football, you know the entertainment industry. And also the religious entertainment. Don't say, one is not an entertainment and the other is more holy, it is still entertainment. It is a sensation. Please don't think one is blasphemous, we are just facing facts.

So from the moment you are born until you die, problem after problem, and the solution of the problem, and in the solution of the problem you have ten different other problems. When a brain has been trained from childhood to resolve problems, mathematical problems, geographic problems, technological problems, engineering problems - you follow - so our brains are conditioned from childhood to resolve problems, not to understand problems, see what problems are, what is a problem, but to the resolution of them. And in the resolution of the problem it is organized in a different way. Right? One organization after another. This is our life - political, economic, social, and we are never for a moment free. And specially in this country you are talking about freedom all the time, freedom to choose, freedom to go from this little place to another place, change jobs, change wives. So choice we think is freedom. But it isn't, is it. Choice exists only when the brain is uncertain. When it is clear there is no choice at all. And so this very deep confusion, uncertainty, loneliness, despair, depression,

you know the whole cycle of our living.

And when death comes we are blown off, there is nothing else. And so we invent reincarnation. Do you believe in reincarnation? If you do, then live rightly. Live now rightly, because if you don't live now rightly the next life will be exactly the same thing as you are now. Naturally, because time, whether it is a thousand years or now, there is no right action, which can only take place where there is this quality, this perfume, this extraordinary thing called love. If that is not there the next life will be exactly the same thing as you are now, only slightly modified, perhaps a bigger house - that is all what you want, bigger car, more pleasure, but it is the same thing continued.

So what is death? We have understood what life is, at least what we consider life is, a tremendous bondage to time. And what is death? There is death to the organism, we are all getting older every day, from the moment we are born we are getting older and older and then die. And we have never asked what is death, what does it mean, while living - not when we come to the end of it? While living we have never asked what is the meaning, the significance, the depth of death. We have never asked what is the depth of life, living. It must have something enormously significant living, but we have reduced it to such a potty little affair. So we have never asked there, and we never ask secondly what death is. And as two friends let's look at it, not frightened, because then you will never understand it.

So as we went into the question of fear last week, and the ending of fear, there must be the end of fear to understand the nature and the quality and the depth of death. As we said,

biologically, organically, we are wasting, day after day, the organism. If we are living wrongly, all this travail, the misery, the confusion, the pleasures, the pain, tremendous wastage of energy, and that is coming to an end, that is part of death. And also what is it that is dying apart from the physical, biological existence, what is it that is dying? What is the 'me', that is the 'I', the ego, the person, the persona, the self - let's stick to that one word - what is that self, the 'me' that is going to die. Right? And that is what we are frightened of, not of death. The 'me' which has been accumulated in this life as memory, knowledge, experience, the 'me', my selfishness, my greed, my ambition, all the recording records, which is stored in the brain, the 'me', and we are frightened that me is going to come to an end. So we have to examine closely what is the 'me'. Who are you, apart from your name and your bank account, where you live and all that kind of stuff, apart from the physical me, the physical body, tall, short, apart from all that, what are you? Have you ever faced it? Let's face it now, don't be frightened.

What are you? Are you not all the accumulated memories - memories, pleasurable, pain, the fifty years, or thirty years, or ten days of memory, aren't you all that? Memories of your pleasure, the pain and anxiety of your desire, the loneliness, the depression, the struggle, aren't you all that? That is all memory. Right? Look at it as it is now, don't say, "Isn't there something superior beyond memory?" I know that game! You can invent something superior, that there is a soul, and the Hindus call it the atman, and so on, superior consciousness, something divine, something very, very clear. Those are all theories, absurdities; the actuality is what you

are, that vast collection of humanity, of memories of human beings. If you are a great technician, putting the atom bomb together, the neutron bomb, you have to accumulate a great deal of knowledge and death comes along and you say, "Wait a minute, let me finish it." But it is all the process of gathering, dispensing, gathering. You are that. That's a fact. But we don't like to look at the fact. We say, "No, I am something more." This 'something more' is the desire, is thought saying, "That is too small, surely I am something much more important than that". So that too is the invention of thought. So you are the bundle of memories put together by thought. Face it! And death comes along and says, "My friend, that's the end." And you say, "Please, let me live a little longer."

So please follow this closely and you will see it for yourself. Time is now. Time is contained, the past, the future is now. So death is now. That means if I am attached to my wife, to my something or other, to my furniture - aren't you attached to something? - and death comes and says, "That is the end of it." Cuts it. So can you be free of the attachment? Therefore you are living then, living and dying at the same time. You understand this? Oh, no. Do it, sir, and you will see what an extraordinary thing it is then. If you are attached to your memories, to your experience, to your failure, to your ambition, all that is going to come to an end. So can you live with death, which is to end your ambitions now? And to live without ambition means tremendous energy - not to do more mischief.

So death and life are always together. And when this happens, actually, not theoretically, not imaginatively, not wishing for it but

actually doing it, to whatever you are attached. I know it is difficult if the husband says to his wife, "Darling, I am not attached to you any more." - he will have a lot of trouble. And that is another problem, a tremendous problem. You may be free from attachment and she is not; or she is and you are not. Then what is relationship? Is relationship merely the accumulation of memory as pleasure, pain? Is relationship then merely a sensation? The image of each other, is that relationship? And so when there are these separate images there is conflict, pain, anxiety. So where there is pain, anxiety, fear, love is not.

So death and life always march together. Then there is that sense of absolute freedom from the little travail of myself. And that is necessary to understand that which is timeless, if there is such a thing as eternity. We will talk about it another time, but see all this as a movement of life, dying and living. Therefore in that sense you will never kill another, never deliberately hurt another. Right, sirs, finished.

OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 27TH MAY 1984

This is the last talk, or conversation between two friends. We have been talking during the last three talks about various aspects of life. We said how important it is to have the capacity to doubt, to question everything that is taking place in the world, not only externally but also inwardly - all our thoughts, our feelings, if one aware of one's own illusions, to question all those. Because scepticism without cynicism has a great beneficial effect. Our brains have been programmed for two thousand years according to the Christian world, and the Hindus, and the Buddhists, three to five thousands years. They have been programmed like a computer - Catholics, Americans, Russians, believers, non-believers, specialists, psychoanalysts, psychiatrists and so on, scientists, doctors. We have been programmed, and of that there is no doubt, because this programming has resulted in our being conditioned. And unless we question, doubt, have a great deal of sane scepticism, the brain can never be free. And freedom, and to be free are two different things. If we may go into all that.

We are going to talk about various things this morning - freedom, desire, and the importance of thought, and what is religion upon which most civilizations are based, most cultures are born out of this religious aspect of life. And also we are going to talk over together the very complex problem of what is meditation. All this we are going to talk over together this morning. And also, if one may remind you again, if it is not too repetitive, that this is not in any way entertainment, not something you attend for a weekend and forget all about it afterwards. But rather it is

concerned with our daily life which has become so disturbed, chaotic, uncertain, confused.

And this conditioning, this being programmed - one must understand the nature of it and see whether it is possible at all to be free of it, otherwise there can be no creation, it will all be invention. Invention is totally different from creation. A technical invention is the product of thought. Invention along any lines, poetic, religious, technological and so on, that's fairly comparatively easy; but to find out, as most religions have tried to find out, what is creation, and to understand the nature of it, and the depth of it, and the beauty of it, one must understand and be free from being programmed.

So what is it to be free? Freedom is from something - freedom from our own misery, from our own troubles and problems, free to have an economic society that is providing for all human beings, a society that is not too corrupt and so on. Freedom from our own bondage, from our own peculiar tendencies, opinions and judgements in which most of us are entangled. Opinion, judgement, conclusion, is so strong with each one of us, and that prevents perception, seeing clearing what is going on in the world both externally, outwardly, and much more so inwardly, the whole psychological complexity of one's own life.

So what is it to be free - not freedom from something which then becomes a reaction? Freedom from capitalism has led to totalitarianism, with all its misery and brutality. And freedom from our own particular fears is still in the area of a reaction - 'Oh if one had freedom from some peculiar urge' - or tendency - 'one could be so great' and so on. Whereas to be free is something entirely

different. The word 'free' comes from - though etymologically it is not very clearly established - free, to be free, implies in that word love, amongst other meanings. Because we do not really comprehend in our own life what it is to love. And if love is the opposite of hate, if love is the opposite of jealousy, or if love is the opposite of attachment, every opposite has its roots in its own opposite. Are we understanding this? If one is greedy, as most of us are, and the urge not to be greedy, that contradiction is born out of one's own greed. You understand? Is this somewhat clear?

Look, we are having a conversation together. The speaker is not important. The speaker really means it, there is no personal worship in all this nonsense, all that kind of stuff is stupid. But what he said is very, very important, to be evaluated with scepticism, not accepting a thing that he says. He is not a professional expert, but together, as two friends, examining our whole life, one's own life, which is very complex, which demands attention, care, perception, observation, and as two friends talking over their life, so this is not a lecture, or a sermon. A lecture, the meaning of that word is to inform, to instruct; we are not instructing or informing, as though one knows all about life and the other fellow doesn't know about it. But rather together, and it is important to understand what it means to work, to think, together. Because very few of us think together about anything. You have got so many opinions, so many judgements, and so on, we never think together. We have opinions about thought, agreement, or disagreement, you are not right, I am right, and so on, but the capacity, the demand that thinking together about everything requires a freedom, a sense of affection, care, attention. Otherwise

we cannot possibly think together. Then you become a follower, a listener to be informed, to be instructed, to obey. We are back again in the old pattern. Whereas if we could think together, what it is to be free, not what you think is to be free, or the speaker, but together find out. In that togetherness, if I may use that word, there is no you and the speaker. There is only the feeling that we are together examining, looking, sceptically, sanely into the whole question of one's own and the existence of everything around us.

The word free, to be free, has many meanings, but mostly free means to be a friend, to love. And love is not something that thought can evolve, put together, or can be cultivated. You can cultivate a garden, you can cultivate anything, to plough, to cultivate, to grow. But love is not something that thought can cultivate. So it is very, very important to understand altogether very deeply the nature of thought, thinking. If we really could understand that fundamentally then we shall be able to resolve most of our problems. Because we have dozens of problems - of relationship, economic problems, social problems, problems of every kind, human beings are burdened with them.

So not only to understand the nature of freedom from something, and to be free, completely free, not from something. And is that possible at all when thought is operating all the time? You understand my question? So it is important, isn't it, to understand not only verbally, or through explanations the whole movement of thought, because we live by thought, every action is based on thought, in every area, in every sector, in every field of our life both outwardly and inwardly thought is operating. We have given thought tremendous importance. And until we unravel the

whole structure and nature, the movement of thought, merely trying to be free, which is to cultivate freedom, becomes impossible.

So we are concerned together, as two friends, what is freedom, and what is it to be totally free? And can there be this sense of wholeness in which there is freedom, free? So we are going to go into it.

As long as we are programmed - Catholic, Protestant, and the many thousand divisions of Protestantism, or Hinduism and the Islamic world, and the Buddhist world, we have been programmed - and as long as we are being programmed, our whole brain has been programmed for thousands of years, there can be no sense of total freedom. Is this clear? Are we together in this? So is it possible to be free? Or must we everlastingly be condemned to be programmed like a computer? Our brain functions, not that the speaker is a professional brain specialist, but he has observed many, many, in the course of sixty, seventy years, how people's brains work, observing them. And also observing one's own brain in operation. It has become so mechanical, repetitive, its very accumulation of knowledge is limiting it. I wonder if you understand this? When one has a great deal of knowledge about various disciplines like science, being an expert in surgery, medicine, telecommunication and so on, our brain actually becomes very small, it can expand along a particular line, but that expansion still is limited. I hope you are getting all this. Now is it possible to be totally free from all this? Otherwise we will never know what it is to be creative, something totally unthought of, totally new. "There is nothing new on the earth", but if we accept

that slogan, then we will never find out what it is to be creative.

So to understand this programming, and why we accept it, one must go, not only as we went yesterday morning, into the whole desire to be secure. We went into that very carefully yesterday morning, we won't go in it again. But also we went into the nature of thought many, many times but most of us really haven't seen the depth of it, the quality of thought, how limited thought is, though it has done the most extraordinary things, in the technological world, and also in the psychological world. But whatever it has done it is still very limited because, as we pointed out yesterday, there is always the 'more', not only in the technological world but also inwardly, the 'more', the 'better'. The 'more', the 'better' is measurement, and where there is measurement there is limitation. This has been one of the problems of religious people. We have gone into this, that is, the Greeks, the ancient Greeks, were concerned with measurement, otherwise we wouldn't have this extraordinary technology in the western world, because the western world has its roots in the ancient Greeks. And in India, the ancient people said, measurement in any form is illusion. You cannot possibly measure the immeasurable. So there are two contradictory statements: technologically you must have measurement, and psychologically also we have accepted there is measurement as the 'more', the 'better', the 'becoming'. Whereas the ancient Hindus said, every form of measurement is limitation. And they said that and forgot all about it. But probably they never - the speaker does not know the full extent of their saying because he doesn't read books - measurement implies thought. Thought is based on knowledge, experience and memory, and knowledge is always

limited now and in the future. So thought is always limited. It can imagine the immeasurable, it can invent all the gods on the earth, all the rituals, all that business, which is extraordinarily unreal.

So thought can never be free, or thought can never bring about a sense of being totally free. Right? I wonder if you understand this. Because thought itself is limited, and therefore whatever it does will still be limited. And thought is driven by desire - isn't it? Right? So we have to enquire into the nature and the structure of desire. The word 'desire' means longing for, in expression, which is wanting something more. The meaning of that word is that, longing for, not having, wanting. Right? So we are going together to understand what is desire.

I do not know if you have observed, not only yourself but all the people around you, the priests, the hierarchy of priests, the popes through history, and all the monks of the world, and all the human beings in the world, being dissatisfied with what they are they want something more, longing for something more. Aren't you all longing for something more? Aren't we all driven by desire - to be successful, to have money, to have position, famous, you know all that business. We are full of desires. And what is the relationship between desire and thought? Right? Please ask this question, as two friends talking together, the speaker is saying to the friend, look at it, he is asking, what is the relationship between the two, desire and thought. Why thought in the religious areas has insisted on suppression of desire. You understand? The monks throughout the world have said, you must have no desire, suppress it. Or identify that desire with something you call god, your saviour, you know, symbols. Right? So desire has an extraordinary importance

in our life. And we are not trying to suppress it, or transcend it, or identify that desire with something nobler, symbolic, significant, all that stuff, we can wipe out all that.

So we are now trying to understand the nature of desire. You might have heard the speaker explain it before, but forget what he has said before. We are now afresh, anew, examining this thing. And to examine one must be not only free from personal worship, but also there must be freedom from the fear of not being without desire. You understand? There must be a sense of perception in which there is no distortion, no motive, but to observe very closely the whole movement of desire. Can we go on with that?

We are sitting under a tree, under several trees, and there is the blue sky through the leaves and the distant mountains, hills, the dappled light on all of us, and to see all this clearly and to see the beauty of all that, and what is the relationship of beauty to desire? You understand my question? So we must also enquire what is beauty? All right?

What is beauty? We are asking, what is beauty? A beautiful poem, a beautiful picture, a beautiful tree in a solitary field, the beauty of a wave, the quiet beauty of a blue sea, and the beauty of great mountains, the immensity, their dignity, their immovability, and the line against the blue sky, snow packed. And all the museums in the world with their ancient sculptures, modern paintings, and the classic statuary, most of have seen all these, and we say when we look at them, how extraordinarily beautiful they are. If you have seen the Parthenon in Greece for the first time you almost go on your knees to the beauty of the structure. And when you see a beautiful man, or a woman, or a child specially, and you

are breathless for a moment with all the beauty of this world. And does beauty lie in the perceiver? You understand my question? Is beauty a matter of instruction, being well informed about all the paintings in the world, who painted it, from modern Picasso to the ancient (?) and so on, to be well informed, to talk about it, you know, play with it, is all that beauty?

So what is beauty? When do you perceive beauty? In the face, in the mountain, in a tree, or the slip of a moon when the first moon appears, just a sliver, and the quietness of a still evening, when do you perceive all this? And the word beauty seems to suffice for most of us, just to say, "How beautiful it is", and go on to the next thing. You see marvellous paintings of Leonardo da Vinci, or Michelangelo and so on, and then go off and have tea. Right? This is what we generally do. We never really go into the question of what is beauty. And when do you perceive this sense of immensity and the truth of beauty? When you see a great mountain, with the deep valleys and the snow against the blue sky, aren't you for a second, by the dignity and the majesty of the mountain, for a second you have forgotten all your problems, you have forgotten all your misery, confusion, sorrows, and all the rest of it, and that great immensity of a snowcapped peak drives you away, drives your self away. Right? Haven't you noticed all this?

So beauty can only exist when the self is not. You understand? When the mind, when the brain is not chattering, caught in a net of words, when it is really utterly quiet, when there is total absence of the 'me', the self, the ego, the persona, then you really see the extraordinary sense of beauty of the world, of the tree and the sky. And what is the relationship of that sense of extraordinary beauty

to desire? We want to capture that beauty, we want to hold it, to live with it, to have this sense of utter... to be totally free of all the turmoil, the noise and the vulgarity of the world.

So we must enquire rationally, clearly and sanely, what is desire? Desire has built a great many things in life - great architecture, and also created wars and destruction and so on. So we must really understand this tremendous urge that human beings have, of which we are slaves. When you sit under these trees and look at the beauty of the light, although it is somewhat hot unfortunately, you have a great sense of sensation, don't you - your senses are awake if you are alert, your senses respond to all this. So the sensation of these trees, the light, the hills, the quietness, awakens sensation. When you see the Pacific as you go along the highway, can you look at all that water with all your senses? Have you ever done it, with all your senses fully alive, alert? Then in that total sensation with all your senses, not partially, one operating more than the other, but the whole organism, the nerves, the whole entity of a human, when you give such tremendous attention with your sensation, have you noticed there is no self at all, there is no me at all? We will come to that presently.

So we live with sensations. It is fairly obvious. These sensations are taken over by thought and given a shape, or an image. Right? To make it very simple: you see something beautiful in a shop, you go inside, touch it, contact with it, feel the quality of the silk, or the material, there is sensation. Right? Then thought comes along and says, "How marvellous if I had it, how nice it would look on me". Right? When thought creates the image out of the sensation desire is born. Right, have you got it? When thought builds, or makes out

of that sensation an image which is having that beautiful shirt, or that robe, or that car, or that house, or the refrigerator, whatever you want, then at that moment desire is born. This is so clear and obvious if one perceives every second the whole movement of it, which requires great attention, not to miss a thing.

So the question is: giving shape to that sensation by thought, as an image, as a picture, a pleasure, at that second desire is born. Now the question is: can there be a wide interval between sensation and thought creating an image of that sensation? You understand? An interval? That requires tremendous attention, and where there is attention there is discipline. You understand? Oh come on, sirs, somebody. Are you all asleep, or what? This is important because as we live in conflict perpetually, to understand conflict is to see the fact and the conclusion of the fact. You understand? The fact, and what we make of that fact. What we make of that fact is an abstraction called idea, or ideal, and between the fact and the ideal there is always conflict. Right? Move sir. And if we see where there is sensation, which is natural, which is healthy, clear, unless one is totally paralysed, and thought giving shape to that sensation, the image it represents, if these two can be kept apart for a while, to keep them apart requires great attention. Right? And so there is never a suppression of desire but watchfulness of desire. I wonder if you understand this. Because if you suppress it, it then becomes a conflict. If you say, "I will transcend desire", that becomes also a means of conflict. Whereas if there is great attention and watchfulness, how thought shapes sensation, then that attention, that watchfulness has its own intelligence, and when it is necessary you go into the shop and buy

it, and get on with it, but not make conflict about it. You understand? If you understand some of it at least, because this is really important to understand all this, whether man can live without conflict on this beautiful earth. We live with conflict all the days of our life, from the most ancient of times until now, it is our heritage, to live with conflict, not only externally as war and so on, but also much more inwardly, conflict with each other, conflict in our relationship with each other, intimate and so on, whether this conflict can ever end so that the brain is totally free. And that is why it is important to understand the nature of desire; and the nature of this sense of immense beauty of life, of this earth.

Then we should also go into the question of what is love. Don't let's become sentimental about it, or romantic, but when we say, "I love you", what do we mean by that? When a man, or a woman says to the man, or the man says to the woman, or friends say to each other, 'I love you', what does that mean? There is the love of a book, love of a poem, love of sports, love of sex, I love to be famous. We use this word so easily. But we have never apparently gone into the full meaning of it, what is it to love? Love apparently has become another means of conflict, one loves one's wife and there is conflict, quarrels, jealousy, antagonism, divorce, and all the pain of that relationship, and the pleasure of it too. So we should go into this question very carefully because that may be the solution of all our problems, it may be the one thing when we understand, whether it is in the brain, or outside the brain, whether love is contained in the brain as thought, anxiety, pain, depression, fear, loneliness, the whole content of our consciousness. Is love part of that consciousness? You understand? Oh come on sirs.

Q: Yes.

K: Or it is outside, totally outside consciousness, outside the brain. Probably we have never asked these questions even. One hopes you will not mind asking these questions.

So what is love as we know it? Love brings a great deal of conflict in our life, a great deal of pleasure, a great deal of anxiety, fear, jealousy, envy. Don't you know all this? So is desire love? Is pleasure love? Is love in the realm, or in the field of thought? And apparently for most of us it is in that field - conflict, pain, anxiety, and thought. And to understand what love is - not understand, you know, have the depth of it, the greatness of it, the flame of it, the beauty of it - how can there be jealousy, how can there be ambition, aggression, violence? And can one be free completely of all these things? Please do ask this question. Where there is love, then do what you will, it will be right action, but never bring conflict in one's life.

So it is important to see that jealousy, antagonism, conflict, and all the pain of relationship has no place in love, where there is love. And can one be free of all that, not tomorrow, now? You understand my question? Because as we pointed out yesterday, time which is the past, the present and the future, all time is contained in the now. We went into it carefully yesterday. And if we say, "I will cultivate love", or "I will try and get rid of my jealousy" and so on, then when you are trying to be free, trying, then you will never be free. Right? I wonder if you understand this? When you say, "I will do my best", which is so silly. Which means that one has really not fully perceived the truth that all time, the past, the present and the future are in the now, now, in the

present actually. Because if you don't do something now it will be continued tomorrow, the future is in the now. You understand this? Oh come on!

So can one put aside completely all the causes of conflict, which is the self, the 'me', so that there is this sense of flame, the greatness of beauty, of love?

And also we should discuss, if time allows, we should talk over together, what is religion? All the organized religions of the world with their rituals and their fancy dresses and so on, with their symbols, with their myths and crosses over everything, is all that religion? The root meaning of that word etymologically is not clear, it has been said, religion is a binding, a bondage between man and god and so on. So when you examine, and to examine there must be scepticism, the questioning of one's faith, one's belief, otherwise you can't possibly examine, find out the truth about religion. Most of us live in illusions about religions. We never see that thought has been responsible for all the rituals, their dresses and their gods, and their ceremonies, their incense, the whole works are put together by thought.

So what is religion? And the thing is important to find out because man has always from the beginning of time, has always enquired into this: is there something more than the mere physical world with all its turmoil, with all its complexities, struggle, pain and so on, is there something far beyond all this? You are asking that question. And somebody comes along and says, "I know about it, I will tell you all about it" - that's how it began from the ancient Sumerians, from the ancient Egyptians, and the ancient Hindus, they said, we will tell you. They became the priests, the original

people who wrote, read and so on. They became the interpreters of that to man, and it became a good profession, like any other profession. And that has continued from time immemorial.

Now to find out what is the religious mind, what is the truth of religion, one must be free from all authority, of all belief, faith, not belong to a thing. Right? There must be a sense of total being free.

Then one can enquire, or observe, or perceive what is truth - not the truth or the reality. Let's differentiate the two - gosh, a lot of things to explain, aren't there? I don't know why one has to explain all this. I am afraid you are all too learned, you have too much knowledge, have read too many books, listened to professors and all the rest of it. What is reality? Reality is that you are sitting there, and the speaker is up here. The reality is the trees, the reality is the nature, the birds, the ocean, the whales, the beauty of those enormous creatures in the deep depth of the sea. Reality is what is both externally and inwardly. Nature is a reality, and also reality is inwardly the illusion that you have created and hold on to that, the symbol, the picture, the idealized picture, however illusory you hold on to that, that is a reality. Right? So reality and truth are two different things. Truth is not a matter of conjecture, of speculation, of idealization. It is not the invention of thought. And to find that truth - not to find - for that truth to exist it has been said you must meditate to find that eternal thing which is beyond all measure and beyond all thought, beyond all words, you must meditate. And they said too, in order to meditate you must follow a system, a method, and we will tell you what the method and the system is. Right? The gurus have played upon this theme endlessly, coining money. Right?

So we are going to enquire not how to meditate, which seems to silly to ask, but what is meditation. Why is it necessary to meditate at all? Meditation, the meaning of that word, is to ponder over, think over. But also it has a deeper meaning, measure, to meditate also means to measure. Now meditation is being free completely from measurement - measurement being comparison: I am this, I will be that - to compare. To live a daily life without a shadow of comparison. Have you ever done it? To live like that, never having an example, never a goal, never an end, never having the future, which is comparison - I am this, I will be that - to live without becoming, which is comparison. When you go to a museum you compare, you compare between two materials, one cloth is better than the other cloth, you compare one car with another car. That's natural, that's necessary. But to have this sense of inward comparison all the time, to be completely free of that. That is part of meditation. So the brain then is free from all sense of comparison, except where it is necessary, physically, art, shirt, clothes and so on. Is this possible? Can one live that way, never comparing? See what happens if you don't compare. There is the end of conflict also. Right?

So meditation is not a practice, not a system, not repeating a mantra - you know that word? You know the meaning of that word? No. But you repeat it. This is a most marvellous country! The meaning of that word, mantra, means ponder over not becoming. And also it means end all self-centred activity. The root meaning of that word in Sanskrit - ponder, consider not becoming, the whole question of becoming. And also it means put away altogether all self-centred activity. And if you are given some

words, and you repeat it, you are playing just a game. It is not worth it. And the speaker is not telling you not to do it. If you want to do it you will do it, if it pleases you, but it has no meaning, your repetition, Ave Maria by the dozen, or your particular mantra.

So meditation means to be free from fear, from all sense of conflict which we have been talking about, and also much more seriously the ending of thought. Whether thought, which is time, has a stop. You understand? And so because if there isn't a sense of being totally free the brain then becomes limited, and all its activity will be limited, and the limitless, the timeless can never exist.

So we are asking: can thought, which is of time, which is time itself, can that stop? Probably you have never asked this question. Not you stop it by will - that's silly, you cannot stop by will thought. Will is the essence of desire, and desire we explained earlier. So is there thought coming of its own accord to an end? Thought must be used naturally when you drive a car, when you go from here to your house, when you cook, when you wash dishes, and so on, thought must be there. What is the necessity of thought in the psychological world at all? If thought is really understood, all its activities, its beginnings, its origin. Its origin is experience, knowledge, memory stored in the brain, and the reaction to that memory is thought. All this process is limited because knowledge in the future or now is limited. When you see, perceive actually the limitation of thought, not the imagination of it, not the idea of ending, but actually see for yourself that thought, whatever it does, both in the technological world and in the psychological world, will always be limited. When you see the absolute fact of that, and the necessity of thought in a certain area, when you give your total

attention to that, then you will find out for yourself thought can end. If you say, "What then?", then you are lost. Then if you say, "What is there if thought ends, is there something more?" - you follow how our brain works. That is, I will see if thought can end if you give me something in return. Right? If thought can end you will find out, there will be something totally different. And this is meditation. Not control, not control thought, because the controller is part of thought. Right? So the controller is playing a game. So there is always the controller trying to control thought. But the controller who is also thought is the controlled. There is no division between the controller and the controlled right through life, if one can understand this profoundly you will eliminate altogether conflict. Therefore the brain, which has been conditioned, narrowed down, has lost its tremendous vitality, its great immense capacity. If one has acted that way, as you get older and older it becomes much more active, not that you get senile. Do you understand all this?

So meditation is to be totally free from all bondage, from all measurement, from all conflict. So the brain becomes quiet, utterly still. And that silence, stillness, has its own beauty, its own truth, its absolute sense of immeasurable thing. So meditation is not a reward, it is not something that you get illumined by practising, which is all so childish. So truth is something which is not to be measured, and it has no path to it. And that is beauty, that's love.

RAJGHAT 1ST PUBLIC TALK 11TH NOVEMBER, 1984

It all looks so formidable, doesn't it? Just relax and let us talk about things. I think we should talk over together - I mean together - many things. Unfortunately we were not able to come earlier because of other events. And I am sorry to have kept you waiting here.

This is not a lecture. A lecture is meant to give information or direction on a particular subject. So, this is not a lecture, this is a conversation between you and the speaker. Both of us are going to explore together several problems that we have. The speaker may put it into words, but you have to also share, or investigate together, not only the meaning of the words, as we are speaking in English, but also the meaning of the word, the significance of the word, the content of the whole word so that there is a direct communication between us. I hope this is clear. This is not a lecture, or a sermon, or a guru talking to his silly disciples.

So, together we are going to first think together, see what we are examining together and go as far as possible into what we are investigating, so that we both of us understand the meaning and the significance in our daily life what we are investigating. I hope this is clear: that we are together investigating, having a conversation, a dialogue. Right?

First of all we should look together at why human beings who have lived on this earth for millions of years - and recently the scientists, biologists and the archeologists are saying we have lived on this earth as human beings for the last 50,000 years or more -

why we have not been able to find, especially in this modern world, security, both psychological, inward security and outward security. That is one of the problems that not only this country but every country in the world is facing at the present time. Is that clear? Security: why socially, economically and physically we have not been able to find complete security for all human beings; not just for a few, not for the rich, not for those who live in a small commune or a committee. But ask ourselves why we have not found physical security. First, physical. There is murder going on of the most savage kind, terrorists, kidnapping, destroying and the ultimate violence is war. War is organized murder that is tolerated, considered highly respectable, blessed by religions, and so on. You know all this perhaps, some of you. So, we are asking why is it, however civilized we are, however cultured, we are still fighting, killing each other, why there is not security, and is it possible to not have to begin with psychological security, but inward security. Then, that inward security will express itself outwardly. That is, if we are not inwardly, psychologically, subjectively, completely secure, then whatever we do externally will also be insecure. I think this is clear.

So, we ought first to enquire, if we may, why inwardly, inside the skin, subjectively, psychologically, man has not found security at all. He has sought security in god, which is an idea invented by thought. Right? Am I shocking you - I hope I am! God is invented by thought, because we human beings are frightened, and so we want something on which we can rely, hold on to, look to somebody who will help us, and so we invent various illusions. I hope you are following all this. One invents various ways of

seeking comfort, security. And all those ways, as one has observed, have utterly failed. You may have your guru in whom you have faith, and hope he will give you some kind of inward security - but even those gurus are failing. Right?

You are sure of all this? You are investigating. I am not - the speaker is not telling you what is right or what is wrong but together, we are going to find out what is true, what is right. So, can there be inward security first, and then that security will inevitably create a society that will be orderly, that will give security for all human beings, not only for the rich and well-to-do, but for the very, very poor. Right? Unless you are secure inwardly, outward expression of that insecurity is the present state of society. That is clear; this is all logical, reasonable, sane, not something fanciful. So, we must ask why haven't we inward security? What is it that is preventing us? Why? If the speaker asks you that question, why, what would be your answer? Why each one of us is not secure inwardly. Why are we so frightened? Why are we so subject to fanciful concepts? If one examines the cause of this uncertainty, insecurity, is it - please I am questioning it, please you question it - is it because each one of us is so self-centred? Each one of us is concerned with himself, concerned with his own fulfillment, concerned with his own success, concerned with his own advancement, achievement, his own pleasures, his own sorrows? That is, each one of us has this great self-interest. Would that be correct? That is one of the reasons, would you agree to that? Self-interest. What does that self-interest mean? Please question - what does self-interest imply? Does it not imply a separate, divided, narrow limited activity? Right? When I am concerned about myself

from morning till night and even in my sleep, it becomes a very small affair. Doesn't it? Even one's meditation, if you are concerned with achieving something or other, it is a very small affair. No? It is a very limited activity. It is like keeping something to yourself all the time, worried, anxious, fearful, depressed; you know it all becomes such a petty little affair. Doesn't it? No, don't agree because it is very easy to agree verbally.

But to act actively be concerned, whether it is possible to live in this world with all the corruption, with all the bestiality of it, the brutality, the cruelty of all that, is it possible to live in this world without self-interest? Have you ever asked that question? Or is it something that we very carefully avoid. One may be married, children, family and that is our concern. We may pray, we may do some puja every morning. That is also a sort of self-concern. No? Also self-concern implies a separate, divided, fragmentary activity. Right? Which then brings about social division: the upper, the lower, the middle class and the lowest, this division - doesn't it? When you are concerned with yourself it becomes a dividing force in the world, which is nationalism, racial division, linguistic division, religious division, the Sikhs, the Hindus, the Muslims, the Buddhists, the Christians, fragmented, following one guru after another. Right? Haven't you noticed all this? Which is, the Arab and the Jew killing each other. nationalities are dividing people. Right? And we hope to find security in nationalism: in India, France and so on - America and Russia. So, this self-interest expresses itself in many subtle ways. So one has to be aware of all that, if you are interested, if you are serious and not carry on as we do day after day. If one is seriously concerned with life, with all

the things that are happening, all the terrible things that are happening then one must ask, very deep fundamental questions, not be satisfied with superficial questions and superficial answers. Can one live in this world, in the modern world without belonging to any group, any nationality, any religion, following no guru?

Can you do all this? Or is it all a superficial talk and when you leave this hall you will follow your old ways. What is the point of all this then? Listening to something that is true, that is not invented by the speaker, but these are facts, daily facts of our life: our cruelty, our self-concern, our deep apparently abiding selfishness, and that is what is destroying the world. The Americans are concerned with America. And the Americans as separate human beings are concerned with themselves, as here, and so on. So one begins to understand not verbally but very deeply that where there is division, there must be conflict. Where there is division nationally, there must be conflict, the Muslim and the Hindu the Pakistani, and you know all that rubbish that is going on. And when you face facts, the realities, not just some imaginary, romantic concepts, but when you face daily facts, then you are confronted with a challenge that demands an answer, a challenge that you must accept and understand it and act.

So, there is only security, not in self-centredness and self-interest, but in seeing the fact, and understanding the fact and acting. That is intelligence. And in that intelligence there is security, not in some romantic concepts, sentimentality and all that superficial stuff.

So, we also ought to ask why is there so much corruption in the world? I know this is a rather tricky subject. Why is there so much

corruption in the world? What is corruption? The word, the etymological meaning of that word from Latin and Greek and Italian means to break up. I won't go into all that. What is the root of corruption? Where does corruption begin? Passing money under the table, is that corruption? Bribing the porter to have your entrance into a big man? What is corruption, which is so prevalent, more so in this country - pulling wires for your friends, for your nephews, for your sons - is that corruption? Please think about it, look at it? Surely that is a very, very superficial form of corruption. But it is a deeper cause, a far deeper cause, this terrible corruption that is going on. Is it corruption when you follow a leader? Go on, answer this question sirs? When you follow your guru, is that not corruption, in the name of truth, in the name of bla, bla and all that stuff? When you follow somebody, or when you follow some ideal, is that not also corruption? Are you surprised at these questions, or are you just taking it? We are trying to find out together what is the cause of all this? Is it not corruption when each one of us is ambitious, envious, when each one is concerned with his own fulfilment, when he wants his own particular way, when human beings take a stand about something? Do you understand all this? I believe, and you take up a position on that. Another says, I believe quite the opposite. Right? Is that not also corruption?

So, does not corruption start when each one of us is not only concerned with themselves, but also deeply attached to some superstitious, ideological, imaginative belief? No? Isn't that the beginning of corruption? The Catholic believes very strongly in something; in some concept, in some belief, in some faith, and you take another stand in some faith, in some belief, in some god, and

you are at war with each other - not actually at war, but you kind of separate yourselves from that silliness as though your silliness was totally different. Haven't you noticed all this? Doesn't corruption begin there? Doesn't corruption begin where there is essentially, deeply self-interest? (Skip it, sir. Leave it sir, will you. Leave it, sir, will you. He doesn't listen, and you don't listen either! That is a perfect example sir. He doesn't listen and you don't listen.) You know one must learn the art of listening. You get used to the voice of your wife or your husband, you never listen to each other. Do you? You get used to it. She might be telling you something real but you have already understood it. And so we never actually listen to somebody, and I am sure that is what is going on here, quite sure. I can take a bet on it! That you really are not listening. That is the pity of it, because if you really listened, not only to the words, but to capture the significance of the words. That is, to listen, not translate what you are hearing to confirm or contradict your ideas, but to find out what the other fellow is saying.

When you tell a story to a child, if you have ever done that, he is so extraordinarily attentive. He is thrilled by the story, he wants you to keep going because the child is curious, eager, wanting to find out what the story is about. Therefore he is paying attention to it. But apparently we don't. You are not actually listening to what the speaker is saying. The speaker has a certain reputation, unfortunately. You have a certain image about him - and you are satisfied with that, you don't question it. You don't say, what do you mean. You don't have deep suspicion, not suspicion, doubt, to question. But you know, it is like a good breath in bad air that passes by. So, please if one can request you, do listen, not only to

what the speaker is saying but also to all the things, the whispers of the world: to your wife, to your husband, to the birds, the sound of the wind. You must have the quality of sensitivity to find out. So, if you will kindly pay attention, and that apparently is very difficult because most of us cannot pay attention for more than a couple of minutes - a few minutes and then you are off somewhere else.

There is never deep attentive listening to something. Because if we do listen deeply that is the greatest miracle, you don't have to do a thing. The very act of listening is an action.

We ought also to talk over together why there is so much poverty in the world. One can answer the reason for it, as in this country, over population, bad government - sorry, are there governments officials here? I am sure there are no government officials here. Bad government, corrupt government, it is so appalling what is happening. And poverty arises not only because of the over population, but because each country is concerned with its own economy, with its own problems, building up armaments. I do not know if you know all this. Each country is spending millions and millions on armaments, ready to kill each other. Right? And so where there is division there must be not only conflict but poverty. Do you understand this? If all the world felt it was our responsibility to wipe out poverty, we could. But you won't let America or India interfere with another country, each country is concerned with itself, each human being is concerned with himself. Right?

Now we also ought to talk over together - because we have only one more talk tomorrow morning, so we must bring everything quickly together - why are human beings frightened - fear. Aren't

you afraid? Be simple sirs. To acknowledge what one is, is not a shameful act, it is 'what is'. We are frightened human beings. And we have carried this burden of fear for centuries, millions of years. Right? If you have observed historically, and also if you have observed without reading a book, all religions are based on fear. If there was no fear there would be no gods. Right? Do you see that? If you are not really frightened at all, subjectively, inwardly, would you have gods? Would you have puja? Would you have prayers? Would you follow somebody who says, 'I know the truth, you don't, I will help you'. So, we can look at fear? Can you look at your own fear?

You want to ask me something, madam?

Q: Yes, you were saying that pujas and all these things might be just coming from fear. But they might also be a celebration of life, not totally negative.

K: Just a minute, just a minute. What do you mean by love?

Q: It's a unity.

K: You see that is an immense question, madam. You can't say celebration of love.

Q: No, life, it is a celebration you know.

K: May we just go on first. May we just go on with enquiring, not only into fear, but what is life? What is living? That is life, the living. What is our living? Conflict. Right? Our life is a struggle, our life is a pleasure, sexual, pleasure of achieving something, pleasure of possessing something, and also fear, conflict, being hurt psychologically, sorrow, sympathy, kindness, generosity and so on. That is our life. That is life, in which there may be certain spurts of tenderness, kindness. Love is not pleasure. Love is not

desire. Love has no reaction. So we won't go into all that at the present moment. So it is no good saying, live a happy life. One of the strange things is, India is a very sad country, but there is always a smile. Haven't you noticed it? The poor smile. They are starving - they smile. No? And that is the miracle of this country. They are starving, down trodden, no means of happiness and perpetually working, and yet as you go by on the street especially in the country, they smile at you. This happens nowhere else in the world. That is one of the great things of this country.

So, we were talking about fear. Can this fear end? Do you want to know what is the cause of fear? Not a particular form of fear; you may be frightened of your wife or your husband or your boss or this or that, that is only various branches of fear. As a tree has many, many branches, many leaves, and it is no good merely cutting off one branch, one must understand the root of fear, go into it very very deeply, what is the origin, the beginning, the causation of fear. I can explain - the speaker can explain the cause, can describe the origin of fear. But explanation, the description is not the actuality. Right? I can describe the Himalayas, but the description is not the actual beauty and grandeur of the Himalayas. Right? But most of us are satisfied with description. I can explain the cause of fear, you will agree or disagree but there it is. But if you can go into it for yourself deeply - not merely agree or disagree but go into it, put your teeth into it, then perhaps you will be free of it. But we have not the energy, or the inclination, or even the urge to be free of fear. Right? Because you do puja, believe in god and so on, but you never go to the root of anything and find out for yourselves. So may I go into the cause of it? Why human

beings throughout the world after millennia upon millennia, have lived with fear.

I can't hear what you are saying, sir? Say it to me slowly, sir.
Don't get upset?

Q: Somebody has power, somebody else has property and somebody has position and is creating fear in those who have not.

K: Sir, I am asking, those who have positions, are afraid of losing. The fear death, the fear of their husbands and their wives, fear of public opinion, fear of losing something that they have, fear of not having affection, fear of loneliness, fear of not being somebody. So you have are many, many forms of fear. Now, do you want to take each subject, or go to the root of it?

Q: Go to the root of it.

K: Go to the root of it. Will you go to the root of it with me?

Q: Yes.

K: But go to it, not just play with it. Will you actually take the trouble, use your brains, your capacity, your energy to find out, and not be satisfied with description? One can paint a marvellous picture of the Himalayas, but the picture is not the Himalayas. The word is not the actual. So will you go beyond the word and work at it? What is the cause of fear, not the various forms of fear, but the root cause of it? Is it not thought? I am this, but I might not be that. I have a job, I might lose it. Right? Do you understand? So thinking is part of fear, isn't it? Right. Thinking: thinking I might not become a successful man in terms of the world; or in terms of religion I might not achieve enlightenment. Right? Thinking is one of the major causes of fear.

Q: Insecurity is the cause of fear.

K: We went into it madam, earlier we went into it. Perhaps you were not here when we began, or you didn't listen. We talked about insecurity. Why is there - I won't repeat it.

So is not thought the cause of fear? If you didn't think about death, would you be afraid of death? If death happens suddenly to me, now, that is the end of it. But if I begin to think, my god, what will happen to me, I might lose my house, my family, my bla bla, and I get frightened. Right? Would you agree to that? Not agree, see the fact? So thinking is perhaps the cause of fear. Right? So we have to enquire what is thinking. Do you understand? What is thinking? Because your actions are based on thinking. All the puja you do is based on thinking. All the technological advancement, marvellous advancement, is based on thinking. Right sir? Your business, your way of life, everything is based on thinking. And yet you would find thinking is one of the causes of fear. Right? So what is thinking? What is the process of thinking? Do you understand? The speaker can go into it, but if you merely follow the words, it will mean nothing. But if you put your brains to work on it - as you do when you want money, when you want sex, when you want anything you work at it - so will you also work on this? The speaker will show, will explain, knowing that explanation is not the thing.

What is thinking? Is it not born out of memory? If you had no memory, you would not think - would you? Be quite sure, don't accept anything the speaker says. If you had no memory, which means no knowledge - right - you couldn't think. Are you certain of that? Certain, not just play around with it. That is, experience brings knowledge, as is happening in the scientific world, in the

biological world, in the world of genetic engineering. Perhaps you know all this. But I won't go into all that. There is thinking, this thinking is based on experience. Which is, experience gives you knowledge, brings accumulated knowledge step by step, as in the scientific world, more and more and more. Right? So knowledge and experience are limited, aren't they? No? Limited. Therefore thinking is limited. You may think of immensity, of illumination, of complete knowledge - you may think about it, but thinking itself is limited, therefore whatever you think is limited. Right?

Whatever you think about god - god is limited. You may give him all the attributes you like: kindness, all knowledge, all powerful, all this, all that, but your thinking being limited your gods are limited. No?

Q: Thinking about god is limited.

K: All right. Thinking about god is limited, but is god limited?

Q: No.

K: How do you know?

Q: God is unlimited.

K: How do you know? You love god, don't you? To you god is very important, but how do you know god exists? Because you have believed, it is part of your tradition, of your whole religious concept. Right? And you just follow, and say, god exists. And the scientists say quite the opposite, that man began from the sea, as a cell and built, built through centuries until he became man. You don't like that, but god you love, he made the world. And you say, god made us. He must be a very poor god to make you. No? So god must be very poor, you are not even logical.

So we said thinking is one of the causes of fear. I am alive now,

but I might be dead tomorrow. Right? And I am afraid of that. So thinking, being limited, and that is limited because knowledge is always limited - right sir? Be quite sure of it, knowledge whether now or in the future, knowledge will always be limited, because it is based on experience. Within the last 150 years or more science has been accumulating. Right? More and more and more. Where there is more it must be limited. Where there is better it must be limited. So thought is limited, and where there is limitation there must be conflict. Thought has created war, and all the instruments of war. So we say thought is one of the causes of fear. Right? And also time is a cause of fear. Right? Time. Are you interested in all this stuff? Or is it just a kind of game? You have nothing better to do. Time is a factor of fear. Let us begin to find out what is time to you. What is time to you?

Q: Change.

K: What do you mean by that word change.

Q: One thing is passing into another. It is the movement of change.

K: Isn't time a series of movements? That is, I am not a scientist, I am not an expert on anything. Thank god. But I have watched, I lived, enquired. So time is the past. Isn't it? Is not time the past? Past memories. Yesterday was rather a cloudy day and cold - not here, in Delhi. So there is time as yesterday, time as now, time as the future. Right? So time is a movement from the past, to the present, to the future. So time is a series of movements. Right? So evolution is time. And we have lived on this earth for 50,000 years as homo sapiens, man, and during that long duration of 50,000 years we have been what we have in the past now, slightly

modified - they were selfish then, we are selfish now. Right? You don't think about all this. So, what is the past? All your memories isn't it? All that you have acquired, all that you have felt, all the things that have hurt you both biologically as well as psychologically. The past is memory, isn't it? Isn't it? You are quiet sure? You are all so hesitant. The past is your father, your mother, your grandmother, your grandfather and up and up and up or down and down, if you like. The past is all that accumulated memory of the whole race, the community, the family, the one in that family. All that memory which includes tradition, knowledge, practise and all that, the skill, that is the past. And what is the present? Is not the present the modified past? No, you don't think so. Tell me what the present is.

Q: It is mainly the past.

K: Yes sir, modified, I said that, the past meeting the present, the challenge modifies itself or controls the present and goes on. So the past is modifying itself in the present, and goes on. So the past goes on modifying itself all the time. It is still the past. Right? Oh, my goodness! No? The past modifying itself becomes the future. The future therefore is now, because the past modifies itself in the future, so the future is now. No? Look, sir, if one is envious, one might modify. Suppose I am envious, because you have a better house, better car, better position. I am envious of you. And I struggle with it. But, tomorrow I will still be envious. Right? No? What is the difficulty? Unless I change now, tomorrow is still envy. Right sir? So tomorrow is now unless I change - right?

Q: Is it possible to listen - is this possible in the present?

K: Only in the present not in the future.

Q: Because the past is gone, the future is not in our hands.

K: You haven't listened, sir. You are the past, aren't you? You have been to college, university or if not to university something or other, all your skill. If you are a first class carpenter - not you, sir - if you are a bureaucrat, or a business person or something or other, if I want to be a good carpenter, I apprentice myself to a master carpenter, and I have to learn the quality of the wood, the grain, the beauty of the wood, and I have to learn how to use the instruments which I have on the wood. Right? That is, acquiring knowledge which becomes memory. Right? And then I am a carpenter. Do you understand? As you are a business man or a government official, you accumulate. So you are the past. There is no difficulty in this. I don't know why you are resisting it. You may think you are god, that is all right, that is also past, that is part of your tradition. So you are the past. And that past meets this challenge which I am challenging you now, and says, yes, may be, may be. And tomorrow you will be like this unless you change now. So the future is now.

Q: How do I know the future? I don't know whether I will be envious tomorrow or not, I don't know.

K: You will be, unless you have an accident. You are going home. You have your things at home. That is just a theory. You will be here tomorrow, unless you have an accident and I hope you don't. But you know the future because what you are now is the future. Of course. I know you don't like this. The future is in the present. Right? I am envious now and I will be envious tomorrow. Right? Tomorrow is the future. If I am envious now I will be envious tomorrow, but if I stop envy, therefore tomorrow is now.

For god's sake see this. So, is it possible to end envy now? You don't think about these things. I am violent now, as most human beings are violent. They talk about peace and all that nonsense but human beings are very violent. It is so. There is no question about it. Now, non-violence is in the future - because you are violent now. Therefore, non-violence has no meaning. Can you stop violence now? If you don't stop it now, tomorrow you will be violent. So tomorrow is now. Right? So is it possible to end time, which is tomorrow, now? I am violent - if I cannot end violence instantly now, I will be violent tomorrow, slightly modified, but I will still be violent. Right? And humanity has said, we'll gradually become violent, less violent. Right? Which is nonsense. Are you surprised at this?

So, can you end everything now? Say, you are attached, as you are, attached to your beliefs, your gods, to your family, attached, you know, hold on. If you are attached today you will be attached tomorrow, naturally. Right? Unless death comes and says, sorry, that's the end of it. I know you believe in reincarnation, that is a different matter. But even death comes and says, sorry, you can't carry things away with you. You have to drop them. So can you drop attachment now, to be utterly free from attachment? To your beliefs, to your gods, to everything you are attached to, otherwise tomorrow you will still be attached. So change is not through gradation, through gradual time. Change is instant, immediate. That is freedom; not to achieve freedom next life or two years later. This requires a great deal of application to your daily life. Therefore your ideas, your theories, your ideals have no meaning. You believe in non-violence, don't you? But you are all terribly

violent people. So what does belief in an ideal matter at all? It has no meaning. What has meaning is what you are now, and that can be changed instantly, not tomorrow because tomorrow is now.

We should also talk over together very, very seriously - not that we have not been serious - what is a religious brain, mind. What is a religious mind? Sir, we have talked for an hour and a quarter. You want to go on with this?

Q: Yes.

K: It is easy for me to talk. Please this is a very serious subject, like fear it requires a great deal of enquiry. Because the religious brain - to find out what is a religious brain, one must be free of all organized religions. Naturally. Free of Buddhism, Hinduism, Jainism, Sikh, Christianity and all the variety of so-called religious attitudes and practices, and all that. Now, will you be free of all that - can you be free of all that? Really enquire very deeply what a religious brain is.

Q: Not be a Hindu or a Buddhist, one can be a broad-minded man.

K: It sounds very nice. That is what the United Nations say - you can all be nations together, but keep your own particular nonsense. Is that so, is that a fact?

Q: Yes.

K: Just listen to it sir, you say yes, is it a fact. I am a devout Christian, suppose - a devout practising Catholic. Do you know what that means? I believe in the Virgin Mary going physically to heaven. That is one of the dogmas, I believe in that. You would call it nonsense. Wouldn't you? Wouldn't you? Why are you nervous about it? You would, for god's sake. You would say, what

kind of stupid belief that is: anybody physically going to heaven, what is heaven. It sounds so silly - but I believe it. I devoutly am concerned with it. And you would say, yes, we will tolerate it - that is all. You can live in this country, but you are a Hindu, you have your own beliefs. There is a division between us. No? Right sir?

Q: You can have your own belief and I can have my belief.

K: That is it. Lovely! I am an American, you are a Russian - keep it, and we are willing to kill each other. No? So I stick to my belief, you stick to your belief. And we call this religion. When you are faced with facts you doubt it, you keep quiet. So, sir, belief is dividing, will you drop your belief because division brings conflict between you and me? Because I have no belief. What is fact is important, not belief.

Q: Can non-belief be a belief?

K: Oh no, the end of belief is the end of belief. Not belief and the ending of it, I end it.

So to enquire very deeply into what is a religious brain, because the brain - the brain, that is that which is within the skull, is the centre of all thought. Right? The centre of all emotions. Centre of all your reactions. Centre of all your beliefs. All your fears, all your sorrow, all your depression. It is the centre of every physical activity. No? Right? Do you see that fact? I am not a scientist, a scientist would explain this to you very carefully. It is so, whether you like it or not. You may believe there is atman, there is soul, there is god in you, but it is still within the skull. You may imagine or say, god is perfect, it is still within the skull. Right? I am not trying to convince you of anything. Don't be convinced. I am not interested.

So, to enquire into what is a religious brain one must be free of all belief. If you have a belief you are attached to that belief, therefore, you are not free. It is like going out into the middle of the river with a rope around you. Right? I am attached to the bank and I go safely, then I am not free. So, we are tethered to a belief therefore there is no freedom in that - you are tethered to some concept. So there must be freedom from all religious concepts, beliefs, faiths, images, idols - all that man has put together through fear. Right? Will you do that? I am not asking you to do it. I don't care. If you are really enquiring into what is a religious mind, brain you have to be free. Obviously. It's like a man in prison wanting freedom. He can want it, but he must leave the prison. Then he will never ask what is freedom. Right? Unless we are free from the bondage which we have created for ourselves we cannot possibly enquire into something that demands tremendous energy and freedom. That is the first thing.

So the religious mind or brain must be free completely, from all attachment. And very, very few people want this kind of stuff. Very, very few people are serious enough to go into this matter. They would like to talk about it, play with it like children. But a childish mind can never understand this.

Perhaps we had better stop today, we will go on and enquire into what is a religious human being, what is a religious life, tomorrow, shall we? We had better stop now.

RAJGHAT 2ND PUBLIC TALK 12TH NOVEMBER, 1984

I will continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning. We were asking what is a religious life. What does the word religious mean? The word, what does that word mean to you or how do you react to that word? The origin of that word, the etymological meaning is not very clear. And in enquiring into a religious mind, if we are at all serious, and I hope we are, one can see obviously that the present structure, or the nature, or the organization of religions throughout the world, have really no meaning at all. They are just a jumble of words, either in Sanskrit, Latin, Greek and so on. They have really no meaning. The present ironical structure of Catholicism or Buddhism or the many aspects of Hinduism or Sikhism and so on, they have no depth. There are rituals, a kind of emotional stimulation and a lot of words that have no significance at all.

So can we in enquiring into what is a really religious mind, brain, could we put aside actually, not verbally, all the implications of organized, sectarian, limited religions of the world? Could we do that first? Not accept any guru, because in the world of religion there is no authority, neither of a book, nor of a person, nor of an idea, a concept. So could we put aside all that: the authority in spiritual matters, with all its tradition? And when we can put aside all that literally, not verbally, not follow any guru - sorry, this may be rather troublesome for most of you - not accept any book as the authority; according to the Christians the Bible, the Islamic world the Koran, or in India with their many other books.

I think it is important to realize that in spiritual matters, in matters of the psyche, in matters of the subjective understanding, there is no authority. Would you agree to that? Do we see the truth of it? You have to have the authority of a surgeon, of an expert in computers or the authority of a policeman, limited though they be, there we have to have the authority of one who knows technological subjects. But in the matter of the psyche, in the matter of the so-called spiritual world, there is no authority. The authority is only that which is true. And we are going to find out for ourselves in enquiring into what is a religious mind, we must discover for ourselves what is truth. And we are going to enquire into that.

You don't mind talking about all these matters? Or would you like to talk about politics, or yoga, or some particular idol you worship? But if we are serious and go into this question, which we must because religion has been the origin, the beginning of a new civilization, a new culture. And now all the present day cultures are falling apart, being destroyed. We must enquire. It seems so urgently important to understand, to discover and to live it - the truth of religion. If we go into it we must ask what is the first most important thing in a mind, in a brain. Here let us differentiate between the brain and the mind: the brain is all the reactions, nervous responses, biological urges and all the fears, human hurts, anxieties, loneliness. All the activities of thought are centred in that which is called the brain, which is within the skull - that is the brain. And the mind surely is not all that: the mind is something unrelated to the brain. That is what we are saying, what the speaker is saying. We have discussed this matter with many scientists, and

biologists and so on, but they are rather hesitant about it. Naturally to them it must be a proof either under the microscope or destroying some animal and so on, and so on.

To the speaker the mind is entirely different. Please as we said, don't accept anything the speaker says. Question it, doubt it, but enquire, go into it. Otherwise it becomes meaningless. As we were saying, the first demand or necessity to have a religious mind, is beauty. Beauty, not in a particular form - a beautiful face, a beautiful way of living and so on. What is beauty? Without that there is no truth, there is no love; without beauty there is no sense of morality. Beauty in itself is virtue. Now, we are going to enquire together what is beauty. The speaker may put it into words, but you may have to take the responsibility of enquiring for yourself what is beauty. Is beauty in a painting, the marvellous old sculptures of the Egyptians, the Greeks, and Mahesha Murthi of Bombay and so on? What is beauty? What does it mean to you? The dress with the beautiful patterns of a sari, or the beautiful sky in the evening, or early in the morning, the beauty of the mountain, the fields and the valleys, the meadows, and the streams, the beauty of a bird, or the marvellous old trees. So does beauty depend on a particular culture or a particular tradition? The weavers of India have a tradition; they produce marvellous clothes, designs. Is that beauty? Or beauty is something totally different. When one observes great mountains with their snow-cap, the eternal snows, the glaciers and deep valleys, the outlines of a magnificent, majestic mountain against a blue sky, when you perceive that for the first time or the hundredth time, what actually takes place?

Are we going together or am I talking to myself. I don't mind

talking to myself, but if we are listening to each other we must naturally ask this fundamental question: what takes place when you see the river in the morning light with the sun just coming up and making a golden path along the waters. When you look at it, what takes place, or are you repeating some mantra, or for the moment you are completely silent? The beauty of that light on the water pushes aside all your problems, all your anxieties, everything else for a few seconds or a few minutes or for an hour, which means the self is not there: the self, the egoistic, self centred activity, the self-interest. All that is banished by the great beauty of a cloud full of light and dignity - at that moment the self is absent. So, does not beauty exist when the self is not? Don't agree with it, or nod your head and say, he's quite right, how marvellous, and then go on with your ugly ways, go on with our selfishness and self-concern and then talk logistically or theoretically about beauty. Beauty is something that must be perceived, and not held in the mind as a remembrance. So, beauty is something far deeper, much more profound and extensive than a mere picture, a design, a beautiful face or graceful manners. There is beauty only when the self is not. And that is the first thing that is required in understanding what is a religious mind.

And also enquiring into it one can see it must be a global brain, not a provincial brain, not a sectarian, limited brain, it must be global, understanding the vast human, complex problem. That is, a holistic mind, a brain that comprehends the whole of existence. Not your particular existence, your particular problems, because everywhere you go, whether in America, Europe or in India, or in Asia, we human beings suffer - we human beings have so many

destructive and creative problems. We are lonely people, we are anxious, fearful, seeking comfort, unhappy, sad, depressed, irritated: the whole human existence is this, with occasional their joy, their pleasures, sexual and so on. So to live with this feeling of wholeness - you understand all this, or are you being mesmerized by the speaker? Are you sure you are not being overwhelmed by words?

And we are saying a brain that is holistic is concerned with the whole of humanity, because we are all alike, whether we live in America or in England, or France or in Italy or in this country. We may express it differently - different gods, different angels, but we human beings suffer whether you suffer, or an American suffers, or Europeans, or Russians or Chinese; we all suffer. It is common to all of us. Therefore a religious brain is concerned with an holistic way of living.

And also we must find out for ourselves what is the relationship between nature and each of us. That is part of religion. You may not agree but consider it, go into it. Have you any relationship with nature, with the birds, with the water of that river - not that the river is holy, all rivers are holy, getting more and more polluted: you may call it Ganga, or the Thames, or the Nile, or the Rhine or the Mississippi, or the Volga, but they are still rivers. What is your relationship with all that - with the trees, with the birds, with all the living things which we call nature? Aren't we part of all that? So aren't we the environment? I wonder, am I talking nonsense and you are just listening casually? Does it mean anything to you - all this - or am I a stranger from Mars talking about something with which you are not really related at all. Does it mean anything, all

this? It is up to you.

Q: Please explain relationship of nature and exploitation.

K: Obviously, that is nothing new. Nature has been exploited by man for thousands of years. They are destroying the forests, they are polluting the rivers, they are polluting the air, they are killing animals for pleasure, for food. This has been going on for millions of years. And so when one asks, what is your relationship with nature, is it merely exploitation that you are interested in? Digging coal, getting gold out of the earth or finding diamonds, or cutting down trees to build houses: is that all your relationship with nature? If you have no relationship with nature have you any relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour? Have you any relation at all? Have you enquired into that? Oh Lord, isn't that part of religion to find out what is true relationship? You all look so dazed. Are you asleep or what? I don't know why you sit here.

Let's enquire what is relationship. To be related to another. Not only with nature and all the beauty of the earth, but also what is relationship. What is your relationship with the speaker? What is your relationship with your neighbour, with your wife, with your daughter, with your husband? Have you any relationship? Have you ever asked this question? When you say, yes, she is my wife, or my husband, or my girl friend, what does it mean to be related? How can there be a relationship with another, however intimate or not, when each one of us is pursuing his own way? Right? The husband goes to the office. Aren't you all familiar with all this? Your husband goes to the office from nine to five, working, sweating, being bullied, insulted, adding up figures, or being

bureaucratic, ambitious, seeking more money, a higher position, concerned with his own activity. Aren't you doing that? No? And the wife either is cooking, bearing sex and children, or going to an office too. So the husband and wife are running parallel lives. Perhaps they meet in bed. Don't be shocked. Or occasional or daily quarrels, nagging, bullying each other, saying, she is my wife, my husband, they mustn't look at anybody else - jealousy. This is your life. So where is your relationship with your wife, when each one is pursuing his own line of thought, ambitions and desires? In that is there any love? Oh, for God's sake what are we talking about.

Is there love in your life? If there is no love, there is no religion. You may go to the temple three times a day. If you are a Muslim, pray five times a day, and worship all kinds of silly gods, but if there is no love, life has no meaning. So, we also have to find out what is love. Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love sorrow and pain and anxiety, jealousy, hatred? Or is love something totally divorced from all this? You see you hear all this - if you do hear at all, all this - and you know this is a fact, not imagination, not something that thought has invented, and you will go back to your old life, to your old ways. You say it is too difficult, we cannot live in the modern world with all this. Right? And so you carry on. Then what is the point of listening to all this? Have you ever thought about all these matters? Or is all this something totally new? Somebody talking in Greek?

So, let's proceed. At least some of you will give your attention to what is being said. So, a religious mind, or religious brain, is that which has a great sense of beauty. Beauty is truth, beauty is morality, the way we behave, how you talk, how you walk. Beauty

is that which is eternal, everlasting, beyond time. And also there is beauty in relationship, not attachment. There is no beauty in attachment. Do you understand? Probably you will repeat this saying, beauty has no attachment, love has no attachment. You will repeat it and it becomes a slogan. And you think by repeating you will reach heaven. It is quite funny, isn't it, all this? So, a religious brain has this quality of beauty. And it implies a relationship that is real, not selfish, not limited. I may love my wife, but that doesn't mean I only love my wife. I doubt if you love your wife. Again, without love there is no religion. Love has compassion. Where there is compassion there is intelligence; not the intellectual cunning intelligence of thought - which is limited. Where there is love, compassion, there is limitless intelligence. And when there is that intelligence, whatever it does is right, correct, precise.

And also, as we said, most human beings are frightened. And when there is fear there is no beauty. So, can human beings be free of fear? We went into it briefly yesterday morning. As we said, fear is time and thought. You know, just to look at it and not to say how, to stop time and thought. That is impossible, you can't stop time and thought, but you can observe it. Do you understand what the word 'observe' means. Have you ever observed, looked, looked at your wife? Have you ever done it? You shake your heads all the time. Have you ever looked at your wife? Now, you stop shaking your head? I am glad. Have you ever looked at a tree, the clouds, the rivers, the child on the road? Have you ever looked at this, observed it?

So one has to enquire into what is observation? Sir, please. To observe without prejudice, without opinion, without any

judgement, without any value, just to observe. To observe how you sit. To observe your own thoughts, not condemn your thoughts, right or wrong, I shouldn't think this, this is ignoble thought, this is noble thought: just to observe your thinking. To observe the way you dress and so on. When you so observe your fear, not condemn it, not run away from it or transmute it to something else, but just to observe it, in that observation you bring all your attention in that. Observation means complete attention - can you so observe? Observe a tree completely, listen to the sound of the breeze in the trees, the birds fluttering, landing on the tree, calling of an evening. Just to listen, to observe. When you do that the implication in that observation is that you bring all your attention to it. It is like focussing strong light on something. Then that very light, that very flame destroys that which it is turned on. Do you understand what I am saying? Will you do it or just shake your head and carry on?

If you give your whole attention to fear, then you will find fear goes completely. But if you try to escape from it, try to run away from it, try to avoid it and say, how terrible to be afraid, then that activity is lacking attention. But when you give your complete attention, it is like turning on a great light. Then the whole pattern of fear is shown, the beginning and the ending of fear.

And attention is not something to be practised. Have you noticed how we are becoming mechanical? Does this interest you? Have you noticed in yourself how your brains are becoming mechanical? You repeat, don't you? You are traditionalists, aren't you? And where there is tradition in this limited sense, or in an extensive sense, it is constant repetition. You get up in the morning at a certain time, go to bed at a certain time, repeat, repeat,

sexually, repeat, repeat, repeat. Are you acquainted with computers, some of you? The modern computer does almost everything that the human brain can do. It is a machine put together by thought. And that machine has mechanical intelligence. In certain ways it is far superior to the human intelligence. It can calculate, remember, analyse - a million memories. You people don't know all this. And the computers with robots are building cars. They can write poems, paint, do extraordinary things. I won't go into all that, because that is a different matter.

So our brains are becoming - are mechanical. This is a fact. You are a Hindu, you repeat that everlastingly, or you are English or French or this or that. So our brains have become mechanical. And as we said, thought is limited. And to find out, for ourselves, the limitations of thought and go beyond it; not imaginatively, fantastically or romantically, but actually find out. That is part of religious activity. We have to do certain things mechanically: all our biological, nervous responses are mechanical. I say something to you - you call me a fool - I react - or you put a pin in me - I react. That is mechanical, that is natural. Not when you call me a fool and I call you another, that is partly mechanical too. But to be aware of all this - not practise. Do you understand? You know - oh, for god's sake you are so childish. I mean, to pay attention to your toe and gradually become, you know... don't dome of you do all these kind of tricks? No? Awareness it is called, practising awareness. You are all smiling, some of you. Can you practise awareness? If you do, it becomes mechanical, when you sit down and concentrate on your toe, and then from your leg and all the rest of it, your breath, it is a kind of monkey trick. I am not insulting

you, please. Practise for twelve hours a day: think of your brain, what is happening to your brain. You are becoming dull. Your brain has got extraordinary faculty. Look what they have done - they have gone to the moon. It is the activity of the brain. The extraordinary surgery that is going on, transforming hearts, limbs and so on. The brain has capacity, immense capacity. What they have done in the technological world is incredible. I am not going into all this. But if the brain becomes mechanical then that mechanical attitude limits the activity, and the faculty of the brain. It becomes conditioned, limited. And where there is limitation there must be conflict. Don't you know all this?

Would you like to discuss conflict, why human beings live perpetually in conflict, perpetually have problems? Have you gone into it? Shall I also sit like you, apathetically and just listen casually? Why do we live in conflict? What is conflict? Your lives are in conflict - aren't they? Honestly, be simple. Aren't you in conflict? Aren't you? Be honest and simple for once. Why? What is conflict? Opposing desires, right? Right sir? Opposing demands, opposing opinions: I think this, and you think that. Right? My prejudice against your prejudice. Right? My tradition against your tradition; and deeper still, my selfishness against your selfishness. No? Yes? My meditation against yours. My guru is better than your guru. So there is this contradictory process going on in us which is the dualistic attitude towards life. Right? The good and the bad. Right? Have you ever enquired whether there is a relationship between the good and the bad? Is this all something new? I am asking you gentleman and ladies: is there relationship between the good and the bad? That is duality, you understand,

hate and not hate. Let's take one thing: violence and non-violence. Is there a relationship with violence and a brain that has no violence? Do you understand? Is there a relationship between the two? If there is relationship between violence and that which is not violent, then that relationship implies a connection between the two. Do you understand what I am saying? If there is a relationship between violence and that which is not violence - then one is born out of the other. Right? I wonder if you see this. Do give your mind to this for a while, will you? Two opposites: violence, or if you don't like violence, envy and not envy. If envy has relationship with non-envy - right - then one is born out of the other. Right? Is this clear? No. Is this clear, sir? Right?

Look sir, if love is related to hate or to jealousy - that is better. Let's take a very ordinary daily fact. If love is related to hate, then it is not love is it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's just an idea, for god's sake, don't say things that you don't know what you are saying. Look sir, if violence is related to that which is not violent, violence is still part of that which is not violence. Do you understand some of this? So violence is something entirely different from that which is non-violence. So if you see the fact, then conflict ceases. Look: if I am blind, I accept it, I can't keep struggling, saying I must have more light, I must see. I am blind. But if I don't accept it and say I must see, I must see, I must see, then there is conflict. You understand this very simple fact? I accept I am blind. Then that acceptance that I am blind, the fact that I am blind, then I have to cultivate different senses. Right? I can feel how closely I come to a wall. Seeing the

fact that I am blind has its own responsibility. But if I say constantly to myself, I must see, I must see, I am in conflict.

This is what you are doing. If I accept that I am dull. If I accept that I am dull, not because I compare myself with you who is clever. Do you understand what I am saying? I know only dullness through comparison, don't I? I see you, very bright, very clever, intelligent - all the rest of it, and I say, compared to her how dull I am. But if I don't compare, I am what I am. Right? I can then begin from there. But if I am comparing myself all the time with you who are bright, intelligent, nice looking, capable and all the rest of it - I am in perpetual conflict with you. But if I accept what I am - I am this and from there I can begin. Do you see this? So, conflict exists only when we deny the actual fact of 'what is'. Look: I am this but if I am trying all the time to become that, I am in conflict. Right? But you are like that because you all have a psychological becoming. You all want to become holy, saints or business men or meditate properly, don't you? So there is conflict. When you realize the fact and not move away from the fact: I am violent, but I pretend not to be violent, but when I pretend not to be violent, conflict begins. Right? So, will you stop pretending - and say, I am violent, let's deal with violence? It's like when you have a toothache, you go to a dentist, do something about it, but when you pretend I have no toothache... So conflict ends when you see things as they are, and not pretend something which is not. It is a much more complex problem, conflict, we won't go into it more deeply.

And so, we are saying, as this is the last talk here, the last discussion rather, communication, we ought to talk briefly about sorrow and meditation. Man has lived with sorrow from the

beginning of time. Right? Man has suffered, he is in sorrow. And nobody has faced the fact, we are asking whether sorrow can end. Your sorrow, you understand sir? If I have lost a son, or a child whom I have loved or had affection for, I suffer. Don't you suffer? Is this something strange to you?

Q: No.

K: Then what do you do about it? Sir, this is a serious question, I am not trying to harass you. But, we suffer and we go on suffering, we never ask whether suffering can end. And when you suffer all the time, your brain becomes dull, your life becomes dark, ugly; when you suffer you can't love. So, can you find out whether sorrow can end? Part of sorrow is self-pity. Right? Isn't there in sorrow self-pity? That means you are concerned about yourself. I have lost my son, in whom I have invested a lot of money. My son and he dies. I am becoming old - nobody to look after me. I had hoped that my son would grow up and look after me. Don't you know all this? And he dies, and I suffer. In suffering there is loneliness, attachment, feeling that I have lost something that can never be replaced. And loneliness is emphasized, brought into my consciousness directly. All that is part of suffering.

So, can all that end? Can you end your attachment to your gods, to your beliefs, to your faith, to your house, to your attachments? You understand, sir? Can you end it? That is what death means doesn't it? Death means the ending. Not the continuity in the next life - that may just be theory. And if you like theories and that gives you comfort - all right, but there is nothing real about theories or beliefs. What has reality is your attachment to your family, to your beliefs, to your gods, to your tradition. And death

comes along and says, wipe it. Right? So can you, while living, be free of attachment, to your guru, to your belief, to your bank account, if you are lucky enough, or unlucky enough to have a bank account? Can you be detached, free of all attachment, and live in this world? Be free of attachment, can you? That means living with death all the time - not fifty years later, or frightened of death. I won't go into the question of death because it is too complicated. We have no time this morning. But death means not only biological and physical ending of the organism, but to also to all the memories, attachments, your reputation, to your fulfillment, that all ends. So, can you live with death? Not commit suicide. I don't mean that. Live with death, ending every day all the things that you have psychologically accumulated. That requires tremendous care, attention, to every thought so that you are living all the time with that shadow, with that thing called death, then you have immense vitality. Not to do more mischief, not to get more money, more fame and all that rubbish, but a brain that becomes extraordinarily alive, free.

Also we have to talk for a few minutes about meditation. Do you want to talk about it? Are you sure?

Q: Yes.

K: Because what I am going to say about your meditation is, it is nonsense. What is the difference between a man who wants to accumulate money, working, working, working, getting richer and richer or poorer, whatever it is, working day after day to be rich, famous as a politician, guru or something or other - what is the difference between that and your practising daily to become something, to achieve enlightenment? What is the difference? Is

there any difference? The man who pursues, day after day to acquire money, position, status - status, you know, as a big man, works, works, and the other man who says, I am going to meditate in order to achieve something or other? What is the difference between the two?

Q: None.

K: Then why do it? Don't agree with this, this is a very, very serious subject. Don't play around with this. I say, conscious meditation, deliberate meditation, which means daily practice, daily repetition of a mantra, all that is like any other business, like any other activity, nothing noble about it. So, deliberate, conscious practice, following a system, repeating some words, in order to pacify the mind, to become quiet, pay attention, is like any other man who says, I must have status. Right? So we are saying, please listen carefully, we are saying that any deliberate, conscious meditation is not meditation at all. Do you like what I am saying? No, you don't.

So we have to find out what is meditation, which is not deliberate action, sitting in a certain posture, breathing regularly and following a system. Have you observed what happens to your brain when you do all this? It becomes more and more mechanical. Right? You so easily agree, but you don't really agree at all, you just play with words. So, there is a meditation which is totally different, which is not if you put aside the deliberate activity of meditation, which is, to say, I will do this. Meditation is not the activity of will or determination. Right sir?

So is there a meditation that is not all this? We are saying there is, totally different, because this is all rather immature, rather

obvious. And you have practised, practised for generations this kind of meditation, where are you at the end of it? Right? Where are you? On the contrary your brains have become extraordinarily dull. So we are saying, there is a meditation - meditation implies a state of the brain in which there is no measurement. Do you understand? No measurement. That means no comparison; that means no becoming - you don't become enlightened. That is a horrible idea: I am going to become enlightened. That is a reward. If I do this I will get rewarded. If I don't do it I will get punished. You see that brings in another: we live on reward and punishment.

Sir, after all to have great silence - and that silence is not brought about by deliberate, purposeful activity, without having a silent brain there is no meditation. Meditation is to give attention to everything daily, to everything that you do. You begin there: how you dress, how you talk, how you eat, how you walk - pay attention to all that. Then as you pay attention you will know what it means to give complete attention. That is, to observe, to watch, to listen. Thereby you become highly sensitive. Not 'become' - you are highly sensitive when there is attention. And that is why beauty is important.

Q: Will death automatically grant me freedom from pain and sorrow and attachments?

K: Who are you? Who are you sir? Are you different from sorrow? Are you different from your anger, are you different from your greed? So if you end your greed now, that is part of death. Are you different from all this?

Q: No, sir. Suppose I am not able to do that just now?

K: That is a wrong question. You are saying, if I don't do it

now...

Q: I will never do it

K: Yes. The same thing. Are you unable to do this now - be honest sir, are you unable?

Q: I am trying.

K: When you have toothache or pain you go to the dentist, don't you? You don't say, I am trying to go to the dentist. Sir, you are all playing games. Sir, we have the idea, a concept, a tradition that I am different from my anger. I am the atman and all that kind of stuff, I am different from everything, I am the watcher. Right? I am the controller As that gentleman points out very clearly, that if I don't do anything now, that is, I won't do anything about my attachment, I won't do anything about my anger, envy, will death end all that? That is his question. Yes sir. That means that if I don't stop all that now, I will be like that tomorrow. I will be like that till I die. Right? Then what happens after that?

Q: That I don't know.

K: As you don't know, why don't you do this first? Do you understand my question sir? You don't know actually what happens after death. You may believe in reincarnation, you may believe in the future. Right? You may believe. Sir, please I am an ordinary person.

Q: It may be.

K: May be. You don't know, so why not begin now. Sir, if I don't know what I am going to be in a years time. I may die. And if I am going to die in two years time, why don't I begin to die now, which means, don't be attached Can you, will you? Not try - do it? This is our trouble, we always say we are going to try. You don't

say that when you are hungry. When you are sexually demanding, you don't say, I will think about it. So, sir, don't play with these kinds of things.

Q: I have to become a dead body just now.

K: Do we realize what our life is?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: What is your life sir?

Q: Hunger, anxiety, fear.

K: All that, why not end it now?

Q: I can't end hunger.

K: I never said that, those are biological demands. But psychologically, anger, envy, jealousy, hate, attachment, can't you end all that? Of course one can, then do it. Talk to your wife or your husband, to your neighbour, gently, quietly, with affection, with care. Sir, you make me cry. You don't listen to all this. Well sirs, sit quietly, shall we, for a few minutes.

RISHI VALLEY 1ST TALK WITH STUDENTS

7TH DECEMBER 1984

K: What shall we talk about this morning? What would you like to talk about? No? What interests you? What would you like to do, or talk about?

S: Fear.

K: Fear? I thought you were rather fed up with that word. Do you really want to talk about fear? Yes? All of you want to talk about fear?

S: Comparison.

K: Comparison. Anything else? Fear, comparison and something else? Some of the older people there, the older boys.

S: Love.

K: Love. Good lord! Fear, comparison, love and what else?

S: Prejudice.

K: Prejudice. Fear, comparison, love, prejudice. Now which would you like to talk about first? Among those four questions, which would you like to talk about first? Go on. This is not an examination so you don't have to be afraid. Shall we talk about prejudice first? Do you know what that word means? Prejudice. That means you don't know me but you have already judged me. Right? You don't know something but you already have an opinion about it, a judgement about it. So out of that arises prejudice. Have you prejudices? Of course you have. You don't like certain people, or a certain class of people, because you are prejudiced against them. You mightn't like your teachers but you may be prejudiced against them. Right? Have you got prejudices? Have you? You are

all very silent. Don't you talk? Would you all like to sit quietly? Then talk! Or have you lost your tongues? Good lord, don't you talk? All right, I'll also sit quietly. Until you talk to me I won't talk to you. There we are!

S: Why is it that one gets prejudiced?

K: You understand the word prejudice? You don't belong to my caste, to my group, to my ideological community, so I am prejudiced against you. It arises, doesn't it, from having an opinion about somebody. Do you know what opinion means? No? Yes? Have you opinions?

S: Yes.

K: Why? I have an opinion about the prime minister? Right? I have an opinion about the governor, or about the man next door, or about your educator, your teacher, or you might have an opinion about me. Right? Why do you have opinions? You don't know me so why have opinions about me? You really don't know your teacher, what he thinks, what he feels, what his life is, whether he is unhappy or happy, whether he is ambitious and so on. You don't know anything about him but you already have an opinion about him. Right? From that opinion you have a prejudice, you are prejudiced. So why do you have opinions at all?

S: It appears as though opinions are inherent in us.

K: Is there anything inherent in human beings? Why do we take anything for granted that there is something inherent? You know what that word inherent means? Something born, something established; inherent in, say for instance, a tamarind tree, it is inherent that tree is a tamarind. Right? Have we human beings anything inherent? Or it is cultivated? You understand? Or

educated?

S: It is cultivated.

K: Cultivated. Who cultivates it?

S: We do.

K: We ourselves. Right? Why? Think it out. Don't say, just think it out. Why do you have inherent prejudice, who cultivated it? Your parents? Or you belong to that caste, your parents say, 'I don't like that man' and you say, 'I also don't like him.' Is there anything that is part of you, anything that is inherent, inborn, or is it cultivated? If it is cultivated, it is either cultivated by your friends, by your parents, by your community, by your society. Right? So why do your parents have them? Why does society educate you to have prejudices?

And would you ask also what is society? Discuss with me, come on!

S: Sir, society seems to depend on prejudices.

K: Prejudices. Yes. So have you asked what is society? What is the society? Don't go to sleep! Come on you older people up there: what is society? Who created this society? The social structure? You know what society is? The government, the bureaucracy, the community, the individuals in the community and their relationship with the community, with the government, with the whole bureaucratic, religious structure around us. That's generally called society. Agreed? Would you agree to that? Hey, don't you talk? I am sure you do, you chatter away like monkeys, but here you refuse to talk. Are you nervous? Are you shy? If you don't talk with me, how am I to talk with you? I won't hit you, I won't beat you, I won't bite you! Are you not used to asking questions, trying to find

out? Or you just read books, memorize, and pass exams? Is that it? How am I to talk to you if you don't talk to me? Shall we keep silent again?

S: Sir, I'd like to know about prejudice which you create for yourself.

K: By all human beings.

S: By yourself, not by the others around you.

K: You have prejudices.

S: Because somebody has done something.

K: Somebody has done something to you and therefore what? You get prejudiced against him? Either that prejudice is friendly, or antagonistic. Right?

S: How can you have a friendly prejudice?

K: How can you have friendly prejudice - don't you have friendly prejudice about your friend? You say, he is a nice man, or a nice girl, nice boy. You see we all have prejudices, unfortunately. Those prejudices prevent us from looking, observing, understanding another. Right? If I have prejudices against you, I won't be able to understand what you are talking about, or what you want to tell me, I cut you off. So to find out what you are, what you are actually telling me, I mustn't have prejudices, I mustn't have opinions, I must be free to listen to you. And by listening to you very carefully I understand you, what you want to tell me. But you are frightened of me, then I can't communicate with you, or prejudiced, or you have opinions about me. What is important is not to have prejudices, not to have opinions, so that you can understand, look at people. If you have prejudice you can't love people.

S: Sir, after meeting the person and if you find he is very stubborn, not very nice, then you form an opinion.

K: Of course. But he may be very nice, you may think he is not nice, but he may be very nice, you have to find out. And if you want to find out whether he is nice or not you have to listen to what he has to say. You can't have prejudice beforehand. Or even after. One must have a free mind, a free brain to understand something.

S: When you say you understand a person, it is also a prejudice.

K: No. I want to understand you. I want to listen to what you are saying. I want to find out why you think this, or that. Right?

S: You can't say anything about anyone.

K: You come over here. Come out here. Come and sit down.

S: What I am saying, it is the same thing, I mean if I say I understand a person, then that is another prejudice again.

K: No, no. Is that a prejudice? I understand, not you because I don't know you, I understand, say for instance, Mr Narayan. I have known him for a number of years and I have talked to him and he has talked to me, he has told me his problems, and I have understood. I have talked to him, I have communicated with him.

S: Then you can't really describe a person as he is.

K: No, I can't. Therefore I am not prejudiced.

S: Is that all there is to it then?

K: No. There is much more to it. A human being is a very complex person. Right? Very complex. I have only understood Mr Narayan very, very little, and that little doesn't prejudice me. I say I understand a little. And I really don't know Mr Narayan.

S: So you can't say anything about him unless you know him.

K: That's all, that's all. So I have no prejudice. I can't say, I

know Mr Narayan. That would be stupid on my part if I say, 'I know Mr Narayan'. Right? I only know a little bit, that which he has told me, which he has conveyed to me, and so on. Very little. But if I want to know him, and he will allow me to know him - you understand - then I can talk to him, I can discuss with him, I can spend days with him. Right? Then I begin to say, 'I know, somewhat, Narayan'. There is no prejudice involved. Agreed?

S: Sir, there is a friend of mine, whenever I talk to him, suppose he rebukes me or something, and the next time I don't talk to him, isn't that prejudice?

K: I wouldn't call that prejudice. You talk to me and I insult you, and you don't like it, that's not prejudice. I have been rude to you, unfortunately, that doesn't make a prejudice. You say, he has been rude to me.

S: Then in future he will always attribute the quality of rudeness to that person and then he will keep avoiding that person.

K: Why?

S: Because you have attributed rudeness to him.

K: No, just listen. I have been rude to you - suppose. Then you avoid me. Right? Why?

S: I am afraid of getting hurt by you again.

K: Wait a minute. You are afraid of getting hurt again. Right? Now what do you mean by getting hurt?

S: Well I don't like the way you have behaved to me. Therefore I avoid you.

K: Quite right. Now what is it that is getting hurt?

S: Well I don't like what you said about me.

K: I know. You don't like what I said about you. Right?

S: Yes. And I'm afraid it will be repeated and I don't want to be insulted again and therefore I avoid you.

K: What is it that is getting hurt? You understand my question?

S: My feelings.

K: No, your feelings - what do you mean by your feelings? What is it - listen carefully - what is it that is getting hurt? You said, me, my feelings. What is 'me'? Think it out.

S: Could it be my ego that is hurt?

K: You come out here! Come on. I am glad you are a boy, there is a girl here, so come and sit here. Now what do you mean by ego?

S: Say, like I think of myself as a person, like I think of myself as someone and someone says I am not that person, it hurts me.

K: That's right. What is that person? What are you? Sit comfortably.

S: Well I think myself to be.

K: I know. What do you think yourself to be? Go on, old boy. You said that you would get hurt if somebody was rude, your ego. Now what do you mean by your ego? Why do you mean you? What are you?

S: What I thought of myself.

K: Yes. What have you thought of yourself? You mightn't like to tell us but what have you thought about yourself? That you are a great man? That you are clever?

S: Yes sir.

K: That you are much more intelligent than me?

S: Yes.

K: Or somebody else.

S: Well I don't know that I compare my intelligence with another person. I mean I just know my own capacity to do something. That's all. But I don't think I have to compare myself with another.

K: I didn't say that. If you act according to your capacity then you don't compare yourself with anybody, do you? But when do you compare yourself with somebody?

S: When you think you are better than that person, or you are worse than that person.

K: You compare with somebody. Now, I compare myself with somebody here, and I feel very dull because he is much cleverer, much more beautiful, has much more capacity, he has travelled a great deal, etc., etc. So I compare myself with him, or her, and I feel dull. Right? Right?

S: Yes.

K: Why do you compare? Tell me.

S: Well you said in a person..

K: No, why do you compare? I compare myself with that person, and I feel because he is so clever, so intelligent, I feel dull. Right? So I ask myself why do I compare.

S: Sir, I think it is because I am bit insecure in myself.

K: Insecure?

S: Yes.

K: Would you come out here too?

S: OK!

K: You compare yourself with another because you are insecure.

S: Yes.

K: What do you mean by being insecure? Careful!

S: Sir, maybe something earlier has happened and I am a bit frightened by it, or a bit hurt by it. Say something happens, take for example if I do better than someone else, and then I compare my performance with that other person and I say, oh, I have done better. When I start thinking that I am not as bad as what I thought I was last evening, and it does give you a sense of security.

K: So what do you mean by having security? Careful! Careful, think it out. Look at it. A man has a lot of money, he feels secure, more or less, he is also frightened but he feels secure. A man who has great capacity, he feels secure. A man who has got a good position, like a good professor in a university, where he cannot be turned out, he feels completely safe. Like the prime minister, getting elected, he feels safe. Right?

S: You are better off than him.

K: You think so, good! You mean the prime minister or the businessman?

S: I think the prime minister would feel much less secure.

K: Much less secure? Yes, you are quite right. So what do you mean by being secure? Listen carefully, listen carefully. Everybody wants to be secure: your father, your mother, you, the prime minister, the guru, everybody, every human being on this earth wants to be secure. Now what do you mean by secure? Careful, think it out.

S: When you have no problems, and no worries.

K: That's right. No problems, no worries. That is one type. Is there a human being that has no problems?

S: No, sir.

K: Right. So he is not secure. Now go on. Who is secure in the world? Is anybody secure in the world?

S: No. Temporarily secure.

K: Temporarily secure - you are a good boy! Where have you come from?

S: Delhi, sir.

K: Delhi? Delhi is the most insecure place. Now, nobody is secure, are they? Nobody. Agree?

S: Nobody is totally secure.

K: Permanently. They may be secure for five years, or two years. There is insecurity because we are all going to die, we may lose our position, a war may come and destroy us, and so on and so on. And yet human beings all over the world want to be secure. Right? Agree? Everybody, including you, me, everybody wants to be secure. And there is no security because my wife may run away, I might fall ill, I might lose my money, I might lose my reputation. Yet the human brain - you understand, you know what the human brain is, do you? What is it? You agreed, old girl. You said, yes. What do you mean by the brain?

S: Whatever is inside our skull.

K: Yes, what is inside the skull. Quite right. Right? What is inside the skull. Now, what is inside the skull? Think it out. What is inside the skull?

S: Something that...

K: No, listen: what is inside your head, there. Be simple and then you will find out lots more if you begin simply. What is inside your skull.

S: Grey matter.

K: Grey matter. Go on. Apart from the matter, the cells, the atoms, and all the nervous - I won't go into all that. So the brain is what you think, what you feel, what you react to, what you act, what you think and so on, it is there. Now - what were we talking about?

S: About the same thing.

K: What do you mean, the same thing?

S: About feeling.

K: I know, but how did we come to the brain?

S: Sir when you were discussing prejudice.

K: Trace it.

S: From prejudice we went to discussing insecurity, from insecurity to what the brain actually is. We said insecurity makes us feel low.

K: Look old boy, you missed a step.

S: Understanding the other person.

K: I know, that's later, earlier you missed a step. Everybody wants to be secure. Right? And apparently there is no security. Right? In the temples, in the gods - Tirupati, or in bureaucracy of Delhi, or the prime minister, or the local chief minister, there is no security. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: But I said the brain, inside the skull, needs tremendous security, otherwise it can't function properly. You get it? Are you following this carefully? The brain, your brain, needs extraordinary security to function properly. That's natural, isn't it? If you want to function properly, physically, you must have a very good body, very healthy body. Right? You must eat properly, exercise

properly, rest properly and so on. So similarly the brain which has sought security, has not found security out there, so where will it find security?

S: In itself.

K: Now, you say, in itself. Now careful, think it out. What do you mean by that?

S: The brain can think of itself as something and therefore find security.

K: Now, just think it out. Is thought secure?

S: Not always.

K: No, why? Go on. You began to talk, don't keep quiet now.

S: (Inaudible)

K: I know, old boy, he said to me - what's your name?

S: Ajit.

K: Ajit told me that the brain can think it is secure and therefore it is secure. Right? But I questioned, I said to him, is thought secure? You may think one day this, and the next day that, another something else. So is there security in thinking?

S: Sir, I think so.

K: Come in front then. At last you are all waking up.

S: Suppose you think, OK, suppose I get low marks and when I think, OK, I have the will power I can stand it, then I feel secure, OK I have the will power I can do it. I can say, it's OK. And then you feel secure.

K: I know. So I am asking you, will thinking make you secure, thinking that you are secure?

S: If you get less marks than the others you begin to compare.

K: So you find security through comparison. Right?

S: Sometimes.

K: Sometimes.

S: When you find that you are better - suppose you get more marks and you find you are better off than the other person in study.

K: All right, you get better marks than I do, suppose. You feel secure.

S: Yes.

K: But that person gets better marks than you.

S: Well I don't want to compare with the other person because I want to feel secure, and if I compare with the other person...

K: I know, old boy, that sounds nice but you are comparing.

S: Yes.

K: Yes. Therefore you are insecure when you compare.

S: I will avoid comparing with that person because I will feel insecure.

K: With anybody, not only with that person, will you stop comparing with everybody?

S: No.

K: If you compare with other people you become insecure. Right? Because somebody is much cleverer than you.

S: Yes, but what I am saying is that I won't compare with that person, I'll compare with people who less better off than me. I am looking for security.

K: I understand. So do you ever compare with somebody less than you, or always somebody better than you?

S: Well sometimes it's both ways.

K: Both ways. When do you do that?

S: Quite often.

K: Be honest.

S: Well I really don't know. Sometimes I don't even follow it up.

K: You are too lazy.

S: Well that may be the fact, sometimes I don't even think I am comparing. I don't realize it.

K: We said this, any form of comparison, any form, below or above, makes you insecure. You may compare yourself with me and feel very superior, but there is somebody else who is superior to you, therefore you are always - you follow? So through comparison, we said, there is no security. Right? Clear?

S: Yes, but then it gives you a temporary security. It gives you a temporary security.

K: A temporary security but it is not secure. Right? And I say, the brain, your brain needs security otherwise you can't function. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Carefully listen. We thought there is security in knowledge, passing exams, getting more information, gathering, you follow, getting a lot of knowledge one felt secure.

S: Why do you say that?

K: Why do I say that? That's what you are all doing.

S: Well then you just said that you are insecure.

K: First see what you are doing. You are being so-called educated, god knows what that means, you are all being educated to have more knowledge, aren't you, and you use that knowledge to be secure.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Yes, sir. So is knowledge secure? Will knowledge give you security?

S: That is also a temporary thing.

K: A temporary thing. But when the brain is in a temporary state, isn't it confused? Is this getting too difficult for you?

S: A little.

K: A little difficult. All right. Let's simplify it, shall we? Suppose I have studied, what, engineering, and I am good at engineering because I have passed exams and I have got a degree, whatever that stupid degree is, I have got a degree. And - listen - she has a better degree than me, so I am already insecure.

S: Yes, sir.

K: So my knowledge, however little, or however much, it doesn't give me security.

S: But if you have got the maximum knowledge possible.

K: There is no maximum knowledge. Think it out carefully. I'll show it to you. Are you getting tired of all this, a conversation between the four of us? Are you?

S: Thought makes you feel secure and insecure.

K: Wait, I'm coming to that. That's quite right, boy.

S: Let me ask you a question. Sir, it means you can't work properly unless you have proper security, you said the brain cannot function unless it has got security.

K: Got complete security.

S: Complete security.

K: Not temporary security.

S: Where can you get it?

K: Wait, wait, wait. First put the question clearly: if the brain has temporary security it is not secure.

S: What is security?

K: First see when the brain thinks it is secure, actually it is not secure. Right? It is not secure when it says, I have got knowledge, because you have got more knowledge than I have.

S: Then why do we compare?

K: I said because we are educated to compare. In all your schools, in this school you are given better marks, aren't you.

S: OK.

K: Not, OK. Just see what you are doing first. Here in this school somebody gives you better marks than the other fellow, and you feel a little superior and you get better exams and so on and so on. So we said very carefully, where there is comparison there must be insecurity. Right? So don't compare. Don't say, yes, and then keep on comparing.

S: What will stop us?

K: Stop it because it is silly, it is so.

S: So what we are talking we can't bring in to our daily lives. You have come twice before to Rishi Valley, you have talked, we understand but then we can't put it into our daily lives.

K: Why?

S: Like you are saying, don't compare.

K: Why don't you put things which you listen to in your daily life, why don't you?

S: Because it is something that I don't think is really possible, I don't think it is possible to stop comparing.

K: Wait a minute. Do you see the danger of comparison?

S: No.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Really see it?

S: Yes.

K: Do you see it as dangerous as a cobra?

S: No, sir.

S: No.

K: That's all. If you saw something dangerous you would stop it, wouldn't you? Why don't you see comparison is really a very dangerous business?

S: Sir, I think comparison is very dangerous.

K: We said so. We said it is very dangerous. We have pointed it out.

S: How can we stop comparing?

K: Don't stop it. Don't stop comparing but just see how dangerous it is, how meaningless it is, it doesn't give you security.

S: When we get down to stop comparing we can't do it. I mean understand that it is dangerous for my security and I want to be secure, so I want to stop comparing but I can't stop comparing.

K: Oh, yes you can if you see it really is dangerous to your security.

S: By now it has almost become a kind of built-in habit.

K: So break the habit. Look, if you are scratching your head and it becomes a habit, you stop it. Right? Now just a minute, go slowly. I said the brain which now lives in insecurity all the time, therefore whatever it does is confused, don't agree, see the facts, see that's a fact. The wall is a fact you don't hit your head against it.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Right? So see the brain which now lives in insecurity, without security, whatever it does will be confused. Right? Do you see that? Face it, old boy, don't take time over it. I'll put it another way. Gosh! Are you confused?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Now when you are confused whatever you do will be confused also.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Yes? Clear? Are you quite sure? Don't agree with me, I'm not important. S: Sir, you can have clarity in thinking in some field but then you needn't have it in another field.

K: Begin with one field and you will see what you mean by clarity. How can you be clear when you are confused? How can you be clear when you are seeking security in things that don't give you security? Right?

S: Then do you mean to say that our life is a confused life?

K: Yes, sir. That's just what I am telling you.

S: What do you do about it?

K: What do I do about your confusion? Or what do I do about confusion?

S: Sir, he means what does one do about one's own confusion.

K: Now, all right. That's much better. Now what do you do about your confusion? Do you know you are confused?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Wait, wait. Don't say, yes sir.

S: Well, it's a fact.

K: It's a fact. Now think it out carefully. You are confused. Right? Do you realize whatever you think will be confused?

S: Yes.

K: Of course. Whatever you do will be confused?

S: Yes.

K: Whatever your aunt tells you will be confused?

S: No.

K: She is confused too.

S: It seems if I am confused everything is.

S: No, I don't think that everything you do will have to be confused.

K: If your brain is confused, which you said yes, then whatever the brain does, think, feel, act, whatever it does it is confused. Right? Don't agree with me, think it out. Right?

S: I'm not really sure.

K: You don't understand?

S: No, it's not that. Now I feel confused so I don't know what I am doing.

K: That's it. Therefore let's find out why you are confused.

S: How can I get confused every time I am thinking about it?

K: I'm going to help you, we are going to find out whether we can clear up this confusion. Right?

S: Sir, are we capable of doing it if we are confused?

K: You are not.

S: So then...

K: Wait, wait. That's a good question you have put. You are too quick to answer it. How can a confused brain act unconfusedly? Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: First of all, what do you call confused, who is confused? The

brain or the whole of you?

S: The whole of me.

K: Right. Except the physical organism.

S: Well the brain is me.

K: Darling, just listen. When the whole of your physical organism is confused you will be ill. You are not ill now. Right? Therefore the body has its own capacity, intelligence to function properly, the body. You eat, digest and so on, your heart functions, your liver functions and so on, there is the natural process going on. Right? Unless you fall ill, unless you catch a virus, then it becomes ill. Right? Now we are talking about the brain. The brain is confused.

S: Sir, is the confusion of the brain the cause of all these troubles?

K: Yes, sir.

S: So the brain controls the body, it helps us to do things, it tells us what do to, then how can we say that?

S: He is saying that the brain commands the body.

K: Wait, sir. If the brain is confused, as it is, the body is also getting confused, it doesn't know what to eat, it gets ill. They react on each other.

S: So what you mean is that the body is not confused but the actions of the body are confused.

K: Your body is healthy. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: For the moment. Your body is healthy but if your brain is not healthy it is affecting the body.

S: Yes, sir.

K: And the body will affect the brain.

S: Yes, sir.

K: It is an interrelationship between the brain and the body, it's all one.

S: Then how can you get out of that?

K: Yes, that's why I am telling you, asking you to find out whether the brain can clear itself of its confusion.

S: I don't think the brain can clear itself.

K: Don't come to any conclusion.

S: I said, I don't think.

K: Don't even say that. You say, I don't know.

S: But is it capable of doing so, a confused brain?

K: We are going to find out, sir. Right?

S: Let's go on.

K: Find out, don't say, it is capable, or, not capable.

S: If it is confused then how does it do so many things right?

K: What do you call right?

S: In some cases we don't know what to do but in many cases we know what to do.

K: You haven't got the real basis of it, old boy. You may do things out of habit, you may do things out of tradition, you may do something because your educator tells you to do something. And you think you are doing the right thing but you may not be. No, you haven't got the principle, you are going off.

S: But you mean to say that the right thing is right for only one person, for himself?

K: No, sir. If it is right, it is right for everybody.

S: No, what I mean to say is, what he thinks is right, won't be

right for everybody.

K: Not necessarily.

S: So you can't say, it is right.

K: No, that's all. You can't say, this is right. Somebody will say, no, that's wrong. So find out for yourself, not what is right and wrong at present, but find out for yourself whether your brain can become clear, unconfused.

S: How do you find out?

K: I am going to show you, help, I am going to point out to you, but will you listen to it?

S: Yes.

K: Wait, don't say, yes. Have you listened to anybody?

S: Yes.

K: Partially.

S: Yes.

K: Yes. Right? So you have never actually, completely listened to somebody. Right? Correct? Now will you listen to me completely?

S: I'll try.

K: Don't try, do it!

S: I have listened to some people completely.

K: Are you sure?

S: Yes, sir.

K: What does it mean?

S: That is without any opinions.

K: Careful, careful. Don't just invent, do it, actually do it. You cannot listen to me or to somebody else if you have prejudices.

S: Yes, sir.

K: If you have opinions.

S: Well if I don't know anything about that...

K: About anything.

S: Well if I don't know anything then I will have to listen.

K: Just listen, old girl, I want to tell you something. Right? Will you listen to me without prejudice, without opinions?

S: Well I don't know anything about that so I can't have any prejudice, because I don't know what it is about.

K: So will you listen?

S: Yes, sir.

K: That means listen very, very carefully. Right? The brain is the centre of all your emotions, your thoughts, your feelings, your reactions, your fears and all that, your brain is that. Right? Your brain is the centre of all this. If you had no brain you wouldn't be able to think, if you had no brain you wouldn't be able to feel. Right? Are you listening?

S: Yes.

K: So the brain is the centre of all your feeling, your fears, your pain, your sorrow, your pleasure, your anxiety, fear, all that is there. Right? Now, so the brain is so confused with all this. Right? So the brain thinks this is right and this is wrong, and so it is creating more and more confusion for itself. Right? Are you listening to it, or are you asleep?

S: Sir, you are asking us to listen without any prejudice, but we know about the subject.

K: I am telling you the story, listen to the story. Right? Listen to the story. I am telling you, the brain is an extraordinary instrument. The brain has invented so many things - the aeroplane, the jet, the

computer, the submarine, the quick communication and so on - the brain has got extraordinary capacity. But its capacity is very, very small when it turns to itself. That is, I am afraid, I don't know what to do. You understand? So thinking about itself the brain has become small.

S: Sir, the brain doesn't think of itself.

K: It does because you are selfish. Right? This is too much for these people. Is it too much? Is it too much for you, too complicated for you?

S: I don't know because I don't know what you are trying to get at.

K: Quite right. She says, I don't know what you are trying to get at. What I am trying to get at is, a brain confused, whether it can clear its own confusion. Right? I say to you, it is possible.

S: That one's brain can clear one's own confusion?

K: Do you know your brain is confused?

S: Yes.

K: Now I am telling you, pay attention to that confusion; don't try to say, I must get clear, pay attention to why it is confused. I draw the curtain to prevent the light and I know to draw the curtain back will give me light. So in the same way the brain has the capacity to find it can clear up its own confusion. It has got the capacity, we are not using it.

S: So if we want to we can.

K: Of course you can, of course the brain can. The brain can, being confused, it can find out for itself the cause of the confusion and break the confusion because it has got extraordinary capacity.

S: The brain is me.

K: The brain is you.

S: So I will be doing it.

K: You are the brain. You are not different from the brain.

S: Yes, sir.

K: What you think, what you feel, you are, your name, where you come from, your family, all that is memory, all that is thought. So the brain has this capacity to go in one direction to an extraordinary extent, technologically - you know what it has done technologically? And being self-centred, selfish, that capacity has been reduced to a very small affair. Thinking about oneself is a very small affair. Because it is small it gets confused. A technician is not confused in what he is doing. Right?

S: Yes, but that again is technology, that's another field.

K: No, it is the same brain. The brain can work there with an enormous capacity but it is not working here. You understand?

S: Sir, in the same way a philosopher will study himself but he won't be able to do the technician's work.

K: He may, why not?

S: So in the same way a technician...

K: It doesn't matter. He says, I can do that too, but I am not interested in that, I am interested in something else. Right? First of all, sir, just see your brain, which is my brain also - I won't go into all that, it's not your brain - the brain has an extraordinary capacity, capacity to kill people by the million, capacity, the means of killing people, capacity technologically to communicate between New York and Rishi Valley in a few seconds. That's an extraordinary thing to happen. Right? Now that extraordinary capacity of the brain is limited, made small by thinking about oneself.

S: That means I am limited.

K: Of course you are limited.

S: Sir, does that mean that out of one hundred per cent of our knowledge we use only around five per cent of it?

K: Yes, sir.

S: It is different to say, I am limited, and my capacity is limited?

K: The brain is limited by thinking about yourself.

S: Sir, what are we doing right now?

K: Just a minute, one thing at a time. If you are thinking about yourself as you are, as most people are, ninety-nine point nine per cent people are, thinking about themselves: their ideals, their hopes, their fears, their capacities, their success, their design. You follow, they are thinking about themselves. So thinking about oneself is a very small affair. Of course it is.

S: You can't think of everything all at once.

K: I did not say that. Thinking about yourself is a very small affair.

S: Sir, what you are doing now is a small affair, what you are talking about?

K: No.

S: But then we are talking about ourselves.

K: I am not talking about myself.

S: Well whatever we are saying is from what we hear.

S: Whatever we are talking is part of everyone, it is part of us.

K: Look, both of you are shouting at me. I'll come back to you. You asked me a question.

S: Yes, sir. What you are speaking right now is part of us.

K: Look, sir, we are examining together a human mind, a

human brain. The human brain is yours, mine or hers. Right? And I said to you - listen carefully - I said to you, this brain has got extraordinary capacities, technologically, but it becomes very small when it is thinking about itself. Right? Each person thinking about himself, it becomes very small. Right? Therefore the capacity is limited there. And that limited capacity is destroying the world. When you are thinking about your own family, your own goodness, how much money you will have, and I think about myself, we are fighting each other. Right? So every human being is fighting another human being; in the business world, in the intellectual world.

S: Yes, sir.

K: So that becomes a very small affair. Right? Therefore that which is very small becomes the factor of confusion. This is a little bit difficult, leave it alone. Now you have listened to it?

S: I haven't followed the last part.

K: When you are looking after your own little room all day long, and all night long, and all the rest of your life, your own little room, and you don't look at all the marvel of this land, all the colours - look at it - all the colours, the beauty, the flowers, the poor people, but only concerned with your own little room, what does it do?

S: It makes me selfish because I am thinking of myself.

K: What does that do?

S: Sir, does it make us limited to ourselves?

K: Yes, sir. What does it do when you are thinking about yourself all day?

S: It makes us limited to ourselves.

K: Yes, sir, but what does that limitation result in?

S: Confusion.

S: Confusion of yourself, like you keep on thinking of yourself, and you feel confused of what you are.

K: Now just a minute. When you are thinking about your own country, India, India, India, India, what does that do?

S: It makes us insecure.

K: And the Pakistani is thinking, Pakistan, Pakistan, Pakistan. Right? What does it do?

S: It makes a conflict between the two countries.

K: That's right. Right? Conflict. So if I am thinking about myself and she is thinking about herself we are in conflict. Right? Right? Clear? Which means stop thinking about yourself. Will you?

S: I don't know.

K: That's it, nobody wants to.

S: Nobody wants to stop thinking about themselves.

K: That's right.

S: What do we think about then if we stop thinking about ourselves?

K: You will find out, first stop thinking about yourself.

S: Sir, we have to care for ourselves.

S: But if we care for others they will care for us.

K: What?

S: Sir, if we think about the other person, the other person will think about us.

K: Which is, thinking about a person is still limited. It's too complex, we won't go into all this. We have talked for an hour and

a quarter. Isn't that enough? Right? I think that's enough for this morning, don't you? Don't be nervous.

So will you do something? Will you sit very quietly, comfortably, sit comfortably. Sit very quietly and find out, or watch every thought that comes into your brain, watch every thought.

All right, sirs.

RISHI VALLEY 2ND TALK WITH STUDENTS 18TH DECEMBER 1984

K: What shall we talk about? What would you like to talk about?

S: Death.

K: You want to talk about death? Aren't you too young to talk about death?

S: Let's continue with what we were talking about last time.

K: What were we talking about last time?

S: Prejudice and insecurity.

K: Oh yes. Have you got a lot of prejudices? You have, haven't you? Lots of them. Are they fun? Do you like them? You know what prejudice does? Suppose I am prejudiced against whom - for whom would you like me to have prejudices, against whom? Won't you suggest some? Suppose I have prejudices against Rajesh - there he is, I caught his eye! Do you know what happens if I have prejudices against him? I won't understand him, will I? My prejudices come in the way in understanding Rajesh.

S: Prejudices for him?

K: You come over here. Come on!

S: Prejudices for him?

K: Against him. Either I like him and therefore I have prejudices in his favour; or I don't like him I have prejudices against him. Right? Now what happens if I have prejudices?

S: You don't understand him.

K: I don't understand him, I don't see what he says clearly. I don't want to understand him. So it is like a dark glass - you understand? If I have a dark glass in the window I can't see the sun

clearly, can I?

S: No.

K: So prejudices act that way. I have prejudices against him, they become a block. Right? So I don't understand him. Now will you drop your prejudices if I drop mine? Take time over it. Will all of you drop your prejudices and try to understand somebody? If you have prejudices in my favour you won't understand me. Right? If you have them against me you won't understand me either. Right? So will you drop your prejudices, will you? Have you opinions against me, for me? Have you?

S: Sir, if we expect something out of you do we have an opinion about you?

K: No, no. If you expect me to give you good marks because I like you then that is a prejudice.

S: Suppose I expect you to not make one hour boring. Is it a prejudice?

K: I don't understand the last word. Slowly.

S: Suppose I expect you not to make one hour boring. I have one hour with you in class, let's say. And I don't want it to be boring.

K: You don't want it to be boring - so what?

S: So is it a prejudice, like I am expecting it not to be boring?

K: That's not a prejudice, old boy.

S: Like when you prejudge.

K: Prejudge is not prejudice. It is almost a prejudice. If I prejudge you, I can't see you directly, can I?

S: Sir, isn't it a prejudice if I expect the class to be interesting?

K: Come over here, that's your punishment!

S: Isn't it a prejudice if I expect the class to be interesting and I find it isn't?

K: I saw you the other day, didn't I, here?

S: Yes.

K: Yes, all right. What were you saying?

S: Isn't a prejudice if I expect the class to be interesting and I find that it is boring.

K: That is not prejudice. I want to teach you something about the flowers. Look at all those flowers. Marvellous, isn't it. I want to talk to you about it, and you might find it boring. That's not prejudice.

S: But then it is prejudging the class.

K: No, I want to tell you: look at those beautiful flowers, how nice they look, and the green lawn, green hedge, I want to show you them.

S: But I am not expecting anything out of them.

K: I am asking you to look and you don't even look. That's not prejudice. I am asking you: look at all those flowers, the green, the different kinds of green, and the yellow flowers. And then I say, look at all the people all round you, all these boys and girls, look at them carefully. All of them: those boys who are sitting out there who won't talk, and all those people who are sitting here, watch them all. Is that a prejudice? Or you don't want to watch them, therefore you consider it is a terrible bore.

S: No, I don't know anything, so I just...

K: Just watch them. You don't know anything about those flowers, do you?

S: No.

K: You see the beauty of it. You see the beauty of it all? The green, the varieties of flowers, colours. Does colour mean anything to you?

S: Well it looks beautiful on trees and flowers.

K: No, I said colour, not the flower which is specially beautiful, just colour. Now who has got the brightest colour here? That girl with the red jersey. Does colour mean anything to you?

S: It can mean so many things.

K: No, I am asking you about one thing, old girl. I am asking you, sirs, out there, do all those colours in this valley and the rock on that hill, I don't know what you call that hill up there, and that rock early in the morning with the sunlight on it, does it mean anything to you? When you look at all this beauty around you, does it mean anything? Do you appreciate all this extraordinary valley?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Come over here, there is plenty of room! Sit up here, come on, old girl, don't be shy, there. That's good.

S: Like when you see them every morning you feel happy, it means you have seen something nice. So it really means something to you, your heart can rejoice.

K: But do you get used to it?

S: Yes, you get used to seeing it.

K: Why do you get used to it?

S: Because you see it everyday.

K: I know. Just listen: if you get used to me and I get used to you, what happens? I don't listen to what you are talking about, and you don't listen to what I am talking about. Will you?

S: I don't get that. Like, you can always listen to someone. I may be going with one person every day, but still I may know that person, it means not know that person.

K: Of course. Don't get used to anything. That way you keep alive. If you look at those flowers - look at them, turn round and look at them, carefully look at them. Look at Kabir, sitting out there, and Mrs Jayakar and Radhikaji, there, against the background. Isn't that beautiful? And do you get used to it?

S: Yes.

K: Yes, why?

S: Because I see it everyday.

K: No, beauty is not seeing something every day, that later in the day will be totally different, won't it?

S: Yes.

K: In the mid afternoon it will be much more bright, and towards the evening it will have totally different colours, won't it. Can you get used to it? You can't, can you? So don't get used to anything: don't get used to your father, your mother, or to your teachers.

S: But then we have a routine in school, then we get used to it, what is different in a routine every day?

K: Your mind then becomes routine, your mind then goes round and round like a gramophone.

S: Well that doesn't mean that I think along the same lines every day, but the routine, the things we do every day, we get up at 5.30, we go for breakfast, we go for classes, that's a routine.

K: No, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Why do you call it routine?

S: Because that's what happens every day.

K: Listen to what I am talking about, don't be so quick to answer. Why do you call it routine?

S: Because we do it every day.

K: Do you do everything every day and call it routine, or are you aware what you are doing every day? Know what you are doing? Get up in the morning at 5.30, cleaning and all the rest of it, are you aware that you are doing it? Do you pay attention to what you are doing? Or do you do it casually and get on?

S: Yes, I do it casually.

S: Not always.

K: I am asking you do you do this every day, conscious, aware, know what you are doing, when you are cleaning your teeth do you know you are cleaning your teeth? Do you watch very carefully?

S: I don't.

K: No. Why? If you watch carefully it never becomes routine. You understand what I am saying? Are you still here? Good! Do you watch carefully everything that you are doing every day? Why? If you watch everything you do every day it gives you much more, aware, you watch everything then. You watch all those tamarind trees with their fruit, and that rock over there. It is an extraordinary thing to watch.

S: It is.

K: Will you do it?

S: I do it.

K: Every day, every minute, not just casually one day. All the time watch, all the time watch people, watch what they say, how they dress, and all the rocks here, and the trees. You learn much

more by watching. Will you do it? If you say to me you will do it, if you promise you must keep your promise. Otherwise don't promise. Right? Don't promise if you can't do it. Will you promise? Careful!

S: No.

K: Quite right! So when you don't watch carefully everything you are doing, what you say, how you dress, how you clean your teeth and so on, your mind becomes routine, mechanical. You understand? If your mind becomes watchful then everything you are doing becomes much more fun.

S: Isn't it something mechanical even if you watch it.

K: No, it depends how you watch. Nothing becomes mechanical if you know how to watch.

S: How do you watch?

K: I am going to tell you. Will you do it first?

S: I'll try.

K: Don't try, do it.

S: That's easy to say.

K: I know it is easy. You all want to be very comfortable, easy. But I will tell you how to watch - not 'how', what it means watching. I will tell you what it means to watch. Will you follow it carefully?

S: Sir, then won't it become a routine to watch?

K: Of course not. But I haven't told you what it means to watch. Then you can call it routine or not. Right? Will you learn from what I am saying? Learn, find out, will you? I have asked you, look at those flowers, see the beauty of it, see the colour of it, enjoy it, have fun with it. Don't hurt them. You know. I'll tell you.

Scientists, biologists, have discovered that trees communicate with each other. If one tree gets diseased - you understand - it tells the others, be careful, guard yourself against me. Do you understand? They are much more intelligent than human beings in some ways, because when you are ill you don't tell the others, keep away from me!

S: Of course you do, sir.

K: You do.

S: If you have conjunctivitis...

K: Wait a minute. Now I am going to show you how to watch, will you learn?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Good. First you watch with your eyes, don't you, look. Look at those almond, tamarind trees, look at them, look at them. Do you see them?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Now wait, watch it. And you see the rocks behind there?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Now how do you watch it? Are you thinking while you are watching?

S: No, sir.

K: You have learnt something, haven't you? That you are not thinking when you are watching.

S: Right.

K: Right? Then do you watch with your eyes only? Or do you watch altogether? Not only with your eyes, but the feel of it, the colour of it, the depth of the trees, the shadows, the little shadows, do you see them? Do you see those dragonflies flying?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So you see everything when you are watching. Right? Agree? So when you watch very carefully, that way I am showing you, then you watch me, or watch somebody else very carefully, what happens? You have a friend here, haven't you?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Watch him.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Now who is your friend, that boy?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Right. I thought so, I thought it was your friend, you two sat together and smiled together. Now watch him, or watch somebody else. Carefully watch them, how they sit, how they look.

S: I can't watch them, sir, they are smiling.

K: They are smiling, then see them smiling. So that when you watch very carefully you begin to see things you have never seen before. Right? If you watch that carefully, you saw all those dragonflies, you saw the shadows deep down, there is a man going by on a bicycle, do you see it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So when you watch you begin to learn much more.

Now the next step is you not only watch with your eyes, but also listen to all the noise going on. Listen carefully. People coughing, people moving, never sitting still. Right? Watch and listen. Right? So watch, listen and learn.

S: Is there learning while you are watching and listening?

K: I haven't finished, old boy. Find out what learning is. Now listen carefully, listen carefully. When you watch and when you

listen you are learning, not merely memorizing, you are learning to see all the things that are happening around you. Right? Are you doing it? Who is there? Look, you learn from books, don't you, or you learn mathematics?

S: Yes, sir.

K: What else are you learning?

S: History, we are learning biology, learning chemistry, learning geography.

K: So much already! English, mathematics, geography, history, chemistry.

S: Biology.

K: Biology.

S: Physics.

K: You must be a great man! Now - I am joking, right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: When you are learning what is happening? You have got a book, your educator points out, the teacher informs you. You are memorizing, aren't you?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Memorizing, which is what? You are recording as it is recorded on a gramophone plate. Right? You understand what I am saying?

S: Yes, sir.

K: You have a gramophone, haven't you in your school?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So you put on a plate and it repeats, repeats, repeats. Right?

S: Right.

K: Are you doing that?

S: While studying, yes.

K: You are memorizing, not learning. You are memorizing. Right? Because at the end of the school, at the end of the term you are going to be examined. And you must answer quickly so you memorize. Now memorizing is like a gramophone record repeating, repeating, repeating. Right?

S: Yes.

K: Is that learning?

S: I mean when you are beginning to memorize then you are learning.

K: No, at the beginning. Afterwards you repeat.

S: Yes, afterwards it is not learning.

K: At last. Have you got it? Have you learnt it? Do you see something? That is, I don't know, what language, German. I don't know German, I speak Italian, French, a little bit of English, a little bit of French, a little bit of Italian. If I want to learn German I have to study it, haven't I? I have to look at the words, how they are pronounced, the meaning of the word, and the irregular verbs and so on and so on, all that I study, memorize. Right? My brain records everything - all the German words, the syntax, the irregular verbs, it memorizes, that is, it records. The brain records, and then at the end of four months, three months, or whatever it is, you begin to speak German. Right? When you record like that all the time it is like a gramophone that is recording.

S: So it is just like memorizing, it is not learning.

K: That's it, that's all I am saying. Memorizing is not learning.

S: Then by watching you learn.

K: Wait, first see it. First see memorizing is not learning.

S: Until you finish...

K: Wait! You are too quick. But do you see this fact, that memorizing is not learning? Memorizing is repetition because you have to pass an exam, you have got to get a job. Right? So learning is not memorizing. So what is learning then?

S: Each time you watch you are learning something.

K: That's right. Right, you have said something true. Each time you watch you are learning, because things change. You understand? If you are watching those trees early in the morning they have quite a different light, haven't they? And later on in the day it has a different light, there is a different movement, different shades, different colour, you are learning.

S: Each time you...

K: Come over here! I am going to have all the class round here. Give her some room, old boy.

S: Sir, when you see people, when you see them every day...

K: Don't get used to seeing people every day. Watch them.

S: But there isn't anything new in them always.

K: How do you know?

S: Sir, I don't think so. Every time the same ones...

K: Do you know your body cells are changing, so people are changing. I am not the same as you saw me yesterday, I may have moved, I may have changed, I might do all kinds of things. I am a living being, it is only dead things that don't change.

S: And if we watch them then we can find out.

K: That's right. If you watch them you learn because then as you watch those trees the first thing in the morning they are different. Right? Different colour, different movement, different depth of

light. Right? Different shadows. It is just like that human being.

S: Sir, I see the change in the trees and that, but I don't know why I don't see it in people.

K: Because you are lazy, because you don't want to look carefully at people. Right?

S: Yes.

K: So watching, listening, and therefore learning, not memorizing. Is that clear?

S: Yes.

K: But do it. Now in India specially they have a lot of theories, about god, about heaven, about - a lot of it, nothing to do with their daily life. Right? The daily life counts much more than your gods and theories. Right? So watch your life. When you promise something always keep it. So don't promise without realizing that you must keep it.

S: So you watch what you say, you watch what you are doing. Like when I watch a tamarind tree I must have that realization in myself that I am also watching.

K: Yes, you are watching yourself. I am watching those trees and I am also watching myself. I am watching what I am saying, whether I tell the truth or lie, I am watching my various annoyance, anger, jealousy, fear, I am aware of all that. You understand? As I am aware of those flowers, I am aware also of myself. Right? It is much more fun watching yourself because you are changing, you are different. One morning you are depressed, the next morning you are happy, the third morning you are irritated. Right? Will you do all this, or just say, yes, yes, and carry on?

S: I have watched myself.

K: Will you do it?

S: Yes.

K: Promise?

S: Yes, I will do it.

S: No. I will try.

K: You promise? Careful!

S: I think I will do it, sir.

K: Not, "you think you will do it". But do you promise to do it every day? That means you must keep it. Don't promise now.

S: I'll try to do it.

K: Not, try. Either do it, or don't do it.

S: But I want to do it.

K: Then do it. You see, just listen, if you do that you become extraordinarily alive, your brain becomes extraordinary, so sensitive. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: You are not sensitive. You are very young, you are not sensitive.

S: Sometimes when I am thinking of something I don't realize I am thinking, I am so caught up in that thinking. Whereas sometimes, suppose I am watching a tree, I know that I am watching a tree. I am aware that I am watching a tree, and I am watching it at the same time. Whereas sometimes I am thinking, I don't realize that I am thinking. So I am not watching myself at that time.

K: Wait, wait. Realize that you are thinking. Watch your thinking. Why you think, what makes you think that way, watch it, watch everything that you are doing.

S: Sir, but sometimes I am so caught up in that thinking.

K: Just listen carefully. Now listen. We are talking to each other, aren't we, so we are thinking too. Right? And we may think silently and put it into words. Right? That is what we are doing now. You think and you put it into words. And you want to tell me something, so I am very careful to convey what I want to say to you.

S: Sir, but sometimes you don't think and then put it into words, the words come.

K: Yes. Why is that?

S: Sir, doesn't it become mechanical again?

K: That's just what I am telling you: don't become mechanical. Don't become mechanical. You have got glasses, right? Find out if you can do without glasses.

S: I can't.

K: Don't say, you can't.

S: I can't see anything without my glasses.

K: Find out, old girl! I am supposed to be ninety, I don't have glasses. Do you know why?

S: Because you can do without them.

K: You are nuts!

S: Sir, but she knows she can't do without them, she has tried it all before.

S: Yes, that's why I got glasses.

K: Find out if you can see clearly without glasses. If you can't then find out if you can do eye exercises.

S: I am doing that.

K: That may improve it. But if you keep on saying, "I must have

glasses, I must have glasses".

S: No, I don't do that.

K: But you are doing it, you say, "I can't see without glasses".

S: That's because it is a fact, but I am doing exercises to see without glasses.

K: So remove your glasses and make an effort.

S: One question sir: you asked us to start learning and stop memorizing.

K: Memorizing, as I explained to you, old boy - listen carefully - memorizing becomes mechanical. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: The brain that is inside the skull is always recording.

S: Yes, sir.

K: I say, that is yellow, that's green. Right? Those are trousers. It is recording. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: That recording becomes mechanical.

S: Yes, sir.

K: and then being mechanical your whole life becomes mechanical.

S: Sir, but isn't it a fact that...

K: Wait, darling, I haven't finished with this chap. You jump on me before I have finished. Right. Ask your question afterwards. Remember your question. You understand? If I all the time am recording - green, white, purple, yellow, he is my friend, he is not my friend - right - it is like a gramophone.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Right? So memorizing is not learning. Learning is all the

time something new.

S: Like when you are studying something.

K: You have to learn that. You have to study it.

S: We have to memorize then.

K: Wait a minute. I am your teacher. And I want to teach you history. Right?

S: Yes.

K: I want to teach you history. You must know all the kings, and all the rest of all that silly rot. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: It is silly rot. You must know who was the king of India in the 15th century and so on and so on. Right?

S: Why do you call it silly rot?

K: It is silly. At the end of it it doesn't affect your life at all, does it?

S: But if you want to become something, or do a course.

K: That's it, you memorize in order to become a professor.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Yes, sir. You memorize in order to get more money.

S: Get what?

K: Money, better job.

S: Not necessarily, sir.

K: Ah, yes. If you don't have good memory you won't have a good job. Have you watched the carpenters? Those people who build beautiful furniture? I have. They must know the quality of the wood. Right? The quality of grain and so on, and the instrument they use. They are very careful so they memorize, they become an apprentice first from another carpenter, they learn by that,

memorize, and then they become good carpenters. Right? Now I want to teach you history - just listen quietly, will you? Will you listen, or you are off somewhere else?

S: I am listening, yes.

K: Good. I want to teach you history. History means story. Right? It is a story of all the past kings, past queens, all the wars, etc. etc.

S: Right, sir.

K: And also story means story about yourself.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Story about what is happening in the world, and story also about yourself. You are a much more interesting story than the story of all the kings.

S: I agree, sir.

K: Agree? Right, sir. So I am going to talk about not only the history according to the books, but also I am going to talk to you about the story of yourself.

S: But that is not what we do in class.

K: I know they don't. I said, if I was your teacher I would do that. You understand?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I would combine both - the book and also about yourself.

S: That is a very far possibility of your ever being a teacher.

K: What? Slowly, slowly.

S: Sir you couldn't ever be a teacher.

K: Why not?

S: Not on a subject as such.

K: Ah, I said I would combine both. I would combine the book.

Right? And also I would combine the history about oneself. The history about oneself is the history of all mankind. Right?

S: So the history of all mankind is the history of oneself.

K: Which is yourself.

S: So if you study the whole of mankind we are studying ourselves.

K: That's right.

S: So then we are studying the whole of mankind.

K: You are not listening to what I am saying, old boy. I am saying, telling you, if I was a teacher of history, the meaning of history from Latin is 'storia' - storia means history. In Italian it is called storia, it comes from Latin and so on. Now I am going to talk about what - who is your king in the 15th century.

S: There are so many kings, sir.

K: So many of them, quite right. Give me one of their names. Come on somebody.

S: Babu.

K: Barber?

S: No, B-a-b-u.

K: I thought you said a barber! I know, that's a joke. So I would teach you, I would say, Babu was the father of Humula, right? And Humula's son was Agba - right? So I would go into all that. Right. And also I would say, what about you, you are also story, you are a great story, much greater than Agba. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So I would talk to you about yourself. I would say, what are you? You have a book about yourself inside you. Learn to read that book, you understand?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Are you sure you understand what I am saying? Don't say, yes, sir. I am saying, the book about Agba, there are many volumes that have been written about Agba. And there is a volume also in yourself, what you are.

S: So you said that...

K: Are you listening to what I am saying?

S: Yes.

K: There is a book inside you which you must learn to read. But you neglect to read that book. So I am going to see that you learn to read that book - not only the book of Agba but the book about yourself. So I am going to go into that. I would teach you that way. That is a most marvellous way to learn: not only what is happening in the world outside you but the extraordinary book that you have inside you, the book that is the rest of mankind - not just Indian history.

S: Then why doesn't it happen?

K: Because your teachers don't do this.

S: Sir, well you are President of the Foundation, why don't you do something?

K: I am the President of the Foundation, he says, why don't you do something about it. You are quite right, sir. But they won't listen. Wait, they won't listen.

S: But they are like us.

K: Quite right.

S: Probably they...

K: Just listen carefully. The teachers are like you, only much more grown up. Right? I am not insulting them. You understand? I

am very polite, respectful, I respect people, I don't insult them. They are like you, so learn from each other. You understand? I am learning now from you, why you say things and don't mean it. Do you understand? Why you say, yes, sir, yes, sir, and don't mean it at all.

S: Yes, I do mean it.

K: That means you live it.

S: My 'yes' meant that I understand it.

K: First understand but live it. Right?

S: So I don't...

K: Listen, old boy, don't say anything in your life if you don't live it. If you don't live it you become a hypocrite. Right? Say one thing and do something else, that is hypocrisy. Right?

S: Sir, I am not saying anything, I am saying I understand what you are saying.

K: I said to you, understand what I am saying, I said, don't say anything that you don't mean. If you mean it, say something, and if it is right, be honest. If you say, "I lie", say, "I lied, sir". That's honesty. Right? If you are angry, "Yes, I am angry", don't pretend. Grown-ups do. That is the only difference.

S: Everyone is different, no one can be the same.

K: Yes, sir.

S: I mean I tell everyone honestly like I am angry, I am this, everyone isn't going to say that they are angry also.

K: What?

S: Suppose I am having a fight with someone...

K: Why do you have a fight with someone?

S: Because he...

K: Hey! Why do you have a fight with someone?

S: Because we have come to a disagreement about something.

K: Why do you have disagreement? Learn, don't say, I have disagreement and fight him, learn. If you fight now, when you grow up also you will fight, that becomes violence. You know all over the world violence is spreading, you know that, don't you? They are killing each other, wars, terrorists, you know. You understand? They are killing each other, that is tremendous violence in the world. So don't be violent, don't get angry. When you get angry say, "I am angry, I apologise", don't fight.

S: If you don't fight someone else may take advantage of you and bash you up.

K: Perhaps not. If I don't get angry with the man who wants to get angry, he might quieten down.

S: Might.

K: Might, I said, might.

S: But then...

K: Wait, wait.

S: But suppose the other person is going to hit me, just because I am not angry with her?

K: If I don't react, you understand? You are angry with me - right? Suppose you are angry with me, I won't react to you, I won't get angry, I won't hit you back: see what happens.

S: Sir, sometimes it might aggravate the person.

K: Not 'sometimes'. See what happens if you get angry with me and I don't get angry with you in return, something happens between us. Right? If you call me a fool, I don't react by calling you another fool, I don't react, I keep quiet. So my keeping quiet

affects you - not always because people are not gentle enough. So you learn. My god! I wanted to talk about something totally different from all this.

S: Sir, I don't understand where all this is leading us.

K: You don't understand - she has asked a question. She says, I don't know where you are leading us. I am not leading you anywhere.

S: What are we talking about?

K: What I am talking about is: learn to watch, which is one of the most difficult things to do. Learn to listen, and learn to find out the way of living, not just repeat, repeat. Right? That's what I am saying this morning: don't become mechanical.

S: Sir, you said you wanted to talk about something different. So why don't you start the topic. Why don't you start talking about something?

K: Because, sir, I wanted to find out what you were wanting first. Right? I wanted to find out - it's more polite, isn't it, to find out what you wanted to talk about.

S: Well we want to find out what you want to talk about.

K: Quite right. Now I can talk to you about it. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: First I ask you. Right? I serve you tea first, not myself.

S: Yes, sir.

K: In the same way I ask you first what you would like to talk about, and you jump, and say all kinds of things. After you have finished if there is time I will talk about what I want to talk about.

S: What do you want to talk about?

K: What I wanted to talk about this morning, if I remember

rightly, was are you sensitive?

S: To what?

K: Sensitive. You see, your immediate answer is, to what? We are not talking about 'what'. But in yourself are you sensitive? You know what it means to be sensitive?

S: To feel.

K: To feel.

S: Alert.

K: Alert.

S: Understand.

K: You are sensitive to those flowers, aren't you? Are you sensitive to people?

S: People.

K: All around, these boys and girls, grown-up people, are you, sensitive to see what they are feeling, or how they look, what they do, sensitive?

S: Sir, only to people who are around me most of the time.

K: Yes. Not even that.

S: Not all the time.

K: No. So are you sensitive? You say, occasionally I am sensitive. That's not good enough. It's like having a bad potato. So I was going to talk about sensitivity. Then I was going to talk about what is your relationship - you understand the word - what is your relationship to what is happening in the world? You understand what I am asking? Your relationship. You are related to your father and mother. Right? Are you related in some way to the rest of the world, to what is happening in the world?

S: Yes.

K: Wait, wait, listen to me. Two thousand five hundred people were killed in Bhopal, and hundreds and thousands of people hurt, what do you feel about that?

S: I feel sad.

K: You feel sad, then what?

S: You feel that carelessness takes place everywhere. Just due to a small leak, sheer carelessness.

K: So are you - listen carefully what I am asking - are you sensitive to other people's suffering?

S: No, sir.

K: Wait, I have asked you a question. Are you sensitive to other people's suffering?

S: Sir, quite often I am the one who inflicts the suffering.

K: You are being very clever, old boy. I am asking you a question, you are also asking something else. I am asking you - I am as clever as you are - I am asking you, are you sensitive to other people's suffering, strangers?

S: Not as much as others.

K: You are not. That's it. You are not. Why? You know yesterday, the day before yesterday I was walking down there, there were two girls, blue with white stripes, students. They walk six miles that way, six miles that way, twelve miles a day. Are you sensitive to how they feel about walking all day?

S: No sir, because it doesn't affect me. It doesn't affect my life.

K: Quite right. So you are not sensitive to others.

S: Only myself.

K: You are selfish.

S: Sir, quite often you are sensitive. You feel sorry for a person,

like when people died in Bhopal.

K: I said to you, look, don't be clever with me, are you aware of those boys and girls walking twelve miles a day, not having enough food, they are suffering, how do you feel about all that? You don't care?

S: I do care.

K: Then what do you do?

S: What can I do, sir?

K: You can't do very much, but you can tell Mrs Thomas and Mrs Radhikaji, and say, look, let's find out how we can help them, let's find out a bus for them, so that they can go there and come back. You work for it, you do something, you don't say, yes. Right? Right? Will you do it?

S: Sir...

K: Wait a minute, I am asking. Will you go to Mrs Thomas and Radhikaji, and say, please sirs, or ladies, we must do something about it. Will you? Hey, will you? Or you don't care?

S: I do care, sir.

K: Then go to them, as I am going to them. I want to have a bus for those children. I would pick them up and drive them there, or have a school for them all here, out there - not just out there! I am working, I am going to talk, I am going to raise trouble if they don't do it.

S: You can, sir.

K: You do it, you help me to do it, will you?

S: If you tell me, I will.

K: I won't tell you, you go and do it. That's where your independence is.

So I want to talk to you about sensitivity; I want to talk to you about your relationship to the world. You are growing up, you are going to leave this lovely place, Rishi Valley, and go to college, university, get married, children, and jobs, and quarrels, and misery, all that, which your life is going to be, and what is your relationship to the rest of the world, to violence, to politics, to the tremendous corruption in this country? Right?

S: Then you would become so selfish if you have all that...

K: You don't get selfish, you are concerned. You are concerned with this tremendous corruption.

S: Sir, what can we do about it?

K: Don't be corrupt.

S: Yes, but how...

K: Wait, you haven't listened, you are too quick. Don't you be corrupt, fight for it, stand for something that you think is wrong.

S: And if someone disagrees fight him?

K: I meant fight in the sense, you don't get corrupted.

S: So I don't get corrupted but...

K: It doesn't matter, leave the others, don't you get corrupted.

S: I do.

K: When you grow up, now you can say, yes, I won't get corrupt, but when you grow up and go into business.

S: It won't be any use if only one person is not corrupt.

K: Begin with yourself first.

S: OK, so you are not corrupt - I am just giving an example - and you go for a job and there is the managing director interviewing you, and he directly asks you for a bribe or you don't get the job.

K: Don't get a job. Why don't you stand for something?

S: Without a job I cannot live.

K: Don't live.

S: Then what is the purpose of coming into the world?

K: Find out. You see you are all so weak, you give in. Suppose you say, no, sorry, I won't be corrupt, and you collect people around you, you work for it.

S: Sir, but if there are only five people around me...

K: That's good enough. Begin.

S: Sir, suppose there is a person who is incorrupt, but like he is insensitive, and everybody around him is insensitive, how will they know what he is trying to do?

K: I will tell them. I am doing this. Listen to me. I am going round the world saying, religions as they are, are rubbish. Right? They don't like it, I don't mind. If they say to me, you can't come into this country, I don't mind. I can always come back to Rishi Valley - if they will allow me. I don't mind. But you people mind, you are all so frightened.

S: Sir, but we don't have anything else to do, if we go for a job and don't get it then we don't have anything else to do.

K: If you don't get a job...

S: You don't want to be corrupt and you don't want to accept the bribe, you don't get the job, then what can you do after that?

K: Become a gardener. What is wrong with becoming a gardener, what is wrong with being poor? Educatedly poor - what's wrong?

S: How do you live?

S: What is the use of this education?

K: What is the use of this education? Probably none at all.

S: Being literate you can't go for gardening.

K: Then you do something literate. You people never - you are all so - I won't use certain words - you are all so mediocre. That's what I am objecting to.

S: What does that mean?

K: Mediocre means - in the English language, mediocre means going up the hill half way, never going to the top of it. You understand that? Don't become mediocre.

S: Why have we given such positions to people, like a gardener, we say that he is something different from us, and none of us want to become gardeners because it will be something...

K: Because I don't mind being a gardener, I don't care what people think, whether I am a minister or somebody, I don't care. I do what I think is right.

S: So if we all do what we think is right.

K: No, that is very difficult to find out what is right, not what you think is right - what is right. That's very difficult. Right? I think this is right - it may be wrong.

S: Everyone around us tells us, you must do this because this is right.

K: That is just tradition, that is the authority. I want to find out what is right - don't you? How will you find out?

S: Sir. won't that be an opinion. Right for one person can be wrong for another.

K: I said to you, old boy, you didn't listen, you didn't listen. Everybody thinks he is right in his own way. Right? You think this is right, another thinks that is right, or wrong, but I want to find out

what is right - listen carefully - under all circumstances, under all pressures, under all what the public says - I want to find out what is right. Don't you? And it is difficult to find out what is right. To find out what is right you cannot have opinions, judgements, convictions. Right? So if you perceive what is right when there is freedom...

S: Only when you have complete freedom.

K: Complete freedom, that's right. When you have complete freedom then you see what is right.

S: Sir, but how do you gain freedom?

K: How do you gain freedom? You don't gain freedom. Freedom exists, comes, if you are not attached, if you are not self-interested - you understand? If you are not selfish.

S: Then you are free.

K: Then there is freedom, then what you see then is right.

S: But I can't live alone in the world.

K: I don't mind living alone in the world.

S: No, sir.

K: You mind it, you are frightened.

S: So how do you get rid of selfishness?

K: How do you get rid of selfishness? Shall I tell you a very simple way? Don't be selfish!

S: It is not the same though.

K: Just listen girl. Don't be selfish. You know what selfishness is. Don't be. Don't say, I am going to get rid of it, don't be selfish. Therefore learn what it means to be selfish, watch.

S: Everything leads to watching.

K: Yes, sir. Watching. You learn an infinite lot watching. I learn

a great deal by watching you walking down the road, how you walk, how you talk, what you say, whether you say exactly what you mean, or trying to double cross - you follow? - double talk. I learn, I watch. That's one of the things. First I wanted to find out if you are sensitive; then what is your relationship with the world; then are you different from the world? The world is violent, are you violent? The world is corrupt, are you corrupt? The world is violent, are you violent? Right? The world is saying, I am British, I am French, I am an Indian, I am a Russian, I am a Muslim. Right? Therefore there is conflict among us. So I won't be any of them.

S: Sir, the world is also saying I am Chi, I am Gotham.

K: Of course you are Gotham, you are a different name, that is natural. But don't be nationalistic.

S: Isn't it the same thing, sir, when I say my name is this, and I say that this is my country, isn't it the same thing?

K: Quite right. That is selfish. You identify yourself with something greater but selfishness still remains. Now wait a minute, it is now quarter to, nearly. Right, we have talked an hour and a quarter. They are all getting restless, so let's stop. Will you sit quietly now for five minutes, absolutely quiet? Don't move, take a comfortable position, then sit very quietly, really quietly, don't cough, close your eyes and see what you are thinking. (Long pause) All right sirs. Thank you for listening to me.

RISHI VALLEY 3RD TALK WITH STUDENTS 20TH DECEMBER 1984

K: What would you like to talk about?

S: Pride.

K: Pride. Are you proud?

S: Sometimes.

K: Sometimes. Why? What are you proud about?

S: Achieving something.

K: Achieving. What have you achieved? Or you are admiring people who have achieved, or do you want to achieve? Is that what you want to talk about - pride, achievement, success, money, position, power - is that what you all want? Probably you all do. Don't fool yourself, don't deceive yourself, you all want to have those things.

S: No, sir, we all want it because in this world we can't live without those things.

K: In these times, the boy says, we can't live without those things. How do you know?

S: Anyway you see a poor man...

K: You come out here!

S: Anywhere you see a poor man, or anything, sir, they'll argue if you don't give them anything, or if you try to make them a nice man, they won't give you any respect.

K: So what do you want to be?

S: Anything which we can have a respect for living a happy life, but not too much respect.

K: You are quite right - not too much respect but a fairly

comfortable life, and a happy life. Is that it?

S: Yes.

K: Is that what you want?

S: Yes.

K: Then go after it.

S: Sir, but it is not so easy unless you try and achieve it.

K: Any other questions?

S: What is the difference between meditation and concentration?

K: Do you really want to talk about that, or is it a game, or just fun to talk about something I may be interested in, is that it? Do you really want to know what is meditation and concentration? All right, sir. If you really want to talk about that will you pay attention to what I am going to say?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Don't say, yes, sir, and fidget. Do you really want to talk about it? If you do it is a very, very serious subject. What do you think is concentration?

S: Something which you really want to think about, sir. Think about deeply, go into it deeply, think about it deeply.

K: Think about it deeply.

S: Think about it deeply.

K: Think about it deeply - what do you mean by that?

S: Something which we want to keep our minds on.

K: Come over here! Something you want to keep you mind on. Right? Have you tried it? You want to look at those flowers, or your book, or what your educator is saying. Have you ever looked very carefully, at those flowers, what the teacher is telling you,

listen to him, and concentrate on a book, have you?

S: Sometimes.

K: Sometimes. When does that happen? When you like it - right?

S: Yes.

K: Now when you like something you put your attention, your thought, your energy in observing it. Right? And that is generally called concentration. That is, you concentrate on the book you are reading - right - or on something that you are looking very carefully at, those flowers, or what your friend, or your teacher is telling you. Right?

S: Yes.

K: Have you ever watched very carefully, concentrated on something for a long time? Not for a second or two but for a long time, have you done it?

S: I don't know, sir.

K: Try it now. Try now to listen very carefully to what somebody is saying to you, or look at those flowers for a long time, not allow any other thought to come in. That's what concentration means - focussing, giving all your attention to something that you are listening to, or reading a book, or watching something, a lizard going across the wall. Will you do it, are you doing it now?

S: Yes.

K: You are? Good! Now when that takes place what happens?

S: We understand it.

K: Not only you understand but what is happening? I'll explain to you presently, you think it out for yourself. Where do you come from?

S: Bangalore.

K: Bangalore, good. I have got two boys - now two girls?

Now he wants to know what is the difference between concentration and meditation. Right? You don't know the word meditation, do you, what it means, no. Nor do you know the meaning of the word concentration.

S: Now I do.

K: Now you know because I have pointed it out to you. So concentration means focussing your thought, your energy on something.

S: Sir...

K: Come over here! Move a bit so that we give her more room, she is a big girl. Right?

S: But isn't it difficult to concentrate on something without any thought in your mind?

K: That's it. Is it not difficult - listen to it carefully - is it not difficult to concentrate on something without thoughts coming in.

S: I think it is.

K: It is difficult, isn't it. So then what do you do?

S: We try and keep the other thoughts away.

K: Away. Then who keeps the - oh, I won't make it complicated for you. So you concentrate on a book and other thoughts come in. Right? Then what do you do?

S: You try to keep them away.

K: Yes, you try to push other thoughts away. Now what goes on in that process? I am concentrating on this, thoughts come in, then I try to push them away, and then thoughts come in. So I keep this, don't I. Right?

S: Yes.

K: Are you listening to what I am saying? If you are not interested don't bother.

S: I am thinking of an answer which you could give correctly.

K: I can't understand.

S: I am thinking of an answer which you could give correctly for it.

K: Look, sir, I was telling you when you concentrate on something other thoughts come in. Right? Then you try to push those thoughts away, and then you try to concentrate. So there is this going on all the time.

S: But why do those thoughts come in?

K: Wait, wait, I am coming to that presently. First see what is happening. You want to concentrate on something, then thoughts come in and then you push them out, again thoughts come in and again you push them out. So you really are not concentrating, are you? Because thoughts come in and disturb you. Now he asked, why do thoughts come in. Right?

S: Yes.

K: You tell me why thoughts come in. I will tell you.

S: I think it is because we think about those things. Because when we are doing something something else happens and you think about it.

K: Yes, that is, you are thinking about this, you are also thinking about something else. Is that it?

S: Yes.

K: Why does this happen?

S: Sir, if you are thinking, concentrating...

K: Come and sit here! Sorry, three boys and a girl.

S: Sir, as you try to concentrate, I keep thinking that I should not allow thoughts to come in and so they come in.

K: Yes, why do they come in?

S: Because you keep thinking about them.

K: But you are also thinking about this.

S: Because we are suppressing them.

K: That's right. You have got it. You have understood what you have said? Not quite. You are trying to concentrate on this, other thoughts come in, then you try to suppress thoughts, only the other thoughts except this. Right? So what is happening when you suppress? I suppress, I am uncomfortable, I have eaten bad food, and I am full, and I try to suppress my pain. Why do you do that, why do you have suppressions, why do you suppress?

S: Because we think it will be nicer, if you suppress they won't come again so you suppress it.

K: That's right. So he says, when you suppress them they come back again. So it is futile to suppress. Right? It would be wrong to suppress, futile to suppress. Then what will you do?

S: If you are really thinking about something very seriously, sir, there are no other thoughts.

K: But other thoughts come in, old boy.

S: But when you are really thinking without any other things why should they come in?

K: Now wouldn't you try to understand why thoughts are always moving back and forth? Right? Wouldn't you ask that question?

S: Because we suppress thoughts come in and we can't control

them and we lose our concentration. So what should we do because, sir, is it possible that if we just leave it the other thoughts will go by themselves?

K: I haven't quite grasped it, have you?

S: If you don't do anything with the other thoughts, will they go away?

K: Would you come up here? Sit up here, don't be nervous. This is a very complex subject, isn't it? Most people, grown-up people, young people, are told from childhood - are you listening, listen carefully - from childhood you are told to concentrate. Right? You want to look out of the window and the teacher says, concentrate on your book. But you are really interested in watching that lizard on that wall. Right? And the teacher says, don't look, pay attention to the book. So from childhood you are interested in watching the lizard but the teacher says, do this.

S: Yes.

K: Now if I were your teacher I would say, let's both of us look at that lizard - you understand? Not try to force you to look at the book. You have understood what I am saying?

S: Yes, sir.

K: That is, you are watching that lizard - there is no lizard here! And your interest is in that lizard, not in the book. So I, as a teacher, would tell you, let both of us watch that lizard very, very carefully, see how it sticks to the wall, how many claws it has, see the head, see the eyes. Right? I would help you to watch much more than the book.

S: Sir but I have got a question, sir.

K: What?

S: If the teacher - OK, in a class children get distracted at different times, like I might get distracted at a certain time and another person might get distracted at another time. And if the teacher tends to all our distractions, sir, how will she cover the portion?

K: I am going to show you. You are all so very clever here, aren't you? First of all I have no distractions. Don't call it distractions. What is important is that you watch, pay attention, listen, that's important. But there are no distractions. Don't use the word 'distraction'. Right? Now, wait a minute, I help you to watch that lizard, or I help you to watch that boy sitting over there being restless, fiddling with his fingers. Right? What I am helping you - not helping - what I am showing you is when you pay attention to something, whether it is right or wrong, then you can pay attention to the book. You have got it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Are you sure?

S: Yes, sir.

K: That is, when you pay attention to that lizard you have learnt the art of attention. And I am going to help all the boys, twenty or fifteen boys with me to pay attention. And when there is attention there is no distraction.

S: Then why don't teachers do that sir? Suppose we get distracted in the class.

K: There is no distraction, don't call it distraction.

S: Suppose we want to watch something, then why don't the teachers help us to watch that thing?

K: Ask them. I am telling you - come over here, two girls.

Come up here, that's better! All right? You are not shy?

S: No, sir.

K: That's better. You are asking why don't your teachers tell you all this. Right? Why don't they tell you?

S: Sir, I think they want to finish their particular whatever they wanted to teach us.

K: That's right. They want to get it over. They are bored, you are bored. Right? And they want to quickly finish what they have to say and get on to the next subject, or the next class. So they are bored with teaching. Right? Now find out from them why they are bored, why they want to finish quickly, why don't they help you to pay attention? You understand? If you pay attention to that lizard then you have learnt the art of attention. Right? Have you got it? Then you can pay attention to the book, then there is no distraction.

S: But...

K: Wait, wait, wait old boy. I haven't finished. If I were your teacher I would point out to you very carefully what attention is. Right? Attention is to pay complete energy, attention, to what you are watching. Right? And if you learn that you can learn how to pay attention to your book.

S: Yes, sir.

S: You might be interested in the lizard only, and you might not like studying, you won't be interested in your studies.

K: Somebody might not like to study. Then don't study.

S: Sir then...

K: Find out, sir, find out. Learn. Find out why you don't want to read books. Now you listen to me.

We have talked about concentration, that is, you are thinking,

paying attention to something, then other thoughts come in, and you push those thoughts out. And so there is always this conflict - wanting to pay attention to that, thoughts come in, and so there is constant chattering of the brain - chattering, chattering, chattering. Right? Got it?

Now meditation, the word meditation, you know what that word is, you have heard about it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Meditation in English means also to measure. Right? To measure. As in Sanskrit, if you ask Radhikaji, she will tell you, 'ma' is also to measure in Sanskrit. So meditation also means to measure. Now without measurement there is no technological advancement at all. Agree? See that? Do you see all this, what I am saying?

S: I didn't understand that word which you said.

K: You don't understand the word I am using?

S: No.

K: I am using to measure. You have a tape measure, haven't you? Meditation means also measurement.

S: I think he doesn't understand the word 'technology', technological.

K: Ah, you don't understand the word 'technology'. Technique - to do something, say for instance you want to build a car, and you must know all the parts, put them together, they must all work together. I have dismantled a car, put it all to pieces, and then put it all together hoping it will work. But it did work. Right? Learning about all the machinery, how it works, what are its components, what are its measurements, its metallic strength and so on, all that,

learning about that is called technology, some of it.

Now meditation, concentration, for me, are two entirely different things.

S: Sir, quite often you concentrate without even trying to concentrate. Like you will be doing something, there is no need to concentrate, you will be concentrating.

K: You can do something - if you love something you don't have to concentrate. Have you understood that?

S: Yes, sir.

K: If you love something there is no concentration. Do you love something?

S: Quite a few things.

K: You love quite a few things. What are they?

S: Sir, I like reading books.

K: Flying kites?

S: Yes, sir. Flying kites.

K: Climbing mountains, climbing trees, chasing monkeys. What do you really love?

S: Collecting stamps.

K: No, just a minute. This is too complex a subject for little boys. Meditation means to be free of measurement. This is too difficult for you all.

S: Concentration is something which you force and do something, and meditation might be where you don't force anything.

K: That's right. Meditation can only take place when there is no effort, when there is no contradiction. You know contradiction, saying one thing, doing another thing. Right?

S: Sir, suppose you like reading, then you are really concentrating on it, isn't that meditation, where you don't know you are concentrating?

K: No, no. You are then trying to understand what the book is saying.

S: You don't know you are concentrating. Like he said you don't know you are concentrating but you are concentrating.

K: That is when you like something, when you like to read a good detective story, you enjoy it, don't you. This is too difficult for you. Don't bother about meditation and concentration. It is much too difficult. Right?

S: Yes.

K: A little bit. Now I would like to talk about something else. May I?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I have asked you what you would like to talk about, and then after asking you all these questions I would like to talk to you about something else. May I?

S: Yes, sir.

K: All of you?

A: Yes, sir.

K: Yes, sir!

Human beings, like you, have capacity, have some kind of hidden talent. Talent, you understand, that is to paint, to play the violin, to play the flute, or to be a very good human being. You, human beings have hidden talents. Right? And your society, your parents, everybody says, become a business man - or become a doctor, or become an engineer, or become Indian Administrative

person, the Service. So your brain, you understand, what is inside the skull, is conditioned by your parents, or by the society in which you live. You understand?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So your own talent is destroyed by this pressure. You might be a great painter. Right? Or a great singer, or a marvellous botanist, horticulturist. Right? But your parents, your society, say, no, that is not good enough, you must become a really good businessman, or a good doctor, or I.A.S. So you destroy your own talent. And what is important is to have your own talent, then you are happy with it. You understand what I am saying?

S: Sir...

K: Listen to what I am saying. I am talking. And you are listening to me. That is one thing: human beings have essentially hidden a certain talent. Right? Not always to become a businessman, or a captain in the army, or a flyer. So you have to discover your own talent, and stick to that talent, whether you become poor, rich, successful.

S: Sir, but if you want to be a businessman and by the side of it you can also sing, or paint, or whatever.

K: Clever boys - you have trained these boys beautifully! They say you can become a businessman, or a General, or an army captain, and also paint. Do you follow how his brain is working. You are quite right. Then you will do neither thing properly, fully, happily.

S: Why, sir?

K: Because you are torn between the two.

S: No.

K: I know this, I know this. You understand? Wait a minute, I am talking for a while. So it is very difficult also to discover your own talent. And it might not lead you to success. It doesn't matter then. You understand? Then you don't mind not having much money because you have got something in yourself. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So find out, all of you, find out your own talent, something of your own, not imposed by education, by your parents, by society, but find out something that you have for yourself.

S: But if our parents want us to do something.

K: I know your parents force you to become an engineer, force you to become something or other. But while you are young play the game and say, yes, I accept that, and find out for yourself.

S: But supposing something happens to you.

K: I know, just listen to what I am saying. Because I have got something more to say. Right?

S: Yes.

K: You don't mind?

S: No, sir.

K: And also you are going to enter into a world when you leave this marvellous valley, with all the rocks, and the shadows, and the trees, and the flowers, and the really peaceful campus, you are going to face a world that is terrible. Right? There is violence, kidnapping, shooting, bribing. The world is becoming more and more dangerous. Right? And the world is becoming corrupt, all over the world, not only in India, where it is quite blatant. You know what the word blatant means? Quite open. They say, give me something before I will do something else. There is corruption.

Right? All over the world, not only here in this country, but in America, in France, in England - political corruption, social corruption, black market and so on. There is tremendous corruption all over the world. We say that corruption is bribing, passing money under the table, paying cash without giving an account. All that is called corruption. Right? But that is only a symptom. Do you know what symptom means?

S: Yes, sir, signs.

K: Do you know what symptom is? Symptom is I have eaten something, very heavy food, and I have got tummy ache. The tummy ache is the symptom. But the cause is my eating the wrong food. Got it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So I want to go into the cause of corruption. We say corruption - I hope you are all listening because you are all going to face the world when you leave Rishi Valley.

S: Sir, supposing if you don't take the money he is giving, sir, he might do something worse. If you take the money...

K: If I give you money under the table you become corrupt.

S: Yes, sir.

K: And then you also become corrupt because you are accepting money. Right?

S: Yes, sir. But if I don't take the money he might do something.

K: I know, I know. If you don't take it he will hurt you. Just listen, understand, what is the cause of corruption. You understand? Corruption isn't merely passing money under the table, bribing, black market, but the cause is something entirely different. Right? I am going to go into that if you are interested.

Corruption begins with self interest. Do you understand this?

S: Yes, sir.

K: If I am interested in myself, in what I want, what I must be, if I am greedy, envious, harsh, brutal, cruel, there is corruption. You understand? Corruption begins in your heart, in your mind, not just giving money - that also is corruption but the real cause of corruption is inside you. Unless you find that out and change that you will be a corrupt human being. Do you understand what I am saying? Corruption is when you are angry, when you are jealous, when you hate people, when you are lazy, when you say, this is right, and I feel this is right, and stick to it. You understand what I am saying?

S: Sir, it seems like everything comes under selfishness.

K: Everything comes under selfishness. You are quite right. Corruption begins there. You understand, old boy?

S: Yes.

K: So don't be corrupt. It doesn't matter if you die for it.

S: Sir...

K: Wait, listen to me. You understand? We are all so frightened. You say, how will I live, what will I do if I am not corrupt when all the people around me are corrupt? You understand what I mean by corruption, not just the outward sign but the deep inward sense of corruption that human beings live with - selfish, thinking about themselves, wanting their success, envious - you understand? So corruption is inside, in your heart, in your brain. So if you understand that very carefully, and you are really serious, not cynical, most of those grown up boys who are going to leave have become cynical, they see what the world is, they say, well I have

got to accept it. That is a form of cynicism. But if you understand very carefully from now that corruption is not merely passing money under the table, bribing - bribing whether it is two rupees or ten million dollars, it is still bribing. And being violent is part of what is called corruption, terror, all that. That is what is happening in the world. You are a human being growing up, don't be like them. Don't become angry, don't be envious, don't always seek success.

S: Sir, how can we stop all that? How can we stop being envious?

K: If you want to be envious be envious and see what happens. You understand? But if you don't want to be envious, don't be envious. Don't say, how do I stop it? If you see something dangerous, like a cobra, nobody tells you, you run. Right? So corruption inside is most dangerous. Right? So don't be corrupt. Begin there first, not out there. You understand? Will you do it? Don't promise. Don't ever promise unless you are absolutely going to carry it out. Right? But if you see how important it is in life because you are all growing up, growing into this terrible world, this insane world. You understand? There is no sanity in the political world, in the religious world - right - in the economic world, there is no sanity.

So please, I am just pointing out to you, whether you are grown up, or leaving this marvellous valley, or staying here for another two, four years, don't be corrupt, inside, don't seek vanity, proud, pride, don't say, I am superior to somebody else. You know you learn a great deal when there humility. You know the word humility? You learn a great deal if you are really humble. But if

you are merely seeking success, money, money, money, power, position, status, you understand, then you are beginning with corruption. You might be poor, be poor, who cares. That's why it is important for you, for all of you, to find your own talent and stick to it even though it doesn't bring you success, fame, and all that, which is all nonsense anyhow because we are all going to die. You understand, old boy? While you live, live, not with all the rubbish that is going on.

S: Sir, why don't people realize this?

K: Because they don't think, they don't feel, they are thinking about themselves all the time, their job, their administration, their work. You understand? They are not interested in this. But if you are...

S: How do you stop being selfish?

K: How do you stop being selfish. Don't be selfish. Just listen. Don't ever ask anybody, how. You understand? Then they will tell you how, then you are lost. That is the biggest corruption.

S: You mean we must find out for ourselves.

K: Find out, enquire, use your brain, doubt, question. Don't merely accept. I am your teacher, suppose I am your teacher, I want to see that you have a very good brain. Right? To have a good brain means not to have conflict in yourself or with somebody else. I think all this is too much.

S: I wanted to ask you, sir: supposing you are not selfish and somebody does something to you?

K: If someone does harm to you, what will you do? Hit him back?

S: It depends on the depth of what he has done.

K: Yes, you have said it. By jove, you are quite... If he hurts you deeply what will you do? Have you asked what it means to be hurt? Go on think with me, think with me.

S: Sir, is it corruption again to be hurt?

K: Just listen. Suppose I hurt you very deeply - suppose, I don't want to hurt you - suppose I want to hurt you very deeply. Now you say, I am hurt. Now what do you mean by that? Use your brain.

S: Sir...

K: Don't repeat.

S: Physically?

K: Yes, not only physically but inside, he hurts you. He calls you a fool.

S: Sir, I think...

K: Just listen carefully. All of you listen carefully. He calls you a fool, and you get hurt. Right? Have you found out what gets hurt? Careful, careful!

S: If you think you aren't a fool and then someone comes along and tells you that you are a fool...

K: Look, somebody calls you a fool and somebody calls you a great man - they are both the same, aren't they. Do you understand what I am saying? Somebody calls me a fool, an idiot, and I get hurt - suppose. What gets hurt? Careful, think it out, don't reply quickly, think it out. Think it out.

S: Sir...

K: No, I won't listen. I said think it out, carefully think it out. I am asking you - I call you an idiot - I hope I am not saying that. And you get hurt. What do you mean, you getting hurt? What is

you?

S: Your ego.

K: Think it out, old girl, think it out.

S: It is me, my ego.

K: What is you?

S: I am one...

K: Come over here, old boy. Sit here. Come on, don't waste time. I know you, so go on.

S: Sir, what is hurt is me, what I have build of myself.

K: What you have built of yourself, which means what?

S: Sir, what has been achieved, what I have achieved, what I have done.

K: What you have done, what you have achieved. Why are you all so accustomed to achievement? You all talk about achievement. Like your father, your mother, your grandmothers, they have achieved. Right? They have become successful you mean.

S: No, sir, what they have done to themselves.

K: Yes. Say for instance, I have been all over some of the world. Right? I have talked to various thousands of people, I have been to the United Nations, all kinds of things I have done. Right? Which means what? I have built an image, a picture about myself. Right? Picture about myself. You come along and say, you are an idiot - and I get hurt - suppose. What gets hurt?

S: Your feelings.

K: My feelings, my image.

S: The image of yourself.

K: Yes, that's right. The image of myself because I have travelled, I am a great man, I have written books, I have seen Mrs

Gandhi. You follow? I have built an image about myself; that image gets hurt.

Now the next step, listen carefully. Can I live without image, any image?

S: Can you, sir?

K: Can I? Yes. I wouldn't otherwise talk about it. That is dishonesty to talk about something that you yourself are not living.

S: Sir, but...

K: Wait, wait, listen to what I am saying, old boy. So have you an image at this age? Of course, all of you have images. And those images get hurt. And all through life you will get hurt as long as you have those images.

S: Should you forget them, sir?

K: Leave them, don't have them. Somebody - many people have flattered me and many people have insulted me. I have no image, I can't get hurt, it doesn't matter. You understand?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Be like that. Be - that is where corruption begins.

S: Sir, but how do you get rid of your images?

K: How do you get rid of images. If you see they are dangerous you will get rid of them immediately.

S: Sir, if you get rid of them, what is left of you?

K: Nothing!

S: Then what are you?

K: Wait. Listen to what I said. Be nothing and then you live.

S: Sir, those might have images of you but we shouldn't have images.

K: Let the others have images, don't you have them.

S: Sir, sometimes we don't have images...

K: Not 'sometimes'. Are you talking seriously, or theoretically?

S: No, suppose a person can...

K; Why do you suppose?

S: If a person doesn't have an image isn't he likely to feel insecure?

K: Be insecure. Know you are insecure. Then find out what is security. But if you are always seeking security you don't know whether you are insecure. But first find out for yourself if you are insecure, what it means, physically, inwardly, and so on.

S: Whether you have an image or not you are insecure.

K: Whether you have an image or not, you are insecure. I am asking you, have you found out if you are insecure, or are you just talking?

S: Sir, I feel insecure about some things.

K: Wait. Find out what it means - what it means to be insecure. Either you are insecure physically - right - or economically, or insecure in public opinion - right - or insecure in money matters, or insecure in your relationships. Find out.

S: And then what?

K: When you learn where there is insecurity then you are secure. Get that, old boy.

S: Sir, do you have an image?

K: Listen to what I said.

S: Yes, sir.

K: You get it? When you find out for yourself, what is insecure, where you are insecure - with your family, with your father, with your mother, with your wife or husband, with god? You

understand? Find out, learn about it. The moment you know and have learnt a great deal about insecurity, then you are out of it, then you are secure.

S: Sir, if you learn a great deal about insecurity, you don't know the full insecurity.

K: Oh yes you will. Sir, if you begin rightly - you understand - then what is right is at the beginning. This is too difficult.

S: Sir, are you saying, live with insecurity to find out what it is.

K: You are insecure, not live with insecurity. You just now said, I am insecure. Live with it, find out. Use your brain to find out. Don't become mechanical.

S: Sir, to get rid of insecurity we have to get rid of fear first, no?

K: Fear. Right? Now I am going to show you, you have to learn, not from me, learn. What is fear?

S: Fear is the thing which we think about.

S: The thing you don't know about.

K: Wait, sir. You don't listen to somebody else first, you are always ready with your own questions. He said - do you know what he said? You don't because you didn't listen, because your own question was more important; that is selfishness. Right? He said, fear, how is one to be free of fear. You meant that, didn't you. Right? So first listen to that question. He said, what is fear, how is one to be free of it? Now do you know you are afraid?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Yes, sir! Why?

S: I think it is because I think of something which makes me feel afraid.

K: Now just a minute you have said something tremendous. I

don't know if you are aware of it. You have said something very true.

S: Then if we don't think of something...

K: That's it. You have learnt the first thing, that thinking brings fear. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Right? So you have to find out what is thinking, not how to stop fear. You understand? You just now said very carefully, that thinking brings fear, which is true. I might die tomorrow and I am frightened. I might lose my job, I am frightened. Right? So thinking brings fear. Then what is thinking? Now go step by step to find out. What is thinking?

S: Sir, is it that to get rid of fear we have to get rid of thinking?

K: No. I said never get rid of anything because it will come back.

S: Sir, OK, you said if anything is dangerous you wipe it out by yourself.

K: Yes.

S: So you see that fear is dangerous...

K: No, first listen carefully. I said to you, fear, he said, fear exists, comes when you think about something. Right? Fear I might die, fear I might lose my job, fear of my father, fear of my teachers. So as long as you are thinking about the future - right - there is fear. Right? Now you have to find out what is thinking.

S: It might be selfishness.

K: Yes, wait, wait. I am asking you something, first listen, old boy. I am not trying to stop you. What is thinking? Carefully. Use your brain.

S: What the brain does.

K: No, use your brain to find out what is thinking.

S: Imagination, sir.

K: Imagination, go on.

S: Sir, what you have seen you record and you think about it.

K: That is good, you are beginning. You are recording, aren't you. That is - oh lord! I'll show you. Our brain, what is inside the skull is recording. You are recording mathematics. You are recording geography, history, you are recording. A tape is recording. This is recording, down there. You understand? I am talking, electrically it is connected to that machine, and that is recording on the tape. Our brain acts exactly like that. It is recording. Right? Mathematics, history, geography, your father - it has recorded your father. Right? Now, wait a minute. What do you mean by recording? Think it out, use your brain.

S: If you recall something back.

K: What do you mean recording? Isn't it necessary to record?

S: Yes.

K: Why?

S: Sir, to...

K: No, isn't it necessary to record? I hope the older boys are paying attention to all this because it is their life. So recording is necessary when you write a letter, when you drive a car. Right? When you have to pass an exam - unfortunately - when you record that you have a father in some place, and a mother. All that is recording, that is necessary. Now there is also another recording. I get hurt - you get it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: There are two kinds of recording: the recording of driving a car, writing a letter, becoming I.A.S., becoming an engineer. Listen carefully, old boy, you are following? And there is also another recording, me first, I am selfish, I want this, I want success. Right? So these two are recording all the time. Which is recording is memory, isn't it? Memory of your father, memory of your mathematics. Right? So recording means memory, which is repeating. Do you see this? When you learn mathematics you are recording, you are repeating, memorizing - like that tape. So you become mechanical. Like that tape is mechanical, it repeats, repeats, repeats - I am a Brahmin, I am a Brahmin, I am a Brahmin. I am a Hindu, I am a Hindu, I am against Communist, Communist, Communist. And so on. Our brains then become conditioned, limited, small. Right?

So thinking is part of memory. You can't have memory if you haven't met your father, if you haven't seen your father, your mother. So you have seen the father and your mother, and that is stored in the brain as memory, and also that is knowledge, and knowledge is based on experience - of course.

S: I am memorizing.

K: You are memory. You understand? You are memory, the whole of your being is memory - memory that you are atman, memory you have got a soul, memory there is light inside you, memory that there is god. It is all still memory. You listen carefully, find out if it is true what the speaker is saying, or it is a lie. You understand, find out. You are memory, without memory you are nothing - memory of your name, memory of your family, memory of mathematics, memory of going up that hill, memory of

your friend. Right? So you are memory. Memory is something dead, gone.

S: Then how are we alive?

K: Because the organ, you have food, you have air, water.

S: Then how can we...

K: Find out sir, that is the great point. You understand? Find out what is truth. Memory is not truth.

S: Sir, what do you mean by truth?

K: You can't describe it. What is the flower, what is that flower. Look at it. You never ask when you are looking at that flower, what is it, how did it come, the beauty of it. Please learn something. Beauty is truth. You understand? Beauty is truth - the beauty of a good life - good life, not successful life.

Now sirs, it is ten to eleven, will you sit quietly for minute? Sit quietly. (Long pause) All rights, sirs, thank you.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 8TH JULY 1984

What a lovely morning this is, isn't it? A great silence, specially very early in the morning, just as the sun is rising. All the snow capped mountains, the deep valleys, the vague shadows and the sense of great immensity that is beauty. Beauty is very important in our lives, not merely the romantic side of it, the imaginative side, but the sense of utter silence, specially when you wake up in the morning, looking out of the window when there is no car passing by, no chattering of people, and this great immensity can only be seen or appreciated when the self is not. What corrupts our daily life, as well as nature, and the beauty of the earth, is our narrow little minds, our selfishness, our brutality, violence and all the corruption, and the wars that human beings are preparing. All that denies the immensity of life, the goodness of life, the goodness of freedom and the beauty which is not romantic, that beauty that demands great austerity, a sense of a brain that is at rest, not chattering. This beauty is truth, this beauty is goodness. And we search for it all over the earth in different ways, following various leaders, scriptures and obeying and disobeying, pursuing various pleasures - all that denies surely the great beauty and the immensity of life. Why is it that we have reduced this immensity of life, which is immense, why is it that we have made it all so petty, personal, destructive, utterly meaningless? I wonder if one asks this question of ourselves, and one hopes that you will be doing this during all these talks, that we are together going to question everything in our life, doubt everything in our life.

Doubt is an extraordinarily important thing, not scepticism. To

observe every experience that one has, doubt that very experience, doubt that very thought, doubt that very feeling, so the brain becomes extraordinarily cleansed of all our accumulated experiences, tradition and so on. This is what we are going to do during all these talks. This is no personal, or personality cult. Please understand this. We all want to cling or worship, or feel near some one person. We are accustomed to that. And we are saying this is not a personality cult at all. So please don't build an image about him, the speaker. The speaker is not very valuable. What is valuable, what has significance, is what he is saying. And to understand what he is saying you must question, not accept a thing. Which means you have to observe, one has to observe one's own reactions, one's own attitudes, justifications, defences and so on. Then it is possible for both of us to communicate with each other, not theoretically, not in abstraction but actually, because we are going to take a very long journey together, no detours at all. We are going together to watch this whole phenomenon of life, of which you are. And also please bear in mind that this is not an entertainment. Because we are used to being entertained, it is our habit; cinema, television, books, novels, we want to be entertained. And religions have become that too, a form of entertainment. So please bear in mind throughout these talks that this is not in any way entertainment. The speaker is not trying to help you. Please bear that in mind very seriously. Because if he is out to help you then he becomes the leader, a man who then conducts you, tells you what to do and so on.

So this is not entertainment, nor an intellectual feast. Because we must use our intellect, it is part of our daily life, it is part of our

biological construction. But those of us rather neglect the intellectual capacity and treat the whole thing as a kind of romantic, theoretical, activity. So the speaker is not helping you but we are together, if you will, think, observe, feel the whole extraordinary complex phenomenon of daily living. Please be serious about this, that the speaker is in no way your guide, or the abomination of a guru. That means then you become merely a follower. And generally the followers destroy that which is truth.

So we are going together to think, and that is one of the most difficult things to do because each one of us has opinions, very strong opinions, very strong conclusions, biased, prejudices, conditioned according to our particular pleasure or experience. So one becomes isolated and thinking together becomes almost impossible. I do not know if you have not noticed this, even between the wife and husband, girl and a boy friend and so on, they can never think together, observe together the same thing, the same reaction, the same intensity, at the same time, but there is always this division: "I think, you think", "It is my opinion, my judgement" and so on. So please first see how difficult it is and arduous, it requires great attention to think together. Because thinking is very important in our life. All our action is based on thinking. And now as each one of us feels separate, individualistic, with his own gods, with his own experiences, with his own prejudices and so on, and thinking together, if we could do that, it would be a marvellous thing. If one could put aside, at least for this hour, put aside our prejudices, our opinions, our tendencies, idiosyncrasies and observe, not according to your observation or my observation but to observe the mountains together, the beauty,

the majesty of those hills, the splendour of sunshine, the running waters, the extraordinary glory of the earth, together. And our difficulty is also that we have - we are caught in words. You have a certain meaning to words, or the speaker has a certain meaning to words. And we use the words to communicate, which we must. But also if one can realize our brain is caught, trapped, captured in words. I wonder if one realizes that, how words have become extraordinarily important. And so it becomes very superficial when we are constantly using words, which have become a slogan, repetitive, mechanical - I am British, I am French, I am German and so on. But to go much deeper, beyond and above the words requires an extraordinary alertness, not to be trapped by words. And then only it is possible to think together. Can we do this this morning? Actually be aware of one's own prejudices, opinions, dogmas, our own particular attitudes and put all those aside for a while at least, if you can do that. Then we can think together. Then we can work together.

And also it is important to realize that this is not an activity of stimulation. The speaker is not trying to stimulate you. He is not acting as a drug so that you are stimulated for this morning and let it peter out during the day. So it is not a stimulation. It is not a propaganda, to make you think in a certain way. He is not propagating any ideal, any theory, any belief, because theories, ideals, beliefs, dogmas, have separated human beings. There are the totalitarian ideals, and the ideals of the so-called world of freedom. They are at war with each other. And we are also at war with each other, this perpetual conflict in our life. If you cannot get on with one person either you break away from that person,

divorce, all those extraordinary divisive processes that are going on in our daily life. Please listen to the words and see if they are true, if they are actual, if they have any meaning in our daily life, or these talks and gatherings are something separate, utterly unconnected with our existence, with our daily conduct. If this is possible, one hopes it is, we can then go into very, very complex problems of life.

To approach a complex problem - because our life is very, very complex, the society is very complex, relationship is very complex, our labour, going to the office, all that, the whole psychological as well as social, outward existence, is extraordinarily complex. There is no ready answer. There is a ready answer if one goes through with it, sees it clearly right from the beginning. Our life is complex therefore we must approach it very simply. That will be our difficulty, because our brains are very complex, they have had thousands of experiences, have accumulated great knowledge, both biologically, psychologically, externally. We have great knowledge about almost everything. I do not know if you have seen lately on the television the birth of a child, how it is conceived, all the complexity of the cells and so on. So our brain is a very complex machine. To understand that we must approach it very, very simply. But we have very complex minds - brains. We are never directly simple. Simplicity is not merely having one meal or few clothes, and so on, that is very complex too. Simplicity means to have no prejudice, like and dislike, no personality entering into it. To look at the beautiful sky of an evening, with the sun just over the hills, the radiance, the extraordinary light and the clarity, to observe all that requires great simplicity of brain, not chattering

everlastingly. It requires that sense of silence to observe the great immensity of a sunset.

So if all this is fairly clear between us then we can proceed. But please this is just the foundation, the first couple of bricks. Unless we lay very deep foundations you cannot go very far. The first movement matters enormously. Whether that movement is precise - which is the brick - precise, correct, impersonal and it becomes impersonal when you are considering the whole of life, objective, non-romantic and sentimentally. And that is what we are doing now, laying the first brick. Having laid it, if you are willing, if you are pursuing it, then we must enquire into a very complex problem which is time.

We are together, I am not - the speaker is not telling you but we are together observing it. To observe is not through the words but just to look, to look with your eyes first so the perception is very clear. That perception is denied when you have problems; when you have problems you can't see clearly - right? So together be free for this morning at least to observe the whole content, the significance of time. Because we live by time - sunrise, sunset, the evening star, and the morning light, the dark and lightness. There is the time of yesterday, time as tomorrow, time as now. Time is now as you are sitting there. So there is time to cover a distance from here to there, time to learn a language, time to write a letter, time to acquire skills, time to experience. So we live by time, both outwardly, externally and inwardly. Please this is very important to understand because we are going into something which both of us must really understand, not just theoretically, not in an abstract sense but actually. Because if we understand the nature of time

then perhaps there is a possibility of understanding that which is beyond time. That is much more complex. Don't jump to that. First we must understand what is, what actually is. And therefore we are enquiring into what is time. You are enquiring too. As we said, time to cover a distance from here to your home, to become an excellent carpenter, to become a great scientist, to write a great novel, requires time. And so on. And also there is time inwardly: I will be, I must be, I must achieve enlightenment - whatever that may mean! I must reach God, Heaven - you know all that implies time. I am this, violent, but give me time and I will be free of violence. Please see this actual fact in yourself. The speaker is acting merely as a mirror in which you can see yourself. When you see yourself clearly the mirror can be thrown away. The mirror is not important but what is important is what you see in the mirror. The mirror if it is clear, without any distortion, it shows exactly what your face - how you look and so on.

So we are together enquiring into time. We have described time outside, by the watch. We met here exactly at ten thirty, it was exact when I sat on the platform. And there is time also inwardly. One is an apprentice and gradually one becomes the master, that takes time. You are a business clerk in an organization and if you are good at it you become gradually the manager. That attitude, that way of thinking has spilled, has extended over into the psychological world - I am this, I will be that - right? We are understanding each other? So there is time outside, by the clock; time inwardly, time between now and death. Right? Now we are going to enquire much more deeply into the nature of time.

First of all one must use our brains to find out, not just accept.

The intellect's function is to discern, judge, evaluate, but if you brush aside the intellect as being too lop-sided - intellect is part of our structure, part of our being, as emotions. But if you merely cling to your emotions and say intellect doesn't matter, or if you are merely intellectual - so we must have the capacity to look at the whole of it with our brains, with our intellect, with our feelings, with our nerves and our entire being - right? If you can do it. That is why it requires great attention, watching every movement of thought. I don't know if you have ever done that. Watching without trying to distort every thought, never letting a single thought escape. That requires attention, watchfulness, great self awareness. So time there is as the past, the present and the future. Right? Time as the past, all the accumulated knowledge, experience, all the incidents, the things that we have done which we regret, the things we want to do, which is the future, the things that are being done now - right? So the present, the now, is the past - of course - is the present and also the future - right? Do we understand each other, this? Because it is important to understand in order to communicate what we are going to say still further.

We are saying, the speaker is saying that all time, all time is contained in the now. That is, the past is contained in the now - that is simple, you can see that. You are your past - right? Your memories, your incidents, your experiences, your failures, your regrets, your remorse, your guilts, all the tradition that you have been brought up in, both the religious and sectarian, the whole of the past is time. Right? We are supposed to be on this earth as human beings forty five thousand years, or more. Think of the vast accumulated knowledge that we have had. Forty five thousand

years of striving, conflict, misery, unhappiness, joy, sorrow - right? All that is the past. Clear? All that is now, as you are sitting there, all that is what you are now. And the now also contains the future. I will show it to you. You see I am showing it to you - I don't - you understand, you are not meeting it. Like two friends walking along in a shady lane, talking about all this. Two great friends who have known each other for some time. There is no animosity between them, no defence, no aggression, two old friends who have known each other for many years, talked together, perhaps belong to the same club, same tie, same way of talking, they know each other extraordinarily well. And they are not trying to convince each other of anything, and they are asking this question: what is time, what is the now? The now, one says to the other, contains all time because what you are now you will be tomorrow - right? So tomorrow is now. Have you understood? I am prejudiced now, I like and dislike people, and tomorrow I will be prejudiced, I still will like and dislike - right? So tomorrow, the future is now. Is this clear? Have we understood each other? Please, this is very important to understand this. Not the speaker is putting an extraordinary, some kind of exotic, oriental nonsense. When the Orientals bring something it will be nonsense but if you can see this point for yourself, that all time, the past, the present and the future is contained now - right? I am what I have been, and what I will be is what I am now. If I don't change now I will be tomorrow exactly what I am - clear? Are we together in this? - not verbally, not theoretically but actually - that we now contain all time, apart from learning a language, learning a skill - you understand - writing a letter, that requires time, to come from one place to another, that

requires time but psychologically, inwardly, all time is now. Right? See the difficulty of it, that there is no tomorrow, there is only now. That means there is no becoming - right? There is no psychological evolution at all. Now this is... you understand? It is not "I am going to achieve something" - that means time. Do you understand? Suppose I want to be illuminated - whatever that may mean, quotes! I want to find truth, all the rest of it. That means in the future - right? Clear? The future is now, what I am - right? If I don't fundamentally change the future is what I am tomorrow - right? What I am now tomorrow - clear?

Then from there we can go on to something very complex. If we see the truth of this, that there is no psychological evolution at all. There is no becoming, there is no what I am but what I will be. The future is now - if I don't radically change now I will be exactly tomorrow what I am. Right? That means seeing the truth that there is no psychological becoming. The psyche, which is the essence of the self, thinks in terms of becoming - right? Do you follow all this? This is not an intellectual feat. This is a simple, obvious fact. Christianity has one way of expressing it - resurrection, reaching God, attaining Heaven, which is expressed in the Asiatic world differently but it is the same movement - right? That is, I am this, I will gradually become that. That is, never to think in terms of graduality - gradualness. You understand all this? I need time gradually to learn a skill - right? I need many years to learn to dance well in a ballet, from childhood I must begin. To play the violin I must begin when I am very young, if I have got the talent, if I have got the passion behind it. And also I feel the same movement is carried over into the psychological area, I must one

day reach. Right? That is why you belong to various groups, various gurus, you put on various dresses, robes to be different, because you want to achieve something. So if you see the truth, the absolute truth that all time is contained in the now, to realize the depth of it is rather frightening. When you say, "I hope to see you tomorrow", "I love you tomorrow" - you understand? So either that love is now in its entirety or not at all. If this is very clear, the absolute clarity of it, that the psyche has no future - you understand what - that you have no future. That is because what you are now you will be, unless fundamental mutation - which is a biological word but a good word to use - unless there is fundamental mutation now, you will be what you are tomorrow.

So, realizing that as an actuality, not a theory, not a supposition, not some ideal, all that nonsense, but fact, then we must begin to enquire into what is action? Into what is relationship? Into what is change? Right? Change, action and relationship - right? If I understand, if that truth that all time is now, then what is my action, what is then action? Please enquire, don't go to sleep. Sorry. Forgive me. If the speaker is emphatic please it is not that he is aggressive. The speaker feels very strongly about these matters. Humanity is destroying itself - right? All over the world terrible things are happening. They are preparing all kinds of horrors, the scientists throughout the world. Gas warfare, germ warfare, these terrible missiles, atom bombs, neutron bombs. We were at one of the centres where they are preparing all these, top scientists. We casually go on every day of our life not paying any attention to all that. When you are aware of all the things happening in the world, which is you, round you, you feel utterly responsible, not for

yourself, for this whole humanity, not just for Switzerland. I know this means nothing to most of us because we just want to go on with our old traditions, our old habits, our old defensive mechanisms and so on. So when we realize all time is now, what a marvellous truth, then what is action? What is our present action? We must begin with the actual to find out what real action is, which has no future. You understand what I am saying?

What is our present action? Action, the doing? It is either based on memory, the past - right? Memory which has been accumulated through various experiments, experiences, so the past dictates action. Are you following? Please come on. Or the future dictates the action, the ideal, the theoretical concept of the communists, dialecticism, you know all that. So action is according to the past memories, past remembrances, past hates, past dislikes, past prejudices, past personal attitudes, that is all the past. According to that past there is action - right? Whether in the scientific world, or in the psychological world. Action there is invention - right? Do you understand? Are we together in all this, or am I going off ny myself? There is a collection of top scientists in a certain place, Los Alamos in New Mexico in America, they invited the speaker to talk to them. There were seven hundred top scientists of America creating all the things for war. They asked: what is creation in science? You understand? What is creation in science? I said there is no creation in science there is only invention. We will go into that apart. What the speaker wants to explain is that the past is so formidable, so strong that guides, controls, shapes our action - right? Or you have a future ideal, future theories, and act according to those theories as approximating as possible - right? Past

memories and the future theories, ideals, concepts, dogmas, faith. So action is based on these two principles - right? Clear? Of course, this is simple. But when one realizes all action is now, there is no future action - you understand? Because the future is now. I must go over it. If that is not clear that all time is now, contained in the now - right? You agreed two minutes ago, at least you shook your heads, some of you, indicating that you were following, you saw the fact of it. Now if there is no future, because the future is now and the past is now, then what is action? We said action as we know it now is based on the past - memories, regrets, guilt, experience, which is all knowledge, or the future, the ideal, the concepts - right? Theories, faiths, you act according to that. So you are acting according to the past or to the future. But the past and the future are now - right? So what is action? You understand my question? Please do - don't give up. You have to exercise your brain, your intellect, your energy to find out, your passion to find out. What is action? If - no, what is action when all time is now? What is your answer? What is your deep truthful answer? When the brain - listen to it - when the brain is conditioned to act according to the past, or to the future, and when the truth is all time is now, therefore there is no future, but now. The future is contained in the now, and the past is contained in the now. You understand all this. So what is action?

I can tell you but you see you are waiting for me to tell you. Too bad, you are not really going into it. You are waiting for somebody to explain all this. Suppose there was nobody to explain to you, what will you do? You have seen the truth of something - the truth that all time, the past, the future, is in the now. You see.

And you meet a man who says, "Look, what is action?", and leaves you. And you have to find out because when once you have seen the truth that all time is now, that truth will never leave you. You understand? It is like a thorn, like an arrow in your body that will not be extracted, pulled out. So you have to answer it. And you won't answer it because you are incapable of answering it, because our brain is conditioned to the past action, action according to the past, or according to the future. So one has to tackle that problem first: whether the brain can be free from the past. Careful now. I need memory to function in the world - right? To go to my office, to work in the laboratory or in a factory, or some skill, I need a great deal of time, a great deal of knowledge. There, there is a becoming there - right? I don't know but I will know. That same movement, same - it is extended, that same thought is extended into the psychological world. I am this, I will be that - right? Now you perhaps have seen for yourself very clearly the truth that all time is now. And the speaker says, find out what is action. Right? Your action has been according to the past memories, past training, past experience, which has conditioned the brain, and also conditioned the brain to the future idea, ideal, concept, I must be, and so on. Can the brain be free of these two? You understand? Are you following all this? You understand my question sirs? (Yes).

Can the brain, which has been conditioned to act according to past memories, or thought has projected a concept, an ideal, a theory, according to which you are acting. The brain is conditioned that way. Can the brain be free of that, otherwise you will never find out what action now is - you understand? I can - somebody

can explain but it won't be the depth of your own understanding. Clear? I'll explain it. I'll go into it. This will be a verbal explanation, naturally. It won't be something you yourself have discovered, and therefore truth and therefore live according to it.

We have to enquire into what is perception, seeing, perceiving. One perceives the fact actually that all time is now. That is a fact. Irrevocable fact. No other clever man comes along and say, "It is not like that." If what you have discovered is truth then you can meet any challenge. You won't be bowled over.

QUESTIONER: I don't know the answer but I can feel...

K: Listen Madame, you can ask your question, write it down and we will answer it, not now. I hope you don't mind.

What is action, which is totally independent of the past and the future? Right? What is action which is not dependent on the past or the future - right? Is there an action which is so complete now, not fragmented - you understand? That is my action - human action is based on the past or the future, therefore it is fragmented - right? It is broken up. So we are asking: is there an action which is totally free of fragmentation? I don't know if you see the beauty of the question itself? Therefore there is - the speaker says there is such an action. And that action is to see the seeing is the doing. There is no interval of time between the seeing, perceiving, understanding and the doing. The understanding, perceiving, the seeing, is action itself. Say for instance - I am working so hard, come on! One perceives very clearly, objectively, without any bias, that all organized religions throughout the world, all of them are based on superstition, faith, belief, tradition. Obviously. With their various forms of rituals, dresses, fancy dresses and so on and so on and so

on. You see that is put together by thought, whether the ancient thought or present thought, it is put together by thought. Therefore as thought being limited it must be limited. Because thought - I will briefly explain it to you - thought is the outcome of memory. Memory is part of knowledge. Knowledge is the outcome of experience - right? There is no complete knowledge. In the scientific world they are adding knowledge - right? - bit by bit, by bit. A thousand people, or a hundred thousand people are adding to it day after day, day after day - right? Therefore the more is limited. Right? So experience is limited. The experience of a man who says, "I have reached God" is limited. Right? So knowledge, whether now or in the future, is limited. Therefore thought is limited - right? So anything that thought has put together both externally or inwardly is limited - right? So action based on thought is limited. Get it? Hear it for the first time for god's sake. All action, if it is based on thought, will always be limited.

Therefore that which is limited must invariably create conflict. If I am thinking about myself all day long, as most people do, it is a very small affair - right? I must practise, I must meditate, I must not do this, I must not do that - you follow? I must seek, I must have no conflict, I must meditate. It is all very self centred activity and therefore it is very limited - right? So thought is limited. Is there an action which is not based on thought? Thought is the past - all the memories, all the tradition, all that. And thought also has projected the future, the ideal, the communist theories - it is still limited. So if we are acting according to the past or to the future, it is still limited - right? Therefore breeding enormous conflict and confusion, obviously. So is there an action which is not based on

the past or the future, because all time is now? Is there an action which is so complete now? You understand? Which means, seeing something clearly is to act instantly. I see very clearly, the speaker sees very clearly to belong to any organization, specially spiritual organizations, is utterly detrimental, limited, therefore don't belong to anything. Yes, sirs. Because to belong to something gives us security. We want to feel safe. The guru knows, I don't, therefore I will follow him, it is a form of self deception, insecurity. Right?

So one perceives that, and instant action. The whole thing, you are free of the whole so-called spiritual leadership. That requires - you understand, it is not strength - mere perception of seeing what is.

It is a quarter to twelve. An hour and a quarter. I hope you aren't tired. We will continue on Tuesday morning. Please if one may remind you one must - life is a complex, you can't take parts of it and say, "I understand" and go away, it requires the whole of it, not just part of it. We are only just beginning - a very small part of it. We are going to talk about fear, relationship, meditation, sorrow, the whole complex problem of our daily living. If you read a book you don't read the first chapter, you must go through to the very end of it. Not we are inviting you to come to all the meetings, I don't care - the speaker doesn't care if you come or don't come, but what is important is if you begin go to the very end of it, don't stop in the middle of it. Right? Put all your energy into it.

May I get up now?

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1984

May we go on where we left off the day before yesterday morning? We were talking about time: time as the past, if I may briefly repeat, time as the past, time as the future, time now, at this second. We were saying also that all time, the past, the present and the future is contained in the now. We went into it fairly thoroughly, that the future is the present, because what we are now, our behaviour, our vulgarity, our - what? - our cruelty, bestiality, terror, and all the rest of it, what we are now, violent, tomorrow will also be violent if there is no fundamental change now. So the future is contained in the present. The future, though modified, is still violence. So please, as we pointed out yesterday, in greater detail, all time is in the present, is in the now. If one realizes the truth of that it has tremendous significance. I am using the word tremendous purposely, without exaggeration. It has a tremendous effect in our behaviour, in our relationship, in what we are actually doing every minute of the day. It has great significance. If one captures that, the truth of it, not the mere verbal expression, the intellectual, logical explanation, description, but the substance of it, the quality of it, the depth of it, the truth of it, then that perfume of that which is true affects the whole of our existence.

We would like this morning also in relation to time to enquire together, I mean together, not I explain, you just accept, or you deny or agree, but together investigate closely, both intellectually, logically, sanely, rationally, and also to go beyond it. Because logic, rationality has its own limitation because it is still within the field of thought. We went into that, I'll go into it again today. So if

we capture the significance of time then we should also enquire into what is freedom, what is health and what is energy? Right?

Freedom, health and the quality of energy that comes when one captures or sees, perceives the truth of all time contained in the now. Right? What is freedom? All human beings throughout the ages have sought some kind of freedom, historically, religiously and so on. And freedom is translated now as doing exactly what one wants, which you are all doing obviously. Choice - one can choose to go from one place to another place, from one job to another job, unlike the totalitarian states where there is total dictatorship and everything is controlled. Even your thinking, feeling is moulded according to pattern. So there is a denial in the totalitarian states of freedom, therefore the totalitarian states are retrogressive - you understand? Going back, not moving.

So we must enquire into what is freedom? Is freedom choice? To choose between two cars, between two materials, to go where you want, to fulfil yourself at the expense of everybody else - right? I hope you are following all this. To try to become much more than what we are - better, nobler, wiser, more acquiring, more knowledge. So - which is the whole process of becoming, which is called fulfilling. I must fulfil. I must have roots somewhere. You follow? The implication of all that is becoming. Not only physical becoming, from an employee to the owner, from an apprentice to a master, but also we feel becoming inwardly. I am this, I will be that. I am envious, greedy, violent - we will use the word violence, that is good enough. We are violent. I will one day achieve non-violence, perhaps in a year or two, or perhaps at the end of my life when I am just about to die - right? And all this

implies a psychological becoming. That's clear. And is there freedom in becoming? You understand my question? Or is freedom something entirely different? Please, together we are investigating, exploring. I am not explaining and you are just receiving. Together we are enquiring which demands that you exercise your brain, not accept a thing, not accept whatever the speaker says. Therefore the enquiry must be yours, not the speaker's. The speaker may just outline, put it into words but the activity, the penetration, must be on your part. So we are both sharing in this - right? Not I put something forward with which you agree or disagree - that implies no sharing. But if we are both enquiring, probing, asking, doubting everything we think and feel, and its relationship to time, and see if that becoming prevents freedom - right? Are we together in this a little bit? May I still more explain it?

That is, if one is a teacher who wants gradually to become a professor in a university, or an apprentice in any discipline, he is all the time attempting to become something - becoming more, becoming a greater expert, greater skill, greater knowledge. This limited energy given to a certain subject is limited. Therefore that denies freedom. You understand? Are we together in this somewhat?

You see we don't really demand freedom. We demand only within the limited area that I must do what I feel, I must act according to my like and dislike, and in that action I am free, I can choose between you and another, and so on. So all that activity is very, very limited, and that very limitation denies freedom. Of course. We are also verbally limited, linguistically - I won't go into the question of linguistics - linguistically we are limited. Let's find

out whether language limits freedom. You understand all this? Language. That is words. Whether - the speaker is using English - whether that language, the words, condition the brain and therefore it becomes limited. Whether language conditions the brain - right? Are you getting this? Or language doesn't limit the brain, condition the brain? You are enquiring? Please go into it with me. I wish there were - sorry I don't wish - if there were only you and the speaker together and not such a large audience, together, my friend and myself, then we can discuss it very, very closely. And I am going to do that - right? That is you represent my friend and I represent the speaker. The speaker and the friend are discussing this question, which is: does freedom lie in becoming something all the time? Does freedom lie in expressing your ambition? Does freedom lie in trying to fulfil your own desires? And the friend says, "I really don't understand what the devil you are talking about." We are used to this, our conditioning, our habit, is this. We are always wanting to fulfil, to become, as in the outer world also in the inner world. We must achieve something otherwise there is no progress. And so on, my friend is saying this, countering everything I am saying, the speaker is saying. And the speaker says, don't get so excited about it, let's look at it together. When you are ambitious, both in the external world and in the psychological world, ambition is the same whether you are ambitious to become tremendously rich or ambitious to reach Nirvana, Heaven or illumination, or ambitious to become silent. Ambition is the same. And that ambition, the speaker is saying to his friend, is limited, is not freedom. And we have misused that word freedom. Which is, each person trying to assert himself,

aggressively, holding on to his opinion, judgement, evaluation, dogmas, creed and so on. And all this we call freedom. And is that freedom? Right? My friend says, "I begin to understand what you are talking about. I agree". I say, don't agree but see the fact of it, the truth of it - right?

So freedom must be something entirely different. And is it possible to come to that, to realize that freedom? That is not to be ambitious at all. Go into it. Which doesn't prevent the love of doing - right? The scientists throughout the world are very ambitious too, like the rest of us. They want to achieve some superior armaments against the Russians and so on. All that game, that horrible game they are playing. So every human being in the world, however uneducated, stupid terribly intellectual, are always caught in this process. And that is called freedom generally. And the speaker says that is not freedom. And the friend says, "Does language prevent, or encourage the limited activity of the brain?" You are following all this? Does this interest you? Eh? Are you quite sure? Or is it that you are playing a game with me? Does language condition the brain? It does condition the brain if the words become important. Whether the words are English words, or French words, or German, or Italian or Russian, when the word has lost its depth, when the word is used casually, when the word has special significance to each one, when the words have become the network of the brain. You understand? Are you following? Then the words condition the brain. Right? But when the words, which are merely used to convey a certain... used for communication purposes, if you and I, and the speaker, which requires a certain sensitivity, attention, pliability, affection, then words can be used without their

limiting quality. Then the brain is not conditioned by words. But now, as we are, words do condition our brain. When you say the totalitarian states - immediately I have a picture of it. You immediately see various dictators in different parts of the world, because their pictures have been in every newspaper for the last fifty years. The image springs up and that image conditions the brain. You are following all this? When I use the word guru (laughter) - there you are, you have a reaction immediately! Or when a word like the Christ is used to a Christian - immediately. Or to a Hindu with his particular word, or the Buddhist. Please see the importance of the linguistic conditioning, and whether in that conditioning all kinds of troubles arise, all kinds of conflicts arise - the Hindu conflict against the Muslim, the Muslim and the Arab against the Jew, the Christians who believe in God against the totalitarians - you follow? This is going on.

So is it possible to be free from the linguistic prison? You understand? Sirs, you don't put your minds to all this. Right? See if it is possible for you, sitting here now, to be entirely free of the image of words. So there is freedom - there is no freedom in becoming. There is no freedom when a man is ambitious, or a woman is ambitious, greedy, envious. He may think he is free because he expresses his ambition. So there is freedom - there is no freedom in becoming. And there is no freedom when the brain is caught or imprisoned in words with their images.

And also we ought to enquire: what is health? Does this interest you, health? Now, you all wake up! What is health? Can there be healthy organism, biological organism when there is constant conflict? - between each other, one opinion opposing the other, one

expressing his desires fully against others' desires? This constant struggle, strain, conflict in which human beings live, does that contribute to health? Don't say, no. Then that means those are the factors of ill health. Psychosomatic diseases. You understand all this? So can there be intellectual health, and emotions which are healthy, not romantic sentimentality and all that, that conduces to ill health. I don't know if you are following all this. So we must enquire very deeply what is really to be healthy?

This enquiry is not just when you are reaching death, on the deathbed, but one must enquire right from when you are very young, or middle aged, or now as the speaker is. What is health? And health implies energy, tremendous energy. And we dissipate that energy through conflict, through strain, through all kinds of tobacco, drinking, you know all the business of it. And without becoming 'food fad' - 'food fads', you know what that means? Crazy about food, only concerned with what one eats and nothing else. Without becoming food fads, to find out if the brain can live without a single conflict. That means without any kind of emotional strain or intellectual strain - you understand all this? Are you doing it as we are talking, or you are just listening, agreeing and perhaps at the end of the day you will try to think about it - you understand my question? Are we doing this together? Seeing how ill health is brought about, heart trouble and all the rest of it. Suppose I am, one is highly intellectual - very few people are - but suppose one is highly intellectual, only using that part of the brain which is called the intellect, which is only concerned with discovering new ideas, new expressions, new way of putting it, new concepts, and disregarding the whole of one's existence,

biological and other ways of living, completely caught in that - right? Then that affects the health naturally. And if one is highly emotional, romantic, sentimental, as most people are, that also brings various forms of conflicts which affects ill health. Health means energy - right? Not through drugs, not through alcohol but - oh, need I explain all this silly stuff? - but when there is no conflict whatsoever then there is tremendous health. And we said there is freedom, we talked about health and energy.

There is intellectual energy - right? The intellectual energy is when they have put a robot on the moon, it requires tremendous intellectual energy - you understand? To invent all the horrible things of war requires great intellectual capacity and energy - right? There is emotional energy by itself, perhaps slightly modified by the intellect, but when we are sentimental, emotional, a kind of ugly vulgar sentimentality, that too deprives energy - right? Are we together in this? I don't know if you are or we are not. I hope I am not talking to myself.

So what is energy which is not dissipated at all? - dissipated, wasted. Because this is important to understand, the quality of energy which is highly intelligent, highly capable of reasoning, highly capable of analysing, looking, observing, self-critically aware and therefore constantly removing any impediment in the movement. That requires a great deal of energy. People who are purely - not purely, one can't use that - semi-physical energy, you know you have plenty of them in the world - their energy is limited naturally, their energy controls all thought - you understand? Are you understanding what I am saying? I may be stupid but I have got tremendous energy. What I think is right and that drives me.

And you see such people all over the world with extraordinary amount of energy. And those people who are very, very clever, their energy goes into calculation, all the rest of it. Now is there an energy which is not contaminated, polluted by or through conflict? You understand all this? Right? Are we together in this? A little bit? Then we must enquire: why we human beings for the last forty, fifty thousand years of our evolution, which the biologists and the archeologists are saying that we have lived on this earth, as human beings walking on two legs, why from that time on until now we are in perpetual conflict - right? Why? Is it agreement and disagreement? Look at it. I agree to something and you disagree with that. There is the beginning of conflict. I believe in a certain - the speaker - or one believes in ideals, the other doesn't, immediately a conflict. One likes, the other doesn't like. One protects the few, and the few are against everybody else. In our relationship with each other there is conflict - man, woman, conflict. And there is conflict between the guru and the disciple. Don't you notice all this? The disciple wants to become like the guru. How silly that is. But the guru himself is probably rather silly. So there is this perpetual struggle, conflict. One holds on to something, identifies oneself with that something, and one resists at any price. And between man and woman there is not only sexual conflict, but also each human being, the woman and the man, or the man and the girl and so on and so on, each wants to express things in his own way. He is ambitious and she is ambitious. And therefore there is conflict - right? Why do we live this way? That is an immense waste of energy - right? But why we human beings after this long duration of experience, knowledge, wars, suffering,

the eternal anxiety and so on, why do we live this way? Why do we, who are so clever, who have so much knowledge, so learned, why do we carry on this way? Please ask this question. Don't wait to find out. Ask it, demand it, put your passion behind to find out. Is it our brain which evolved through conflict - right? Conflict with nature, conflict in the air, conflict in everything. So our brain has become accustomed to it. Having become accustomed it says that is the way to live, that is the way to progress. If there was no competition there would be no progress. And so the brain which has become accustomed, used to live in a certain environment, says that is the way to live. Are you in that position? You, sitting there, say, "Well I am used to this". And because you are used to it you rationalize it, you say, "Yes, in nature everything struggles. The little tree, the little plant is struggling towards the light. The tiger kills the deer." - right? "So it is part of our nature." - to be violent, to be in conflict, to be at war with each other and therefore war with much greater significance - right? We have lived that way.

There have been wars for, historically, five thousand years, practically every year there has been a war, and we are living in a state of war - right? And you say that is natural, we have done it for fifty thousand years, why not? The profit - the politicians profit by this - right?

So, we are asking each other: is it possible to live without a single conflict? From that we have to enquire why we human beings have problems. Problem means conflict - right? Why have we problems? Why does the brain accept problems. Is the brain itself - you understand? I am going to ask something, please listen. I am just discovering it - is the brain itself in a condition of

problems? Vous avez compris? Is the brain itself (Noise of aeroplane) - we won't compete with the aeroplane! Is the brain itself caught in problems? Is the brain itself, with all the activity that is going on, that brain itself is a problem? You understand? Gosh, I wish this noise would stop. Our brain is conditioned from childhood. You go to a school and you have problems of solving mathematics, how to write. Poor little child goes to a school and writing becomes a problem. (Noise of aeroplane) This is a small country and they have all this noise. (Laughter). We are asking whether the brain itself is the problem? The questioner is part of the brain - you understand? The questioner who says, "Is the brain the problem?", and the questioner is also part of the brain, naturally. But the questioner is asking the brain: why are you in conflict? And it says, "I have been trained from childhood to solve problems. I have been to schools as a child, they have taught me how to write which has become a problem to me. And how to read, however pleasant that reading may be, that has also become a problem because I don't know first what 'A' means, how it looks. So I go through school, college, university, if I am lucky, and that whole movement of acquiring knowledge, in any discipline has conditioned my brain." So the brain is the problem-solving machinery. You have understood? The word problem, means something thrown at you. Problem means a challenge to you. From childhood something is thrown at the poor child - right? He must learn ABC, he must know mathematics and so on. So the brain itself has become a machinery which creates problems, and tries to solve problems. You understand this? Come on sir, move - eh?

So what is one to do? Right? If the brain, that which is inside

the skull, is the machinery which creates problems - it is - mathematical problems, technical problems, problems between man and woman, problems with politics, problems with pollution - right? All the depository of all the toxic material - you follow? The whole process is all becoming a problem. And the problems have arisen because of the brain. Right? Just a minute, we are moving further. So the brain is responsible for problems and the resolution of those problems. Right? Are we clear on this matter? Somewhat? Need I go more into it? Eh? Do you want me to go more into it? Why? It is so simple, isn't it?

Religiously, look at it, you are trained as a Christian, to have faith. Saviour and faith. And those who are the Buddhists say that is all nonsense. That is the invention of the Western priests - which is probably true. Basically there is no such thing as Saviour, Buddhists, or having faith; they say doubt, question, enquire, never accept. So there are two - and the Christian says that is all rubbish, the pope says faith is important. And my family, my education has been Catholic so I am programmed, as the Arab is programmed, as a computer - right? And so on. So our brain is a form of computer programmed. And when a brain is programmed, as we are, linguistically, religiously, with many, many problems, the brain says I am tired, I can't think, you tell me all about it. That is what is happening here. So your brain becomes gradually withering, gradually atrophied, which is with problems. Krishnamurti says something and that has become a problem.

So can the brain be free of problems? You understand? That is, there are problems in life, you can't help it, it is so. But to meet the problem with a brain that has no problems - do you understand?

That is my statement, do you understand? You put in front of the speaker a problem. If his brain is also full of problems he will solve your problem and create more problems out of it. Right? Haven't you noticed this? That is what the politicians are doing. The economic problems are solved by experts and other experts come along and say sorry it is all wrong - right? And so on and on and on.

So to find out whether you can have a brain that is not a mechanical brain, that is not a machinery that is solving problems, which means to have no problem. And that is possible - I will show it to you in a minute, if you go into it carefully - that is possible only when you understand time.

As we said, time is the past, present and the future. All that time, all the past, the present and the future is held in the now - right? You understand? Problem means a future. You get it? Come on sirs. You understand? Any problem implies the resolution of it, which is in the future. Right? That is why it is very important to understand all time is now. Sirs, see the beauty of it. So you put a problem, there is a problem - there are several problems, I know, I am aware of, in all the places I go to, in various schools I go to, various politicians one meets, the scientists one meets, they are all asking, demanding, questioning, and if your brain is also full of problems, anxieties, uncertainty, then your answer will be as muddled as theirs - right? So we are asking: whether the brain can be free of problems? And to understand the nature of that freedom you have to enquire into time - right? That is, as there is no - the now has no future, the now is in the future - right? I wonder if you understand this? So any problem arises and the solution means

time - right? Therefore if you understand very clearly - I am going to go into it very slowly. I am also learning as I go along. It is fascinating, this. Let me take a breather.

There are problems, life has problems because human beings are so obstinate, so arrogant, full of their own importance. I have done this, I am going to stick to it. And they create problems, and the speaker has to meet them - right? If he is also full of problems he will make a mess of it - right? So to be free of problems implies the enquiry into time - right? Because the problem and its solution implies inherently in it, time - right? I have a problem, I must think over it, I will discuss it, I will go into it, I read books about it, or consult my guru - you follow? All that goes on. So the problem and its solution, inherent in itself, is time - clear?

Then we have said previously, time is contained in the now. See the relationship between the problem and the time, do you see it? Therefore any problem I meet has no time. It must be solved instantly. You have understood this? That implies - may I go on? I hope you are as excited as the speaker is, because he is discovering something new each time. That implies perception of the problem - perception not according to your prejudice, according to your judgement, according to your opinion and so on, but perceiving with your brain, with your heart, with your whole being. Seeing, in which there is no distortion. There is distortion the moment there is motive. So to put away motive, direction and absolutely perceive as it is, and not allowing a second to hinder the solution. You understand? I wonder if you understand this?

Look sir, there are problems between man and woman - there are other problems, I am just taking that one problem. Man and

woman. They quarrel. This is one of those unfortunate things that happen in relationship. They quarrel about god knows what, every petty little thing on earth. They quarrel. And they never solve the quarrel. You understand? They keep on until it becomes unbearable and one of them says, "I'll buzz off". And thereby they think they have solved the problem. Then they get married to another man or woman and start the whole game again. You must all be familiar with this, aren't you? That is why you are all in agreement with this I see. So this goes on.

Now if the man or the woman understood the nature of time, the truth of it - you understand? - that is, to see the quarrelling going on, the conflict going on, and see, perceive, and you perceive it instantly the cause, and instantly remove the cause because you are not allowing time at all to interfere with the solution of the problem. You understand this? Come on sir. Is this somewhat clear? That is, when time becomes the most important thing in life, the understanding of it, not mere verbal description of it, the agreement with it, but you yourself see the truth of it profoundly, then there is no problem at all for the brain. You may have a problem. But the brain that meets the problem is all important. How you approach the problem. If you approach the problem already having a solution to the problem, then it is not soluble - right? You solve it according to your old pattern. But if you approach it without any bias, without any sense of anxiety, and you can only do that if you understand the depth and the strength and the vitality of time. Is that right, clear?

So can your brain, which is no longer a slave to linguistic control, linguistic images, and has understood the nature of

freedom, real freedom in which there is no sense of moving away from something. If you move away from, let's say, if you move away from anxiety, the movement is time. And therefore that movement may appear secure, security but that movement has inherently in itself uncertainty. Right? You are getting it? Is this too intellectual? No. It is just common sense.

So enquiring into freedom, enquiring into what is health, because if you are not healthy you cannot have freedom, because that will impede you. I may be paralysed but still I can be healthy - you understand? I may have only one eye to see clearly but that doesn't prevent me my health. Health is destroyed by this constant conflict, achievement, success, ambition, uncertainty, confusion, all the pain of life. And energy, energy never dissipated. You understand sirs? By chattering, arguing, holding on to what you have done and say, "This is right, I am going to stick to it." You understand? Energy implies constant movement, constant discovering something new, not technologically, psychologically. So that your brain becomes extraordinarily active and not dissipate that energy. When you have that energy then you can look at problems - you understand? And understand time. They are all dove-tailed, they all fit together, they are not separate. It is one long steady movement.

And also we ought to talk over together why human beings are hurt, psychologically wounded, why human beings in their relationship quarrel and so on. I don't think this morning there is time for it - it is now twenty to twelve. So may we stop this morning and continue on Thursday morning? Would that be all right?

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH JULY 1984

Thank goodness it is a little bit cooler!

May we continue with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? We were talking about freedom and - I have forgotten! We were talking about freedom and energy and time, I think.

We ought to consider this morning together what is the capacity of the brain? The brain that is inside the skull. And that brain is very carefully protected, various layers of bone, air, more bone and then water, so it is very carefully protected. The speaker is not a specialist on brains - thank God! But one has observed how the brain operates for oneself. The brain has extraordinary capacity, as is shown how it has developed in the technological world. They are doing incredible things in the field of technology - computers, and all the incredible, unbelievable technological things that are taking place throughout the world. And inwardly, I do not mean in the sense of veins, bones, arteries, liver and heart and all that, inwardly, psychologically, we are very, very limited. That is a fact. And after forty five thousand years or more we are still rather primitive psychologically, inwardly. And our brains, which have incredible capacity, psychologically are very limited, and therefore we are misusing the technological world and all the inventions that human beings are bringing about to do immense harm and also great good, but psychologically we have neglected the capacity of the brain inwardly. Why? Please, as we said the other day, and one must repeat it again, we are observing together, seeing objectively, not merely subjectively prejudiced, opinionated, holding on to

certain dogmas, beliefs, and conclusions but together observing very closely why the psychological world, which is the whole field of thought, emotions, sensations, fears, pleasures, joys, and incalculable suffering that man has gone through, why inwardly we are so limited, concerned with our own self, with our own advancement, with our own so-called progress, with our own ambitions and so on, do we together see the limitation of that?

Please I am asking this question, let's consider it together. The area of psychology, psyche, is in the field of thought and all the projections that thought has put forward, images, imagination, symbols, mythology, and the various hurts human beings have received from childhood, fears which man has borne for forty five thousand years and the pleasures in relationship, both sexual and other ways of pleasure, and the pain of relationship. And also the - not only personal suffering but suffering of humanity. And man has also thought, or wanted, or desired, or hoped there was something more than the mere physical activity, something greater, something that is holy, sacred. Man has sought all these things since time began. And we are still groping, we are still seeking how to escape, or how to understand, or how to resolve the cage, the prison in which the brain is psychologically caught. We are understanding each other? Why have we not paid attention to it? Why have we not broken the limitation and found out the extraordinary capacity inwardly of the brain? Why? Is it that we have always sought security? Both externally and inwardly, because security is necessary, otherwise the brain can't function at its excellence - right?

So physically, externally, we have found some kind of security -

security in the family, security in the community, security in the greater community and in nationality - step by - there have been physical, psychological security we have sought, which is an obvious fact because if we haven't had our breakfast, had no food and no clothes, we can't possibly think very, very clearly, act impersonally. So security physically is necessary and that is being denied by nationalities, nationalism, because that produces one of the causes of war - French, Russian, English, Swiss, if you will allow me, Belgian, America, India, and all that business. It is really a form of tribalism, which we all know. And psychologically, inwardly, we sought security in relationship - right? Please we are thinking together. You are not just listening to the speaker and just accepting some ideas or rejecting, but carefully observing the function of the brain, the complex thought, observing the whole process of living, both externally and inwardly.

We have sought security inwardly. We have - thought has created God - would you be shocked by that? Thought has created it. Thought has put all together the various rituals, the various dogmas, beliefs, faith, rituals - this is the common factor of all religions. And thought, not finding psychological security, projected the concept of god from the ancient days, from Jupiter, Zeus and the Asiatics had their own peculiar ancient deities. Is there such security psychologically at all? You understand my question? One follows another, specially in the so-called - the speaker doesn't like that word 'spiritual' - in the so-called spiritual world one seeks security - following the guru, following the various traditional concepts, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, and also gurus, and security in knowledge - right? In skill,

in various forms of activity, consoling, disturbing, destructive but trying to find through all these means security. And the brain needs extraordinary security - right? Otherwise it can't function clearly.

So one questions whether there is, apart from physical security which is slowly being denied and destroyed, is there psychological security at all? Right? Please let us investigate that very carefully because most of us want in our relationship some kind of stability, some kind of safety, a sense of being at home - not in the house, but inwardly of being at home, with somebody - man, woman, or with some symbol, with some concept. Or, as the Christians would have it, in faith. I don't know why, what that means, but they find security in faith. And in the Asiatic world, specially in India, doubt has been one of the major tenets of their religion. That one must question the very highest authority, one must doubt. So in that doubting, questioning, probing, one asks, if one has done it very, very deeply, is there security at all? You understand my question? One must have physical security - that is understood, don't let's... and that is being destroyed through nationalism, through wars, through division. There is the peculiar thing going on called United Nations. It is a contradictory in terms, nations cannot be united, they are always separative, divisive - right? They can never be united and therefore they are always at war, getting more armaments and so on and so on, I don't have to go into all that. We all know that. And nobody seems to say, "Let's stop all this." The religions encourage it, this division - Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist and all that nonsense, to me. And this division, the divisive process which is going on throughout the world is bringing about great conflict. And inwardly too we are divisive. We are, as

human beings, broken up - right? - fragmented, never whole, holistic. And if one begins to enquire more deeply, is there any security at all? One tries to find security in relationship - let's look at that world relationship.

What is relationship? To be related to, to have - to be in contact with, to have a communication with another so complete that there is no divisive process going on - you understand? What is this relationship which brings, as it is observed with almost everyone all throughout the world, it is a constant conflict. Would I be right in saying that to the married people and the unmarried people? I am glad - the speaker is glad we all agree about that at least!

And why is there this division? The brain is seeking security and yet that very brain is creating division - you follow? Is it thought? Is thought creating the division in relationship?

Then we have to enquire very deeply into what is thought. Some of you may have heard the speaker explaining the movement of thought, the origin of thought, but if they would kindly put aside what they have heard the speaker say perhaps a thousand times before and start anew. What is the origin of thought? Thought has created the most marvellous world technologically - right? The incredible things thought has done - in the world of medicine, surgery, in homeopathy - all right? - in producing instruments of war, and so on, the computer. We will talk about the computer a little later. Great fun, that!

And thought has also created a division between you and me, my wife and me - follow? - this whole process of division is going on throughout life. Is thought the cause of it? Please look at it carefully. Let's find out. If thought is the cause of this divisive

process then we will have to ask a question which is much more serious: whether thought can ever function in one area completely, in the physical world, in the daily world, but completely end in the psychological world? Vous avez compris? You understand what I am saying? We are going to find out. Let's go slowly.

Thought is functioning when I learn a language, when I learn - when one learns various skills, when one skis - right? - constructing various ships - thought is very active there. And thought also is psychologically very active - right? And we are asking: is thought - please listen, pay attention to this, if you will, if you are not too tired - is thought the origin of this divisive process? Christian god, the Hindu god, the Muslim god and so on and so on and so on. God must be one god - right? - to be at all god. But thought has divided the poor chap!

So let's enquire very carefully: What is thought? Why thought plays such an extraordinary part in our life? And what is thinking? - which is the same as thought. What is thinking? If there is no memory you wouldn't - one would not be able to think - clear? That would be a state of amnesia. So if memory is necessary for thought-(noise of aeroplanes) - it is a small country! (Laughter) - thought is the response of memory and memory is the outcome of accumulated knowledge - right? Knowledge is gathered through experience - right? That knowledge in the scientific world is gathered bit by bit or through jumps - right? Constantly accumulated. Technology is based on experience. And is experience - please go into it carefully together - is experience limited? Right? Can there be ever complete experience? What does that word experience mean? I am just thinking it out aloud. To

experience: if you are driving a car, if one is driving a car and there is an accident, that is an experience. From that experience you have learnt, one has learnt to be more watchful, much more to observe all the roads, 300 yards ahead and so on. Now we are asking: is experience limited? And who is the experiencer who is experiencing? Right? Lord! (Noise of aeroplanes).

This is rather important to ask this question. We all want to experience, when you are young sexual experience, as you get older religious experiences, and ultimately the experience of illumination, or whatever you like to call it. Now who is the experiencer who is experiencing? Right? You follow the question? One works, practises, certain forms of meditation, so-called meditation, which are not meditation but we will go into that later on, practises it, day after day, day after day. And he is experiencing in that process certain imaginative states, or some illusions. And there is an experiencer who is experiencing. Now who is the experiencer? Is the experiencer different from the experience he is going to have? You have understood my question? I want to - if one wants - I will keep to myself - if I want to experience god or that state of holiness - please I am not belittling it, I am not being cynical - that god, that illumination, that concept of illumination, thought has projected it - right? And I want to experience that which thought has put forward. See what is happening. I project something, and then experience that something. Right? Is this clear? That is, I project some imaginary deity and I work, practise to achieve or experience that state of deity which thought has invented. So I must be very clear who is the experiencer? Right? Surely the experiencer is all the accumulated memories - right?

Accumulated knowledge and when he experiences something either he must recognize it or it is no experience. If he recognizes he already knows - you understand all this? So thus experience becomes very, very limited - right? In the scientific world knowledge is added bit by bit, bit by bit - right? Or during the last hundred years it has jumped. But it is still limited. Therefore there can never be complete experience because the experience is always limited. Clear? Do we understand? Not verbal explanation but the fact, the truth of it. That is, the experiencer is the past, and that experiencer when he has experience of any kind must recognize it as something which he is experiencing, which means he already knows that which has happened before - right? So experience is always limited, whether the experience of God, or the experience of particular Christian deity or symbol or person, or in the Asiatic world with their deities. Any kind of experience, scientific, psychological, must always be limited. That is clear. Therefore knowledge is always limited, whether now or in the future - right? If you observe it, it is so clear. So thought and memory are limited. So thought being limited must be divisive. Anything that is limited must be separative - right?

If I am thinking about myself, my progress, my ambition, my achievement, how marvellous I am, or how stupid I am, and so on, thinking about myself is a very small affair. But that small affair can be extended and say, "I am thinking about universal" - it is still limited - right? So thought, whatever it does in any field, both in the technological world or in the psychological world, must be limited, therefore its action will always be limited - right? It becomes rather...

So what is the relationship of thought to time? Right? Are you asking this question? I am asking it. We said time is the past, the future and the present - contained in the now - right? Is that clear? Thought and time is the past, past memories, past knowledge, past experiences, stored up in the brain as memory, and the future is projected from that memory and that future is now - right? Is that clear? No, I am afraid not.

We are the result of the past - right? Obviously. Both biologically, through long period of evolution and psychologically all the accumulated memories we have - right? So the past are the memories - right? And the future is projected from the past memory. So the future is already the past because it is part of the past. The future is part of the past. Right? Clear? No?

Look sir, make it much more simple. I am all my memories - right? I am all my memories, I am memory. Even if I say I am god, inwardly there is something, it is still memory. So my whole being is memory. I know you will refute it, or not agree with it, but see the fact: if you have no memory you are not. Right? So you are a whole bundle of memories. And that memory - those memories project the future. "I must be", "I must not be," "I mustn't be violent". So it is a movement of the past towards the future. But that future is the present. I can't go on with this - right?

So the present, the now, contains all time. Now what is the relationship of thought to time? You understand? It is necessary to use our brains, not just go to sleep and somebody tell you all about it. We are both of us acting, exercising the capacity of our brain. And we are asking a question, we have explained very carefully to each other, what time is; the whole movement of time is in the

now. And we have also explained the nature of thought. What is the relationship of thought to time? Are they not both the same? So thought is time. Which is, I need time to have knowledge, experience. So time and thought are together, they are not separate movements - right? Do we see this as a fact? - not as an idea explained by some person. Do we see it as a fact? Not make an abstraction of what you have - from the fact into an idea and pursue the idea. Vous avez compris? Because it is important to understand this. Is time separate from thought? Or thought is time? Of course it is. So see what happens. If thought is time, and thought is now - if thought is time and we said thought is time - right? - then what is relationship? You understand? What is one's relationship with another? We will approach it differently. We live, life is relationship. Without relationship there is no life.

Relationship to the earth, to the water, to everything, to nature, to all the things of the earth, we are related to it. And we are related much more intimately with a woman or a man. And in that relationship there is conflict - right? The man pursues his ambition, he pursues his fulfilment, sexually and in other ways, and the woman does the same - right? They perhaps meet sexually but all the time separate. What has brought about this separation? We are saying thought - right? That's clear. So please follow this carefully - we said thought is time and this division between man and woman and so on is brought about by thought, not love.

So one has to go into the question - there is so much - into the question: what is love? Is love time? Go into it. Find out sirs, don't... Is love time? Is love thought? When you say to someone, "I love you" - and I hope you mean it - is that love the expression, or

the outcome of your self-fulfilment, whether it is sexual or otherwise - right? So why is there then this division? I won't go further into the question of love - if you want I'll go into it now. Good Lord it is already twenty past eleven. All right sirs, let's go into it.

Is love thought, the movement of thought? You understand? Which means: is love the product of time? Please carefully watch it in yourself. Or is love pleasure? Pleasure has become extraordinarily important in life - the whole industry of entertainment, sports, religious entertainment - right? - churches, you know, you go there to be entertained, to have new kind of sensations. So is love thought, time, pleasure, and is love desire? Has love a place - no, has thought a place in love? Go on. If thought has a place in love, then that love is limited. And that which is limited must create conflict - right? This is logical, sanity.

So is it possible to have that perfume, that extraordinary thing called love, which is a great flame in one's life, without all this travail, without all this division? You understand? That means one has to understand very, very deeply, or perceive instantly the nature of thought, time, pleasure and desire. Right? They are all interrelated, they are not separate things. Thought, time, pleasure, desire are one, they are inter-related - right?

So to capture that perfume and to - for it to abide all one's life without any division one must understand desire. Right? Desire for most of us is extraordinarily important. Desire for God, desire for a new house, desire for somebody with whom you can get on better, desire for more wealth, desire for greater peace - you know, desire, that which is burning in all of us, furiously. Desire is being very

prominent in our lives. Like thought. And various religions have said, "Suppress desire". When you enter a monastery - have you ever been in a monastery, any of you? I was in one - the speaker was in one, it doesn't matter. There, in the monasteries, and in the monks who are wandering the earth without any organization, they have desire. And desire being a dangerous thing, they said, "Don't look at a woman, only be committed to God" - or whatever it is you are committed to. And man has always tried to suppress, control, shape desire. You desire when one is young for some silly little thing, then as you grow older you desire for position, power, money, status. As you also grow much older then you desire for some peace, then you desire for immortality - if there is such a thing - then you desire to escape from the fear, the darkness of death. From the beginning of life until the end of life one is tortured by desire, with its pleasures too - right? And as we said, is love desire? Is love pleasure? Pleasure is in the fulfilment of one's desire. I desire a car. When I get it I am happy, I am satisfied. Not quite because I want a bigger car! And so on. Desire in its fulfilment brings satisfaction, from that satisfaction gratification, there is a great sense of pleasure - right? And we have done everything conceivable either to express fully our desires, which is called freedom, or go to the other extreme, suppress desires. This has been the constant movement of man. Both in the so-called spiritual world and in the world - in the exterior world. The expansion and the contraction of desire. And now we are trying to find out what is the origin, the beginning of desire. We are not saying we must suppress or fulfil. We are trying - not trying - we are observing the whole movement of desire from the very

beginning to the very... right? What is desire? (Noise of train).

I hear that train going by and I want to listen to what you are saying. I desire for that train to move quickly, not make all that row - right? That is, the hearing of the noise, the sensation from that noise, then from that sensation the desire saying, "Please I wish that train wouldn't go by so often". (Noise of train) There it is! (Laughter) The hearing is a sensation, pleasant or unpleasant. And if it is pleasant I want to hold it, if it is unpleasant I want to push it away. But it is still sensation. Right? And that sensation is necessary, otherwise I am deaf, dumb. So there is sensation, then thought comes in and says, "I wish the train wouldn't pass so often" - you understand? Sensation, which is normal, healthy, natural. Then thought makes the image and says, "I wish it didn't happen" - or wants it to happen. So when thought shapes or controls or gives an intention to sensation, then at that moment desire is born. Is that clear? Are we clear on this matter? That is, sir, if you are a man, you see a woman, that you know very well, or if you see somebody in great power, position, status, you see him. And the sensation is there, seeing is a sensation. Then thought comes and says, "I wish I had that power, that position." - right? When thought gives shapes through the image to the sensation, then at that moment desire is born - clear?

Now sensation, as we said, is normal, healthy, natural, unless one is paralysed, deaf, dumb and no reaction at all. Now that is normal. Then thought comes instantly, gives a shape to that sensation, at that moment desire. Now can - please watch this - can sensation and thought - can thought be slow and not capture the sensation? You understand my question? You understand? No.

God! The speaker is working and you are not.

Sir, I go to a museum, which I have done rarely because the museum of the woods is much more beautiful, the mountains, than any museum in the world. You go to a museum and see a picture, a marvellous picture, and you see the beauty of it, then thought says, "By Jove, I wish I had it. I'd like it in my room where there is some space. I'd like to hang it there and look at it every day." The seeing of that picture is normal but when thought enters into it desire is born to possess it. Now can the sensation and thought be kept apart for a while? You understand my question? There you need tremendous alertness - right? Keep these apart. Which means alertness has its own great discipline. Not the discipline of conformity, of obedience, of following, practising, but that seeing sensation is necessary, is normal, and desire is the movement of thought. To keep these two apart. If you do it you will see how extraordinarily quick thought is. The instant you see thought is there. So to be so tremendously alert so thought and sensation are kept apart, then there is neither suppression nor fulfilment, there is only that alertness. And that alertness, that watchfulness, the intensity of it, is its own discipline. You understand? The word discipline means - it comes from the word disciple. The disciple is one who learns. Learns, not learns what the master is saying but is learning. I wonder if you understand that?

We consider learning - do you want to go into all this? I'll go on, it's up to you. Learning is an extraordinary faculty. Not the accumulation of knowledge only - you understand? You go to school, college, university, if you are... or in a factory, there you are accumulating knowledge. And also you are accumulating

knowledge about yourself. When you say, "I am memory", you have learnt that and you repeat that. Right? But learning is something totally different. There is never a moment where you are stuck, so always moving. That makes the brain extraordinarily active. Knowledge may be the most destructive thing in relationship. You are getting this? Because where there is knowledge - 'I know my wife' - what a terrible thing to say. When you say that, which means you have come to a conclusion, you have built an image about her, and she has built an image about you, naturally, and when you say, "I know my wife", that knowledge becomes the dividing factor between you and your wife. So that evokes a very fundamental question.

The brain has the function to record everything - right? To record. You are sitting there, the speaker is sitting up here, only for convenience, not for authority. The platform doesn't give him authority. I must tell you a story, rather amusing. We were in India, in Bombay. Some disciples of a guru came to see us and said, "You must meet him, he is an extraordinary man. He has achieved. He wants you to come to him. We urge you to come to him." I said, "I am so sorry, I don't go out chasing gurus" - I was more polite. And after three or four days they persuaded the guru to come. And we happened to be sitting on a mattress about two inches thick, not fifty centimetres, or less than that, and when he came in we got up naturally, and offered him the mattress. He sat down there, took a position cross legged and became the authority because of that little height! You understand? That's life. (Laughter)

So, as we were saying, knowledge in relationship is really a most dangerous factor which destroys relationship. You build an

image about her and she builds an image about you. And when you have that image, and she has that image, she knows - "I know my husband" - and you repeat too, "I know my wife." So can one - please follow this - can one live without creating a single image in relationship? To find that out, whether it is possible or not, one must enquire much more deeply into this whole process of recording. You understand? The brain is recording. The brain now, if you are listening, is recording what is being said. And in relationship the recording process goes on. She tells me, "You are a fool" one day. Right? And that is recorded. And that has left an imprint on - that has hurt me. Or one day, she says, "You have been marvellous, old chap" - you know, "Darling you have been extraordinarily nice to me yesterday." That is recorded. Right? So our brain both outwardly and inwardly is recording. The question then is: is it possible to record physically certain things, you understand, but not to record a thing psychologically? That is, when one's wife says you are a beastly man, not to record it. And when she says you have been awfully kind to me yesterday, or you have given me such pleasure, not to record. You follow? So that the brain is recording when necessary, physically, in daily life, and inwardly, psychologically, never to record. Yes sir! That recording is knowledge. That recording is the image that separates you and me, and they and we, she and me, or me and him. You understand? Now can that recording never take place in relationship?

Sir, it is time to stop. But what is the point of listening to all this? What do you learn from all this? Do you hear and go away and repeat the old pattern? Then what is the value of listening? Either you listen with intensity, with passion to find out, to live a

different kind of life. You may have done wrong things before, you may have done some harm to another, the remorse, the guilt, and all the rest of it is gone, not live with it. And so to find out passionately, you know, as you want money, as you want sex, as you are hungry, you are tremendously active, to find out for yourself whether this recording can end, so that there is no conflict between you and me, between a wife and yourself. It is this recording that is divisive. The recording is the me, is the self. And meditation is the ending of that recording, total ending. Not sitting cross legged, closed eyes and doing some kind of tricks. That is all nonsense. This requires enormous energy, passion, which brings its own tremendous discipline, which means learning.

It is a quarter to twelve. May I stop please.

SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH JULY 1984

May we continue where we left off on Thursday? I am afraid they are all standing there - apparently there is no room. Do we extend the tent? It can't be done this morning, it will have to be next year.

We were talking about freedom. I won't go into all that again this morning because we have only two more talks. So we have to go into several other things like order, what is the nature of order, disorder, and what it means to change. And we should also consider this morning what is fear, and whether it is possible for human beings who have lived on this earth for more than fifty five thousand years, why human beings have never been free from fear. And also we ought to talk over together the whole question of suffering, the pain of sorrow, anxiety, loneliness and all the innumerable travail that human beings are heir to. And we also should talk over the next two days: what is love? What is compassion and the nature of intelligence? And also we should talk over together what is death, what is religion and the nature of meditation. We have got a lot of ground to cover. Is that all right?

So we will begin this morning: what is the nature of order? And if one may again remind you, we are not doing any kind of propaganda, propagate any theory, any concept, a new philosophy, a new concept of life, or substitute for all this, faith and so on. And also this is not personality cult. And also if we may remind you, doubt is necessary. Doubt your own experiences, doubt, question, your own thinking, your opinions, your judgements, your evaluations, whether we can look at the world and at ourselves totally impersonally, objectively so that we see things as they are,

not as we would like them to be. And the speaker is not an authority, because we are going to discuss, or talk over together this problem of order and authority, or disorder - they go together. What is the nature of order? We live in disorder, both externally, outwardly, with all the things that are going on in the world, all the demonstrations for peace and at the same time cultivating, preparing, inventing new means of destruction of humanity. There are political divisions, religious divisions, economic divisions and so on. So outwardly through this division there have been thousands of wars, and religions have added to this division. And inwardly, psychologically, in the area of the psyche, we are also in conflict. And so we should talk over together why, after all these thousands of years, why we accept and live in disorder.

It is an important question to ask whether one can live in perfect order? And to understand that deeply, not superficially adjusting, arranging, reorganizing, but much more deeply, what is the cause of conflict, division, why human beings, who are supposed to have evolved through thousands and thousands of years, whose brain, that which is within the skull, why there at the very centre there is such disorder. Disorder exists where there is contradiction - right? We are talking over together. Where there is division, where there is the process of duality, opposing elements, opposing desires, contradictory thoughts. This division in which we live, you and I, we and they, this division is the basic cause of disorder. Right? Do we see this? Not merely verbally or intellectually but actually see in ourselves the opposing contradictory pursuits. Where there is love there is also apparently antagonism, hatred, jealousy. Where one wants to live peacefully there is also in us the opposite of that,

violence. Man has lived - human beings have lived on this earth with constant violence. We are as human beings violent, aggressive people. And apparently we have never solved the problem of violence. And probably we are not even aware that we are violent. If we are, as most of us should be, then we pursue a thing that is the opposite of violence, which is called non-violence. That is a fact. And violence has no opposite. It is violence. Even though thought say we must pursue non-violence, live peacefully. So in us there is the dualistic process going on. Agree? Do we see this together? I am violent - will you go into the nature of violence? And at the same time I have an ideal and I pursue that ideal, which is I must not be violent. Or I rationalize my violence, say it is necessary in a world as it is now, socially, morally, religiously and so on, we must be violent, we must be aggressive, we must be ambitious, otherwise we will be destroyed. That is one aspect of the violence. And also we say at the same time, if you are at all slightly aware of what is happening, we say there must also at the same time, or perhaps a little later, be a pursuit of that which is not violent. So there is this dualistic process in us going on all the time - right? We see that? Right? Would you agree to this? Not agree but see the fact of it.

I am glad there are some children here. It is so nice to see children, isn't it? It is beautiful to see children. And unfortunately through education, through the corruptive moral society they are dragged into it, willy nilly through their education, through their social economic environment, they are destroyed. Probably the parents know all this. And they are also in despair, the parents, seeing their own children who were so nice and gentle at the

beginning of life, become gradually violent, conforming to the group, and all the misery of life begins. That is another matter. That is, is it possible to educate children without all the pressures and the ugliness of life on them? The society is too strong, they are sucked into it, because we think society is something different from us. You understand? When you see all this you want to cry. Society is what we have made of it, each one of us, society is not different from us because we have created it. It hasn't come into being miraculously, some strange chance has brought this society about, but that is not a fact. The fact is each one of us who are so confused, uncertain, each one seeking his own security, his own fulfilment, his own ambitions, his own urge to gratify his particular pleasure, desire, we have created this society, we are of it. And we don't seem to realize that unless we, each one of us, radically, deeply change, which we will talk about presently, the society will go on as it is, murderous, divided, creating wars. I am sure you have seen the pictures on television of all the terrible things that wars have brought about. But apparently we are rather indifferent to all that, because inwardly we carry on as we are - confused, contradictory, fragmented, and so we are always contributing to the horror of things that are going on in the world.

We were talking about order. And we said the cause of disorder, which is what is fact, not order, so we must deal with fact, the fact is that we live, each one of us, in disorder, what is the cause of this disorder? Is it division in ourselves? Contradiction in ourselves? Concern with ourselves, we are so self-centred? Our own self-centredness is essentially bringing about disorder. When each one is thinking about himself and from that self-centred activity life

becomes very narrow, small, and that very limited state of brain will inevitably cause division. Right? That is the basic cause of disorder.

And we talked about the other day, and for several days, about the nature of time. Please don't get impatient. We must talk about it again. We said time is the past, time is the future, and that future is now. The future is what you are now. Right? If I am violent now, the future is, tomorrow, or a thousand tomorrows. And if I do not radically change now the future is now - right? Have you understood this thing? Please don't let me talk to myself. We must share this together, it is not my truth and your truth, truth has no person, no path. And this is a fact, this is the truth that all time, the past, the future and the present are contained in the now. It is logical, rational, it is intellectually irrefutable. But you may not like it. And most of us live in like and dislike, we don't want to face something actually, we would rather slur over things. As we are - I hope we are serious people, at least for this morning, which is a tragedy, at least for this morning let us look at this thing together: that time, the past, the present and the future, are in the now.

Suppose one is self-centred, which becomes very, very limited. That self-centredness may identify itself with something greater but it will still be self-centredness - right? You understand? Right sir, come with me, will you? Do we agree to that? If I identify myself with my country, with my nation, with my religion, with my superstitions and so on, that very identification is the continuation of self-centredness - right? I have only used a different set of words, but essentially this identifying process is

self-centredness. Bien? Are we together in this? Right? It is a strange business this, isn't it? Please the speaker is not trying to convince you of anything. On the contrary, doubt, question, discuss, don't accept. But examine with a critical, sharp brain. Which is, one lives in disorder. That is a fact, you can't deny it. You may cover it up, you may run away from it, but we human beings live in disorder - hating, loving, anxious, wanting security, knowing there is insecurity because we live constantly with the threat of war, and also the threat of death. So we live in disorder. Will time solve that disorder? You understand? We have lived on this earth, archeologists and biologists, they say we have lived on this earth for forty five thousand years as human beings walking on two legs, during those long periods of evolution we are now what we are, in conflict, in disorder. Time has not solved that problem - right? This long duration has not solved that problem. So we have to - we may have misunderstood time. That is, we hope another forty thousand years, acquiring great deal of knowledge, ascending through knowledge, we will eventually come out without any conflict, without any disorder. Right? You understand this? So we may have misunderstood the meaning of time, because we rely on time. I have been this, or I am this, give me time to change. And we have had forty thousand or fifty thousand years of time and we are very primitive still. That kind of thinking in time may be wrong - you understand? There may be a new way of looking at it, a new approach to this whole problem. Which is, time is not a duration, a movement from this to that - right? You need time to go from here to your house and so on, but psychologically, inwardly - if you don't like psychology, inwardly, if you don't like that, inside the

skin - we have accepted time as a duration in which we will eventually emerge as human beings who are extraordinarily sane, rational, healthy, no conflict. And time has not shown that. You have had forty thousand years and if you wait another forty thousand years you will be exactly the same. This is logical.

So let's look at the whole meaning of time. Time is the past, the whole content of our consciousness and if you don't like the word consciousness, the whole world of reactions, which is the past. The past with all its memories, inherited, acquired, racial, environmental memories which we have gathered for thousands of years. And that time, that past, is now. You are the past - right? Agree? Oh! Right? You are the past, you are all the accumulated memory of the past, you are memory. That memory needs time to accumulate. And the future, tomorrow, and a thousand tomorrows, is what you are now - clear? Obviously. So the future is now. And is it possible - please understand this - we live in conflict and not allow the old time to interfere but this new sense of all time now. You understand what I am talking about? Do you understand this? I live in disorder - suppose I live in disorder, which I have become aware of. And I say to myself I will gradually work at it, think about it, go into it, which means all time, which is tomorrow - right? I will work at it, go into it, I will explore it, find out the cause of it - right? All that takes time - right? At least please agree to that, see that fact. And I see that is a false way of approaching time so I put that aside completely. Which means I am breaking - the fact is breaking the conditioning of the brain, which has accepted the old pattern of time. You see? You understand this?

I can't go on about it if you don't understand it, it is your

business. I can't keep on repeating this, it rather becomes futile if you don't see it after many explanations. So as I have put aside the old way of thinking in terms of time, I now look at time as it is. All time is now. Either I change completely now, which is to uncondition the brain, which has been accustomed to the old time, and I break that because I see the fact and the falseness of it. And in that very perception I have brought - there has been a radical change, which is, I must in the very perception act instantly. You understand this? I act without time, which is the thinking process doesn't take place. Vous avez compris? Oh gosh!

I will go into it. It is very fascinating this, if you go into it. Time - thought is time - right? Agree? Do you see that fact, that thought is time? Because thought is the accumulated response of memory. That memory has been accumulating through time, that memory is the outcome of knowledge. To accumulate knowledge you need time - right? You need time to accumulate knowledge. You are not paying attention sir. I don't want to waste your time or my time. So please kindly pay attention, if you want to.

We said time is necessary to accumulate memory. Time is necessary to accumulate knowledge and knowledge comes from the accumulation of experience - right? Experience is limited, so knowledge is limited, and memory is limited, so thought is limited. Now I said thought is time. And if we exercise time, which is thought, to change what I am now it will be futile - you understand? But if I see - if there is perception, not I see, if there is a perception of the fact that all time is contained in the now, then what takes place? You understand the proposition? I am violent, I live in disorder and I perceive that disorder. And I also see the fact,

the truth, that all time is now, so my perception must be so acute, so clear, and that clarity is not the product of time. So we must discuss what is perception. What is it to see clearly? - not only ourselves as we are, but also to see what is happening clearly in the world. What is happening clearly in the world is this extension of division - nations, religions, sects, gurus, and so on, the whole lot of them, politically, religiously, though they talk about peace, unity, they want them all to join their unity - you understand? I won't go into all that.

So outwardly there is this immense disorder, and the ultimate expression of that disorder is war, killing each other. And we also live in disorder. And that disorder is brought about through time, we have lived with it for centuries, so time in the old sense is not going to solve it. So what is perception? Can you see something very clearly if you have prejudice? Obviously not. Right? If you are personal - I get hurt, please don't tell me anything. My opinions are so strong, I have thought this out and I stick to what I have thought out. All these factors, which are personal, not objective, clear, they prevent perception. Right? It is like putting on coloured glasses. Your lenses, photographic lenses, they take the picture in and print it on the film, but if the film retains the pictures it cannot see any more - right? It cannot take any more pictures. Have you understood this? It is a simple fact. So what we do is retain it, which is you can't see any more. But if you retain, look at it and put it back, finish with it. That means you have to have a very clear, strong active brain, so that there is no personal prejudice, no attachment to a thing. When there is such perception, that perception is not a factor of time, and therefore when there is

disorder you see it instantly, the cause, and all the rest of it is division, there is the ending of it immediately, which does not mean that it will continue again and pop up the next day. When once you see a danger, a poisonous snake, you don't play with it. That is the end of it. But we don't see the danger because we are so prejudiced, we are so narrow minded, our own concern.

So disorder can only end not tomorrow, now. As you are sitting there, observe your own disorder, see whether you can see that disorder, perceive it clearly, with all the ramifications of that disorder. When you perceive it completely there is the end of it. And that perception is not possible if you are prejudiced, if you are personal.

And we ought also to talk over together the question of fear. I am sure this will interest you. What we have said may be what you may consider, all that has been said, really very intellectual. I know you will say this. It is not intellectual. Intellect is necessary, as emotions are necessary, but when one predominates the other then the trouble begins.

So we ought to talk over together fear. Together - you understand? Explore together what is the cause, what is the nature, whether it can end completely. Or must we carry on for the rest of the human existence living in fear? If one is aware at all, conscious, we have many, many fears. Fear of darkness, fear of living, fear of public opinion, fear what my neighbour might say, fear of my wife or husband or the girl or the man, fear of insecurity, fear when you have security economically fear that you might lose it, fear - we have got so many fears. Why haven't we solved these fears? You have solved the problem of war - that is to

continue war, and you have applied your brain to prepare for war. All the vast generals on both sides, or a thousand sides, they are all preparing for war, plans, submarines, airplanes, - all the rest of it. They have exercised their brain to produce all that. And why hasn't that same brain applied, apply to this enormous sense of fear man has from the beginning of days - why? Which means why have you and the speaker not gone into this question seriously, as you do go very seriously when you are hungry, when you are ambitious, when you want more money, you work at it. Why have we not gone into this question of fear? The psychologists, the therapists, have explained the causes of it, in different ways. If we could put aside all that they have said, because after all it is all what they have said, it may be merely verbal. They might be as scared as you - probably they are! I met several of them, I know they are scared like you, about something or other. And why have we not solved this question? And is it possible to end the fear? We are going to go into that. Apply not only your feelings, your emotions and your brain to work at this, not escape from it, not try to rationalize it but to see why we are incapable, or allowed ourselves to become incapable.

What is fear? And you know when there is fear, the nature of it, how it throbs, how your physical organism shrinks, how your brain becomes addled, almost paralysed. Don't you know all this? Am I describing something abnormal? It is a fact. It affects your sleep, it affects your daily life, it brings suspicion, anxiety, depression and you cling to something and hope that won't change, and that won't bring fear. Either we deal with the root of fear, or we trim the branches of fear - right? Right sir? Which do you want to do? Trim

the branches of fear - please one is asking this seriously, don't neglect what the speaker is asking. Do you want to deal with the branches of fear? There are a thousand fears. Like a lovely tree - a tree, which is the most beautiful thing, one of the most beautiful things on earth, it has got many branches, many leaves; likewise fears, which is so ugly, it has also got many branches, many leaves, many expressions. Do you want to deal with that, the expressions, the surface, outside? Or do we go together into the root of it? Personally, the speaker doesn't want to trim the branches, which is so futile. So let's together find out what is the cause of fear. We know all the expressions of fear. So if we can find the root of it the expressions can wither away. So what is the cause, or causation of fear.

If one asks you that question: what is the cause? - would you answer it? The cause? Or do you expect someone to explain the cause of it? The explanation is not the fact - right? You may paint a marvellous picture of the mountain, hung in all the museums of the world, but that picture is not the mountain. The word, fear, is not fear - right? But the word 'fear', may evoke fear. So we are not dealing with the description, with the word, but the depth and the strength of fear. And we are trying to find together, not I explain, you accept but together find out for ourselves so it is you discover it, therefore it is your truth not somebody else's truth. You can't live with someone else's truth, you can only live with truth. So what is the cause of it? The cause of it - I will go into it. Is it thought? Is it time? Is it thought? Let's look at it. I am living - one is living now. And thought says, "I might die tomorrow", or "I might lose my job", "I have my money in the Bank, but the Bank

may fail", "I am all right with my wife but she may turn to somebody tomorrow", "I have printed a book and I hope it will be a great success', which means fear. "I want to be known" - which is the most childish thing in the world - 'I want to be known and somebody is known already much more than I am'. So there is this thinking, that is, thinking I might lose, I might gain, I might be lonely. So thinking is one of the factors of fear - right? I am all right with my friends, with my wife and my children but I also know, I have experienced this sense of desperate loneliness. Don't you know it? A sense of deep frightening loneliness. And I am frightened. Have you ever examined what loneliness is? Why it has its cause? Don't you know - don't you have this feeling of loneliness? Am I talking something, saying something abnormal? Eh? You must all be saints. Sir, what is this loneliness which causes - you understand sir? - which causes attachment, holding on to something however illusory, however false, however meaningless. I hold on to my wife. I hold on to my club, to my god, to my ritual, to my friends because if I let go I am utterly lonely. Have you ever gone into that question: why human beings are so frightened of loneliness? They may live with a group, they may follow some guru and all the rest of that nonsense but strip them of all their decoration and they are what they are, lonely. Why? Why are they, what is loneliness? Not to have any relationship with anything, with nature, with another, with the friend or woman or the man with whom I have lived, all that somehow has withdrawn, I am left utterly empty, lonely - why? What is this feeling of utter despair? I will explain but the explanation is not the fact. The word is not the thing. If that

becomes very clear that the word is not the thing, you Mr. Smith is not Mr. Smith, the word is not you, when you say, 'My wife', or 'My husband', that is - you understand? I am glad you understand that at least.

So explanation is not the reality, the truth. So look at it, let's look at it without the word, without the word 'loneliness'. Can you do it? To look at that feeling without using the word 'lonely', or 'despair'. Loneliness comes when all our days are spent in self-centredness. The very activity of self-centredness is producing loneliness - right? Because it is narrowing my whole, or the vast extraordinary existence of life into a small little me. And when one realizes that there is that feeling, "My god, how lonely I am". And to face it, to be with it completely, not move away from it, then there is a radical change.

So we must come back to this question of fear. We said thought is one of the causes of fear, obviously. I am thinking about death because I am an old man, or young, or you see some hearse going by with all the flowers, horses, cars. What a civilized country this is, with all the noise of death. And I see thought is one of the causes of death - one of the causes of fear - right? Do you see this? An obvious fact, right? Right sirs? And also time is a factor of fear - right? I am afraid what might happen. I am afraid of something I have done which others are using as a blackmail, you follow? I am afraid of that. So time and thought are the root of fear. Time and thought. There is no division between thought and time, thought is time - right?

Now the problem is - I am sorry, I won't use the word problem. The question is: thought is necessary, time is necessary - right? To

go from here to there time is necessary. And thought is necessary to drive a car, to take a bus, take the train. Thought is necessary, time is necessary at that level. Right? Now I am saying as thought and time are the root of fear, is thought and time necessary? Vous avez compris? There it is necessary. But psychologically is thought and time necessary? Right? Is it? As long as time and thought, if you think are necessary, in the psychological world, in the world of the self, in the world of psyche, in the world of inside the skin, then you will be perpetually in fear - right? If you perceive that, if there is perception that thought is the root of fear and time, perception, not acceptance, then thought and time are necessary at the physical level, inwardly it is not necessary, therefore you are watching them. You are watching, the brain is actively watching itself every minutes to see that thought and time do not enter into its realm. This requires - you understand? - this requires great attention, awareness, so that the brain, which has accumulated fear for centuries, or for one day, that brain sees where it is necessary, where it is not necessary, therefore it is watching like a hawk so that thought and time doesn't enter into the whole process of living. You understand? This is real discipline, this is learning. As we explained the other day, discipline means, the root meaning of that word is disciple, the disciple is one who learns, who is learning all the time, he never says, "I have learnt" and stays. The brain is watching itself all the time so that it is active, so there is no time for it to move or to change. You have understood something? It is now quarter to twelve, we must stop.

You see sirs, and ladies, our difficulty is, we listen to a lot of things, we know a great deal, we have searched, asked, read, we

have sought the advice of others, we have wandered the earth to find out, to find out what it is all about, but we never ask of ourselves, we never demand of ourselves serious, deep questions. We always ask superficial questions. And so we make our life very superficial. But if you asked questions, questions that demand answers from yourself so that you exercise your brain, your feelings, your whole attention is given to that question, then you begin to discover for yourself without being told by anybody, including the speaker. And so when there is freedom from fear you don't want gods, you don't want anything from anybody in the world, then you are really a free man.

SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1984

May we continue where we left off on Sunday?

We have been talking about various issues and problems of life, like fear, relationship and the conflicts that one has in our daily life. Why is it, if one asks oneself, that we have always problems - problems of relationship, economic problems, social problems, individual problems? We seem to be living with so many, many problems and we never are able to solve any of them. In the solution of one we seem to bring about many other problems. Until we die we seem to be living with so many issues, so many unresolved crises and so on. If one is at all aware, at all concerned with our daily life, can one ask why we have these problems? Why we live with so many issues, so many demands, so many unresolved problems all our life? Is it our brains are conditioned to problems? From childhood, through school, college, university, if one is going through that process, every level of education has conditioned the brain to problems: mathematical problems, problems of skill, problems of various disciplines that one goes through. Is it that our brains are conditioned from the very beginning of our life? We have problems, and the brain has been conditioned to resolving problems - right? So our brain is conditioned to problems - right? We are talking over together, the speaker is not instructing. The speaker is not informing, so this is not a lecture but rather we are together taking a journey, taking a journey, not only as we have done in the outward world, but also deeply inwardly, psychologically. And to take that journey we must both go together. So you are also taking that journey, not just

the speaker. So we are together going into these questions. So the speaker is not an authority but rather as two friends talking over their many, many problems of their life. And that is what we are doing together.

We are asking why we have never resolved any of our problems? Is it because our brain itself is conditioned to the resolution of problems, And therefore the brain itself is not free of problems? It is only a brain that is free that can solve problems. But if the brain itself is conditioned and therefore it itself has become a problem, therefore whatever problems arise it never solves them. And we are asking why? Why is the brain - or if you do not like the word brain, why is it our consciousness, which we shall talk about presently, why is our consciousness so entangled, so many issues, and when our consciousness, which is what we are, is such a complex entity, then that very complexity cannot solve anything. Right? It is a simple fact.

And we are asking can that consciousness, can that psyche, be ever free? Because life has problems. Life is constantly throwing up problems and if the brain, consciousness, our whole nature, is not free then we shall never be able to resolve any problems - clear? Are we listening to each other? Do you, if I may ask as a friend asking you, do you ever listen completely, wholly, as you now are sitting there, or walking in a wood together, do you ever listen wholly, or only partially? If one is listening partially, in a state of distraction, then you do not give your whole attention to listening. Do you ever listen completely to your wife or husband? Or you already know what she is going to say, or he is going to say? Because we have lived with her, or him, and so on and so you

have got used to her voice, or his voice, his usage of words, his repetitive responses, so you almost know what he is going to say before he begins to speak. Are we like that? Will you listen to the speaker? Not that you have heard of him before, but for the first time you are listening to him - have you ever tried it? To listen to a bird warbling in the night, or in the early morning? Have you ever listened to the whisper of leaves? Have you listened or looked at the clouds floating in a blue sky?

So listening is an art. It is a great art. When you listen so attentively, fully, there is no barrier because you are then giving your whole attention to what you are listening to? It is only when there is inattention, when there is only a partial listening, then communication between you and another ceases.

So can we learn together the art of listening? The art of listening. The art of not only hearing with the outer ear but also listening to the inward ear. Not only to yourself, to hear your own reactions, your own responses, but also listen to what another is saying, so that your own reactions and what you are hearing coincide, there is no division. That's a great art to learn. When you listen to classical music, Beethoven, or Mozart, or Bach and so on, when you so completely listen, not remembering that you have heard it before, and going back to all the romantic pleasures that you have had when you listened, but actually listening now. That, as we said, is an art, like seeing is an art; seeing the clouds, the train going by, the beauty of a great cloud. When there is that total perception of beauty there is no self intervening, the self, the consciousness with all its problems. So where there is the art of listening and the art of seeing, this beauty, or the sound of a train

rattling by, listening so completely, then there is no self at all. You are just listening, seeing. This is not something romantic, but if you do it actually then you will see how simple it all is.

So we are asking - (Noise of airplane) - listen to that sound! The thunder of that aeroplane. When you are really listening, then you are not, are you?

So let's go back. We have to investigate (noise of plane) - when you are listening to that aeroplane completely there is no resistance to that sound: when there is resistance, or defensive process, then the self comes into being - right? (Noise, laughter)

We were talking about problems and whether the brain can be free from problems itself so that it will solve problems. To understand that we must go into the question of consciousness. Consciousness, you may not like to use that word consciousness. There are some psychologists objecting to that word. If you object to that word there are all the reactions, biological, emotional, intellectual reactions. These reactions are registered in the brain, recorded in the brain, so the reactions, biological, which is physical, emotional, intellectual, all those reactions are contained in the brain, recorded in the brain. If you have pain, it is recorded. The records, the memories, are part of the consciousness. And that consciousness is your beliefs, your reactions, your faith, your fears, anxieties, suspicions, depressions, loneliness, pain, pleasure, sorrow, and all the imaginative romantic concepts of god, universe, all that is what you are. Right? All that is your consciousness. So our consciousness is perpetually in conflict with its own reactions - right? Are you following this? Obviously. Need I go into all that?

One desire opposing other desires. One opinion against another

opinion, one conclusion changing later to another conclusion. One puts aside one belief and takes on another belief - right? One pleasure and the boredom with that pleasure, and demanding another pleasure. So our brain is constantly in a turmoil - right? That is a fact. Nobody can deny that. So our consciousness, what we are, each one, is the whole content of our consciousness - right? What you have learnt, whether it be skills, what one has accumulated scientifically, what one has accumulated as knowledge, as experience, all that is you. Your soul, if you believe in souls, or if you are an Asiatic you believe in some other form of belief, and so on - right? Are we clear on this matter?

So what is this consciousness which is so specialized as yours - right? Do you understand my question? You say, "It is my consciousness, not yours. I suffer and that suffering is me, mine. Pleasure, it is my pleasure, my dogma, and that dogma may be shared by millions, or thousands, but it is still mine." - Right? Now we are going to question whether it is yours at all. We are educated both biologically, socially, religiously, to think that we are totally separate from another - right? You are a man, another is a woman, child and an old man just one foot in the grave, there is that difference. But in consciousness, are we different? You understand my question? Please give your consideration to this. Don't just listen. I am questioning therefore you are going to wait for an answer but together we are sharing this question. We have so far accepted that our consciousness, our intelligence, our feelings, our concepts are all mine, are me. And the speaker and you are questioning that fact. That means you are enquiring into it with scepticism, with doubt.

When you go all round the world, various parts of tiny hamlets, fairly large villages, and great towns of the world, you there find all human beings suffer, they all laugh, they all shed tears, like you, they all have their troubles, and they all have their own feelings, like you. They may not be sophisticated, not learned, not know what the world is, but they all have fears, anxieties, depressions, this sense of deep loneliness, sorrow, and hoping there is something beyond all this misery, and having their own gods, like you have your own gods. So this consciousness - please don't accept what the speaker is saying, question it, doubt it, but move - so this consciousness, as we think it is ours, is shared by all human beings - right? Shared by everybody on earth.

So this consciousness is common to all of us. Clear? The sequence of that, that all our consciousness, the feelings, the responses, however subtle, however gross, however crude, is shared by every human being on this earth. So it is not my consciousness, it is not your consciousness - right? This is where you are going to not accept. Therefore we are not individuals. Do you accept that? Do you see that? See it logically first. Logic is necessary. Reason is necessary. Logic, step by step, investigating reasonably step by step, as we have done. And when you realize that, the fact, not supposition, or romantic ideal, but the fact that we all share this, we all stand on the same ground. We all have the same movement of pain, sorrow, pleasure, depression, anxiety. When you see the truth of it and feel the reality of it, then you are all humanity. You are all humanity, you are not separate and say, "I am a Swiss, I have my own peculiar upbringing" - of course you have peculiar upbringing, you are surrounded by these marvellous

mountains, prosperous, well fed, educated - quotes - perhaps a boy living in a small village far away in a foreign country, he may not be educated, he may be just living, struggling, having one meal a day, but he thinks like you, thinks. Thinking is common to all of us. Expression of that thinking may be different. If you are a poet, you might write a poem. If you are a painter you might do this and that. But thinking is common to all of us.

So if you see the truth of it, the depth of it, the feeling of it, the subtlety of it, then you realize you are humanity and therefore you have tremendous responsibility, you cannot kill another because then you are killing yourself.

So in understanding this consciousness, which is, as we said, the whole past memories, the experiences with their knowledge stored in the brain as memory, this memory, not the expression of that memory, is common. You remember the way to your house, so does the man in that little village thousands of miles away remember from his field to his cottage. So we are asking: as long as that consciousness, which is stored in the brain as reactions and so on, as long as that brain is in a state of turmoil, a state of problems, it can never solve any problem. It is only a free brain not hindered, not limited, only such a brain can solve problems.

So we are asking ourselves whether that brain, that consciousness, with all its content - right? - the content makes consciousness. If there was no content consciousness may not be as we know it now. Clear? Am I - is the speaker putting lots of things in one talk? If I am, I am sorry. That is the way it is. Because we are going to, if we have time, go into sorrow, passion, which is different from lust and what is sorrow. And also, if we have time

this morning, we must investigate into the whole immense question of death. Because we have only one more talk, next Thursday.

So we are asking whether this consciousness, with its content, can ever be free, not consciousness but the brain which holds this consciousness - right? This brain which retains all the memories, the past, the present and the future, which holds - can that brain, can that consciousness be thoroughly empty? You understand my question? Please ask that question of yourself. (Noise of train, whistling). That train has never whistled before, probably it is encouraging us! And when we are asking this question: whether the content of the brain, not the knowledge and the skill of daily life but all the psychological retentions, the recording, can totally be free? This is a really very, very serious question, because we have lived with this consciousness for forty or fifty thousand years. And we have invented all kinds of gods, all kinds of saviours, all kinds of religious books, from the ancient Egyptians to the present day. And so we have not only to consider whether it is possible for the brain to retain knowledge in the area that is necessary and not hold it in any other area, which is the psychological, that state of the psyche which remembers, which contains all the past and the present - right?

So to go into that we must also consider time, time as forty five thousand years until now, that immense duration of time. And also during that long period of time there have been many gods, many scriptures, many expressions of cruelty, wars, despair, tears, laughter, anxiety, insecurity. And that is what we are. That is, the past is contained in the present. That is clear. The past is in the present. And the future is in the present. Because we have had forty

five thousand years, we will have another forty five thousand years unless we fundamentally change now - right? This is logical.

So is it possible for this consciousness to cease entirely, with all its troubles, turmoils, and all the rest of it? Otherwise if there is no cessation of all that you will be tomorrow, or a thousand tomorrows, exactly, modified, what you are now. Clear? Right? So that is death. We will go into it much more.

We ought to go into the question now of what is love, what is compassion, and what is sorrow with its pain. Mankind, from the beginning of time, has shed tears. They have killed each other, perhaps a few at a time, with an arrow or with a club, with a sword and thousands and millions of people have suffered, shed tears, they have lost their sons, their husbands, their lovers and all the rest of that. Man has been like this from the beginning and during forty, fifty thousand years we are still going on, the same as before, only now we have marvellous means of destroying millions of people at one blow. We have progressed immensely - right? And this is called progress. So during all those forty five thousand years mankind has shed tears, sorrow, they have lost their sons, their husbands, their wives, destroyed great cities and built new cities on the old site and so on. So mankind, human beings, have suffered immensely and we are still suffering immensely. This is not romanticism, this is not emotionalism, this is a fact. And we are not stopping at all, we are going on along the same road, the same movement. And we are crying. And so mankind has suffered immensely as we are suffering now. There is no single human being on this earth who has not suffered, either physically, biologically or emotionally or intellectually. (Noise of airplanes) -

they seem to love us, don't they!

And we have never asked or enquired if there is an end to sorrow. And instead of asking, demanding that question, we have said someone else will suffer for us, as the Christians do, and the Asiatics, including primarily the Indians, they said it is part of Karma - you know the Sanskrit word, which means Karma, the root meaning of that word is to act. What you sow you reap, whether in this life or the next life. That is their idea. What you sow, what you are now, you will be next life, perhaps slightly modified, next life. So we have taken comfort in theories, in speculations, in faith, in the next life and so on and so on, but we have never faced the thing, we have never stayed with the thing. One has never said "I suffer, I will live with it and find out why I suffer." - not escape from it, not run away, not seeking any form of comfort. That means suffering is like a jewel, a great jewel. You know if you have a great jewel in your hand, you look at it, you marvel at it, you see the beauty of it, how it is set, in platinum, gold, silver, with such delicacy, such refinement, with such beauty, you hold it and look, never want to run away from it. In the same way if one can hold that thing, sorrow. Not get morbid, not run away from it, just to hold it and look at it, not as an observer looking at it. Some years ago a friend had a most extraordinary jewel. It was one of the most beautiful jewels and he said, "Hold it for a minute." I held it, the speaker held it and looked at it. It was really the most extraordinary thing, very ancient, very rich and valuable, priceless. And it was something outside of you. That jewel is not part of you, it is there, like that watch, like that microphone, like that camera. But sorrow is you, you are not

separate from sorrow - right? You are sorrow. But we say, "How am I to be free of it?" Therefore the moment you say, "How am I to be free of it?", you separate yourself from the fact that you are sorrow. You understand this?

When you get angry, or greedy, you are greedy, aren't you? You are not separate from greed, you are greed. But to say, "I must get rid of greed." Or, "I must hold greed", or "It's..." and so on. You understand? The moment you separate yourself from the feeling, from the pain, from anxiety, then that separation causes conflict - right? So sorrow is you - your self pity, your sense of loss, your sense of loneliness, your sense of failure, your sense of remorse, regret, guilt and all the rest of it. The sense of great loss of someone whom you have so-called loved. And when we separate that sorrow from you, thinking you are different from sorrow, then you want to escape from it, seek comfort from it, but when you are that, because you are that, then you hold it, without any movement away from it, hold it without any thought interfering with it. You are just watching. Then you will see, if you give your whole attention to it, that sorrow ends, never to return again.

With the ending of sorrow there is passion, there is energy, incalculable energy, which is passion. Lust is a passing thing, to be repeated. But passion can never be repeated, it is there because there was the ending of sorrow. And most of us have not this passion because most of us are caught in pleasure.

So with the ending of sorrow there is love. If you are suffering, not only physically but inwardly more, how can you love another? You can have pity, you can have sympathy, you can be kind, generous, but that is not love, but love includes all that. Because

we have said we must go into this question of what is love.

It is not only the ending of sorrow but also the ending of jealousy, the ending of ambition - listen to it, please listen - ending of ambition. How can you love another, or have love in your heart, if you are becoming ambitious, if you are ambitious to achieve, to fulfil, whether in the physical world or in the psychological world. When you are ambitious to become enlightened - such a silly statement. When you meditate, as some of you - probably many people who talk about meditation, they are ambitious because they want to get somewhere. And therefore those people have no love at all because they are still thinking about their own gain.

So is it possible to have this extraordinary perfume where there is no jealousy, no comparison, no state of antagonism and so on? Where there is love, that love, there is compassion. That is, compassion can only be when there is freedom from sorrow. Can you become passionate when you belong to a country, to a religion, to a group, to a sect, when you are a leader, when you are a guru? You understand all this? And where there is that compassion there is intelligence.

We ought to really go into this question of intelligence. Intelligence is different from interest. Intelligence is different entirely from the activity of thought which has become very clever. One can be extraordinarily clever in manipulating people and call it love - right? You understand this? Have you ever enquired into what is intelligence? You need a great deal of intelligence to put together a motor - right? You need a great deal of intelligence involving perhaps three hundred thousand people to go up to the moon. You need astonishing clever intelligence to create neutron

bombs, to build a submarine, to build aeroplanes, but that intelligence is limited - right? It can be mechanical, that is, born of memory, knowledge, experience and thought has its own activity which it calls intelligence - right? But that intelligence is limited because thought is limited. We went into the question of thought. That is, thought is based on memory, memory is the accumulation of knowledge and knowledge is the outcome of experience. And we have had thousands and thousands, perhaps millions of experiences, human beings, but there are more experiences to be had. Therefore every experience stored becomes knowledge and therefore that knowledge is limited. It is clear. And that limited knowledge is retained in the brain as memory and the response of memory is thought. Therefore thought is ever limited. You can imagine a limitless state but it is still limited. You can imagine god to be all powerful, all mercy, all this and all that, but it is still limited. So intelligence is something entirely different. It comes where there is love and compassion. That intelligence is rational, sane, healthy, not limited. And is it possible for us human beings, living on this earth, doing our daily tiresome, boring, or fascinating jobs, to be compassionate, have this extraordinary perfume of love? And where that is there is supreme intelligence.

It is time to stop. So we will have to discuss the question of death and the immense significance of death, and the strength of death, which is as strong as love. And also we will also have to talk over together, on Thursday morning, the day after tomorrow morning, what is religion, and what is meditation. The speaker puts death, religion and meditation at the end of the talks, because in the last five talks, and including this talk, we have laid the foundation.

And without that foundation well established, strongly built, which means having no fear, having no illusions, having this relationship with another without conflict, the ending of sorrow, that is the foundation, then only we can go into the question of what is meditation, not how to meditate but the actuality of meditation, the actuality of a religious life, and the great significance of death.

May I get up please?

SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1984

May we continue with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? This is the last talk.

We have been talking about the whole problem of existence, the various aspects of our daily life. We talked about relationship, we talked about fear, pleasure and the endless suffering of man, and whether there is any possibility of being totally free of fear. We went into that very carefully. And also we talked about knowledge, how important it is to have knowledge which is gathered through experience, stored, as knowledge, and memory in the brain, out of which comes thought, which naturally then is limited. We went into all that during the last five talks. And as this is the last talk we ought to talk over together why the brain is always occupied.

We were asking why our brain, which has evolved through a long period of time, forty five to fifty thousand years, during all that long duration of time the brain has apparently been occupied, never quiet, endless series of occupation, associations, one thought leading to another thought, this endless chain. We have accepted it as natural, as part of our daily life. We are going together to question this. As we said, one hopes you will not mind the thing being repeated, we are not doing any kind of propaganda, propagate any kind of belief, faith, or some philosophy. But rather you and the speaker are going together into the investigation of our daily life. (Noise of planes) - I am afraid we will have to wait for a little while. Let the aeroplanes have their fun!

We have talked about a great many things. We are together going into very complex problems this morning: why human

beings have not been able to live at peace within themselves and so peace with the world. Why our daily life is in such confusion, conflict and misery and sometimes joy, why is it, after all these thousands of years, man has not found the tranquillity, a sense of quietness, peace? All this requires a great deal of intelligence, to live at peace with one another and also within oneself, and so with the neighbour, or with one's own intimate relationships. We have not been able to find out why we have not lived at peace. We have talked about it, why human beings are always in conflict, whether that conflict can end, not only outwardly, wars, divisions of nationalities, divisions of religion, divisions, linguistic differences, semantic differences and the various qualities of the brain which breaks up everything into categories and so on. Is it possible, living in this modern world, with all the complexity of it, having to earn a livelihood from nine o'clock until five o'clock, spending one's whole life in an office, in a laboratory or in a factory, or ploughing the fields, and at the end of it all there is death. (Noise of planes) I am afraid we will have to wait. That one ends, the other begins!

We are going to enquire into all this together, as we has done, one hopes, during the last five talks. We are going to enquire together why human beings not only are not capable of living at peace with themselves and with the world, but also why human beings from childhood get hurt, psychologically wounded. This question is very important because that affects our whole life from childhood, through school, through college, university, or at home with other boys and girls that the whole process of living engenders, brings about various forms of psychological hurts which act as a shock to the brain, and so we become neurotic. And

whether it is possible to live without a single hurt. When one is hurt it not only emphasizes the whole self-centred activity but also it breeds fear. When one is hurt one builds a wall, a structure, a barrier between yourself and another. And so gradually one withdraws, one becomes isolated with all its problems of identification and so on. I wonder - one wonders if one is aware of the hurts we have. And if one is, apparently we never end it, there is no ending of hurts completely. What is it that is being hurt? Please, as we said, we are together investigating this problem. Together. The speaker may point out or verbalize or act as a mirror in which one sees oneself, and so the speaker is not a guru, you are not his followers. There is no personality cult - which are all horrible things. So together we are looking at this question. It is your question. It is not a question the speaker is imposing on you. Every human being gets hurt psychologically, wounded. And one carries it throughout life. One never sees the danger, the disastrous results. And is it possible to end all hurts, and never to be hurt again? What is it that is hurt? When you say, "I am hurt" - what is that 'I', what is that quality of the entity that gets hurt? Right? We are together? Are we understanding each other?

Suppose I am hurt, why am I hurt? What is the entity, the structure, that gets hurt? And we call it, "I am hurt". What is that "I"? Is it not the various incidents, experiences, the memories, that have created an image about oneself? Please look at it carefully and not reject what one is saying, though one must have doubt, have scepticism, questioning, not accepting anything that the speaker is saying, one must have the quality of doubt. Therefore we are asking: what is it that is hurt? Is it the image that

you have about yourself? That image has been put together by various impressions, pressures, it is like a computer programmed. And that image gets hurt - right? And so we say, "I am hurt".

Can one - this is the question - can one live a life, daily life, not some romantic, ideological, sentimental life but actually in our daily life live without a single image about ourselves? It is only when there is that image, then that image, that picture that has been put together by thought and that gets hurt. When someone says, flatters or insults or praises and so on, why does the brain record? You understand my question? Is it too difficult? No, no it is very simple. Is it possible not to record? Psychologically, of course you must have a recording process going on when you are driving a car, or so many physical things that one does, there you must have a machine that is constantly recording. And in the psyche, the whole nature of the 'me', need there be any recording in that world? You understand? So is it possible not to record? We are going to find that out, if you are interested. Even if you are not interested, it doesn't matter. Because we have never asked of ourselves, or demanded, whether there is a possibility of being totally free, not only from a particular aspect of life - from our sorrow, from our anxiety, from our loneliness and so on, that is only very superficial - freedom to go where you like, to choose any particular job you want but to be entirely free, totally. It is only when the brain is not recording, except in the physical world. In the psychological world, in the world of inside the skin, not to record; that requires tremendous attention, awareness - which we are going to talk about presently.

And we ought to talk over together a very complex problem

which mankind has faced for thousands upon thousands of years. Though it is a beautiful morning full of light and splendour, the beauty of the hills and the dark shadows of the valley, we ought to talk over this question, which is not morbid, which is death. Right? This is part of our life, as anxiety, loneliness, fear and all the toil and turmoil and conflict of life, death is also part of our life. Whether one is very young, enjoying life, or middle aged or old aged, this is a problem which each human being has to face. We are all going to die, that is certain, that is one thing that is absolute. So we are going to enquire together into the complexity of what it means to die. You don't mind discussing this? All right? If you don't like it, lump it! (Laughter).

Why is it that human beings are so frightened of death? Why is it that human beings have put death as far away as possible from their life? Why is it that death seems to appear such a terrible thing? Books have been written by doctors and others, how to die happily. I saw - one saw a title of that book, it is quite well known in America, "How To Die with Grace", with happiness, relaxed. (Laughter)

So we are going to talk over together this question. Have you ever enquired into what it is to end? What is the significance of ending something? Ending, not a continuity, you understand? We are used to, or have been conditioned to a continuity - right? To continue. What does that mean, to continue? A long duration of continuous memory - right? Continuous attachment to a place, to a person, to an idea. Has one ever experimented completely ending with an ideal? - and not, what will happen if I end? You understand? You have understood? The question of ending is very

important to understand. Ending a habit, both biological or psychological habits. If you end then we ask, "What is there more?" Which means you are still thinking in terms of continuity - right? If I end anger, or selfishness, what is there? Right? So our brain is always looking to something else if I end. Bien? And we have never therefore, ended anything completely. Understood?

Can we go on? So if one understands the nature of ending, and the urge, the desire, to continue, when there is the desire to continue, then there is the fear of ending - right? If one understands the ending and therefore no continuity, then there is no fear. You understand all this? Are we thinking together? Actually thinking together, not accepting what the speaker is saying, that is not important. But putting our minds, brains, together. Not your brain and my brain, but the quality of brain that thinks, the quality of brain that says, "I must go and enquire, find out." The quality of brain that doubts, questions, asks, then we are together. Then our brains are meeting each other, therefore communication between each other becomes very easy, simple. Right? Are we doing this? Half and half. And that is where our difficulty lies. Some people here - I am not being disrespectful to them - they have listened to all this for years, probably bored, knowing what he is going to say. They have become accustomed to the words. But have they really... are we together learning? Not memorizing - see the difference? We memorize, we are educated to memorize, so as to be able to use skilfully our knowledge. We memorize lessons - French, Russian, whatever language - we memorize various historical processes, we memorize scientific facts - right? We accumulate knowledge to act skilfully in any field. But learning is a movement that is like a river

that is flowing, never static. Knowledge is static because you are adding more and more and more. Learning is like a great river that has got tremendous volume behind it, moving swiftly, rapidly, nothing stands in its way. That is the act of learning. So are we learning together? Or our brains have been programmed like a computer. It is rather interesting to talk about the computers. You don't mind?

They are doing the most extraordinary things in the world of computers. The speaker has discussed with many of them, so called top ones. And those computers can almost do anything that the human thought does. They have been programmed by top mathematicians, biologists, scientists, engineers, taking any particular subject and a professor who is top in his profession giving a programme - right? You know all about this. Our brain has been programmed too. You are programmed after two thousand years to call yourself a Christian, belief - right? The Hindus, perhaps three to five thousand years, have been programmed to believe - you know the whole process. And the Islamic world too, programmed - you understand? And the computer is being programmed, ultra mechanical intelligence, it is called. And it can almost outthink man, more rapidly. They have discovered in America a chip that holds a million memories. And so what is going to happen to man, to your brain? You understand my question? If a mechanical thing can outdo man, except in certain realms - I won't go into all that, you can study it - what is going to happen to man, to you, to your children, to your grandchildren, what is going to happen to them? When the mechanical intelligence can outstrip man, in certain ways, it can

build cars through robots, there is going to be certain unemployment and so on and so on and so on. Then what will happen to the human brain that has been active - you understand? Active in doing certain things, carpentry, mathematics, putting machinery together and so on, which computer and a robot can do all that - you are following all this? - what is going to happen to our brains? We asked this question to computer experts. Their reply is, "We don't care. We don't know." And that doesn't matter. What their interest is, is inventing. Getting more and more. The computers do all kinds of things.

Please do listen, seriously listen, it is not a joke, a game we are playing. Either the entertainment industry - sports and so on and so on and so on, including religion, which is all entertainment industry - either the brain is going to be caught in that - if you have noticed how entertainment is growing more and more and more, the children want to be entertained - either the brain is going to be caught in that, everlastingly seeking entertainment, or it is going to turn inwardly, not selfishly, not in the world of self-centredness, that is a very small affair, but going much more deeply. The brain has extraordinary capacity, as is shown in the technological world, and that same brain can watch and go very, very deeply, and that depth is infinite. So you are faced with this.

So let's come back. What is death? As we said, if we understand deeply the meaning of ending and the nature of continuity, which all of us want because we think in continuity there is safety, security - right? Right sirs? Being identified with a country, having roots in a certain place, or attached to some symbol, ideal and so on, which is a series of continuities. Hoping to find in that security,

and so we cling to continuity. And that very continuity is bringing about great disaster because it is bringing wars - right? We cling to democracy - whatever that may mean - and also there is the whole group of Russian totalitarian states, we are the managers of human beings, we control them - right? Dictatorship and all the rest of the horrors that are going on. So where is security? Do you understand the question? We have sought security in the family, in the wife, in the husband, in the community and so on and so on, in nation, internation, but there has been no security for man. As civilization grows more and more complex there is going to be less and less security. And continuity gives us the hope that we shall have security. Where does security lie? Is there any security at all?

And when we are seeking security, which is in continuity, then there must be real fear of death, which is the ending - right? The Asiatic world has - specially India which has expanded all over Asia, psychologically and religiously - they have invented the word reincarnation. That is, a series of continuities - right? I shall die this life, but next life. And so next life and after next life - you follow? Until human beings reach that highest principle or highest state. So that is a very comforting idea of continuity. Right? You follow all this? But we never ask for ourselves: what is ending, actually ending? And one is frightened of that too. To end, for example, completely, psychologically, all attachment. Because we are attached to so many things - to people, to ideas, to knowledge, to concepts, to various forms of idealism, to money, to our knowledge and memories, or to our experience. "Oh, I have had a marvellous spiritual experience" - I hold on to that. Right? So we are attached to so many things. And death comes along and says, "My friend

you can't be attached to anything" - right? You are going, you are leaving everything behind you - right? Your family, your ideas, your knowledge, all your vanities of knowledge, position, power, all that you are leaving. That is ending. And that is what we are frightened of. That is what we call death. The terrible ending, not knowing what happens afterwards. If you knew what happens afterwards you continue - right? So our brain is so cunning, so subtle that it must know before it does anything. It must know if I end what is there. I can't live in vacuity. I can't live in a state of nothing, nothingness. Right?

So that is why it is very important to understand the nature of continuity and the quality of total ending without the movement of a future. So death says, "Don't be attached to anything, psychologically, first." Then you will find out physically not to be attached. If you said to your wife or your husband, "Darling I am no longer attached to you," probably she would throw a brick at you, or you would run. See the importance, please it sounds funny, and it is rather funny, why we are so attached, we are never letting go. So the question is: can you live freely, that means no attachment, and ending every day every form of holding on, clutching to something. Which means can you live a life everyday living with ending, which is death? You understand my question? Have you ever tried it, actually, not theoretically? Which means you have no roots anywhere, you are not identified with anything - your country, your family, - psychologically we are talking about - so that the brain is constantly empty, not chattering. You understand? Because we are wasting our energy through all these series of conflicts. And where there is fear, that is the epitome of

waste. That is the summation of waste. And we need energy, tremendous energy. As you have tremendous energy when you want to earn money, when you want to become famous, when your sexual appetites demand, you have got tremendous energy. But apparently where that tremendous energy is necessary in the psychological world there that energy is wasted by fear, conflict, confusion, you know, all the rest of it.

So we are asking: is it possible to live, a daily live, not some romantic, ideological, Utopian nonsense, but actually in our daily existence, living with death and life together? You don't see the beauty of it. You don't see the nature of its extraordinary quality. But if you go into it deeply one comes upon such depth.

Now we ought to talk over together: what is religion. All civilizations, the birth of a new civilization has been the outcome of religion. Not what the priests have made of religion, not the religions which are organized with property, with money, with authority, hierarchical authority, with temples, mosques, churches, that is not religion. That is all great activity of thought - right? Please examine it, don't reject it. All the rituals have been put together by thought - right? All the dress, fancy dress, it is all put together by thought. All the cathedrals have been put together by thought. And the symbols, the original sin, the saviour, all that is the result of people who have thought it all out. They may say it is direct revelation. All revelation is translated by thought. So religions, as they are now, are the activity, directed in one direction, with one purpose. Not only to help man, not only to control man, which means woman and so on, not only to civilize man but also in their attempt to do all that they have also created

wars - right? Religious wars of a hundred years and so on. All religions are at war with each other - right? Have you noticed all this? You must have. You are all so-called civilized people, you have read all this, they are at war. A whole group of the Western world believing in one thing, dogma, rituals and the whole of Asia with their Buddhism and Hinduism, and Islamic world. All that is not religion, obviously. Because it is based on thought, thought is memory, memory is knowledge, knowledge is the outcome of experience. And therefore thought is always limited, as knowledge will always be limited.

So then what is religion? Right? Is there that religious quality of the brain that doesn't belong to any guru, to any sect, to any recognized, orthodox, well-established religions, so that all that is put aside completely? Which means that there is no fear to find out, there is no sense of the background which holds you back. So what is the religious mind, brain? You understand? What is the quality of a brain that has evolved through millenia upon millenia, please listen to all this, if you are interested, because it is your life, a brain that has evolved through time, and through the long ages there have been so many religions. Always the priests at the top because at one time the priests were the only people that were able to write and read, they were the councilors, they were the wise men, and they gradually assumed authority - you know, the good game! And so what is that brain that has the quality of that religious - we are going to define the word 'religion' presently - that brain that has this quality? We are going to find out together.

The word 'religion' etymologically is not definite. We say this because we looked at various dictionaries, the origin of the word.

There they say there is no conclusion of the etymological meaning of that word. They say it is a form of binding, binding to your concept of the highest, binding yourself to that. Even that they are doubtful. So the etymological meaning, the origin of that word, is not established, so we can play with that word. So we are going to find out together what is religion. Because we have reached a certain stage of evolution: technologically we are tremendously advancing, there is no limit that. And psychologically we have just scratched the surface. And if the brain, which has got such infinite capacity, if that brain is caught in programmes - you understand? - like a computer is caught in programmes, as a British, a Hindu, and all the rest of the silly nonsense, they cannot possibly then enquire into the most extraordinary thing in life.

And this is where meditation comes in. You understand? Not how to meditate. The very word 'how' means a system, a practice, tell me what to do, I'll practise it day after day, day after day, sit in a certain position, breathe in a certain way - you know all the tricks. Don't you know all that? I am sure some of you have played with all that. The gurus from that unfortunate country called India come over here and tell you all about meditation and you lap it up, because you are so gullible, which means you have no doubt, question.

So we are going to find out together what is meditation. Which is in relation to what is religion and in relation to the whole of existence, our daily existence. You understand? Daily existence which is a turmoil, etc. and so on, and death, freedom, and the brain that has got such extraordinary capacity, infinite capacity. And when we ask what is meditation, it is not asking for a system,

for a method, because if you practise a system, that becomes mechanical, you are caught in that system, in that method. See the logic of it. For God's sake see the truth of it, so that you are never caught in a system. Because the brain is demanding not only security - you understand? - it must have security, both physical and psychological, complete security otherwise it can't function clearly, objectively, passionately - right? So what is meditation?

The word 'meditation' means to ponder over, to think things over. That is the dictionary meaning. And also it means measure, both in Sanskrit and etymologically, to measure. Right? That is what the meaning of that word is. The technological world can only exist when there is measurement - right? Centimetres, metres, inches, foot and so on, which is measurement. If that measurement is not possible, if there is no measurement, technology cannot move. That is fairly clear. Psychologically, inwardly, we also have measurement - I am this, I will be that. That is to measure. Which means also to compare to what is to what should be. Can one live - please put your minds to this to find out - can one live without measurement? Right? Ask that question, without comparing yourself with anything. Comparison implies future - right? And we went into the question of time. Time is the past - I will repeat it again. Time is the past, and that past is now, you are there. All you are now is the past. And the future is what you are now. Clear? If you are jealous today, you will be jealous tomorrow. That is a fact. Or a thousand tomorrows. Or many years. Unless you change now you will be jealous tomorrow - right? So time is contained in the now - the past, the future and the present. This is important really to understand the depth of it, not merely the words of it. To

understand the nature of time. And measurement means time. Comparison means time. So if you are always comparing yourself with something or other you are projecting what should be - right? And that what should be is from the present. therefore the future is now. I have talked about it enough. One has gone into this very deeply at other talks.

So when the brain has no comparison, it doesn't compare at all - just listen to it - when there is no comparison it is what is now - right? You understand? It is what it is now. And to remain with what is now and not have a single movement in any direction - you understand?

So meditation is to understand the depth of time, and as we have laid the foundation from the very beginning of our talks, which is to deal with daily life, where there must be total order. Not disorder, we talked about it the other day. That is, you have to bring about order in your house, not only in the physical house, but the house in which you live inwardly, complete order, which means no fear. It is fear that creates disorder, attachment creates disorder. I have built something, I am attached to that. I have invented something, it is mine. So the brain, having established order, a sense of total freedom from self centred activity, it is much more difficult to have, it has to be gone into it, which we did, all along. The talks are to point out our self centred activity and therefore that activity is limited and very small.

So meditation, when there is order, it becomes extraordinarily quiet. And to observe, to perceive something totally, it is not possible when there is confusion. So the brain can perceive something totally when it is absolutely quiet. Are we doing this?

Our brain is never quiet, as we said at the beginning of the talk, it is always chattering, it is always occupied with something or other. And so the brain becomes mechanical, limited, creates friction with itself, and so there is never the quality of absolute tranquillity and silence. When you look at those mountains and those clouds, your brain must be quiet to appreciate the beauty of it, but if you are chattering all the time, talking, talking, talking, never looking, then you do not see the full depth of the beauty of a mountain, or the cloud with an evening light on it. So logically and sanely the brain needs absolute quietness.

Then what is creation and what is invention? You understand? Religion is this creation, not invention. Invention is the accumulated thought in which there is a gap and then something new is discovered, but it is still within the realm of thought - right? I do not know if you have - the speaker has discussed this matter with scientists and specialists and so on. What is creation? Not only creation of a baby from the cells and all the rest of it, but much more beyond all that. What is creation? Not who created - you understand? If you say it is god, then it is finished - your god and my god and the Muslim god and the Hindu god and your own particular pet god. That is an easy way of explanation and most people are satisfied with it. But if you shake away all that, slough it off, then what is creation? Is it born of knowledge? If it is born of knowledge it is not creation because knowledge is limited - right? Because we are adding more and more and more knowledge. Where there is more there is limitation. Right? Which will be measurement - the more, the better, is a measurement. So where there is knowledge there is invention. And creation is not related to

knowledge. Therefore all the paintings of the world that they think are great creations are the activity of thought directed in different directions - great artist, great poet, marvellous music, it is all the activity of thought and so on - I don't have to go into all that.

So creation, that is religion. You understand? A mind - a brain that has knowledge where it is necessary, in the physical world, writing, talking, driving and so on, and knowledge has no place in the psychological world, because knowledge is limited and therefore creating division, conflict and all the rest of it. When you say, "I know my wife", you have already destroyed your wife. You understand that? Aren't you shocked by this? Because then your relationship with another is based on knowledge, which is thought, and thought is not love. All your desires, appetites, sensations are thought and therefore it is not love. Where there is love there is compassion. Compassion cannot come into being when there is no total freedom. If I am attached to my culture, to my tradition, to my religion as a Hindu, it is just a - and talk about compassion, it is childish. Where there is compassion there is intelligence. That's it. And that intelligence is supreme, it is not yours, or the speaker's, or somebody else's, it is intelligence. And in that intelligence there is absolute security. And nowhere else. And so religion, meditation is free of knowledge, and therefore the religious brain is creating, is in a state of creation. Do you understand all this? Even logically, intellectually, see this. If you really understand it, it is something that will totally revolutionize your daily life. We will be the beginning of a new religion, which is nothing to do with present religions. That is creation. Sorry. The talk is over. May I get up? (Clapping) Please clap for your self. (Laughter)

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 22ND JULY 1984

There have been a lot of questions, about probably two hundred or more. Out of those some of these questions were chosen. I have not looked at them before. I wonder what we are really interested in, each one of us. Probably health, probably, if you are rather old, getting one foot in the grave, fear of death, and also while we are very young, sex. And if you have no jobs, no vocation, which is becoming more and more imitation, what are we really interested in, profoundly, for which you are willing to give a great deal of one's energy, vitality and serious intention? How far would we go in carrying out, or pursuing something very, very serious in life? Are we all becoming very, very superficial? Never asking any serious demanding questions: what is it all about, the whole world? Why we behave as we do? Why isn't there peace in the world? I am sure we have asked all these questions of ourselves, probably. And we find no answers for them, or if we do, according to some tenet, some philosophy, some kind of acceptance of a system. Apart from all this, what is one really interested in? If we ask ourselves that question, do you ever find an absolute answer? Or is it all relative? If one is unhappy, one wants to be happy. Insecurity physically, biologically, then one seeks a form of security and fighting class differences. You know all that thing that is going on in the world. What is our answer to all this, these very demanding problems?

Do you ever stick to one thing and pursue it to the very end? We talked about the other day, health, which is naturally very important. How can a body be healthy if one has abused from one's

youth, alcohol, tobacco, drugs - you know the whole medical process of health, keeping the body healthy. Or you do some kind of exercise, jogging along for ten miles, or five miles, or you do some kind of yoga - may I use that word? And become rather fanatical about yoga. At one time, in India, yoga was taught only to the very, very, few. It was not a moneymaking concern. Now it has become a big business. I hope you don't mind my telling you all this. And one is concerned about one's health. I think health comes when the self is not, when the ego is not tremendously active. It is like beauty, when the self is not the beauty is. When the ego with its self-centred activity is not, there is great good health.

And also we have many, many psychological problems, apart from physical problems - we have no houses to live in, only live in a flat in a town or big cities, in drawers, as it were. And that too has a great strain on the body, and so on. How do all these economic problems, which are really devastating the world, each country concerned with its own economic problem, its own security, armaments and all the rest of it, how can each country separate itself from the rest of mankind, and the population is increasing by the million. In India every year there are fifteen million people born. That is the population of Holland and Australia - fifteen million people - unemployed, poverty - you understand all this? Surely all these problems - class warfare, ideological warfare, can only end when we all become really civilized. That is, when we are not attached to any particular part of the country, when we are not nationally, religiously divided, but treat the whole world as our world, and then there will be no barriers. I am sure, we have talked to some of the scientists, the

whole of humanity can be fed properly, housed, clothed and all the rest of it if we can abolish war, all the terrible instruments of war. But we are not civilized, I am afraid. We are too barbarous, and so none of the problems, physical problems, are being ever solved.

And the question arises: if there are half a dozen people in the world who have really transcended, gone beyond the self, which is the highest form of civilization, culture, what effect will they have on the rest of humanity - right? This is a question that has been asked over and over again. You, perhaps, change radically, fundamentally, utterly free from all the idiocy of mankind, what effect will it have on the rest of the world, on the mass as it is called? Will it have any effect? Don't you ask all these questions?

Would it be a right question to ask: what effect will it have? Are we changing because of the effect? Or we are changing deeply, profoundly, because per se, for itself, for its own beauty, for its own strength and love and compassion, and all that. And if we do, perhaps half a dozen or a dozen people in the world, surely it will affect the whole of consciousness of mankind. As Napoleon affected the whole of the world, and so on, and the religious teachers, the real religious teachers - not the phoney ones - have affected the consciousness of mankind. We should bear all this when we say to ourselves, "If I do change, how will it affect my neighbour, the mass of people?" I think that is a wrong approach to the question. One loves, not because of something, not because one is going to affect the world or your neighbour, but that very quality of the perfume, the depth of it, and the beauty of it, will have its own result without each one wanting a result.

So we had better tackle these questions. There are seven of

them this morning. I don't know if we can answer all of them. Why do we put questions? We should. But to whom are you putting these questions? I know - I mean the speaker knows because he has received a lot of letters from all over the world, they want to talk to somebody. They can't talk to their wives or to their husbands, or to somebody with whom they are familiar, but they want to talk to somebody about their problems, their jobs, their quarrels and all those things that make life so utterly miserable. And so one writes letters, long letters. Not that you shouldn't write letters to the speaker but as it is not possible to talk over together each one of us separately, can we not look for another to help us but have that strength, that quality which resolves our own problems? I know it is nice to talk to somebody, to tell of our pain, our depressions, our anxieties, our ambitions, and in that talk, in that conversation, it might help one. And when we ask questions, how do we approach a question, not only the questions which we ask for ourselves, but also if you ask these questions, how do you approach a question? How do you approach a problem? The word 'approach' means coming very near, coming as close as possible to a question, or to the problem. In what manner do we approach - you understand the English meaning of that word, to come very, very, very close. I approach you. How do we approach these questions? Not only the questions that have been put to the speaker, but also to any problems, any questions that we have, how do we come near it? Are we first concerned with the solution of the problem? You understand my questions? Suppose I have a problem. My concern then is to find a solution to the problem - right? But the solution may lie in the question itself. You understand? We will go into it.

Shouldn't we approach the problem tentatively, hesitantly, and if you have a motive then the motive directs the problem. Clear? Right? Is this clear? We are discussing this together, the question how to approach the question. Could we approach it without a motive first? Because if you have a motive it has already set a direction to the question - right? You understand? It is clear, isn't it? If we have any kind of direction, which is the solution, then we have already limited it - right? So could we approach a problem without a motive, without seeking a solution for it? Or wanting the problem to be solved according to our pleasure and pain? Could we approach the problem without any reaction? Which is going to be very difficult because when we have a problem we react to it instantly - right? So could we have a gap, a sense of not having any motive, any direction, like or dislike, then you can look at the problem - right? - not project your wishes, your desires - right? Then you can look at the problem, study the problem, go into the problem, and in the understanding of the problem the solution is there, not outside the problem - right? I talked - we talked to some of the politicians about this - I know they are the last people, but we talked to them. They said all this takes too long. We have to resolve our problems immediately because they are starving, there are people who are terrorists and so on. They never go to the cause of things - you understand? They want quick - all of us do, not the politicians only, all of us want a quick immediate, convenient answer. If one has a headache, as most people apparently do, we never find out why it arises, what is the cause of it, but what we do is take a pill quickly, but the cause is there. So to investigate the cause, go into it very, very deeply, requires a brain that is not

reacting all the time, defending, attacking, aggressive - you follow? It must have the quality of pliability, quickness, but the quickness comes when there is patience. Patience is not time. Patience is the quality of a brain that is looking, watching. I wonder if you see all this? Right?

So here are some questions: some friends have chosen these questions. They have shown me all the questions but they chose these - I haven't seen it, nor have you seen it - right? So let both of us approach it without motive, without any kind of reaction, like or dislike, but just listen to the question first, so that your answer - or rather the solution will be real not just fancy, imaginative, illusory - right? So you and the speaker are going to approach this question hesitantly, without any motive, without any reaction - right?

1st QUESTION: How do we tell the difference between observing ourselves in the sense you mean, and merely thinking about ourselves?

Have you got the answer? Thinking about ourselves and observing about ourselves. They are two different things according to this question. Thinking about oneself, which we all do - I am making progress, I am better than yesterday, I have my problems, which is thinking. I wish I had better food, better clothing, better housing, or I wish I had more sex - you follow? - money, thinking about oneself all the time - which most of us do, even the austere monk, he does think about himself - right? Only is the name of God - right? And the questioner says, what is the difference between that, thinking about yourself, and observing yourself - right? Right, that is the question.

Now we know what it means to think about ourselves - right? It

is really going round and round in circles. Either expanding the self, the ego, or contracting the ego - right? I am the world, I am God, I must be more kindly, I must love. I must be more intelligent, I must meditate in order to achieve - whatever they want to achieve. So we are all caught in that. And observing oneself is something entirely different - right?

Then let's find out what does it mean to observe. You understand the question? We are together in this? Come on sirs!

First of all, do we observe anything without the word? Do we observe the mountain and not call it mountain? Do we observe the evening light on the cloud, with its most extraordinary colour, beauty and something immense, can we look at those clouds and the mountains without using a single word? Can we do that? You understand my question? Don't look so paralysed. That is, can we look at anything objectively, the trees, nature, the waters, the sky and the evening star and the silence of a morning, this extraordinary world we live in, natural world, can we look at anything without a single word? And to find that out we have to find, go into the question why the brain is caught in a network of words? You understand my question? Are we together in this?

We are asking: can we look at anything, including my wife, my husband, my daughter, the politicians, the various gurus and the priests and all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, can we look at all that without reaction first? Then find out if we can look at all that without the network of words interfering with our observation. Can we do that? Have you ever tried that? When one looks at one's wife or husband, can you look at her or him, without all the images, all the things that you have accumulated about her

or him, just to look? Can you? You are exceptionally silent when I talk about the husband and the wife and the girl and the boy. So one has to find out why the brain is so caught up in words. When you say he is a communist or a totalitarian you have wiped it out, you have put him in a category, in a cage, and that is the end of it. Or he is British. Or he is French, or he is an Indian, or he is this or that. See what is happening to our brain. Linguistically the brain has been caught with words, not the significance and the depth of the word, but just the word. This requires careful watching.

Watching is to observe. There was a balloon going up this morning - you must have all seen it - and you watched it, going up and up and up very, very slowly. The gondola hanging and you saw the whole thing. Then you would say, "By Jove, I wish I were up there", or you say to yourself, "How dangerous." And so on. We never look at anything without words, without reactions. Look.

Now you are all sitting there and you are unfortunately seeing the speaker. And you have already put him into a category. You already have an image about him. You already say he is this, he is that, or he is some kind of idiot or whatever you like to say about him. So you never (noise of train) - he has forgotten to whistle! (Laughter) - so you never look at him as though for the first time. You understand? Have you ever done this kind of thing? Not just for a minute or for an hour or a day, but the freshness of a mind, brain - you understand? - which is not caught in words, reactions, look at everything as though for the first time you are looking at the world. That observation is to watch oneself, never allowing a single thought to escape, without watching it, being aware of it, giving your whole attention to that one thought. And then another

thought, keep at it. So that your brain is tremendously attentive. You understand? So that watching is not egocentric movement. Whereas thinking about yourself is egotistic, self-centred activity. It is clear, isn't it?

Now, just a minute. How do we move from this to that? Right? You are asking naturally, you must ask that question. Or am I asking the question and you are accepting it? You understand? Suppose one is self-centred, I am self-centred, egocentric, all my outlook is personal - I am not loved, I must love, you know, all that kind of turmoil, silliness that goes on. I am that, one is that. Then how am I, how is it to move to the other? Right? You are asking that question, aren't you? Is that a right question? Moving from here to there. That is a wrong question obviously. Because if you move from here to there that is the same as this. Vous avez compris? Move! You understand this? If I say I am selfish, now I must not be selfish, I must observe. The "'must' is still in the same category, or the same movement, as thinking about oneself. Right? Are we together in all this? Some of us are I hope at least.

So the question then is answered, not the answer is outside the question, but the answer is in the question. Right? That is observing the question itself, what it reveals. It reveals a tremendous lot. Because you see observing, if I can put it differently, observing, perceiving has not time. The other is caught in time: thinking about myself, I will fulfil one day, I have no roots now but I am going to establish roots some time, I have no identity - you follow? All those are time binding qualities. Time binding quality is essentially the self. I don't know if you want to go into all that. I am finding all this as I talk - right? Whereas watching, if you

watch that bird, there is no time in that at all, just watching - right? So the word and thought create time. I won't go into all that. Got it?

2nd QUESTION: In relationship with another memory is there. What is the action of not letting memory intrude? Is it to see its presence as it arises and drop it instantly? Or should one be in a state where memory does not raise its head unless it is necessary. (I will read the question again more slowly)

In relationship with another - please we are listening to the question, not reacting to your relationship. Your wife is sitting next to you, don't react. It is very difficult. (Laughter) It is a rummy world, isn't it? In relationship with another memory is there. What is the action of not letting memory intrude? Is it to see its presence as it arises and drop it instantly? Or should one be in a state where memory does not raise its head unless necessary? Right? Have you got the question?

What is the question? The question is in our relationship with each other, intimate or not, memory is there - right? It is always there because one is living with that person, cooking, sex, washing up (Laughter) the speaker has done a lot of washing up. Wherever he goes he washes up! Except in India, there they won't allow it.

Now the actual state in our relationship with another is the activity of memory. There is no refutation of that. That is so. Right? Do you all agree to that - no? You are not sure. Is not our relationship based on recognition, words, my wife, my husband, what she said this morning, he was moody, you only looked at the newspaper, never looked at me, his concern about his job and so on. That is the memory in operation. Nobody can deny that. What is the action, the questioner asks, of not letting memory intrude.

Memory is there - right? It is not a question of memory intruding - right? The question is put wrongly. That is, there is another conclusion that memory should not intrude in relationship - you follow? You have already come to that conclusion by listening to the speaker and saying, "Yes, quite right, memory should not intrude". Then you say to me, ask the question, "How is it possible?" You have put a wrong question, then you answer it wrongly. Right? Let's get that clear.

We live with memories, not only with regard to our intimate relationship with another but also the long series of memories which we have accumulated through time. The racial memory, the linguistic memory, social memory, legislative memory, the memory of having read books, this whole accumulation of memories from childhood, and the racial memories which has been impressed upon us and so on. So we have memories. We are memories - right? Be clear - let's be clear on this point. We are past and present memories, and also the future memories unless there is something, a catharsis or a crisis and so on arises. So memories of the past, the present and the future is what we are. Traditionally, religiously, socially and so on, class, economics - I won't go into all that, repeat it over and over again - so we are memories. And she adds to that memory, or he adds to that memory, so we are all the time accumulating memories, not that memories intrude. Right? When you say that memories should not intrude, it is another form of memory. Have we understood? Because you have heard the speaker say in relationship knowledge is a danger, knowledge is an impediment, that you have accepted, or you see that, and you say, "Now how am I to prevent that memory intruding?" - but you are a

bundle of memories. You don't want that particular memory with your wife or husband, to intrude. There you want a good relationship but elsewhere it doesn't matter - right?

The questioner asks: is it to see it's present, that is the memory arising, and as it arises drop it instantly in relationship? You understand? Have you understood? Come on sirs. Somebody say yes, or no whether you understand it or not. Or should one be in a state where memory does not raise its head unless necessary? It is a very complicated question - right? And requires not a complicated brain but a very simple brain can observe this. I am going to show it to you in a minute.

I am and you are memories, a bundle of memories. Even if you say there is in me, god, light, a sense of spirituality, it is still memory. So I am, the whole structure of the ego, me and all my knowledge is memory. Now I see in my relationship with my wife, or husband, or children or neighbour, these memories are always included. The memory of my wife who said something nasty, or bullied me, or said something pleasant or exciting, it is still I have gathered that memory. Right? So the question is - are you following all this? - the question is why does the brain retain all these memories - right? Would you ask that question? Right sir? Why does the brain retain something pleasant she has told me, and something unpleasant which she said yesterday that also is recorded, both pleasant and unpleasant are recorded, which becomes memory - right? Why does the brain record? That is the question. You understand?

There has been a war, forty years ago, nearly forty years ago, and they write books about it, they are talking about it, they show

on the television various exciting scenes about war, the various material for destruction. You know, kept up, keep this going all the time - why? You understand? We will go into it.

So we are asking a much more serious, fundamental question: why does the brain record everything? Why should it record the unpleasant and the pleasant, it is in a state of constant recording? Right? We are agreed to this? This is a fact, not the speaker's invention. Now the question is: it is necessary to record how to drive a car, right? - how to write a letter, to be skilful in using instruments, to have knowledge in dismantling a car and putting it together, which the speaker has done, so it is necessary there. Right? Now why does it record psychologically, inwardly? You have got the question? We are asking this question? Is it necessary to record the pleasant, the unpleasant, the flattery, the insult, the sense of - you know, all the rest of it - is it necessary? Or the psychological recording gives strength, builds up the ego, the me, the personality - you understand? See that. Recording is necessary, otherwise we couldn't do anything in the physical world. If you are a businessman you have to know quite a lot, if you are a banker you have to know a great deal, if you are a surgeon or a doctor, eye specialist, you follow?, or a builder of computers, you must know a great deal. There it is absolutely necessary - right?

Now we are asking inwardly, inside the skin as it were, which is the psyche, the psychological area, why should there be any recording there? Is it an extension of the outer physical necessities into the psychological necessities, is it an extension of that? Is it an extension of that? You understand? Is it a continuity of the outer knowledge, which is necessary, and we say psychologically also it

is necessary? We never question it. You understand what I am saying. Are we somewhat together in this? Surely you are not paralysed are you? So, please I am not hypnotizing.

So we are questioning the whole recording process. When I see that what she has said this morning is not important, it is not necessary, she will say something different tomorrow. I will say something to her, something entirely different - right? We both play this game. And what does it matter? Is it necessary? Which means I am building an image about her and she is building an image about me, a picture about me. The picture, the image, the symbol, becomes very strong - right? You know all this, don't you? It becomes tremendously strong. Therefore I say, "She is like that" and she says I am like that and we keep apart, except perhaps in bed. And the division grows wider and wider and wider, and I break or she breaks, and I pursue another woman and start the same old game again there, and she does exactly the same. Right? Do you agree to all this, the much married people?

So this is going on. And we are saying in examining the question, the inevitable question arises: is it possible not to record psychologically? What does it mean? Can this happen? - this mechanical process? It is a mechanical process. The brain has become accustomed to it, it is part of its tradition, it is part of its continuation of sustaining itself as the self - right? So we are asking: is it possible? Record there, where it is absolutely necessary, not to record at all psychologically? Don't you see the beauty of this, for God's sake? Which means first of all see the danger of recording psychologically. I am a Hindu, you are a Christian - right? You are a Buddhist or Tibetan, or belonging to

some potty little guru, he may have a lot of money, power, position, but it is still a very potty little affair. So you see all this. So we are asking is it possible not to record inwardly? What is your answer? I have put you a question. You have put me several questions, but I am putting you a question. Is it possible not to record psychologically? Which means not to get hurt, or flattered, it is the same thing. You may say it is possible, or you might say it is not possible. If you say either of those things you are blocking yourself - right? If you say "I can't walk up that mountain", you stop walking. But if you say, "Well I will walk, see what happens", then a totally different action takes place.

So what is your answer? The questioner's answer is this.

Are you aware of anything? Aware of the shape of this tent, how many sections there are in this tent, the printed word of the owner of the tent there, are you aware of all this? The proportions of it, the length of it, not measuring, the length of it, and are you aware of the people sitting around you, the various colours, the faces, different faces, young, old, white haired, black haired, and so on, are you aware of all this? Or you have never looked? If you are not aware then you may not be aware of your own reactions. You may not be aware of your own responses. You may not be aware of your body, because you are terribly intellectual, all living up there. Or you are very romantic. Are you aware of all this? Sentimental, attached and so on. If you are aware, aware, not say, "Well I am aware but I don't like that shirt, it is too blue" - (Laughter) So I was told this morning! (Laughter) So are we aware in that sense, without choosing, a choiceless awareness? Then if you are so choicelessly aware, then you are attentive - you understand?

Choiceless awareness means attention, not cultivated, say, "I must attend". But becoming aware of the trees, the birds, the balloons going up the mountains, the light on the clouds, the evening, the moonlight and so on, watching, watching. Aware of all this and your reaction to all this, and by not responding, not choosing, I like this, I don't like that, it is mine, it is yours - you follow? Just to be aware. From this choiceless awareness there is attention, attending with your eyes, with your ears, with your nerves, with all your being. Then when she says something to me I am fully attentive - right? She says "You are a brute", because I am attentive there is no reaction. You understand? It is only when there is inattention there is reaction. Get it.

Gosh, it takes a long time to tell all this. Have you got it? When there is complete attention there is no recording. But I must completely attend there, in driving a car I must be tremendously attentive. Attention is there and here, attention. But the moment that I am inattentive to what she is saying it is recorded, naturally. You have got it? Will you do it? That is the fun, not just listen to a lot of words, but if one actually puts, you know, not into action, see the truth of it. Then there is no recording. But if you record, if you inattentively record, then you can deal with it instantly. But if you are constantly inattentive, as we are, in our relationship with another, because that is our habit, I have known her for forty years, for God's sake, or ten days. You understand? So the quality of attention, and the quality of inattention, not attending, are two different things. Where there is inattention there is choice, unawareness, lack of attention, then the recording process goes on, the old habit is established. But when there is attention the old

habit is broken. Got it?

3rd QUESTION: I understand that inner silence cannot be practised or sought after, but what is the ground on which it may come about? Clear, the question is clear.

The questioner understands that silence cannot be achieved, cannot be practised through meditation - right? Cannot be controlled. I don't know why you accept it but apparently you accept it. But what is the ground in which it may come about?

When you observe something, clouds, the mountain, the river, or the tree, or your wife or your neighbour, this low, uneducated person, can you observe all the phenomenon of life silently? Not say, "Yes, I think so". That is to look, to observe, without the reaction of opinions, because we are full of opinions about everything - right? Why do we have opinions? Go on sirs, tell me why human beings have such deep rooted opinions, or very, very, superficial opinions - I believe - why? My guru is right, better than yours. I am ready to fight. So these opinions, conclusions, concepts, ideals, divide human beings. This is obvious. There is the totalitarian idealisms, and the democratic idealisms - right? They are dividing people, ideals divide people. And the questioner asks: I understand that inner silence cannot be practised. When he uses the word "I understand" what does he mean by understanding? You understand? I am asking you the question: what do you mean by understanding? I understand how this tent is put together, how it is going to be dismantled. I understand the distance between here and Geneva. I understand what someone has said. Right? I understand the internal combustion machine, and so on. Is that understanding intellectual, verbal - right? Is it just understanding because you

have said something, I understand the meaning of the words. Or when does real understanding take place? Which is, I see something instantly and that very perception of the truth changes my whole existence. Which is it? Because it is important to understand, important to grasp the significance of the word 'understand'. I understand intellectually something, or I have grasped it emotionally, sentimentally, romantically, imaginatively, and all that. Or I really not only see the depth and the significance of words but also in communication with each other I see the truth of what you are saying. See the truth of it, not conclusion, or the idea of what you are saying, the truth of it, the perfume, the depth, the taste of it. Then that understanding is a revolution. But you say casually, "Oh yes I understand what K is talking about" - which is nonsense. The speaker says I understand inner silence cannot be practised, or sought after. But don't you all seek some kind of inward quietness, some kind of peace sometimes? You are all seeking. Don't say we are not seeking. We are seeking food, comfort, escape from this terrible turmoil one lives in. But to casually say "I understand inner silence cannot be practised or sought after," if you will forgive me, forgive the speaker for saying you really don't understand what you have said. But what is the ground in which it may come about? That is the real question - right?

What is necessary for the state of the brain to be utterly silent? Why do you want to be silent? When you observe, perceive something, if you have no reaction to it, response to it - right? - just observe, that observation itself is silence - right? You understand? Naturally. I am watching you and you are watching me. If I, if the

speaker has reactions in watching he is not really responding - right? He is not watching your reactions, your feelings, all the rest of it. And if you are watching the speaker and you have reactions you are not watching him, you are watching your reactions.

Simple.

So the ground in which silence can come about is not through practice, not through determination, not through will or desire, but it comes naturally when there is freedom, freedom from conflict. So you have to understand conflict. Not say, "I must have silence", which is nonsense. So the ground on which natural, clear, beautiful, the immense depth of silence, comes when there is complete freedom. So one should ask not the quality of silence, how it comes about, but can one be free? Free from conflict, free from being hurt, free from fear, anxiety, loneliness - you know, sorrow and all that. Then the house of silence is immense.

It is twelve o'clock. Is that enough for this morning. Or do you want one more question? Am I working, or are you working too? Are we together working, or you are merely listening to a lot of words? If you are really actively co-operating, actively sharing, going to the very end of it, you would be exhausted. But if you are casually, it is like that river making noise, you get used to it. Anyhow although it is twelve, we will do the last one.

4th QUESTION: How can one reconcile the demands of society with a life of total freedom?

What are the demands of society? What are the demands of society? Tell me please. That you go to the office from nine to five, that you go to the factory from nine to five, that you go to the night club after all the boredom of office, there excitement, having a

fortnight, or three week's holiday in sunny Spain or Italy? What are the demands of society? That you must earn a livelihood, that you must live in that particular part of the country for the rest of your life, practise there as a lawyer, or as a doctor, or a surgeon, or in the factory as a union leader, and so on and so on? Right?

Therefore one must also ask the question: what is the society that demands so much? What is the society, what is society? Who created the bally thing? Who is responsible for all this? The church, the temple, the mosque - you follow? All the circus that goes on inside it. Who is responsible for all this? Is the society different from you? Or you have created the society, each one of us, through our ambition, through our greed, through our envy, through our violence, through our corruption, through our fear, wanting our security in the community, in the nation, you follow? We have created this society and then blame the society for what it demands. Therefore you ask: can I live in absolute freedom, can I reconcile, that is better, with society and myself seeking freedom? It is such an absurd question. You understand? Sorry, whoever put that question. I am not being rude. Because you are society. If we really see that, not as an idea, or as a concept, or something you must accept. But you, each one of us on this earth for the last forty thousand years, or more, we have created this society in which we live. The stupidity of religions - right? The stupidity of each nation, arming themselves. For God's sake, we have created it because I insist I am an American, or French or Russian. We insist that I am a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and so on, Muslim. It gives us security by calling it, and the search for security is being destroyed by our division. It is so clear, I don't know.

So there is no reconciliation between society and its demands and your demand for freedom. The demand is from your own violence, from your own ugly, limited, selfishness. It is one of the most complex things to find out for oneself where selfishness is, where the ego very, very subtly hides itself. It can hide politically, doing good for the country. It can hide in the religious world most beautifully. "I believe in God, I serve God". Or social help, not that I am against social help, don't jump to that conclusion, it can hide there. It can hide in marriage, in love - right? It requires a very attentive, not analytical, but observing brain to see where the subtleties of the self are hidden - selfishness. Then when there is not, society doesn't exist, you don't have to reconcile to it. It is only the inattentive, the thoughtless, the unaware, that says, "How am I to respond to society when I am working for freedom?" You understand?

If one may point out, we need to be re-educated, not through college, school and university, which also conditions our brain, or when we work in the factory and so on, but educate ourselves by being aware, seeing how we are caught in words and so on. Can we do this? If we cannot do it, we are going to have wars perpetually, we will be weeping perpetually, always in conflict, misery and all the rest of it. The speaker is not optimistic or pessimistic, these are facts. When one lives with facts as they are, as you observe them, not data given by the computers or the poets but watching your own activity, your own egotistic pursuits and so on. Out of that grows marvellous freedom with all this great beauty and strength.

Sorry to have talked so long. May I get up please?

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 24TH JULY 1984

Again there have been probably a hundred and fifty questions, or more. You can't answer them all. Probably it would take a couple of months and I am sure you wouldn't like to sit here for another month.

I wonder - one wonders if there is a final question at all, one question that will answer all questions. We haven't thought about it, I have just thought about it, just now. Is there a question, or an enquiry, not an experience, because experiences are always limited, and experiences are conditioned by one's own desires, intentions and limitations. So one cannot possibly rely on experiences, they are the most doubtful things in the world, even this so-called spiritual experience. I am sure most of you want that kind of experience that will sustain one, give one energy and so on. But every experience, however deep, however wide or intricate, such experiences are limited because there is always an experiencer who is experiencing - right? And the experiencer is the past, past memories, his background, and according to that background the experiencer recognizes the experience and lives with it, hoping he will have a greater experience. But the greater experience, or the wider, deeper, is still always limited because there is the experiencer.

Now the question arises, which I am putting to you, whether there is anything to experience at all? Except biological, sexual experiences, and so on, apart from those physical reactions and so on, is there any experience at all? Why do we want experiences?

Please, as we said, we are enquiring into this together, not the speaker is saying something and you either reject or accept, or pass it by. But if we could examine this very interesting question: is there, apart from the ordinary biological experiences and so on, is there any necessity of experience at all? Experiences apparently keep one awake. Experiences, or problems are something thrown at you, especially the meaning of that word 'problem' is something projected at you. That is a problem, the meaning, the root meaning of that word. And experience also means to go through, not hold on to what you have gone through.

So does the brain need problems to keep it awake, challenges, crises, shocks, does it need these things to keep it awake? Because we live such a superficial life, and we are satisfied by it, most of us at least. And by all the education and so on we become rather mechanical and lazy, indolent. And to keep us awake we feel problems, pressures and so on are needed to keep the brain alert - right? Can the brain be alert, extremely watchful, without any drugs, problems, challenges, shocks? Have we ever enquired into this at all? Or we are so eager to have something more, something better, measuring always, which makes the mind still more dull. It is a dull mind asking for more - right? We are not being cynical please, but if we could enquire into something and find out whether the brain, which has been conditioned for millenia upon millenia, conditioned through various accidents, incidents, pressures, propaganda, programmed, can that brain be naturally, without any effort, fully awake? To find that out one must reject totally all experiences, except the experiences, physical experiences, psychological experiences must be totally rejected. And so not

depend, not depend on pressures, impressions, stimulations. You are being now, by the speaker, stimulated, unfortunately. He will act as a drug, like coffee, tea or stronger drugs, alcohol and so on. If one depends on these things as a stimulant to keep the brain alert, then you are merely sustaining the mechanical process. And the brain has become for most of us mechanical, repetitive.

So to live a life without a single challenge, which doesn't mean it goes to sleep, without a single demand, both outwardly or inwardly so that the brain is extraordinarily active. Action is not movement. I wonder if you see this? May I go into it a little bit? Interested in it?

Action is not movement. Movement implies time - right? To go from here to there and so on. Any kind of movement is in the realm of time and thought - right? All movement, both physical and psychological, all thought is contained in the field of time. Right? And action is not of time. Action is not having done and the remembrance of the things that have been done, or experience or problems solved, which is all the background which is time, or the future is also time. Therefore action is instant, the very living of it immediate, instant. Are we conveying something?

So we are talking over together the question of a brain that has been so spoilt, so shocked, so wounded. Any shock is a wound, or any hurt. To have such a brain which is not capable of being hurt, psychologically, you may receive a shock when you fall down the staircase, that is a different matter, I hope you won't fall down the staircase. But the shock that one receives over bad news, or suddenly the doctor says, "Old chap you have got cancer". Or the shock of someone leaving you. All those kinds of shocks,

wounding naturally the brain so that it is constantly in a strain. But to have a mind which is untouchable by circumstances - you understand? Such a brain is something extraordinary. That's part of meditation, not all the silly stuff that is going on.

So we have asked: is there a question which would answer all questions, only one question. We have answered it. Right?

1st QUESTION: Your statement that art is merely the product of thought and therefore not creation has troubled many artists, poets, musicians, including us who are here, and who think that they are creators. Cannot creation include the activity of thought? Right? The question is clear.

The speaker has said that thought, with all the nature of thought, can never be creative. And thought which is the expression also of an artist, poet, musicians and all of us included, thought is always limited. Right? So first we must enquire into what is thought, why it is limited, whether it is expressed by the greatest poet in the world, or the greatest artist, or the artist who is just beginning. I hope the artist is always beginning, not achieving. I think it was Goya, or Valesquez, I have forgotten who, one of those, said, "I am always learning" - Goya? Bene! He was ninety two when he said that, and still learning.

So we have to enquire into several things: first of all what is creation? Creation, how the world has come into being, that is part of creation. And we ought also to enquire into thought, and the art of living, which is far the greatest art, the supreme art, and the art of painting, the art of music, the art of speech. And why do we give such extraordinary importance to artists? The other day a picture was sold for ten million dollars - it was probably a very good

investment! So we have to enquire into all this, not just condemn, or say why do you say that?

So first let's enquire what is the art of living? Why do you say that is the greatest art, greater than any other art in the world, from the marvellous carpenter who puts a cabinet together, and the great artists, Leonardo de Vinci and so on, great classical artists, and the great poets; and those of us who are not so-called artists, but we may have the sensitivity to look at the mountains, sensitivity to someone suffering, sensitivity to nature, to look at a tree. There is a marvellous tree on the road, single, whole, one great trunk, with many, many branches, full of foliage, fluttering in the wind. When you look at that beauty, or the beauty of a cloud, with sunlight on it, we have to also enquire then what is beauty - right?

So this question implies a great many things, not just one thing. What is beauty, apart from the physical form, clean cut face, healthy, full of sparkling eyes and smile and sense of dignity? There is the beauty of a mountain, of a tree, or the running waters. When does one see such great beauty? You may go to all the museums of the world, and the speaker has visited many, many museums and everybody says "What a marvellous picture that is, how beautifully proportioned, the colours, the shape, the grouping," and all the rest of it. So we use the word 'beauty' in so many ways. Beauty salon! And so on. What is, if you really enquire into it, what is beauty? Does beauty lie in the eye, in the heart, or in the mind? Or there is beauty when the self, the ego is not? You understand? The ego with all its problems, with all its travails, all its confusion, uncertainty, misery, happiness, you know, that is the self. And when that self, says, "How beautiful it

is" it has very little meaning. Perhaps you have heard of the Grand Canyon in Arizona, the most extraordinary Canyon it is, miles of it, a river cutting through it. It is really a most extraordinary sight. And somebody has said in a book, in the hotel book, "I have seen this glorious sight and I am glad I am going to have tea."

So is it possible to look at something, the tree, the mountain, the valley, your wife or your husband, or something without the self, without you coming between that and your perception? You understand? Is it possible to appreciate that sense of great beauty? And that beauty cannot possibly exist when the self is there. You may be a great artist, in the modern sense of that word too, and be tremendously egocentric, tremendously ambitious, grabbing money - right? And painting the extraordinary picture. And we call that a great artist.

So we have to ask what is the art of living? - which is the greatest art on earth because we have never - the great poets, the great sculptures, Michelangelo, and all the rest of them, have they understood - I am not belittling them, or being disrespectful to them, or to you who are here as artists, poets, musicians. Can one discover first the art of living and then everything you do is art. And what is the art of living?

I believe the word 'art' means giving the right proportions to life, giving, placing all the things in life in their order, not exaggerating any one thing. And to find out the art of living requires tremendous, not only intellectual capacity but also great sensitivity. The art of living can only come when there is total freedom, freedom from all our petty little worries, all our intentions, all our problems, fears and when there is this

extraordinary sense of wholeness. That is, when you are nothing. Nothingness is wholeness. I wonder if you understand all this. Because we are always wanting to be something. If you are a clerk you want to become the manager, or if you are a scientist you want to explore more and more and more, and fame, publicity, you know all the rest of it, research. Research into biology, not research into your own mind, your own being. That doesn't count in the world. That is of no importance. But to be a scientist exploring into the atom is given tremendous importance.

So can we find out for ourselves the art of living? To go into that we must find out the nature of thought. Thought is born of knowledge - right? - as memory. Thought is memory, knowledge, experience. If there is no experience, no knowledge, no memory, there is no thinking. You may have a feeling but it is not active thinking. And our thinking in any direction, horizontal or vertical, linear or whole, is still limited because knowledge is always limited whether now or in the future. Is that clear? That is so, it is not what the speaker is saying, asserting, it is a fact because all our experiences are limited. When it is limited there is a demand for the more, more knowledge. And we see that knowledge, though some of the biologists and scientists say through knowledge man ascends - you must have heard them. Man ascends through knowledge, probably physically - you understand? They are building greater houses, better houses, better heating, better roads, better communication, better ways of killing man and so on and so on. So thought being limited has created this world, this society in which we live. Obviously. Thought has created all the rituals and all the religious organizations. Thought has created the gods out of

fear, out of the desire for comfort, security. Thought is a material process because - you understand - it is contained in the brain. The brain - the speaker is not an expert on brains, but he has watched how one's own brain works, its reactions, its rhythm, and so on, I won't go into all that. So thought whatever it does is limited. And being limited it can invent, invent new ways of building a cycle, better ways, invent new combustion, internal combustion machinery and so on - you know, the jet and so on. It can invent everything but invention is not creation - right? One may write a beautiful poem, and feel that is my creation but it is still within the area of thought - right? Bound to be. If one writes a poem however magnificent, however beautiful, however the depth and the rhythm of the words and all that, it is still, the feeling may be different, but the expression of it, is still within the field of thought.

And so whatever thought does is limited. And inventions are limited. One invents something and somebody comes along and invents the same thing much better and so on and so on and so on. So what is creation? This has been a question that has been asked by the ancient Hindus, the later Greeks, and we say "God has created all this" - that is a very convenient way out of things. But if one asks for oneself, putting all these assertions aside, what is creation? Can it be born out of knowledge, and therefore creation is limited? Or creation is something beyond all knowledge, it has nothing whatsoever to do with knowledge. You understand? If you go into this very seriously to find out, not I find out and tell you, but find out for oneself, as it has nothing whatsoever to do with thought, with memory, with knowledge, with experience. We will put all that, use one word to convey all that, knowledge. As we said

knowledge is always limited, now or in the future. And creation must be something limitless. Not I create a poem, that is a misuse of that word, if one may point out. We are not belittling the artist, or the painter, or the etc. but we are enquiring very, very deeply into this question to find out that which is not created by thought, the immensity of the universe. One can look at the universe through a telescope, see the various gases and so on, but the enormity of creation, the thing that is not measurable by words, we measure everything by words, to be free of knowledge - you understand? - and yet have knowledge in its place. To find that out. whether the brain can ever be free from knowledge and the word, but yet keep knowledge in its place - you understand? Driving, talking, writing a letter, various forms of skills and disciplines, there knowledge is absolutely necessary, otherwise you and I, the speaker wouldn't be sitting here. But the sense of immensity, the sense of that creation which is not measurable by thought, and therefore creation is something that has no relationship with knowledge.

2nd QUESTION: I would like to cry out for help but how can one be helped, in quotes, to freedom.

Sir, there are moments and days, periods, when we want to be helped. We want to be helped when we go to a doctor, we want to be helped when we have a disease, when we have been troubled by asking, by talking over with somebody. We are always in the world whether here or in Asia, or different parts of the world, we are always wanting to be helped - right? And there are those who give you help, the priest, the vicar in the local village, the pope, those gurus who say, "I'll help you". There are all those people in the

world who are trying to help others because people are wanting help. This is apparently a natural response to all their travail and to their misery, unhappiness. Probably most of you, if one may most respectfully point out, you are all perhaps wanting to be helped - perhaps. Some may not. And why do you want to be helped? Who is to help one? This is really quite a serious problem. We have been helped by leaders - quotes leaders - helped by priests, by psychologists, by therapists, by various literature - right? The craving, the human craving, this crying to be helped. Why? This has been going on, not only during our life time, this has been going on from the beginning of man, wanting to be helped. Or wanting, not only from another, helped by another, but also praying to God, to some symbol, to something, crying out to be helped. And this we have been doing for thousands and thousands of years - political leaders, social leaders and so on, gurus with their absurdity. All this has been going on. And we have not been helped - right? To be helped means to become strong, not depend on anybody, to see things objectively, very clearly, not personally. And because we are rather indolent we are so easily satisfied. For most of us are discontent. Discontentment is like a flame, we want to smother it. We don't keep that flame alive, because it is too troublesome, it might bring about destruction - not destruction, revolutionary physical destruction, but the destruction of one's own pettiness, one's own uncertainties and so on. So we want to be helped. And there are people who are helping us, therefore they are keeping us permanently in a state of not being able to help ourselves - right? Is it possible not to look to another? Not to look to books, to nothing because what you are is the result of being

helped? If you say to yourself, "I am going to understand myself, I am going to watch myself, see exactly what I am." - not get depressed seeing what you are, or elated, but just to observe. And this observation is very simple, if you really want it. You are not seeking help from anybody, therefore you have to rely entirely on yourself, which means tremendous responsibility. And we don't want to be responsible. This is one of the things that is happening in the world, you are becoming less and less responsible because we say the politicians will see to it, the economists will see to it, if we are troubled the psychologists, the therapists and all the rest of it.

But to have the ever flowing living, the depth and the understanding of this movement called the self, which can be perceived very clearly in the mirror of relationship - right? You are following? You can see yourself very clearly with your wife and in that relationship. Everyday action, every thought, every feeling, not letting one thought escape, watch it, then you have immense strength, then you don't rely on anybody because you are totally responsible for yourself, for your actions. And that demands a great deal of energy, not wasting energy, chattering, chattering, chattering. You follow? All that. And very few will do all this, unfortunately, because we are all rather slack. Forgive the speaker if he uses that word 'slack'.

And so the responsibility is on others, not for oneself. And if you ask for help you are making yourself more and more feeble. If you have a headache - and I am afraid most people have some kind of neuralgia and so on - you take immediately a pill. But one doesn't go into why it comes, what is the nature of it, why - find

out, work for it. You understand? See that it doesn't happen. You may be eating wrongly, etc. etc. We never go to the cause of things. Where there is a cause there is an end to it. You understand me? One drinks a tremendous lot, and next morning you have a hang-over, headache, and to overcome that headache you take a pill, and the next day you carry on - you follow? This is the way we live. A highly sophisticated world we live in and therefore to ask for help is to make oneself more feeble, more irresponsible, more dependent. Whereas if you are totally responsible for yourself, for everything that you do, or that you have promised to do, never find an excuse, you understand? So that you stand on your own feet and dignity and responsibility.

3rd QUESTION: How can we educate our children to be intelligent and both free and responsible human beings in today's world?

Do you want to go into all this? Apparently this is a question that is asked by every parent in the world. Children, and how can we help them to be intelligent and free and responsible human beings in today's world? Are the parents intelligent and free? Are the teachers intelligent and free and responsible? Is the society, the educational system helping them to be free and responsible and intelligent? So we have to enquire, if you will, why are we being educated in mathematics, and biology, science, chemistry, history, all the things that one has to learn? And go through university, college, with a degree and get a good job - at least one hopes so, not in this world where there is an immense increase of population, unemployment. So if one had a son or a daughter - if the speaker had a son and a daughter, what is going to happen to them? School,

where they have to learn how to write and read and mug up all the subjects, which then becomes a tremendous problem - you understand? You must go through mathematics - one doesn't like it but you must, if you want to be a good engineer. And so that becomes a problem. And the society says, "Become an engineer and we will pay you more" - you understand?

So we have to find out what do we mean by the word 'education'. And is it merely to learn the technique of living, acquiring a skill in a particular discipline? You understand? To become a doctor you have to work, study for ten or fifteen years. To become an excellent surgeon - you follow? - it takes time. And so on and so on. Is this what we are educating our children for? - though it is necessary, you understand? And education also, does it not mean educating the human being - you understand? - not acquiring mere techniques, a skill, but educating a human being to live with great art? That means not only technological knowledge - right? - but also the immense limitless field of the psyche, going beyond it, that is a holistic education - you understand?

So all this implies the educator needs education. The parents need education, not just the children. And if the parents love their children - love, not hold them as toys and you know, all that kind of stuff, if they really loved them would they allow their children to be killed, or to kill? You understand sirs? Governments demand - perhaps not in America or in England, but in this country, in France, in Europe, you have to go into the army for two years, how to carry a gun, how to shoot, how to kill another human being. And this, the mothers, the fathers, accept it, and they say, "We can't do anything, the governments demand this" - please, I am not

advocating that you revolt against the government, it's up to you.

So education means a holistic approach to life, cultivating the brain technologically - you understand? - and also cultivating the brain to be free of its own petty little self. That requires teachers who understand this, who are committed, who are responsible. And the parents, they must love their children. Now what happens they cuddle them, they hold them on their lap, they kiss them till they are two, five and after that they throw them to the winds - right? And this is called education. How can there be intelligence when your brain is being conditioned - you understand? Conditioned by knowledge on one side, conditioned by your own fears, anxieties, loneliness, despair, all the rest of the ugliness of human beings. And then on top of that there are the temples, churches, mosques. So religion is something entirely different, away, which has nothing to do with your life, and committed entirely to earning a livelihood - you understand? This is becoming more and more serious, this dichotomy, this separation. And education is something where there must be respect, love, affection in all this.

So will the parents, the teachers, and the students agree to all this? You are responsible for this. You are responsible, if you are a parent, what your children are going to be. One heard a parent saying, "Must I sacrifice my life - which is drinking, taking drugs, sleeping with women and so on - for my stupid little children?" You understand what I am saying? And so the world goes on this way and it has been going on for millenia, because we as parents, as human beings, do not want to live a holistic, a complete life. We are fragmented, therefore we accept that fragmentation. In that fragmentation there is no intelligence, there is no compassion,

there is no freedom.

The last question.

4th QUESTION: What is your relationship to us? (Laughter)

Will you answer that question? What is your relationship with the speaker? If you have put that question, and the speaker is putting you that question: what is your relationship with the speaker, not what is my relationship with you - you understand? I am reversing the question. I will answer the question after: what is the speaker's relationship with you - it will be answered a little later, but you have to ask first what is your relationship with the speaker? That means, why are you here? What is your intention? What is it you want? Are you here to be stimulated? To identify with a large group? To find out the truth of what the speaker is saying? Or just accept it, casually for an hour or so, and then go on in your ways as before? Or you are attracted, physically to the speaker? And the speaker has been saying this is not a personality cult at all, the person doesn't matter. What matters is what he is saying: doubt, question, ask.

So what is your relationship with the speaker?

To put the question differently: what is the relationship between light and darkness? What is the relationship between conflict and no conflict? What is the relationship between peace and war? You understand this question? That means, what is the relationship between the good and the bad? Is the good the outcome of the bad? Please we are working together. Is the good the outcome of the bad? Or is the good totally divorced from the bad? If the bad is related to the good then it is not good - right? If it is related, if good has its roots in the bad then it's partially good, therefore it is

not good - right? So one has to discover for oneself the good is totally free from the bad, totally divorced, nothing to do with each other. Violence and to be free of violence. Human beings are violent, unfortunately. One can biologically trace it to the origin of violence, derived from the animals and so on - we won't go into all that. That is, human beings are violent and they have thought out not to be violent - right? So they are violent, they have created the opposite which they call non-violence, so the non-violence is related to violence, therefore it is not free from violence - you understand? Are we working together? So the good is totally unrelated to the bad. Love and hate, if one knows hates, antagonism, like, dislike, jealousy - right? - and then says, "I love" - right? - then that love is still related to hate - right? - still related to like and dislike, and antagonism and all the rest of it.

So we are asking ourselves what is our relationship with each other. What is the relationship of a man who is free and the man who lives in a prison? You understand? We live in prison - not actual prisons with guards and you know, all that, but we have our own prisons, we make our own prisons and we live in them - right? And someone who is outside that - what is the man who lives in the prison to the man who is outside it? You understand my question? Has he any relationship to you, to the man in prison? Or the man in prison - you understand what the speaker means by prison, our fears, our anxieties, our thought, our loneliness, all the things that human beings have, that is our prison, our gods, our faith, our dogmatic or superficial opinions and so on, that is our prison. And the man is not in that prison, what is the relationship with the man in that prison and the man who is outside the prison? Has the man

in the prison any relationship with the man outside it? Naturally not. But the man outside it has a relationship with the man in prison. Have you understood?

I am in prison, suppose. And you are outside the prison. I have no relationship to you. I would like to have a relationship but I am still encaged. But you have a relationship to me - right? Because you are intelligent and all the rest of it. You love, compassion, you are intelligent, you are utterly responsible out there.

So, you understand? First we create god by thought, omnipotent, all merciful, all powerful, all seeing, all bla bla bla. And we say there is that and I will pray to be part of it. You understand? The same business. I am in prison, there you are free. And I pray to you. See the tricks I am playing. I am praying to something I have created - I have put together, not created, sorry. Put together by thought, the image, the structure, the symbol, the saviour, the guru, all the rest of it. You understand? And so on. We always want relationship with something totally outside of us - right? Something immense. And the immensity has relation to us but we have no relationship to that. If we recognize that, see the truth of it, then we will break the prison at any cost. If we see that, our brain becomes subtle, quick, we are really caught in a prison. And a man in prison is suffocating, crying, hoping, trying to get at that to be free. And he prays to that, being in prison. What value has it? You understand? It is like those people, monks and nuns the world over, praying for peace - right? And the other side, the world is preparing, gathering armaments. Yes sir, you understand the absurdity of all this?

So there is a relationship with another only when both of us are

free - right? But one is in prison and the other is not, then we are in trouble. Then we waste our energy trying to be related to that. Either one is free or one is not. And to recognize the depth of that freedom, the beauty of it, to see the immensity of that freedom there must be no self, no ego hiding in different spaces, different parts of the recesses of one's brain. Right?

We have finished for this morning. May we get up please?

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 26TH JULY 1984

This is the last meeting here. We have been handed over many, many questions and some of them we are going to answer this morning. But before we go into that how can one live in this world, in the modern world, which is becoming more and more complex and dangerous, how can one live totally honestly? What is honesty? Not honesty as some preconception, to some ideological concept, or to some fanciful imaginative, romantic, sentimental perception, but rather not to have any illusions. No illusions whatsoever. The word 'illusion' - we looked it up carefully in the dictionary - comes from the word, root word ludere, to play. We play with illusions, which have nothing whatsoever to do with our daily life. Perhaps the more imaginative one is, the more romantic and so on, and cannot possibly face this modern world, which is fairly corrupt, and if one can use the word, immoral, where money and power play an immense part, how can one live now, every day, with total honesty?

One wonders if each one of us has asked this question: to live totally an honest true life. To go into that a little bit - there are many questions before you can - what is integrity? Integrity is related to honesty. Integrity is the quality of a brain or one's existence which is whole, holistic, not fragmented. Our lives are fragmented. (There are two young people in front of me, rather serious.) Integrity, not something that one has conceived to be true, conceived, thought out to be true and live according to that. That is a form of a way of living which is fragmented because thought has

invented a concept, an ideal, something according to which one lives, which then brings about fragmentation. One conceives something to be true, logical, sane, conceives the idea, and tries to live up to that - right? That naturally brings fragmentation, a break. You have conceived something to be true, imagined, experienced, and one tries to live according to that, which has nothing to do with actual fact. And so there is always this fragment, fragmentation going on in our lives. And that partly brings about dishonesty. The idealist is really quite a dishonest man. Forgive me for saying this. Because he is living according to a preconceived way of life. "I must live according to that pattern" - which is nothing to do with daily life and so there is conflict. That breeds hypocrisy. So is it possible to live in this world with total honesty, integrity, a sense of doing the right inwardly, not externally but first inwardly, to see that one's behaviour, one's conduct, one's way of thinking is completely free of illusions, not dependent on some fanciful concept or on persons and so on. That requires tremendous integrity. So that one never says anything that is not true to yourself. What is true to oneself is rather difficult too because one may say, "It is my opinion and that is true." And if one lives according to one's opinions and therefore come into conflict with other people who have also strong opinions, there is a battle going on - right? These are all daily facts. And is it possible to have such clarity, to see things exactly as they are, not according to one's wishes and desires and all the rest of that business, but to have such a clear, logical sane, brain, that is not persuaded by personal desires, motives and dependence?

And it demands we should also go into very briefly, which we

talked about the other day, time. May we go into it a little bit? We are friends now after ten days, no, three weeks, we are friends now so we can talk together quite easily, casually and with great sense of humour and a sense of friendship, so that we can both of us look at things together. As we were saying the other day time is the past, all the memories that one has accumulated, all the experiences and so on, which is the background. That background is operating now, as you sit there. We are sitting there here, and when you listen to the words you translate those words into a certain meaning, and that meaning depends on your past knowledge and so on. So the present contains the past. There is no question about that. That is sane. And also the future, the tomorrow, is contained in the now. Which is the future is part of the past - right? Together? Are we together? The past, modified in the present, proceeds tomorrow, which is the future. So tomorrow is now. I am - one is angry for whatever reasons, if that anger is not understood, put an end to, I will be angry tomorrow again. Or perhaps not tomorrow, next week. So the future contains in the now - right? Is this clear? So the now contains all time. Right? Are we together in this a little bit? The future, the past and the present is now. And the now is both time and thought - right? Thought, which is memory stored up as knowledge and so on, which is the past, knowledge is always the past, and that past passes through the present, incidents, pressures, modifies itself and goes on. So the past is the future and the future is now - right? And can one understand this whole process, this movement? It is a movement, isn't it? From the past, through the present to the future is a constant movement, a cycle. And that cycle is our life. And can one remain - please we were thinking

about it early this morning, looking at it - can one remain in the now, which is all time, without any movement? You understand? Movement is time - right? To go from here, there, or to learn a language, it requires time. Any movement in any direction, horizontal, vertical and so on, or symmetrical, is time, any movement. And to have this sense of living totally in the now, without any movement, either of thought or of action - you understand all this? To see that time, thought is contained in the now, and that any movement away from it is caught again in time and thought. I don't know if you follow all this.

So integrity, honesty, and a sense of wholeness is a quality of brain in which there is no movement except the brain has its own rhythm. This is all Greek probably. This is very serious this because we are always acting, going round and round and round in circles. We never break the circle. And this constantly going round and round not only makes the brain quite dull but also it breeds a mechanical way of life. And a mechanical way of life is not honest, it is repetitive. So to find out what is the deep abiding, unshakable honesty, which is integrity, a wholeness, is to discover a state of brain in which there is no movement at all. This, of course, is part of meditation, which we have talked about, which we won't go into this morning.

And that non-movement has its own action in life, because to us action is doing something, achieving something, fulfilling something, in something, which is a movement from the centre to the periphery. I don't know if you follow all this. And that is what we are used to. And where there is no movement there is a wholeness, and from that wholeness there is action which can

never bring about conflict. Right? I don't know if you understand all this. I wish you would. Not that I am helping you, which would be terrible but if we could work together, see this thing, it will radically bring about fundamental change. For the brain has become so conditioned, so small, it has lost its infinite capacity because the brain has infinite capacity. Look what the technological world are doing, what extraordinary capacity has gone into it - computers, submarines, aeroplanes, you know, extraordinary things they are doing. And as the brain has that tremendous capacity in one direction, the brain is not exercising itself in another direction, which is inwardly. You understand? And when both externally and inwardly, both of them operating together there is something tremendous.

Let's go on.

1st QUESTION: How can one come to this tent without a motive, a desire to come here, to listen to you, I must have a motive to come here. How does one live without motives?

Why do you want to be without motives? Who told us that we mustn't have motives? If you have heard the speaker say motives are very destructive, then you are merely repeating what he has said. But if we could together find out what is motive, what is the significance of motives, why we have motives, not say we mustn't have it. But if you discover its meaning then we can have them or not have them. But if you say that the speaker has said one mustn't have motives and therefore how am I to live without motives, that is a wrong question altogether.

So let's find out together what is a motive, why we have motives. Why? We are not saying we must not have them: we are

saying why do we have them? The meaning of that word 'motive' means motion, to move. That is to make us move. One comes to this tent with a motive, obviously. That is, the motive is to listen to somebody. And so you come. But you have never questioned what is your motive, why you have that motive, why you have that desire. And if you are not clear about desire and motive, then you have to enquire what is my intention in coming here. Either to be helped - we all want to be helped, it is all our pain, anxiety, misery, all the terrible things we live with. And unless we go into it rather deeply, together, I am not - together, then you will have all the time motives. A motive is a direction - right? I have a motive to come here, my motive is to - for various reasons. Which is what? I have already set - the brain has set a direction - right? To understand this man, or to say, "Oh, he is a stupid man, he doesn't know what he is talking about." To criticize, to accept, to obey, to contradict, all that is occupying your mind - the brain, therefore you are not listening - right? Listening is an art, as we talked about it the other day. To listen to somebody with all your being, not to interpret what he says. But if you listen, that is the greatest miracle. Whereas if you have a motive you can't listen - right? Simple as that.

And if one has a desire, which is part of the motive, why are we slave to desire? You see we don't enquire. We accept I have a desire to come here. We don't say, "Why have I desire? What is desire?" - you understand? Drive, push, enquire, doubt. What is desire? We talked about it the other day. We will go into it briefly.

Desire is born out of sensation - right? I want to come to this tent because I will meet my friends, I haven't seen them for a year. It is a good opportunity for me to meet them, and I would also

listen to K and also mountains, scenery, I will have a good time. And the talks will be thrown in! (Laughter) That is part of our desire. Desire is, is it not - no, I won't tell you. What is desire? Not that we are saying that we shouldn't have desire, or suppress desire, or encourage desire, desire to fulfil, desire to become something, outwardly and inwardly. So desire, what is desire? To go into that one must ask: what is sensation? Right? How does sensation arise? - right? Through seeing something, a beautiful chalet, nice bathrooms and all the rest of it, and a lovely view, the view, the chalet brings - seeing it brings a sensation. That's natural. And also then thought says, "I wish I owned that chalet" - right? Which is what? Thought giving shape to sensation. Thought giving an image of yourself in that house. Clear? Right? At that moment when thought brings the image about you in that house, at that second desire is born. Right? Clear? Are we - right? So desire is given shape - no, sensation - thought gives sensation to desire. Thought creating the image, you in the car, you owning that picture, or seeing a beautiful man, woman and so on, then thought creates the image out of that sensation, at that second desire moves, is born. This is quite simple if you see this. It doesn't require tremendous brains.

And then the question is: can sensation and thought with its image of sensation be kept apart for a while? You understand? Not immediately take shape. You have understood?

There is a chalet the other day I saw - one saw, at Gstaad, very nice, beautiful, oval, modernized inside and everything as it should be. You looked at it. You live in a flat in one of the big cities and you say, "My God, I wish I had that chalet" - I am not wishing

personally, but one wishes. And desire then works to achieve that chalet, buy that chalet, or becomes envious - you know all the process that goes on - right? Now the seeing that chalet is a sensation - right? Seeing the good taps, the bath tubs, the showers, the dining room, you know the whole modern kitchen, and you don't have to wash dishes, you put it - you know, all that goes on. Then thought comes and says, "I wish I could live there". "Or rent it out, I can get a lot more money, specially in the winter!" (Laughter) All that is instantaneous - you understand? There is no interval between sensation and thought giving shape to that sensation - right? Now is it possible to keep them apart for a while? You understand? That requires great attention to see sensation and thought immediately taking, giving a shape to it. And to watch thought, the quickness of thought, and to slow down that thought. You understand? So that the slowing down and the sensation, if one watches it carefully, desire has its place - right? Well, I have gone into it.

Now we have motives. Motives to get rich, motives to be happy, motives to fulfil, desire to have one's roots, to identify oneself with something. This is the everyday business of one's life. And the motive is always changing. Therefore motive gives shape to our life - right? Desire. Desire, motive and so on. So the past - see this - so the past is giving shape to our life - right? The motive is the past. You understand? So the past, which is the motive, which is giving a direction, is giving the mould of our life. Right? Therefore we are the past. Clear? Of course. The past is memory - right? Which is tradition, all the rest of it. So we are the past. We are memories. A whole series of memories, a bundle of memories,

and that is the self, the ego, conscious and the other thing is unconscious. There is no unconscious, there is only total consciousness, not breaking it up, as unconscious and conscious. I won't go into that.

So to break this cycle is to understand time. You understand? - which we went into. But as we have motives, which has almost become normal in our life, how can one live without a motive? And we have accepted motives. We never question our motives, or invent new motives, or justify one's own motives. You understand? But we never say go into this whole question of desire, motive and fulfilment - right? So that brings us to the point, can one listen so completely to another, not interpret what the other fellow is saying, or the woman, but to listen so completely, not only hearing with the ear, but also hearing with the inner ear, as it were so that you are giving total attention. Where there is attention you don't have to have motive - right?

2nd QUESTION: To begin with most of us must consciously be attentive, but does this attention become a constant spontaneous state of action?

There is a desire there, motive. You understand? You see this? How can I maintain this attention constantly? Continuously. That means you have already a motive - right? So let's enquire: what is attention?

And also what is not being attentive, inattention - right? Inattention and attention. What is attention? What is the relationship of attention to awareness? Right? You understand? We are aware of the tent, of the people and so on. In that awareness, which is to see the whole thing, as you enter in the tent you see.

And in that attention, in that awareness there is choice. Are there my friends there, I don't know those people there. I wave to the friends and I don't to the others. And in that awareness I say, "That is a nice shirt, and that is a rather ugly one. He has got a rather nice face, and she looks quite nice and intelligent. I am surprised she is here" (Laughter) It is quite funny. (Laughter) So in that awareness there is choice - right? There is choice. They are there and here. So that choice prevents total awareness. Can one be aware without choice? You understand? You do it now as we are talking. Please don't look at me but watch yourself and see if you can be aware without any choice. You have to choose between good material and bad material - right? You have to choose between a good car and a bad car, second hand car and so on and so on. We won't go into that. You have to choose. But in awareness can one be free of choice altogether? Just to be aware and not say, "I don't like this shirt, I do like that shirt, he is nice to me" - you follow? All that activity going on. To be so completely aware without choice is attention - right? Is that clear? Are we together in this? We are together in this only if you do it. If you are completely aware that you choose, that you have like and dislike, that you have motive, and see how these motives, like and dislike, my friend and not my friend, you know all that thing that goes on, then you are not aware fully. You are aware fully when you have no choice naturally - right? That state of awareness is attention - right? That state of attention has no me in the middle of it. Clear? Choice always has a centre from which you choose - right? That is the ego, the me, the self, and all that. Whereas if you observe and be aware without choice, that awareness expands to total attention. In that attention

there is no self, there is no me, I like, don't like - you follow? All that business.

So, now what is inattention? Is inattention distraction? You understand? We are distracted by the noise, by the train, by, you know various forms of distractions. Why do we call it distractions? You are following all this? Are we together in this? Why do we call it distraction? Because I don't want to be distracted from this, from what I am doing - right? Where the doing is attention? And if I become, if there is attention where there is inattention, the inattention is attention. Oh lordy! Why do we call it inattention? I don't think there is such a thing as inattention, or distraction. There is only complete attention or not attention. That's all. Right? I would not, personally we wouldn't say there is any distraction. There is a train going by, I am aware of it. And there is no choice, I want to listen to that man - you understand? I am just listening to that sound. So there is only attention, and why shouldn't there be inattention, what is wrong? We are working all day and we sleep at night - right? Would you call sleeping inattention? You understand? One goes for a walk, looks at all the trees, the mountains, the perfume on a sunny day of the pines, and the running river, the sound of it, that is all attention, if you are attentive. And why should there be no attention, you take a relax - you follow? We want to be something all the time. We want to have a continuity of something, which we think is right. And therefore that which has continuity is not right. Right? I wonder if you understand this? Are we together in this? We want a continuity, don't we? Continuity of happiness, continuity of relationship, continuity of so many, many things, which is what?

Continuity of memory - right? And if there is no continuity we feel lost, we feel empty. Why shouldn't we be empty for a while? Why shouldn't we be nothing? Even for a few minutes. But to us that is frightening because we know continuity - right? So attention has no continuity. There is only attention. One doesn't say, "I must be continuously attentive" - then it is a mechanical process. Attention is something living, not a conclusion that I must be attentive. That becomes too childish - right?

3rd QUESTION: Could you tell us something more about this vast intelligence of which you speak? Is it an untapped capacity within the brain, or is it some disembodied force to which we may become open?

Lovely question, isn't it?

There is ordinary intelligence, isn't there? You wouldn't be sitting here if you hadn't intelligence, would you? You took a train, you walked, you went by a car, you went by a bus and so on, which is the exercise of intelligence to come here because you wanted to come. Or it is intelligence to write a good letter. It is intelligence to put the computer together. It is intelligence that has put man on the moon. And it is not intelligence that puts a flag up there!

(Laughter) Right? And it is intelligence that has made the computers, missiles, the atom bombs, the neutron bomb, the hydrogen bomb and all the things they are investigating about cancer - you follow? Liver trouble and so on and so on and so on. That all requires intelligence. And that intelligence is the outcome of thought - right? Right? But that intelligence is limited because it is the outcome of very careful, logical, experimental, systematic working it out, which is thought - right? And thought is limited

therefore all measurement, which is technology, is limited; they are adding more and more and more every year - right? Where there is the 'more' it is limited - right? Are we together? Or the better is limited. I am better than yesterday. It is very limited.

Now, is there an intelligence which is not limited? I am asking you, I am - we are not telling each other. We recognise the common intelligence - earn money, do business, go to the factory, get up in the mornings, you know, all the rest of it. That requires certain intelligence, which is limited - right? Because it is the outcome of thought. And thought born of knowledge, and as knowledge is limited always in the future or now, so thought is always limited. And the intelligence of thought is limited. That is simple. And is there intelligence which is not limited? Right? Now who is going to find out? How will you find out? How - not how - how do you enquire? You understand? How do you probe into this, knowing that thought has created intelligence which is limited? The artist, the poet, the great sculptures, the great literary people, painters and so on, all their things are limited naturally - though the artists may not accept that. Scientists have accepted it because they are adding more and more and more every year, getting more and more knowledge about biology, about everything. So is there an intelligence which is not additive? You understand the word adding, adding, adding to it? How can one probe into this?

To go into it together - I am not telling you what to do, please. I am not your guru. I am not your leader. I am not your helper. That's not cruelty because we have been helped by so many people for thousands of years and this help has made us weak. This help from seeking from so many directions is making us feeble. We

cannot stand on our own feet, observe and be responsible - right? If you are seeking help how can you be responsible? Or if you are dependent, how can you be responsible?

So how do we - is it possible to probe into this? Into that intelligence which is not limited? That intelligence we don't know - right? It is not the speaker has talked about it, he may know it, or he may not know it, that is irrelevant. But how shall we come upon it? To enquire into it, I must enquire into my whole existence - right? That means my existence, daily existence not some illusory existence on another plane, on another dimension and so on, super ego, super consciousness, all that ideological nonsense.

So I must probe into my life. Obviously the first thing is where there is conflict there is no intelligence. Right? If I am in conflict all the time with people, with ideas, with theories, opinions - right? - so is there an end to conflict? Which means is there an end to conflict and other problems so that the brain is free? Right? Are we together in this, at least verbally? You can see the logic of it, the sanity of this. The brain is conditioned and conditioned to conflict - I am taking that one issue. The brain is in conflict. Where there is conflict it is impossible to see things clearly. Right? I see things very clearly that thought is limited and whatever it does is limited, technologically, or spiritually, so-called spiritually, is limited. And one sees also conflict being the way of life, struggle, being somebody, achieving something and so on and so on and so on, is conflict. And conflict distorts perception - right? If I am quarrelling with my wife, or my husband, or with the neighbour, I cannot see things as they are. I won't go into it more.

So there must be, if I see the truth of it, that very truth frees the

brain from conflict. That is intelligence. Right? Seeing the truth of something and let that truth act - right? I see very clearly as long as there is conflict in the brain it is not possible to see things clearly. That very perception ends conflict - right? Because it is so. It is so - a snake is dangerous. A wild animal is dangerous. It is so. There is no two ways about it. Right?

So where is conflict, where is the root of conflict? What makes the brain live in endless conflict? Is there a remedy for it? Not drugs, not alcohol, not some kind of fanciful imagination. Is there a perception that frees the brain from conflict and therefore that brain is now moving or living in quite a different state - right? And what is that state? You are following? We are not analysing, we are just observing.

Very briefly, we have got so little time, very briefly: the analyser is the analysed. Now there is the analyser separate from the thing he is analysing. I am analysing myself, suppose. I have separated myself from the thing which I am observing - right? I am angry or jealous or neurotic, probably neurotic more. I am neurotic and then I say, why am I neurotic as though it was something outside of me - right? I am neurotic because the brain is neurotic - right? My whole being is neurotic, it is not I am different from neurosis. So the observer, the analyser is the analysed - clear? Like the experiencer is the experience. Of course. It is rather difficult. Need I go into this? The thinker is the thought - right? That's clear. The thinker who says "I am separate from thought" and therefore he controls thought, shapes - right? But the thinker is thought itself. So the thinker is the thought. The analyser is the analysed.

Now move the next step, which is: the experiencer is not

different from the experience. He thinks he is different and therefore he says "I must experience". To experience you must recognise it - right? Otherwise it is not an experience. But to recognise it is to already know it. I wonder if - so the experiencer is the experience. The thinker is the thought. The analyser is the analysed. Right? Probably the analysts and therapists and so on won't agree with this. But it doesn't matter. Probably, I say, they may.

So there has been - if there is no conflict it means there is only the fact - right? Right? There is only the ending of conflict. It is a fact. Or not a fact. Then what takes place in relationship? You understand? That is when there is no conflict inside my brain, inside the brain, it is not my brain, it is the brain of all of us - that we won't go into for the moment. This brain is now without conflict - right? Because I have watched it, worked, looked at it and therefore in my relationship there is no conflict - with the woman, the man - right? Then when there is no conflict in relationship then what is it? Is it not love? Right? When there is no conflict - you understand? You are all so dazed about all this. When there is no conflict between you and me, you understand, there is no difference between you and me. You may be a woman and I am a man and so on. You may be tall, short, black, white, purple, or whatever it is, but when there is no conflict there is total relationship with you and me. That is love. Right? Love is not jealousy. Love is not desire. Love is not pleasure. Pleasure means conflict. Desire means conflict. I want to do something, you might want, my wife wants to do something else. Where there is love she can do what she wants but there is love. You understand? The

whole transformation has taken place. Where there is love there is compassion. And where there is love and compassion that is intelligence. That intelligence gives - in that intelligence there is absolute security, not relative security. You understand? That is intelligence. But one has to be tremendously watchful, which we have been now. And that intelligence is limitless, it is not yours, or mine, it is intelligence. Love is not my love and your love, it is love. Yes sirs. That love may be for one or the many, it is still love. Where there is love there is no hate, there is no enemy. Sir, don't you know all this?

So that is intelligence. You can't talk endlessly about it unless you do it. One can talk about it, as I have been doing. If you go into it much deeper - I don't know if there is time.

You know, have you ever thought, looked at a drum? A drum is tuned to its highest excellence, the right tone. And when you strike on it, it gives the right note. Right? It is tuned. So the brain when it is tuned it gives the right note, the right response. I wonder if you capture all this. And it is not tuned, like the drum is not, when it is in conflict, it is slack. So to have the brain tuned. Not you tune the brain, because you are part of the brain. I won't go into all that. So is it possible, like the drum which is tuned to its highest excellence, to have the brain so tuned that it gives the right note all the time. Yes sirs.

4th QUESTION: Why do the teachings you put forth have so little effect on us? (Laughter) Why do the so-called teachings - I am adding the word 'so-called' - have so little effect on us?

Are you asking the question of the speaker? Or are you asking the question of yourself? Many people have asked this question of

the speaker. And the speaker says to you: have you asked that question of yourself? Why a truth has so little effect on you, on us, why? One can give a dozen reasons - right? Laziness, indifference, weariness, boredom, holding onto one's habit, being conditioned, and saying it is awfully difficult to get rid of conditioning, what am I to do about it, tell me about it, and so on and so on and so on. So you are never asking this question of yourself: why some of you who have listened to the speaker for years and years and years, why have you not changed? The speaker is asking you the question. You are not asking the speaker. I am reversing - the speaker is reversing the table on to you. He is challenging you if you will kindly - that challenge is respectful, not impudent. So he says: why have you not, having heard, heard, heard, read, video and all the bla, why have you not changed? Will more suffering help you to change? Because we have suffered for a million years, a thousand years, one day of suffering is enough. So will suffering help you, more suffering, help you? Obviously not - right? More pressure? Obviously not, you have had tremendous pressures, environmental, monetary, every kind of pressures, impressions, and more threats, will it change you? Hell and heaven - threats. That has not changed us. More leaders, better leaders, wiser leaders, better gurus than the old guru! What will make us change? Nothing, except your own perception - right? Nothing from the outside can ever change us. The communists tried this. The totalitarians have said this, let us organize the outside so marvellously etc. you know, all the rest of it if you have followed the communist theories and so on, hoping by external arrangements the psyche will change. Right? That is one of their deep tenets.

And it has not happened. On the contrary.

So what will make each one of us change? Not superficially, adjusting to some words and some ideas, that is no change at all, but something profoundly, radically change. If you do not rely on the outer then you have to rely entirely on yourself. And because we cannot rely on ourselves we seek help, we seek all the gurus, read books and all the rest of it because we have never been able to look at ourselves, work this out for ourselves. Which doesn't mean we become more and more selfish. On the contrary this demands great responsibility - you understand? That you are totally responsible for yourself whatever you do. It is no good blaming environment, heritage, my mother and father were like this therefore I am like that. Society is ugly so I am caught in society - you follow? This demands that you work. Either you work hard, you work very hard to earn money - right? Spend years and years, day after day, night after night, year in and year out, to get money - realize how you all work, all the human beings work. And we don't work an infinitesimal of that energy inwardly. And we have become feeble, irresponsible. So we don't change because we don't want to - simply. If you want to do something you do it.

Sirs, we have answered most of the questions. It is nearly twelve o'clock. Really there is no question at all. There are no questions at all, and therefore no answers. You are the problem. You are the trap. One is caught in this prison and you have to work like - I was going to say hell - you have to work, observe and all the rest of it must come from your heart and your mind, then you are a total human being, free. Where there is freedom there is no fear. Or rather where there is fear there is no freedom. And when

there is freedom you don't need any god - right? Right sirs.

SAN FRANCISCO NEW DIMENSIONS RADIO INTERVIEW WITH MICHAEL TOMS 5TH MARCH, 1984

MT: Krishnaji, welcome. It's good to be with you again. The last time we were together we talked about many things, but principally it evolved around you talking about your understanding and experience of meditation. And I was thinking, I was reflecting on our getting together and having a conversation, a dialogue, that many people, many of us, see ourselves in a world of conflict and chaos, and one of the things you said in the last conversation we had, and I quote, was, 'Love means freedom from all conflict.' And I thought that would be a good beginning point for us today. How do we, or what is the first step towards eliminating conflict? As you've suggested the conflict externally is the one that emanates from ourselves, but achieving that state of love you talk about and moving beyond conflict, where does that begin?

K: I think one has to go into it, not where it begins, but rather what is conflict, not only externally but also inwardly. Psychologically it is far more important to understand the nature of conflict, rather than the outward conflict. After all the outward conflict is the result of the society which human beings have created, with all the immorality, with all the corruption, and the monstrous things that are happening in society - human beings have created it. It is not the result of some divine structure. So unless we understand ourselves very deeply, and understand the nature and the structure of conflict, merely trying to organize a state where there is no conflict, or minimize conflict, seems rather

vague and not going into it very deeply.

What is conflict in human beings? Why does it exist? It has existed for thousands of years; whether it is in the Far East, or in Europe, or here, conflict has been one of the major problems: violence, the pursuit of violence, and the pursuit of ideals and so on. What is conflict. If we could discuss that, and understand why human beings have not resolved this problem after forty thousand years of evolution. It is really quite a... if you go into it very deeply whether it is possible to end psychological conflict altogether. It isn't a theory. To me theories and ideals and suppositions have no meaning whatsoever. I think one has to look at things as they are, not translate 'what is' into terms of 'what should be'. We have to face things as they are and see if human beings, fairly intelligent, so-called educated, can end this conflict.

So let's begin to have a dialogue. What is conflict? Conflict implies contradiction: 'what is' and 'what should be'. There is a duality, opposing elements in it: desiring one thing and then contradicting it by another desire. It is really a very complex problem, it can't just be, 'Tell me a system how to end conflict' because that is too childish. Every system intrinsically has its own degeneration: every system, whether it is political, religious, or psychological, or even scientific systems; it is called entropy. So if we could talk over together, not how to end conflict, but rather understand the whole nature of it.

MT: Well, in order to have contradiction one has to have a sense of an idea, a concept, a sense of self is a word to be contradicted in the first place.

K: No. Why should we have an idea? Suppose one is violent, as

human beings are violent, it is shown through five or six thousand years of war, practically every year, not only externally. Let us take an example, let us look at it that way. One is greedy. Why should you have the opposite of it? The idea of non-greed. Why should we have the concept, or the idea, or a projection of not being greedy, why? The fact is we are greedy, let's deal with that, not with non-greed. I don't know if I am conveying?

MT: Yes.

K: Why are we greedy? I mean greed has been one of the major drives of human activity. Right?

MT: Yes.

K: So what is greed? If we could go into all this kind of thing, and not say, tell me quickly how to end conflict. That has no meaning. So could we take an example as greed or violence, and see it in oneself, because we have created this society, it isn't a selfish activity, it isn't a self-centred process of self-concern. Human beings right through the world are violent, or greedy, or any other characteristic. Now what is far important than 'what should be'? A human being is violent. That has been inherited through the animals right up to the present day existence, violence has been one of the characteristics or ethos of human beings; not only in their personal relationships but generally outwardly too.

So let's take violence: what is violence? Why are we violent? Don't say, society has made me violent, or the environment has made me violent. Because the society is created by each one of us. The environment is structured by all of us, not nature, naturally, but the society in which we live, social interrelationship, social activity and all that, what we call society. We have created it. We

go about altering the organization of society. The more you organize it the worst it seems to get. Whereas if we say we are responsible for it completely, each one of us whether we live in Asia or in Europe, or here, each human being living on this earth, which is beautiful, extraordinarily alive, nature, because we have created this society we try to change the organization of society. We never say, I will change, I am violent, I am responsible for violence. The world now, as we all know, is aflame, terrible things are happening, of which most of us are not even aware. And that world is us, we are the world. We are not separate from the world, we are not separate from society. So our consciousness - if we can use that word and go into the nature of consciousness a little later - our consciousness is part of violence, violence is part of that consciousness.

So what is violence? Not only getting angry and hitting each other, killing each other but also inwardly, psychologically, what is violence? Aggression obviously, competition, which is encouraged by the world tremendously, especially in this country: if you compete you become successful. And violence is also essentially, 'I am', 'I must be'. I am - if you want to go into it very deeply - I am ignorant but I will be knowledgeable; there is this constant struggle of conformity, imitation, which are all various forms of violence - aggression, the urge to succeed, to compete, the conformity, imitation, all those are various forms of violence. You may not agree with this, but if you go into it, these are really aspects of violence.

So what is the root of violence? These are the various aspects, like a prism. So why are human beings, whether highly

sophisticated or the man who has never read a book, doesn't even know how to write, he is also violent - the extreme rich and the extreme poor, the black, you know the whole division, classical division, aristocratic division. Is division one of the factors of conflict, me and you? I don't know if you see.

MT: The feeling of being separate from another.

K: Separate. The American and the Russian, ideologically divided; one as a system of tyranny, the other a so-called democratic society. Ideals. So ideals are in conflict. I believe in one thing and you believe in another. I am a Jew, you are a Arab. You understand? So is this division basically one of the causes, or the major cause, of conflict, not only outside but inside? One is a Catholic, after two thousand years of propaganda - forgive me if I can put it that way - you have divided yourself saying, I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a Hindu, I am a Muslim, and all the rest of that terrible division that exists, geographically, nationally, racially and specially religiously. So can man be free of all this? Not speculatively free but actually free from all religious divisions. After all the Hindus, three thousand to five thousand years, have lived with certain traditions, cultivated, propaganda, brainwashed; so have the Muslims, so have the Christians. You understand, the problem is enormous. As the problem is enormous we never approach it simply.

MT: We see it as very complex.

K: We see it's complex, but we say, see the simplicity of it that as long as there is division there must be conflict. That's a law. Not invented by the speaker, by me, it is a law where there is the Arab, Jew, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, or various sects and beliefs,

multiplication of sects, multiplication of gurus, and all the absurdities of all that. So could we see the logic of it, the sanity of it and set aside all this? Not be a Hindu, not outwardly, I don't mean outwardly, inwardly; not be a Catholic. Because this division, which is based on belief...

MT: It is extremely difficult for most people to give up beliefs.

K: Of course. Because certain forms of belief give them security, they feel safe, they feel protected by long centuries of certain beliefs, certain dogmas.

MT: Some people think that is a natural inclination to feel safe and secure, that is something that is built into human nature.

K: One must be secure but not in illusions. If we accept security to be in illusions, like nationalism is an illusion, and so on, that very acceptance of certain ideological or conceptual beliefs is dividing the people.

MT: You are saying that something like nationalism is an illusion because it is a belief system? That's why it is illusory?

K: We are human beings first, not Americans, Russians, or Hindus, we are human beings. And if we are human beings why introduce all this? First let's understand ourselves, knowing that we are responsible for the society which we have created, for the wars. Wars exist because of nationalism, economic divisions - my country first, my religion first. You can see all this, every magazine is that, every politician and so on. And that's why one feels the world is getting more and more dangerous to live in, the threatening of war - all based on this narrow concept of human existence.

MT: The idea of nationalism.

K: Nationalism. Not only that, the idea, I am a Christian, I am a Catholic, Protestant, the innumerable divisions in Christianity and Hinduism and so on. The world if Islam is broken up. They all believe in god: your god and my god. But god, if I may be - I am not an atheist, I am a very religious person, but god is the invention of thought, born of fear, born of uncertainty, born of terrible loneliness, separation. Therefore I project an idea of god. Look at it, sir, sanely and logically. The Hindu god, the Muslim god, the Christian god, and they all talk about peace and they are all fighting each other. Peace requires - to understand peace requires a great deal of intelligence, which is not based on some kind of belief.

So let's come back to the point: as long as there is division in myself, fragmentation, broken up, that very fragmentation is one of the major causes of conflict: I want this, and a little later I don't want it. So if you want to go into it very deeply, isn't desire one of the causes of conflict?

MT: Desire for achieving something.

K: Desire in itself, per se. Isn't it one of the major causes of conflict? I desire to be powerful - power. We all want power from the president down to the prime minister, to each one of us, we all want power - power in our little yard. And the desire for power is one of the causes for conflict. Another cause is, I seek power, I want power more than anything else, which means money, position, security, popularity, the whole superstitious nonsense that is going on in the world. Sorry if I put it emphatically. So as conflict is a very complex problem one has to approach it very simply, and freely.

So as long as there is division, nationally, religiously, economically, socially, there must be conflict, outside as well as psychologically. And to end that conflict one has to go into this whole content of our consciousness. Some scientists and psychologists perhaps don't accept consciousness, but consciousness is our reactions, both biological and psychological reactions. And also our fears, our anxieties, our depression, our beliefs and so on, the whole of human nature, what humans are. That's our consciousness: I am a Catholic, a Protestant and so on. Right, sir?

MT: Aren't those belief systems that are the content of consciousness?

K: Belief is, of course.

MT: Krishnaji, you have been speaking about consciousness.

K: Yes, sir. You see the crisis is in our consciousness, not in the world.

MT: It is internal as opposed to being external.

K: Consciousness. The crisis we think is economic, political or so on, but the crisis is in our consciousness, because we have lived for fifty thousand years on this earth, and we've hardly changed at all, psychologically. Technologically we have tremendously advanced, frighteningly advanced - atom bombs and all the rest of it. And also technologically has given man a great deal of health and so on, communication - this is it, radio, television and so on. Inwardly we are almost the same as we've always been: frightened, lonely, depressed, violent, greedy, you know the whole of human nature. There we are almost static. And if we remain as we are we will be - for the next forty thousand years - exactly what we are. I

don't know if you want to go into it, but we have to go into the question of time.

Time is part of our consciousness. I have been, I will be - the past, the present and the future. So if we do not psychologically have tremendous revolution inwardly we will be tomorrow exactly what we are. It is so. There is no question of disputing that point. So can we change now? Not wait for tomorrow, and the gradual process. The gradual process has led us to this. I mean Darwin and all the species, but we have not basically brought about a deep fundamental change in ourselves, in our consciousness. And that change, we think, will come through evolution: give me time, I will become. Man has had forty thousand years and more of time, and we are still barbarians. I am using the word barbarian in the right sense of that word.

So is it possible for a human being to realize all this, that time is an enemy of man, psychologically. I need time to learn a language, to understand the computer, to go to the Moon, I need a great deal of time; but psychologically, inwardly, if we think in terms of time we will be caught in the same process as we have been for forty thousand years. This is logical. But we don't want to be logical, we want to be romantic and all the rest of the business. So is it possible to have a complete change in the content of our consciousness? You understand? The content is our beliefs, our ideals, our fears, our nationalities, you know, the whole structure and the nature of the human psyche, is our consciousness. And if there is no basic revolution there, psychologically, we shall be in another ten thousand years exactly what we are.

So we are asking a very serious question, which we have

discussed with many scientists, with so-called brain specialists and so on: can there be a radical change in the very psyche, which is made up of consciousness, so that the brain cells themselves are different? I don't know if you want to go into all that.

MT: Is consciousness limited to the brain?

K: Yes, of course. It is part of the brain. The brain is the centre of our reactions, both biological, physiological and psychological. And that brain has been conditioned for forty thousand years to be violent; for two thousand years to be a Christian, or two thousand years to be a Catholic, and so on. I hope I am not disturbing you people who are so attached to their particular forms of beliefs.

MT: You may be. That's all right.

K: That's all right. I don't mind. You can throw me out whenever you want. But these are obviously logical, sane facts. And most of us are unwilling to face facts, and change the facts. To change the fact is to remain with it, give your whole attention to the fact. But you cannot give your whole attention if the fact is looked at with an ideal. Fact is fact. The non-fact is the ideal. So could we give complete attention to what we are? What we are is what is happening every moment: anger, pleasure, sexual demands, various aspects of violence and so on, the whole content of our consciousness as it arises. Which is, the 'me', the self, is consciousness. I don't know if I am making it clear.

MT: Yes.

K: My consciousness is knowledge: I am frightened, that is knowledge. I am greedy; I am a Christian, I am a Hindu, Islam and so on, that is based on knowledge. So the self, the 'me', the persona, is knowledge.

MT: We also have this sense of wanting to accumulate more of that knowledge.

K: Yes. Not only that, it gives one power, position, status and so on, but also it's very satisfying to have power, power over somebody. The whole tyrannical, political world, the totalitarian states are tremendously powerful. Look at Poland and all the rest of it. The few are in power, and it's like the good old system of tyranny.

So we are asking a very serious question, whether the human brain, which has been conditioned for forty thousand years in this state, can radically transform, change itself - not transform, because transform means changing from one form to another form. But radically change to something totally new. Sir, I don't know if you want to go into all this, it involves the question of death.

MT: Please.

K: I don't know if you want to go into all that. You wanted to discuss something about meditation.

MT: Well we did that last time. I think you should continue.

K: All right. I think death is an extraordinarily important factor in life, because we are all going to die, whether we are Christians or Hindus, we are all going to die. Some believe in reincarnation, life after death, you know, and that belief has no actual effect in daily life, it is just a belief, a comforting belief. But the actual living of that, because if I die and I may be born next life, which means what I do now matters next life: correct behaviour, morality, no corruption and so on, because whatever I am now I will be next life. But that belief has no value. It is like playing a game.

MT: It hasn't made much of a difference.

K: None at all. So death is an extraordinarily important thing in life. But we have separated living from death. We are frightened even to talk about it. There are lots of books being written now, how to die happily. It sounds silly.

MT: Well I think most of us are terror stricken about the idea of death.

K: Frightened.

MT: So if you can die happily, it seems to be something you would gravitate to naturally.

K: It sounds rather absurd, to die happily. Nobody wants to die.

MT: True enough.

K: Nobody wants to because living is very important to them. Is living so important? What is living? What is it we call living? Going to the office every day for the next fifty years? Having conflict day after day, struggle, pain, sorrow, pleasure?

MT: Well, I think most people would say that living is trying to be happy, pursuing some form of pleasure.

K: Yes. Is there? Some form of pleasure, which endures for a couple of weeks and then you change to some other pleasure. So the pleasure is a very insubstantial thing. So this process of living, what we call living, is a conflict from the moment you are born until you die, struggle. Right? With an occasional flare of joy and flare of something else, but this battle goes on all the time. This thing we call living. We are not saying death is preferable. That's absurd. But why have we separated the two? Death means the ending.

MT: Ending of what?

K: Ending: biologically ending, physically, ending to all my

attachments, to this house, to my wife, to my children, to my books, to my bank account. I am attached. And death comes along, by accident, disease, or old age and says, 'Sorry, old boy, that's the end of it. You can't take it with you.'

MT: Yes.

K: So this is really a very important question to ask. Instead of separating living and dying, giving it a long duration of time, because where there is fear of death there is no love, there is no passion, except lust. Freedom and passion go together. So, ending. What is it to end?

MT: That sense of self, the me.

K: To end, sir. To end something.

MT: Finished, it's over.

K: No. Go into the question of ending. Of course finishing something, but the nature of ending something, ending. Do we ever end anything? That is, if we end something, in that very ending there is something else coming. I have got cancer, if I end it I will be very happy. There is always a reward, or a punishment. I don't know if you see. So our life is based on reward and punishment. And we have never enquired what it means to end. End. Not, if I end what is there? If you say there is something there, you have already projected something, therefore you have never ended. This is really a very interesting question, the ending. So death is a form of ending. And because we are frightened of it we invent life after death, and proofs and you know all the rest of it. Which is all rather speculative, doubtful. But if we could live with death, which doesn't mean suicide, live with death - morning, evening, day in, day out, live with it. So there is no attachment. I am no longer a

Hindu, a Christian, ending everything. It's not a question of determination. Why separate living, death and be frightened of it, terrified? And the expense of all that: the funerals, specially in this country, profit - you follow, the whole commercialism around death.

MT: What is the link between our fear of death and our conflict?

K: Sir, to end conflict: not, if I end conflict what is there? Not to ask that question, to end it. Because this is very important. Could we look at it differently? We are wasting our energy tremendously, conflict is a wastage of energy. Like an internal combustion machine, if you put gravel into it, it wears itself out. So we are wearing ourselves out psychologically; constant conflict, struggle, never a period of quietness. And to have quiet you meditate. And then a struggle: which is the best meditation, how am I to practise, I must practise. That's also conflict.

MT: Another system, another belief, an idea.

K: Never a day in which you are absolutely quiet, not occupied with something or other. So the ending totally is the cessation of wasting of energy. If I have no conflict I have got tremendous energy. If I am not frightened, fear, there is great energy. So we are wasting our energy. And to live a life without wasting energy - you understand, sir - that is something extraordinary. Which means as long as we are wasting energy our life becomes very small, selfish, narrow, broken up. If there is no wastage of energy, no conflict, which is very, very... - we went into it - then there is an art of living, which you don't learn in schools, or colleges, or from the specialists. You yourself have to become aware of it, attentive.

And that very attention is like a flame which burns out the wastage of energy.

Is that enough, sir?

MT: Well, I am sure there is a lot more.

K: Lots more.

MT: But you've covered it pretty well. Thank you for being with us.

SAN FRANCISCO 1ST PUBLIC TALK 5TH MAY 1984

If I may I would like to point out, this is a serious talk, today and tomorrow. It is not an entertainment, either intellectually or emotionally, sentimentally. Nor are we doing any kind of propaganda to convince you of anything, nor to bring about a new ideology or a philosophy, an exotic nonsense. So please this is a dialogue between you and the speaker. As there are so many people, a dialogue is only possible between two people, a conversation is much more applicable between you and the speaker, in which you are taking part in what he is saying, and not merely listening verbally, or intellectually, not only to the content of the word but also the deeper significance of the word.

All this requires a great deal of attention and energy. And most of us waste our life. We waste our life in so many ways. And to grasp the whole significance of life and death and to find out, or to come upon that which is beyond time, one needs a great deal of passion, a great sense of freedom, and that requires daily action. And we are going to go into all these matters.

First of all we should talk over together - I mean together, not that you listen to what the speaker is saying, agreeing, or disagreeing, or accepting certain ideas and rejecting others, but we are dealing with the whole existence of life, the whole problem of humanity; not only the particular problem of each one of us but the entire human existence. It may sound rather grandiose but it is not. Because each one of us, as we live, with our greeds, anxieties, pain, pleasure, passing love, hatreds, antagonisms, and the eternal

conflict in which all human beings seem to live, from the most ancient of times to the present, all this requires that we think together. Not accepting what the speaker is saying but thinking together, which is very rare. Because if we can think together, not according to your particular way, or tendency, or according to one's conditioning, but think about these various matters that we are going to discuss, if we could somehow manage to put away our personal opinions for a while, if you can, and also our various inclinations and sentiments of belief, and all that business, if we could observe together, think together, then it is possible, one feels, that one can understand at great depth the world of freedom.

If one has a concept what freedom is - from the ancient of times, the Greeks and Egyptians, the Chinese and the Hindus have talked a great deal about freedom: freedom from all bondage, freedom from one's own self created prison, freedom from the various impressions, impositions of society, of all the religious structures, to be so completely free, not committed to any particular ideology, not pursuing one's own particular pleasure with all its complications and pain, to understand the real depth of freedom. Because we are in prison, both self made and the society in which we live, this society is made by human beings. The present American culture, the way of life, the American way of life, and so on, is made by the human beings that live on this side of the world. We are responsible, each one of us, whether we live in this country, affluent, fairly, economically uncertain, tremendous unemployment, and so on, all the political ugliness that is going on, we have created, each one of us, this society. Of that there is not doubt. One can question, but if one is fairly inquisitive,

fairly playing a straight game to observe, then one can see that each one of us is responsible for this society in which we live, with all its corruption, immorality, injustice, poverty, the various forms of political tyranny and so on. This society not only in this country, but in Europe, India and China, we have created this. And mere reformation, or reorganization of society has no meaning. We think it is progress when organization is reorganized. I do not know if you have observed all this, impartially, objectively, with a great deal of scepticism, doubt.

Apparently not only in this country but all over the world human beings are becoming rather gullible. It has been encouraged by religions, specially by Christianity because if you doubt, question the whole structure of so-called religious existence, the whole thing collapses. And in the Asiatic world, specially the Buddhist and the ancient Hindus, insisted that you must question, not accept, not obey. You must doubt, not only every kind of experience that you yourself have, the memories of that experience; question, doubt, enquire its significance. But apparently any form of doubt, enquiry into our very nature, into all the political, religious organizations - it is only through enquiry, not merely the enquiry of professionals, the experts, the specialists, but each one of us enquiring, questioning, asking, it becomes then very important for the brain because through doubt, questioning, the conditioning of the brain begins to break up.

One hopes that each of us is following this conversation. The speaker is unfortunately sitting on a platform; it is merely for convenience. He is not a professional, he is not an expert, he is not a specialist on religion or any kind of philosophy. We are enquiring

together into the whole problem of existence. So we are on the same level, with the same intensity, at the same time. We are taking a journey together. Perhaps one may walk very fast, or very slowly, but whether we walk slowly or very fast we are walking together. If one goes fast, one must not go so fast for the ones who are slow.

So we are enquiring together, questioning what is freedom? In the world, and specially in the modern world, which is the American world, which is spreading all over the world except in the totalitarian states, though there too there are dissidents, disagreements, and so on, in this world we are slaves to experts, specially in this country - sex specialists, specialists of behaviour, specialists of make-up - right - specialists how you dress, how you walk, how you bear your children, and all the rest of it. And these specialists are becoming more and more powerful right through the world. And through that way is there freedom? Please consider what the speaker is saying seriously. We need specialists of certain kinds, but to be told all your life that you must think this way, do that, you know, all the rest of it, that surely conditions the brain. As in the East and in Europe, tradition has conditioned the brain, whether that tradition be ten days or ten thousand years, that tradition has conditioned the brain. The tradition of the specialist, the tradition of politicians and the scientist - is that freedom, though each one of us thinks we are free to do what we want to do? As is happening in the world, each one thinks that he is free to express, to fulfil, to assert, compete and so on. He calls all that freedom. And that freedom, if one observes very carefully and objectively, has brought about great chaos in the world, great

misery, each one out for himself. And certain psychologists encourage that - fulfil yourself, do what you want to do and so on. And this is called freedom. But is it freedom? The word 'freedom' etymologically also means love. When each one is competing, each one is seeking success, and so on, is there love in all that?

So one must enquire very deeply together, what is real freedom. Freedom from something is not freedom. Freedom means the ending, the ending which has no continuity. And this sense of freedom can alone bring that passion which is the ending of sorrow - which we will go into presently. And when there is passion there is action. We also ought to enquire: what is action? What is the relationship of action to time - I hope you don't mind my going into all this, do you? Do you mind?

A: No.

K: Perhaps some of you, if I may most respectfully say, have thought about these matters, or you may not have, all this may be new, or you have read some of things that the speaker has said, unfortunately, and you then repeat. Perhaps some of you have read, and you say, "I know exactly what he is going to say next"! Which means you are not actually listening. You are carrying your memory of what you have read and interpreting what is being said according to the knowledge that you have accumulated, so you actually then are not listening. I am saying this most respectfully.

So freedom: what is the relationship of freedom to action? And what is action is relationship to passion? And we are wasting our life, because we have only one life, some of you may believe in reincarnation, next life, after death, those are very pleasant comforting concepts, beliefs, but death is not something that gives

a continuity - which we will go into when we talk about all that.

So most of us waste our life. We mean by wasting life, though we have to earn our livelihood, a vocation which is now becoming more and more imitative, a vocation that demands all our energy from morning until night, from nine o'clock until five o'clock, and then some form of entertainment, either religious, sexual, or listening to the 'tube', or reading some kind of book, intellectual, or romantic, or thrillers. This is our life. At the end of time we die. And we have never enquired how to live, what is the art of living. And when we begin to enquire into it, the art, not the repetitive processes of life because art demands a great deal of observation, a great deal of attention, awareness, not only of external things but the whole enormous field of the inward psychological, psychic process - that's far more vast than the external world. And that psychological world controls, shapes the outer world, as is shown in the totalitarian states. They hope by changing the environment, controlling the environment, forcing people to think along a certain way human beings will be different. That is one of their tenets. And it has failed because the psyche is far greater, has greater vitality, greater energy than all the outward structure. And we are going to enquire into that area.

To enquire and observe into the whole psychological world of each one of us you require passion, not just intellectual entertainment, intellectual dissection, analysis. You need passion and energy. And that energy now is being wasted through conflict, because each one of us, whether we are rich or poor, ignorant, or the great scientists, the ordinary person that lives a monotonous daily life, and the man in the jungle, in the small village,

uneducated, he has constant conflict. All human beings have great conflict, struggle, pain. And to enquire into that conflict, whether it is possible to end that conflict inwardly, psychologically, to go into it demands not only energy but real passion to find out. Passion to find out whether conflict, human conflict, can ever end. Or must it everlastingly go on?

I do not know if you have enquired, or observed, that we are supposed to have lived on this earth, according to the archeologists, and biologists and so on, forty to fifty thousand years - from the most ancient civilizations to the present time. They have all lived in conflict, not only with nature but conflict externally through wars, conflict also inwardly. This duration of forty thousand or fifty thousand years of human evolution has brought us where we are, still in conflict. I wonder if we realize that, not theoretically, not intellectually, or some fanciful hope, but actually realize how deeply we are in conflict with each other; and not only with each other but in ourselves. And we have accepted this conflict as the way of life, not only externally as war, destroying millions and millions of people, though they talk about *pacem in terris*, which means peace on earth, all religions, except perhaps Buddhism and Hinduism, have killed more people for religions, nationalities, and all that. The glorification of tribalism has been the external world of conflict - competition, aggression, each one seeking his own success, his own fulfilment. Externally we are in conflict, and also inwardly. That's a fact, it is not a theory. If one sees oneself as you see yourself in a mirror, you see you are all in conflict, with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour, with god, with all the things that human beings have created outwardly and inwardly.

And we have never enquired whether we can possibly be free from conflict. We are enquiring now together. Inevitably you will ask the speaker, "Are you free from conflict" - naturally. If he was not he wouldn't talk about it. That would be hypocrisy. And the speaker practically all his life has abhorred any kind of dishonest, hypocritical thinking, or way of life. But to enquire into it together requires that you share, involve yourself, commit yourself, to find out whether conflict can end, living in this world, not go off to some kind of monastery, or escape into some kind of ashrama, and all that silly nonsense. Why are we in conflict? What's the cause, the very nature and the structure of conflict? Please, most of us wait for an answer, for somebody to tell you. That's the function of the specialist. But there are no specialists here. We are asking each other, what is the cause of it. What's the cause of wars, outwardly? Economic wars, social wars, and the destruction of human beings, what is the cause of it? Is it not nationalities, each nation thinking it is separate from the rest of the world? Not only national, which is a glorification of tribalism, but also externally the ideologies of the communists, of the totalitarian states and the democratic world, different ideologies, different beliefs, dialectical materialism on one side, and on the other belief in god, democratic and so on. They are still ideals. So ideals are at war, beliefs are at war. If you believe in certain forms of dogmatism of Christianity, or the superstitions and dogmatism of Hinduism or Buddhism, these very beliefs, these very faiths divide human beings. You are Catholic, Protestant, and the thousands of divisions of Protestantism, as they are in the Hinduism, and the Buddhists - the North Buddhists and the South Buddhists.

So the major cause of external conflict is division. Obviously. I hope - one hopes we are following each other. Where there is division there must be conflict. And in ourselves we are broken up, fragmented. Each one of us thinks he is separate from another - don't we? Religions throughout the world have encouraged that you are separate, you have a separate soul, separate individuality. Please follow this, don't reject it. We are not asking you to accept anything, we are enquiring.

In the Asiatic world, as well as in India, they believe in this separate individuality, separate atman and so on; as you do here in the Christian world, your soul is separate, to be saved and so on. So from childhood this sense of division, this fragmentation within ourselves, is the basic cause of conflict, each one seeking his own salvation religiously - whatever that may mean. Each one wanting to express himself, fulfil himself, pursuing his own ideals, his own ambitions, and your wife and your husband do exactly the same thing, each one pursuing his own pleasure, his own desire.

So we can see that conflict must exist as long as there is division. Can this division end? Can this division which has brought about such misery, confusion, ugliness, and brutality in the world, can this division end in each one of us? You may intellectually ask this question, and speculate about it. Perhaps some of you will say, "No, it is not possible. It is the way of life; in nature there is conflict, everything is struggling to reach the light, bigger animals killing the little ones and so on. So we are part of that nature so we must live in conflict. This is the way of life." We have accepted this, not only as a tradition, but we have been encouraged, instructed, educated, to carry on with conflict.

So we are enquiring together whether this division in ourselves can end. That is, the opposing desires, wanting, not wanting, pursuing, you know all the rest of opposing energies which bring such extraordinary conflict and misery, can all that end? It cannot possibly end through volition, that is by will. I hope we are following all this, are we together, somewhat at least? I'll go on if you will permit it, though perhaps some of you are too tired at the end of a long week. So we will go on into this.

Can this division end? We were saying, that through any form of volition, desire, motivation, wanting to end this conflict, that very desire to end conflict breeds further conflict. Doesn't it? I want to end conflict. Why? Because I hope to live a very peaceful life, and yet I have to live in this world - in the world of business, science and relationship with each other, and so on, the modern world. Can I exist in this modern world without conflict? All the business world is based on conflict, competition, one firm, business firm against another. This endless conflict that is going on outwardly. And inwardly first, can this end, not externally? We are always talking about, can I live in this world externally without conflict, but we will find the right answer, right action, when we enquire into the conflict that each one of us has. Can this division, opposing desires, opposing demands, individual urges, can all that division end?

It can only end if one is capable - I won't use the word 'capable', sorry - if one can observe - observe conflict, not try to end it, not try to transform it into another form of conflict, but to observe it. Which means, to be aware, to give our attention completely to what is conflict and how it arises, which is the dualistic opposing

drives of energy, just to observe it.

Have we ever observed anything completely? When you look out of that window and you see the sea, turbulent one morning, and utterly quiet in the evening, have you ever observed without any words, without saying, how beautiful, how noisy, how disturbing it all it? Have you ever observed with all your senses, with all you being, that extraordinary water, the sea? To observe it without any reaction, just to watch. If you have ever done it, in the same way to observe without any reaction, without any motive, because the moment you have a motive that motive gives a direction. And in that direction there is conflict, but just to observe the whole phenomenon of conflict, its cause, not only division, imitation, conformity, all that. Just to be aware of the total nature and the structure of conflict. When you give complete attention then you will see for yourself whether that conflict ends or not. But that requires, as we said, a great deal of energy, and that energy can only come when there is passion behind it, when you really want to find out. You give a great deal of time and energy to making money, years, as you give a great deal of energy to be entertained. But you never give energy deeply and profoundly, completely attentive, to find out whether conflict can ever end.

So observation, not volition, not any action of will, or resolution, but to observe with all your being what is the nature and the structure of conflict. Then one of the conditionings of the brain comes to an end. Because all human beings throughout the world are conditioned - as Catholics, Protestants, Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims, Mohammedans, all the varieties of human invention.

To enquire into our conditioning: we are conditioned, you are

Americans - American way of life. If you are Catholic you have been conditioned for two thousand years; if you are Protestant from the period of Henry VIII who wanted to get rid of Catholicism, the pope, in order to marry somebody or other. There are various forms of conditioning by the religious, social, cultural condition of India, Japan and all the rest of the world. We are conditioned. And that conditioning is our consciousness.

I hope this is not too many things in one talk. But as we have only one other talk we must put everything we can in two talks. I hope you don't mind - if you can tolerate it, and if you can take the journey with the speaker.

As we were saying, we are conditioned by the newspapers, all the various forms of media, you know, magazines and so on. You have been conditioned. And this conditioning is our consciousness, not only biological reactions, sensory reactions, sexual reactions and so on, that is part of our conditioning; and also various forms of beliefs, faiths and dogmas, by ideologies, by the various religious rituals; the linguistic, if that is possible, conditioning, which the speaker questions very urgently, whether linguistic language conditions the brain - we have discussed this matter with certain linguistic experts and so on. I question it - one questions that. I won't go into it because it is too complicated for the moment.

So we are conditioned. Our consciousness is all the knowledge we have acquired, the experience, the faith, the belief, the dogmas, the rituals, and also fear, pleasure, sorrow, pain. Our conditioning is essentially knowledge. We have acquired knowledge through forty thousand years, or more. And we are adding to that

knowledge day after day, more and more. The scientists are adding knowledge day after day, month after month, to what they already know. And this knowledge is acquired through experience, testing out, experimenting, trying out, if it doesn't succeed they put it aside and begin again. This constant expansion of knowledge, both in ourselves and externally. And knowledge because it is based on experience is limited. There can be no complete knowledge about anything, including god. Knowledge is always, present and in the future, always limited; it can be expanded, added to, but it still has its own limitation.

So thought, which is born of knowledge, stored in the brain as memory, that thought is limited. There is no complete thought. Please, question this, doubt it, ask, find out. Because this is very important because our consciousness is the essence of thought, essence of knowledge. Therefore our consciousness which is the whole capacity of the brain and so on, is always limited, therefore conditioned. Thought can imagine, speculate the immeasurable, this space, endless and so on, but whatever thought does it is still limited. Do we see this fact? Because it is very important, if one may point out, to understand this, not merely intellectually but see actually whatever we are thinking, and any action of thought is always limited, whether it is political, economic, or religious. Thought has invented god - sorry, I hope you will not be shocked by all this. Just a minute, sirs.

If you have no fear, completely no fear both of external incidents, accidents, and also inwardly, absolutely no fear of death, of tomorrow, of time, then what is the necessity for god? Then there is that state which is eternal - which we won't go into now.

So it is important, essential, that we understand the nature of thought. Thought has created the most astonishingly beautiful things - great paintings, great poems; thought has created all the world of technology, from the neutron bombs to instant communication, all the instruments of war, the submarine, you know all the rest of it, the computer and so on. Thought has done all this. The most beautiful architecture of cathedrals of Europe, and all the things that are in the cathedrals and in the churches are put together by thought. So thought is, whatever it has created externally or inwardly, is limited, and therefore fragmented.

Thought is a material process, therefore there is nothing sacred that thought has created. And everything that thought has created we call religion. You might say it is a divine revelation straight from heaven, but that very idea 'straight from heaven', or 'revelation' is still the activity of thought. Super consciousness and so on, all those inventions of the gurus that have come to this country, unfortunately. You have your own gurus, the priests, don't add more. You have enough of them.

So we have to understand really the nature of thought. Thought is born of knowledge, stored in the brain as memory. So thought is a material process. And knowledge is necessary at a certain level of existence - I need knowledge to write a letter, to go from here to there, knowledge is necessary to drive a car, to do anything physically. Knowledge has a certain place. But we are asking: has knowledge any place in the psychological world? Which is, has knowledge any place between you and your wife, your husband? Please enquire into it. Knowledge being the memories that you have accumulated in that relationship, between man and woman,

both sexual memories, pleasure, pain, antagonism, and all the rest of it, and also the images, the knowledge, the pictures about each other.

So we are asking a very fundamental question: whether knowledge in relationship is not one of the factors of conflict? You certainly have, haven't you sirs, if I may ask, an image about your wife - and the wife about the husband, or the girl about the boy and so on. Each one creates not only his own image but also the image of another. You certainly have created one about the speaker, I am quite sure, otherwise you wouldn't be here. And that image is preventing you from actually understanding each other.

So when one is living most intimately with another, and through that relationship you accumulate day after day, night and day, day in and day out, memories of each other. And these memories, which are images, prevent actual relationship with each other. This is a fact. These memories are the dividing factor, and therefore conflict between man and woman. So can the recording processes of the brain in relationship stop? You understand the question? If one is married - suppose I am married, I am not, suppose I am married. Don't ask me, "Why are you not married?"! That would be an easy way out. Suppose I am married: attraction, sex, and all the rest of it. And day after day, month after month, for years, I have put together a great deal of knowledge about her. And she has done exactly the same thing about me. And these images, this knowledge that one has of each other, is bringing a division and therefore conflict. Can this conflict end in relationship? Now that is most important, essential. Because relationship is one of the most wonderful things if you can have it without a single shadow of

conflict. Because one cannot live on this marvellous earth without relationship.

Loneliness is a form of total separation, total division. And being frightened of that thing called loneliness, with all its depression, with all its ugliness of loneliness, we try to establish a relationship with another, whether that establishment is consciously or unconsciously. And therefore we become attached to the picture, to the memory of the woman or the man, or the various forms of relationship, homosexuals and all the rest of that business. It is a crazy world, isn't it! It is becoming more and more insane, and we are all adding to it. And to be free, this is freedom, to be actually free from the image-building process, that is real freedom - not to do what you like, which becomes too childish, too utterly immature, but the freedom that comes totally when in relationship there is no accumulation of memories. Is that possible? Or is it a vain hope, or something to be desired in heaven, which is absurd, of course.

Let's enquire into it: you see the speaker has gone into it very deeply for himself, but to go into it you must enquire why the brain records. The brain is recording, that's its function, part of it, recording how to learn French, or Russian, or whatever language, recording the various forms of business activities, recording, you know, the whole machinery of the brain is recording. So why should it record in relationship? Why should my brain record the insult or the encouragement, or the flattery of my wife? Why should it record? Have you ever enquired into it? Probably not. Probably it is too boring to enquire into all this. Most of us are satisfied with the way we live - accepting, carrying on until we get

old and die. To carry on that way is a wastage of energy. There is no art in that. There is no beauty in that. Just to carry on, day after day, following the same routine, the same misery, the same confusion, insecurity and so on. And at the end of it all it is so meaningless, die. But if you begin to enquire why the brain must record, it is necessary to record at a certain level, physically: how to drive a car, how to be a good carpenter, or some kind of ugly politician and all that business. But in relationship with each other why should there be recording at all? Does that recording give us security in our relationship? Is there security in relationship? I believe there are more divorces in this country than marriages. I - we heard the other day a girl saying, just about to marry the next day, "There is always divorce".

So you understand, relationship is a very, very serious matter. But the quality of that relationship is destroyed when the brain is recording all the petty little incidents, nagging, pleasure, you know what goes on between ordinary relationships. Each one seeking his own ambition, his own fulfilment, his own pleasure. That utterly destroys relationship.

And so is love a matter of thought? Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love memory? Please do enquire into all this - not only enquire intellectually but actually in the very enquiry is action. When you act, and that action demands passion, not just intellectual concept or desire. Love is not lust, love is not within the orbit of thought. But when the brain merely is a recording machinery in our relationship you destroy everything that is love.

You may say, it is very easy for you to talk that way because you are not married. Many people have told me this - which is

nonsense. The speaker lives with a great many people, both in India, Europe and America, a great many, constantly. When thought has really been understood, its nature, its structure, its activity, its limitation, understood, which is, observed, acted upon, that very observation is its action. Then there is a totally different quality of relationship. Because love is outside the brain, not within the confines of thought.

So our conditioning is the movement of thought, like fear. We have lived with fear for centuries, millions of years, thousands of years, and we are still afraid, outwardly and inwardly. Outwardly we want security, physical security. One must have physical security. But that outward security becomes insecurity when one is seeking psychological security. I hope you follow all this. We want psychological security first. Psychologically to be safe, we want in our relationship to be completely secure - it is my permanent wife! Or if that permanency doesn't exist with that woman, I will try and find it with another woman. You may laugh at this, but this is what is happening in the world. Probably this is what has happened to you. And perhaps that is why you laugh it off very quickly.

So one has to enquire very, very deeply whether there is any security, permanency in life, inwardly. Or the search for inward security, which is ultimately god and so on, is that security an illusion, and therefore there is no security, psychologically, but only that supreme intelligence - not of books, not of knowledge. That supreme intelligence comes, exists only where there is love and compassion. That intelligence then acts. You may say, "All this is so far fetched, so complicated", but it isn't. Life - living is a very complex process, isn't it? You must know all that much more

than the speaker does. It is a very, very complicated process: getting to the office, to the factory, writing - you follow - the whole way of living is a very, very complex process. And that which is complex must be approached with great simplicity. To be psychologically simple, not stupidly simple, but to see the quality of simplicity. I do not know if you have gone into all this. The word 'innocence' means, etymologically, not to hurt, and not to be hurt. But we are hurt from childhood by the parents, by the fellow students, through university and so on, we are perpetually being hurt, wounded psychologically, aren't you? And that hurt we carry through life, with all its agony. When one is hurt there is always the fear of 'not being hurt', so one builds a wall round oneself and resists, and all the rest of it. But never to be hurt is simplicity.

Now with that simplicity to approach the very, very complex problem of life, which is the art of living. And all this requires a great deal of energy, passion, and a great sense of freedom to observe.

Right, sirs, that is enough for today. We will continue tomorrow morning with the other facts of life.

SAN FRANCISCO 2ND PUBLIC TALK 6TH MAY 1984

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning? We were having a conversation between us, a conversation about the great problems of life, a conversation about the society in which we live, and all the travail of human life - the pain, the fears, the anxieties, the pleasures and the sorrows, and the innumerable hurts, psychological wounds that we receive from childhood until we die. And we were also talking about together, as two friends walking along a road, where there is no traffic, along a lane perhaps in the woods, and generally as friends do, talk about their own lives. And during the conversation between these two friends, they talked about freedom, how little freedom man has, though he thinks he has, how actually freedom is denied to man throughout the world, how he is conditioned by various cultures, doctrines, faiths, beliefs, and all the impressions that one receives from various media, and so on.

One is saying to the other, there is no actual freedom. Unless there is real deep psychological freedom man is going to destroy himself. And freedom means also love. The etymological meaning, amongst other meanings is to have great love, love. And also with that love goes passion. Not enthusiasm, not lust, not total expression of one's own desires, but that quality of passion that comes when one really understands the deep significance of living, and with the ending of sorrow. And out of this passion and freedom comes action. And the other man says to his friends, life is really very complex and we must surely approach it simply so that

we really penetrate, not merely intellectually or emotionally, sentimentally, but penetrate very deeply, if it is possible, into the whole psychological world which very, very few people have gone into, or investigated or are concerned, or even moderately committed.

Unless one is really seriously concerned, human beings will always be in conflict with each other. We talked about it together yesterday morning, the ending of conflict. We said also that conflict cannot end through any kind of determination, any activity of thought or desire, but to observe what is the nature and the structure of conflict. The essence of conflict is, we said yesterday, these two friends were talking together, we said yesterday, wherever there is division, whether it is nationalistic, racial, class, or the division between man and woman - psychological division, though physiological division does exist, but the psychological division is the basic factor of conflict. Whether that division can be totally, not bridged over, but ended. And we also said together, that it can end completely if one observes the actual conflict one is in. Not direct that observation, not react to what one is observing, but actually observe without any psychological responses. And the other says, it is very, very difficult to do that because all our conditioning both linguistically and generally is to immediately respond, react, verbally, emotionally or with some ideological concepts. So it becomes very difficult to observe the actual fact of conflict. It is like giving your whole attention to what is conflict and trying to penetrate it and end it.

Attention is like a flame which burns away the actual fact, not the theoretical fact but the actuality of the fact. We talked over

together yesterday morning about this.

And also we are saying to each other, that one has to be very serious in life, and very few people are. They want to be entertained, they want to be cajoled, directed, influenced, told what to do and so on. It is very difficult to penetrate without all these pressures, to understand oneself. The understanding of oneself is important, not according to some psychologists or philosophers, or the latest psychiatrist, but rather putting all the experts and authorities, from the ancient days to the present time - whether it is Zen, Buddhist, Hindu or Christian - putting away all those various forms of authorities to look at ourselves, pay attention to every thought, not let one thought go by without understanding why it is there.

All this requires a sense of deep psychological discipline. The word discipline, etymologically, comes from the word disciple. The disciple is one who is willing to learn, not conform, not obey, not adjust himself to what is being said, not to accept, but to learn. And learning is not merely memorizing, storing in the brain what you have heard and hold it as memory. Memory is very limited; you can expand memory, add to it through more knowledge and so on, which we talked about yesterday. But to learn is like a flow of a river that is constantly moving, running at great speed. And to observe, that very observation is discipline.

So we are going together, this morning, being serious, not desiring to be entertained religiously, or emotionally, or intellectually, we are together, if you will, walking down that lane, discussing, talking over together amicably, with a sense of affection, to explore, to look at the many problems that we have

psychologically, because if we understand psychologically first then we can shape the outer. But unfortunately more and more the outer is becoming so extraordinarily important because of organizations, institutions of thousands of kinds, hoping thereby to radically change the human nature. So we should really for the moment put aside the outer institutions, impressions, foundations, and what the experts have said, and look very closely, because one must start very near, which is ourselves, to go very far.

And you and the speaker are going together on this very complex journey. And that demands that we hear each other, listen to each other. Not only listen to the words but also the content of the words, the meaning of the words, and because they are friends, they have known each other for many years, go beyond the words, understand non-verbally also. And this requires a great deal of attentive hearing, not just pushing aside those things which are not pleasant and only looking at those things which are pleasant.

So having said all this let us look together at our fears. We have had fear of living and dying for many, many millenia, from the ancient man to the present time. Fear has been one of our great problems. And we have never apparently given attention to the nature of fear, what's the cause of it. Why it arises, the background, the root of it. And the other friend says, are you saying, don't be concerned with the various forms of fear - fear of darkness, fear of public opinion, fear of what another might say, fear of one's own wife and husband and so on, fear of losing, fear of gaining, fear of tomorrow and of yesterday. We are not concerned with that kind of fear. It's like cutting off the branches of a tree but never understanding the root of that marvellous tree. So please, we are

not concerned for the moment with the various aspects of fear. But only with what is the root of it.

Most of us perhaps one says, to the other, have never given thought to all this, never even concerned whether fear can ever end, or man must everlastingly, until the day of his dying, carry, live with fear. Whatever other people have said, heaven and hell, do the right thing and you will go heaven, do the wrong thing, hell, believe in this, if you don't you are a heretic and there is fear in all that. Religions have also been responsible for fear, and sustaining that fear, nourishing it. There is a temple in South India, very well known throughout that part of the country, there every third day the priests, the authorities of the temple, gather one million dollars every third day. And that's call religion. And that sustains fear because you pray, you make vows, you take vows hoping some good thing will happen to you. And so fear is bred, nourished, as all religions do. And we have never asked, questioned, enquired, if fear can ever end. And we are going this morning to ask that very question. Not only the external fear but also deeper, inward fears, in the very deep recesses of one's own brain. I hope - one hopes that you are also willing to go into this matter deeply. Not merely listen and agree, or disagree, which will have no effect at all, whether you agree or disagree. But the fact is that one is afraid. And whether that fear can ever end. That's really one of the great problems of life. Because if fear ends completely there is great, tremendous energy, which is wasted through all the travails of fear. And also there will be no need of churches, temples and mosques and gods. It is out of fear we have created heaven and hell. We have created all the mischief of religions.

The speaker is not an atheist, he is a religious man but does not belong to any religion, because of their network of superstitions, beliefs, dogmas and rituals. So together we are going to look into this matter of ending fear.

What is the cause of it? Where there is a cause there is an end to that cause. If one has a particular disease and knows the cause of that disease then that disease can be cured, healed. So if we can together find out the cause of it, the root, not the branches of fear, but the very root of it, that requires persistent, intense, investigation, committed to discover for oneself if fear can completely end, psychologically first. Fear of not having security psychologically, and all the rest of it. So what is the causation of fear? Is it not time? And it is important to understand, not only fear, but time as the factor, or the root of fear. Time as yesterday, time as today, time as tomorrow - sun rising, sun setting, light and darkness, time. Not only by the watch, chronological time but also time which thought has invented psychologically. That is, that you will be tomorrow different from what you are today. If you are violent today, pursue - the very idea of pursuit implies time - pursue the state in which violence doesn't exist.

So in our life time is very important - from here to there, from point to point, externally from being ignorant to becoming knowledgeable, from being a little man to a well known man, and all the rest of that business, outwardly. But also psychologically there is this time, which is the becoming: I am this, imperfect, violent, with all the travail of life, and one day I will be free of it all, that is tomorrow, or ten years later, when I will understand more. So time both outwardly and inwardly is a factor of our life.

Is that the major cause of fear, time?

Please, we are together investigating into this matter, not accepting, questioning, doubting what the speaker is saying. One is afraid of tomorrow, you may lose the job, there is so much unemployment, outwardly. Inwardly one seeks security, some ground on which one can stand firmly, to be certain where there is confusion. And most of us are confused, uncertain, psychologically. And through this confusion we try to establish either a concept which will give us security, or in our relationship with each other all that process is becoming. Becoming, the very word becoming, implies time. Is time, we are asking, one of the major factors of fear? Obviously it is. I am - one is afraid of dying - perhaps when one is ninety or a hundred, or something might happen to you: you might not succeed, you might be a failure and so on.

So time essentially, deeply, is one of the factors of fear. And time is also, if you go into it rather deeply, if you will, what is time? Not by the watch or the time of becoming, what exactly is time? The present, the now as you are sitting there, you are here, the present, in this hall, listening, in the now. What is that now? Doesn't the now, the present, contain the past, all the memories and so on, and also the future? I hope we are following each other. So the now contains all time - the past, the future and the present. And the now, if there is no fundamental psychological change or mutation, the future is what we are now. Surely that is clear. The word mutation biologically is a rather difficult word, but we will use it for convenience. Which is really deep psychological change, radical psychological revolution.

Time we are used to as evolution. We have evolved from the past, forty, fifty or more years, thousand years, and we have arrived at this stage through a long distance of time. And we have changed very, very little psychologically. We are very primitive, barbarous. We are using the word barbarous in its original sense. And time has not changed man. Biologically time has changed man from the ape until now. But time, which is evolution, has not brought in the psyche a total complete change, an ending of all the pain, the anxiety, fears and sorrows and all that, time has not changed it.

[Noise of baby crying] I am sorry! One agrees with that baby! It is rather bored.

Please, this is very important to understand, not just brush it off as some philosophical concept and push it aside because the now contains all time. The now is all your memories that you have accumulated during the past fifty, eighty, ninety years. The now is also the future because you are going to continue with your memories, with your images, with your selfishness, with all that human beings have gathered.

So time becomes the enemy of man if there is no radical change now - that is if you rely on time. And is not also time thought? Is not the root of fear also thought? I am this, I must be that. Or I might fail. We talked yesterday together about the beginning of thought, how it arises through memory. Memory is the accumulated knowledge, knowledge is expansive and so on. And there can be no knowledge unless there is experience. So knowledge, experience - knowledge is limited, as experiences are, whether you have experience of god, or this or that, and the

knowledge is limited so thought is limited. And thought, as we said, is a material process, and so thought of losing something, gaining something, the thought of becoming something, so thought is a movement like time. So thought, time is the root of fear. That's a fact, an irrevocable fact, an actuality. One really sees that. And one asks, is it possible to end all fear? Which is, uproot the nature of time, and so end time - please listen to it - and also the end of thought? Because those two factors are one factor, which is time/ thought is the root of fear. If my friend, asks, can thought/time end, that seems rather absurd. I have to go to the office tomorrow, being Monday, I have to think, I have to write a letter, and to do anything I have to think. How can thinking stop? Or time stop? Which are both the same. One says, to the friend, you are putting a wrong question. Time and thought are necessary at a certain level. At the physical level time and thought are necessary. We have to go back from where we started. We have to accumulate knowledge in order to do anything skilfully. The accumulation of knowledge requires time, to learn a language requires time.

So time/thought are necessary at the physical level. But in the psychological area is time and thought necessary at all? Is there, to put it differently, a psychological becoming at all? We have said there is. That is, we have evolved from the ape to now, biologically we have evolved. So there must be psychological evolution. I am this, I will be that. We are questioning that very thing: is there psychological becoming at all? Which implies time. And time is the now in which the past, the present and the future are held, contained. Unless there is a radical change in the whole psychological content, which is the content of consciousness, you

will be the same tomorrow. That again is a fact.

So knowing, observing all this, very closely, attentively, with all your passion and energy, that very attention puts an end to that becoming. Then there is an ending.

It is very important, if we have time, to understand the nature of ending. I do not know if you have ever asked yourself what is ending, coming to an end. Not a continuity after ending, because we are so concerned with continuity. That is the form of tradition, various forms of political structure, organizations and so on. It is really a very complex problem this, I don't know if we should go into it now, but you should, if one may, suggest, ask yourself, what is ending.

So if one is aware, attentive to this whole process of time/ thought, which is the root of fear, observe it, don't run away from it, live with it, hold this thing in your hand, as it were. It's like a precious jewel which you hold, and you are looking at it, observing it, which means giving your attention. As you observe with this attentive passion that very attention puts an end psychologically to this becoming, which is of time and thought.

We also, if we have time, should talk about suffering. Not about pleasure, that's fairly simple. And every man throughout the world is pursuing pleasure. Pleasure of possession, pleasure of power, pleasure of status, pleasure of ownership, pleasure of sex, pleasure of being somebody in this stupid world, this world which is becoming more and more insane because we have created this insanity, with pleasure. And man has pursued that endlessly - endless pleasure, seeking god, illumination, enlightenment. That's the ultimate pleasure. There you completely hope you will be

satisfied, gratified. Enlightenment is not of time. It isn't a process, it isn't something you achieve through meditation. Enlightenment is the ending of time, which we will go into if we have time when we talk about meditation.

So we must concern ourselves with sorrow and death. Sorry to talk about death on a lovely morning in a beautiful hall, where the sea is shining and you can see the hills in the far distance, miles away, and the beauty of the earth. To talk about death seems rather morbid, but it is not. And so suffering is one of the factors, like pleasure and fear. And man has never ended sorrow. The sorrow of the whole of mankind. Not one's own particular sorrow but the sorrow of man, of human beings. Wherever you go on this earth, from the most primitive little village to the highly sophisticated cities, there is always behind the door, behind the curtains, this sorrow. Sorrow which has been brought about by slaughter of man through wars, the maimed, the tears, the appalling brutality of wars, of killing other human beings. People have demonstrated against a particular kind of war, demonstrated against the nuclear bombs, but human beings and religions have never said, no more, don't kill others. We all talk about peace, churches and the religions talk about loving your neighbour, which all becomes such nonsense. When religions support war, in these wars for the last five to six thousand years of historical wars man has suffered, ached, tears and we are still carrying on with the same sorrow and brutality. Is there an end to sorrow? Or man must everlastingly carry on with sorrow because where there is sorrow there can be no love. Where there is sorrow there can be no compassion with its extraordinary intelligence. Where there is sorrow you cannot

understand the nature of death. With the ending of sorrow there is passion. Passion isn't something to be cultivated. Passion isn't something that arises from fear, from pleasure. Only when sorrow ends there is that passion, with its extraordinary action in daily life.

So one can see what is the cause of sorrow. There are many causes, but only one cause, which is the 'me', the 'I', the persona, my consciousness. In that consciousness where there is a shock, where there is a great crisis which cannot be solved, in that consciousness there is felt the utter emptiness of life as lived by human beings, as now, the shallowness, the superficiality of all this. Those are the various causes of sorrow - the sorrow of losing one's son, the husband, the wife, the friend. Suddenly feeling the utter loneliness, the despair, the sense of utter insecurity. We all know this. And there is no ending of it. We have never said, can it all end? And one friend says to the other, don't run away seeking comfort from sorrow, don't analyse it, because the analyser is the analysed, the analyser himself is sorrow, and so he cannot understand sorrow. But hold that sorrow as you hold something precious in your hand and look at it. Give attention to it. Give all you being to live with sorrow and find out. Then you will see out of that observation closely, attentively, with a sense of freedom, there is the ending of complete sorrow. It is only then out of that there is love and compassion with its great intelligence.

We also ought to talk over death. Sorry! Again human beings throughout the world have never understood, or gone into the question of death. The Christians believed in a certain resurrection, and the Asiatic and India has spread over all Asia, at one time. And there they believe in reincarnation. I am this, my life has been

painful, sorrowful, I have done things wrong, wicked and all the rest of it. Give me another chance next life. When I die I will be reborn. But that belief which is very comforting becomes utterly meaningless if next life is what you are now, with certain modifications, what matters is what you are now. And those who believe in those theories, which is supported by various so-called experiences, they never give importance to the life which is now. If they really believed in reincarnation they would be totally concerned how they lived now, how they behaved, what is their morality, how they act, and all that. But they don't do that. It is a very comforting theory, and they play with it, like all illusions.

So we are concerned with death. What is death? Old age, disease, accident, and the ending, both biologically, organically, the physical ending, and the ending of all the things which we are attached to - ending our memories, our status, our power, money and so on - the ending. And that ending is also the ending of me, the self, the things that one has accumulated, the precious memories, the experience which one has enjoyed and has given power. All those come to an end. Obviously, you cannot carry your money, however rich you are. So what is death? Is that ending? And no future? Please, give your attention to this, if you will, because we are all going to die, every one of us. That is inevitable, that is a fact. And we cling to our life, to our memories, living is the complications and the various forms of memories. Living is also going to the office day after day for the next fifty years. Living is also have a relationship with others, intimate or otherwise, in which there is constant struggle, battle. Living is also achieving, becoming known and famous and all that rubbish. All this is

considered living. The travail, the pain, the loneliness, the depression, the uncertainty, the wars, hatreds, wounds. This is called living. Which again is a fact.

So we cling to the known. That's all we cling to, the known, clinging to all the knowledge that we have. And death is the unknown. So we are frightened, not only frightened of living but also frightened of dying. Aren't you frightened of living? That is, frightened you might lose your job, and so on and so on, fear - which we have gone into previously. So the living is the known and dying is the unknown, what happens after, or the ending of the known. The known is what we are attached to - attached to your wife, to your husband, to your memories, to your books, to your knowledge, attached to the known. You are attached to your books, your desk, your old antique furniture - aren't you? What you are attached to, you are. Right? If you are attached to that marvellous old furniture of 15th century, you are that desk - the memory of ownership. So attachment is a fact. And death comes along and cuts it, wipes it away. And the question then is, can we live - please listen to this, if you will kindly, we are not advocating suicide, which is absurd, but to end attachment, which is the end of death. That is to live together, living and dying - day in and day out, night after night, night and day, living with death, which is the ending of attachment. That requires tremendous attention, and great inward quality of discipline. Probably you have never asked this question: living with death. There are the philosophers both in the East and the West, who said, you know you are going to die, live with that knowledge. But we are saying quite the opposite. Because we are a bundle of memories and we are attached to those memories.

Attachment. Can you voluntarily, easily, happily, without any causation end something which you hold most dear? Attachment. Because attachment breeds fear, uncertainty. Attachment breeds jealousy, antagonism, hatred.

So to live with ending and living together. If you have done it, it is the most extraordinary thing. That is real freedom.

Now we will talk about religion and meditation. The speaker puts religion and meditation at the end of the talks because to find out what is most sacred in life, and what is meditation, to find that out there must be no fear. There cannot possibly be any selfish motive of achievement, of gaining, of becoming. So he puts meditation and religion at the end of it, at the end of the talks.

So let us enquire together - we have a little time still - what is religion? Why man throughout the ages from the most ancient of days, to the present time, why is he wanting, searching, longing to find out if there is something more than this physical existence, beyond all the misery, confusion, uncertainty, depression and sorrow, is there something beyond and above all this? That has been his eternal search. And from the ancient days the man, the clever man says - in those days only the few wrote and studied, they became the priests - they said, we will tell you, we will lead you, we will help you to find that. And so they invented rituals, dogmas, faith, their peculiar dresses, their tremendous power over man. I do not know if you are aware of it. Tremendous power. And their thoughts have invented all the business of religious structure, with their wealth, with their property, with all their emotional, sentimental, romantic superstitions right through the world, whether they be Christians or Hindus or Buddhists, or the Tibetans,

or the Islamic world. This is what is called religion - faith, obey, follow, believe. And in ancient India they said to find that which is truth, which is not invented by thought there must be scepticism, there must be doubt, there must be enquiry, not belief. Belief is an impediment, faith is an impediment. We are saying this.

So all the things that thought has put together, which is called religion, is a material process, there is nothing whatsoever sacred about it. So there must be freedom from the organized, structured believing world of religion to find out, or come upon that state which is timeless. That means also: what is meditation? Not how to meditate. The gurus from various sects and religions and priests, have laid down certain systems of meditation, practices. One wonders if you have noticed every system, political, religious, economic, every kind of system has inherently the seed of decay, every system. This seed of decay is re-organized - politically, religiously, adjusting itself, but the seed is always there in any system, in any practice.

So what is meditation? If you put aside all the nonsense that is going on in this word brought by Asiatics or others, if you put aside all that, doubt all that, question, tear it to pieces to find out, then you ask: what is meditation? Is it necessary? Conscious meditation, a deliberate process of it, sitting cross legged, repeating various mantras, going into contemplation, giving certain time to it, it is a deliberate activity of thought. Thought says, if I meditate I will be happy, or I will become calm to do more mischief! Deliberate action of meditation [noise of baby crying] - I am sorry for the people who have to leave with the child. Any form of deliberate meditative practice is like any other form of desire.

Desire is a very complex problem, which we do not have time to go into. Briefly desire, the origin of desire, the beginning of desire, is when sensation, physical sensation, which is reaction, that sensation is shaped by thought. Then at that second desire begins. You understand this? Probably you don't, it needs explanation - I hope we have time. Can you give more time, you don't mind if we sit a little longer?

You see we have to understand desire. We are driven by desire - desire for so many things. It is one of our most powerful urges. What is desire? Desire - I can't go into it very deeply because we have to talk about other things - sensation is normal, you feel, touch, taste, after that there is sensation. You see something beautiful in the window and you go inside, look at it more closely. That is sensation. Then thought comes along and says, if I had that picture, that painting on my wall, how marvellous it would be. So when thought takes possession of sensation through creating an image then desire is born. Leave it at that because it is complex.

So when you meditate consciously, it is another form of desire to achieve some end. The end is silence, quietness. And the end is to have more energy, tremendous energy. The Zen practices, which is to have such tremendous attention out of which is born energy, and you practise, practise, practise, pay attention for years, and you have that - which is another form of desire. And also you want a quiet mind, a quiet brain so that you can be more peaceful, quiet, still. This is another form of desire. And they have said that if you are very still and very quiet you might find something. So you practise, twenty minutes or thirty minutes a day, in the morning, afternoon, evening. It's like taking a drug, a drink, or having a

siesta when you are quiet. All that is not meditation. Obviously it is the activity of thought.

So is there - please ask this question of yourself - is there meditation which is not conscious, which is not deliberate? Then only when it is not deliberate, when it is part of your daily life - attentive, attention to everything that you are doing in daily life, attention to every thought, not letting one thought escape, without understanding it, going into it, so that the brain becomes extraordinarily active, not mechanical as it is now, extraordinarily alive, full of energy. And where there is the highest form of energy there is silence. That energy is not yours or mine, it is this tremendous energy, which is nameless, which is timeless. And in that energy - or that very energy is the supreme thing that man has sought, which is the most sacred. And when that sacredness is, then we behave righteously in our daily life. This is meditation.

BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 2ND FEBRUARY 1985

This is a dialogue between us, a conversation between two friends. So this is not a lecture to instruct, inform or guide. We are going to talk over together many things, certainly not to convince you of anything; not a propaganda; not to inform you of new ideas or new concepts, conclusions or ideals. We are going, together, to look at this whole world as it is; not only this part of the world but also what is happening in the rest of the world. Together. And the speaker means together. You and he are going to observe, without any bias, without any prejudice, what is happening globally. So please, this is a serious talk, not intellectual, verbal or emotional or devotional. But one must exercise our brains. We must have scepticism, doubt, question and not accept anything that anybody says; including all your gurus, sacred books and all the rest of it. Because we are coming to a crisis in the world. The crisis is not merely economic or war, but rather psychological. Because we have lived on this earth for over 50,000 years or a million years. During this long period of time we've passed through every kind of catastrophe, every kind of war. Civilizations have disappeared, cultures, shaping the behaviour of human beings. There have been a great many leaders: political, religious, and all the tricks they have played on human beings. And during this enormous evolution of human brain, we are what we have been - rather primitive, barbarous, cruel, and preparing always for war. Every nation now is storing up armaments. Probably you know all this. And we human beings are caught in this - in the wheel of time. And we

have not changed very much. We are still barbarians, believing all kinds of superstitions, all kinds of beliefs, following various leaders; political, religious and your own local gurus. And at the end of it all, where are we? You may have money - especially in this town - money and power are the most important things.

Please, as we said, we are talking over together. It's not the speaker explaining all this. It's so obvious. But together, you and I - and the speaker, examine, very carefully, diligently, examine what we have become and what we are. And one asks, will time change us? Will time, that is, another million years or 50,000 years, will time change the human mind, human brain? Or time is not important at all? So we are going to talk about all these things. We are going to talk about: human beings are wounded psychologically. Human beings throughout the world are caught in great sorrow, pain, suffering, loneliness, despair. And the brain has created the most extraordinary things - both ideologically, technologically, religiously. Built the most extraordinary beautiful monuments. The brain, which is our brain - yours and the speaker's brain - is extraordinarily capable. Right? And that capacity is very limited. Because technologically we are advancing at an extraordinary speed, and psychologically, inwardly - if I may use the word, and I hope, one hopes you won't mind that word which I personally dislike, the word spiritual. I see a lot of you are here with necklaces and all kinds of dresses. And inwardly, psychologically, we are very primitive. We are barbarians; cruel, thoughtless, careless, indifferent to what is happening, and indifferent to all the corruption, not only environmentally but the corruption that goes on in the name of religion, in the name of

politics and business and so on.

Corruption is not passing money under the table or smuggling goods into this country. Corruption begins where there is self-interest. Right? Where there is self interest, that is the origin of corruption. Are we thinking together or are you merely listening to the speaker? Are you going together as two friends, taking a long journey? Journey into the global world; journey into ourselves; into what we are, what we have become, why we have become what we are. And this requires, to take this journey together, not the speaker takes it and points it out to you, the map, the road and the way; but rather, together. And I - the speaker means together, because he is not a guru. One should not follow anybody in the world of thought, in the world of the psyche. We have depended so much on others to help us. There it is. And we are not helping you. Let us be very clear on that point. The speaker is not helping you because you've had helpers galore. And you have not been able to stand alone, think out things for ourselves, look at the world and our relationship to the world, whether we're individuals at all or part of great humanity. We have not exercised our brain, which is so extraordinarily capable. And we have expended our energy, our capacities, our intellectual understanding in one direction only; that is, the technological world. But we've never understood human behaviour; why we are as we are after this long period of evolution.

And as the speaker said just now, he is not helping. We are together looking, understanding. Because help implies - psyche, we are talking of the psyche - of course you need help to go to a doctor or a surgeon; you depend on governments, however rotten they are;

you depend on your postman and the milkman and so on; but to ask help through prayer, through meditation, seems so utterly futile. You have had such help. You've had thousands of gurus and thousands of books; so-called religious and non-religious, psychological and so on. And in spite of them all we are helpless. You may earn a lot of money, big houses, cars and so on. But psychologically, inwardly, subjectively - which we are going to talk about, most of the time - we are almost helpless; because we've depended on other people to tell us what to do, what to think. So please, the speaker is saying this most respectfully, seriously, earnestly: he is not trying to help you. On the contrary we are together, and the speaker means together, you and he, not only observing impartially what is going on in the world but also why, after all this long period of time, we still remain cruel, brutal, indifferent, callous, frightened, seeking security, hoping our roots will not be disturbed. And together - you and the speaker - using, exercising their brain, investigate all this. As we said, not only our relationship with the world which is becoming more and more complex, our relationship to various nations, our relationship to each other, however intimate it might be, our relationship to an ideal, our relationship to so-called god, our relationship to a guru - if you have one; I hope you haven't. And enquire seriously, deeply into the quality of the brain that comprehends or has an insight, grasp of the whole outward and psychological world in which we live. If this is clear: that we are not trying to point out a way, method, a system or in any way trying to help you. On the contrary, we are independent human beings. This is not a cruel statement or indifferent statement. It's like two friends talking over

together, both of them trying to understand not only the world, that is, the environment, and all the complications of the economic world, the separate religions, separate nationalities. But also together as two friends talking over their problems. If we can start from there - two friends. Friendship means that they are not trying to persuade each other, not trying to coerce or trying to impress each other. They are friends and therefore there is a certain quality of affection, understanding, exchange. We are in that position.

So we first begin: what is our brain? The speaker is not a brain specialist, but he has talked with the brain specialists. And the brain, which is inside the skull, is a most extraordinary instrument. It has acquired tremendous knowledge about almost everything. It has invented the most incredible things, like the computer, like quick communication, instruments of war. And it is free there to investigate, to invent, to search out, research; it is entirely free. And it starts with knowledge, accumulating more and more knowledge; if a certain theory doesn't work, they drop it, and go on adding more and more and more knowledge. And it is not equally free to enquire into oneself. It is conditioned, shaped, programmed. Right? It is programmed to be a Hindu, to be a Muslim, to be a Christian, Buddhist and so on. Like a computer, the human brain is programmed: that you must have war, that you belong to a certain group, your roots are in this part of the world and so on. This is correct. This is not exaggeration. All of us are programmed by tradition, by constant repetition of newspapers, magazines, gurus and thousands of years of pressure, impressions. Our brain, free in one direction, in the world of technology, but that very brain, which is so extraordinarily capable, is limited by its own self-

interest.

Are we together or am I talking Greek? Would you kindly find out for yourself if you are really like two friends, understanding each other? Or is only one man talking and the other fellow doesn't talk at all? Or is there an observation of one's reactions to all that is being said: one's response to this truth that you're programmed; to be a Jew, to be Muslim, to be a Hindu, to be a Buddhist? So our brain being programmed, being conditioned in one direction which is amazingly free, psychologically it is a cripple. And is it possible for the human brain to be entirely free, so that it has tremendous energy; not to do more mischief, not to have more money, power and all that rot - though you must have money - but to be free to enter, enquire, find out a way of life in which there is no fear, no loneliness, no sorrow and enquire into the nature of death and meditation and truth? Is it possible for the human brain, which has been conditioned for thousands of years, to be entirely free? Or must human being everlastingly be slaves, never knowing what freedom is? Not abstract freedom but freedom from conflict; because we live in conflict from childhood till we die. That's one fact for all human beings: this constant struggle, both religiously seeking security and therefore never finding insecurity, or being insecure, wanting security. So we are going together, to find out for ourselves - for ourselves, not depend on others to tell you how to live without conflict, whether it is possible for human beings living in the modern world, with all the complexities of this society, to live without a shadow of conflict. Because conflict distorts the brain, spirit, lessens its capacity, its energy. It soon wears itself out. You can observe it in yourself as you grow older; this perpetual

conflict. And why do we have conflict? Please ask yourself, don't just listen. Find out for yourself why we live in conflict; not only with our wives and husbands but with our gurus. Because you want to be like them and therefore that's a conflict. Why this conflict, which becomes more and more intense, which is war, why human beings - you - live in conflict.

What is conflict? Oh please don't wait for me to answer it. That's no fun at all, but if you ask yourself that question and give your mind to find out, what is the nature of conflict? Conflict exists surely when there is duality. Right? There is me and you. Right? When there is my wife separate from me. When there is this division between the meditator and meditation. Are you following all this? I hope all this interests you, does it? So as long as there is division between nationalities, between religions, between people, between the ideal and the fact, between 'what is' and 'what should be' there must be conflict. That's a law. Wherever there is separation, the sense of division as the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu and the Muslim, you know all the division that goes on, not only in the world but also between families; between the son and the father. You know all this don't you? So wherever there is division, there must be conflict. That's a fact. That division is the 'more'. You understand? One does not know, but, give me a few years I will know. I hope you understand all this? *Nous sommes d'accord?* Who has created this division between 'what is' and 'what should be', between the Arab and the Jew, between the Hindu and the Muslim, between the guru and the disciple? There is this division between so-called god, if there is such an entity, and yourself. Wanting peace and being in conflict. Right? This is the actual

reality of our daily life. And the speaker is asking, as you must be asking too, who has created this division; not only externally but inwardly. Please ask yourselves this question. Who is responsible for all this mess? For all this endless struggle, endless pain, loneliness, despair, a sense of sorrow from which man seems to have never escaped. Who is responsible for all this? Who is responsible for the society in which we live - the society, our modern society with all its complexities? There is this immense poverty in this country. Immense. And there are all the social workers. You understand all this? Or we have never thought about it at all, or we are so occupied with our own meditations, with our own gods, with our own problems, that we have never looked at all this, never asked?

There are several things involved in all this. Man has always sought - those who are fairly intelligent, fairly aware, sensitive - can there be egalitarian society ever? You understand? No class difference, equal opportunity; so that there is no division between the worker and the manager, the carpenter and the politician. There are differences technologically but as human beings. And one of the problems too is, is there justice in the world? We are asking, is there justice in the world? And there have been revolutions - French, recent communist revolution, Bolshevik revolution, trying to establish a society where there is equality, where there is justice, where there is goodness. And they have not succeeded at all. On the contrary they have gone back to the old pattern in a different setting. So we have to enquire not only why human beings live in perpetual conflict and sorrow and the search for security, but also we should enquire together into the nature of justice. If there is any

justice at all in the world. Is there? You're clever, I'm not, another is not. You've got all the privileges and another has none whatsoever. You live in palatial houses and another lives in a hut, hardly having one meal a day. And if you are rich you can hire lawyers. And you know that business very well. And so, is there justice at all? And isn't it important to find out for oneself and therefore help humanity? I am sorry, I don't mean 'help', I withdraw that word. And so, when you understand the nature of justice, is there any justice at all? To find that out one must enquire very, very deeply into the nature of sorrow, whether there can be no self-interest at all. And also should enquire, as we shall during these talks, during these conversations rather, what is freedom and what is goodness?

So, who has created this extraordinary complex society? The division among religions, the division of nations, divisions between the intimate and those who are not intimate and so on? Right? Who has created all this? If the speaker can go into it - not as an informer, not as an instructor, not someone who is telling you, "it is so, therefore accept it" - but you and the speaker are exercising their brains, their intelligence, their capacity to find out. The question is, who has created all this? One can understand the society is created by every human being. The society in which we live is created by every human being through their greed, through their envy, through their aggression, through their search for security. We have created this society in which we live and then we become slaves to that society. Right? Are you following all this? Not following - do you understand all this? No? What am I to do if you don't understand this very simple fact that we human

being have created our culture, our society, our religions, our gods, all that? We human beings, out of fear, out of our loneliness, in our search for security, never understanding what is insecurity but always wanting security. They have never gone into the question of what is religion, whether it is possible to break away from tradition and find out. So to come back, who has created this division? Because where there is division there is conflict. That is an absolute certainty. So, is it not thought? Think it out sir. Put your brains into it. Is it not thought that has divided the world as the Christians, the Buddhists, the Jews and the Arabs, the Hindu, Muslim? Is it not thought? Then, one asks, what is thought?

Thought is the action by which we live. Thought is our central factor of action. Right? Thought, by which we live to make money. Thought, to separate me and you; my husband and my wife; the ideal and 'what is'. Is it not thought? Then, what is thought? What is thinking? Is not thinking the activity of memory? Please sirs, don't accept a thing the speaker is saying. One must have this quality of doubt. Doubt your own experiences, your own ideas, why you put on these garlands, why you do certain things. Doubt. Question. And not just merely accept. So please do not, under any circumstances, accept what the speaker is saying. He is saying as a friend - to whom you can listen or not listen as you please - he is saying, thought has created this division. Thought has been responsible for wars. Thought has been responsible between all the gods man has invented. Thought has been responsible to put man on the moon, to create a computer. Thought has been responsible for all the extraordinary things that they are doing in the technological world, which we won't go into now. And thought is

responsible for this division between 'what is' and 'what should be'. And thought is responsible for that conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. 'What should be' is the ideal, something to be achieved, something to be gained; away from 'what is'. For example, human beings are violent. That's an obvious fact. And during the long period of time, man is not free of violence. But he has invented non-violence. Right? He has invented it and he is pursuing that; he acknowledges he's violent - if he is at all honest. He is violent and he is in the pursuit of a so-called ideal called non-violence. And therefore in that pursuit, in that achieving non-violence, he is sowing the seeds of violence all the time, naturally. This is a fact. This country has talked a great deal about non-violence. This is rather shameful, because we are all violent people. Violence is not merely physical. Violence is a form of imitation, conformity, away from 'what is'. So violence can only end completely in the human mind, human heart, when there is no opposite. The opposite is the non-violence which is not real, which is another escape from violence. If you don't escape, then there is only violence. Right? And we have not been able to face that fact. And we are always running away from this fact: finding excuses, finding economic reasons, finding, oh, innumerable methods to overcome violence, but still violence. The very overcoming is a part of violence. So to face violence, you must give attention to it, not run away from it. Right? See what it is. See the violence between man and woman, both sexually, in different ways. Is there not violence when you are seeking more and more and more? Becoming more and more. So, to look at violence and remain with it, not run away from it, not try to suppress it or transcend it - all

that implies conflict. But to live with it, look at it, in fact, treasure it. Not translate it according to your want and dislike or like. Just to look and observe with great attention. We won't go into for the moment, what is attention. Let's leave that. It's very simple, though it sounds complex. When one gives attention to something completely, it's like turning on a bright light. And then you see all the qualities, the subtleties, the implications, the whole world of violence. When you see something very clearly, then it's gone. Because we refuse to see things clearly. So we are asking, who has created this complex conflict of human beings with each other, with the environment, with gods, everything? We are saying thought has done that.

Have you ever considered why you think you are an individual? Are you an individual? Or you've been programmed to think you are an individual? Right? Your consciousness is like every other human being's consciousness: you suffer, you're lonely, you're afraid, you're seeking pleasure, avoiding pain. It is so with every human being on earth. That's a fact, psychological fact. You may be tall, you may be dark, you may be light. Those are all external frills of climate, food and so on. And culture too is external. But psychologically, subjectively, our consciousness is similar to, common, one with all other human beings. You mightn't like it. But that's a fact. So, psychologically you are not separate from the rest of humanity. You are humanity. Don't say, "yes". Then it has no meaning, you merely accept it as an idea. But it is such a tremendous fact that you are the rest of mankind, not somebody separate. You may have a better brain, more wealth, cunning, better looking, but put aside all that - those are surface things,

they're all frills. But inwardly every human being on this earth is one in sorrow with you. Do you know when you realize that what it means? No, you wouldn't. You'd make it into an idea or an ideal and pursue it. It requires - it implies when you say you're the rest of humanity, it means you have tremendous responsibility. It implies great affection, love, compassion, not some silly idea that you're 'One'. So, we're saying, as two friends talking things over, that thought has been responsible. Thought has created the most extraordinary things - outwardly, in the world of action, in the world of daily life, thought has brought about great convenience, sanity and also insanity, and also the means of war and so on. So, we must enquire together, what is thinking? And why has thinking become so extraordinarily important.

Thinking cannot exist without memory. Right? If there is no memory, there is no thought. Our brain - which is one with all the rest of humanity, not separate little brains, which is such rot - our brains are conditioned by knowledge, by memory. And knowledge, memory are based on experience - both in the scientific world and the subjective world. Right? Our experiences however subtle, however so-called spiritual and all that business, both scientific and personal experience are always limited. And so our knowledge, which is the outcome of experience, is also limited. We are adding, scientifically, in this world of science, more and more and more. Right? Where there is addition, that which is being added to is limited. Right? I'm sorry if you are bored. Are you. You're yawning. Good God, what kind of people are you? Sir, please we are saying something very serious. If you're bored go to sleep. Go to sleep here. If you're tired lean on somebody and go to sleep. But

this requires a great deal of energy, thought, enquiry, doubt. So we're saying that experience being limited and therefore knowledge is always limited, either now or in the past or in the future. And knowledge means memory, either the memory which is held in the computer or the memory held inside our brain. So our brain is memory. And that memory directs thought. This is a fact. So, thought is always limited. Right? Please? This is logical, rational, nothing invented. This is so. Experience is limited, therefore knowledge is limited. And knowledge is part of memory, and memory is the activity of thought. Thought cannot exist without memory. Don't yawn sir. If you are tired, go to sleep. Yes sir. I wonder if it's worth talking at all, having a conversation with you when you're not really serious. Well, it's up to you. You know, you can take the horse to the pool but the horse has to drink.

So thought, being limited, has created the world and divided the world, because it is limited it has broken up the world. Right? Like the Arab and Jew, the Hindu, Muslim, the Christian, the Buddhist, the Hindu and so on, the Sikh, it is the activity of thought, which is in itself always limited, and must create division and therefore conflict. Right? Right? Then you will say, "Is there any other activity which is not divisive, which is not fragmentary, which doesn't break up?" Right? Are you asking that question or am I putting that question to you? Is there a holistic activity that can never break up as a Hindu, me, you? It's the division which creates conflict. Right? Now, how are you going to find out? How are you going to find out for yourself, seeing that thought is divisive, thought creates conflict, thought has created the society and you apart from the society, which you have created, and so on and on

and on? That's the only instrument we've had so far. You may say there is another instrument which is intuition, which can be desire, that can be modified, explained, irrational too. I can believe I have an intuition or one has an intuition that one is a - what? Napoleon? Or a guru? You can invent anything, live in any illusion.

So, we're asking very seriously if one has understood the nature of thought? Is there any other action or a way of living which is never fragmentary, never broken up as the world and me, and me and the world. You understand? Is there such a state of brain or a state of non-brain which is so completely holistic, whole? Right? We're going to find out, if you are serious, if you are free to be, if you throw away everything that you've accumulated - not physical things, but please don't throw away your bank account. You won't anyhow! But psychologically put away everything that you have collected. That's going to be very difficult. That means there must be freedom. Freedom, you know the word 'freedom' etymologically also means 'love'. When there is freedom at such enormous depths and boundless, there is also love. And to find that out or to come upon that holistic way of living in which there is no self-interest - self-interest is divisive. Right? I wonder if you understand all this? As we said at the beginning, self-interest is the origin, the beginning of corruption; whether that self-interest be in the name of god, in the name of meditation or prayer, seeking power. Where there is self-interest, there is corruption, there is something dreadful that is going on. So to find that out or to come up on it, there must be freedom from the friction, the conflict in relationship. Right?

We live by relationship. You may live in the Himalayas or in a

monastery or live by yourself in a little hut or in a palace; you cannot live without relationship. Relationship implies, 'to be related to', 'to be in contact with', not physically only, not sexually only, but to be completely in contact with another. You understand all this? But we are never completely related to another. Even in the most intimate relationship - man and woman - each is pursuing his own particular ambition, his own particular fulfilment - right? - his own way of living opposed to the other and so on. In this relationship there is always conflict, like two parallel lines never meeting. Face the fact. And, what creates conflict between two human beings? In your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your children - which is the most intimate relationship - what is it that creates conflict? Ask yourselves sir? What creates conflict between you and your guru? Is it not that you have an image about your wife and she has an image about you? Right? That image has been built very, very carefully during a short period or a very long period. So the image, the picture, the concept as your wife and your husband, guru and non-guru, all that business, this constant recording. You are following all this? Constant recording of the brain in relationship with another, this recording is the picture of your wife or your husband or the politician or your guru. It's the picture that you have created about him, as you are creating a picture about the speaker. And therefore that picture divides, therefore, there is no relationship between you and the speaker. It's very simple. And especially so when you're living in the same house, and all the turmoil. And to escape from all that you become a monk or whatever it is. But you have your own problems there too. You have your own conflicts, your own

desires, your own pursuits, which becomes again conflict. Right? So can one live - please listen to this, give your attention little bit at least - can you live without a single image between you and another? No image at all. Have you ever tried it? If you do - not try it - see the logic of it, the sanity of it, that as long as there is a picture-making machine going on, which is recording the insult, the flattery, saying, "what a marvellous person you are" and so on, all that is creating the image about another. and that image is the divisive factor. Right? That image is created by thought. "She hurt me", "she wasn't kind this morning", and so on and on. So is it possible to live without a single image? Not only the image made out of stone but also the image of your wife, of your guru, of nobody. Then you will find out what true relationship is. Because then there is no conflict at all in relationship. That is absolutely necessary for the brain to understand the limitation of thought and enquire into a holistic way of living that is completely non-fragmentary, not broken up.

Another factor in our life is, from our childhood we are being hurt psychologically. We are being wounded. From childhood we are trained to have problems. Right? Do you understand all this? We've talked for nearly for an hour. Shall I go on? Do you want me to go with this. Sir, the speaker is capable of talking of serious matters, as we did with a panditji, for hours. Because there was... But, if you are really serious and you've not talked about these things, you must be tired. Your brain must say, "well, that's enough. I'll take it up next day". But let's finish this. From childhood, when we are sent to school, there we have to learn how to write, how to read and all the rest of it. How to write becomes a

problem to the child. Please follow this carefully. You will see in a minute. It becomes a problem. Mathematics becomes a problem. History becomes a problem. Chemistry. So he is educated from childhood to live with problems. Right? The problem of god, problem of a dozen things. So our brains are conditioned, trained, educated to live with problems. From childhood we have done this. So what happens when a brain is educated in problems? Please enquire. It can never solve problems. It can create more problems. You understand?

Audience: (Inaudible.)

K: Please sir, I'm sure there's going to be question and answer meeting on Tuesday morning. I don't know where but there's going to be. Then you can bombard me with all your questions. This is very important to understand. Because we're asking whether the brain can live a daily life in the modern world without a single problem. It's only then it can solve problems. Not a brain trained to have problems, to live with problems, then, when it solves one problem, in the very solution of that problem, it creates more problems - as they are doing politically. Right? I mean for you for example, if you meditate - I don't know why you meditate, if you do - it becomes a problem: how to keep your mind quiet, control it, practice, discipline, you know all the rest of that rubbish. That's not meditation.

So please listen. From childhood we are trained, educated to live with problems. And therefore being centred in problems, it can never solve any problem completely. It's only the free brain that is not conditioned to problems, that can solve problems. Vous avez compris? You understand this or not? Sir, it's one of our constant

burdens to have all the time, problems, and therefore our brain is never quiet, free to observe, to look. So we're asking, is it possible not to have a single problem but to face problems? Because you're going to have plenty of problems. But to understand those problems and to totally resolve them, the brain must be free. Right? See the logic of it, because logic is necessary, reason is necessary. And then only you can go beyond reason, beyond logic. But if you are not logical, step by step by step, then you may deceive yourself all along and end up in some kind of illusion. So to find out a way of living that can face problems, resolve them and not be caught in problems. Yes sir, this requires a great deal of observation, attention, awareness to see that never a second you deceive yourself. Because there must be order, and order begins only when there is no problem, when there is freedom; not to do what you like - that's not freedom at all. Or to choose between this guru and that guru or between this book and that book - that's merely another form of confusion. No? Where there is choice there is no freedom. And choice only exists when the brain is confused. When the brain is clear, then there is no choice, only direct perception and right action.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 3RD FEBRUARY 1985

May we go on with what we were talking about yesterday evening? I suppose you are here for me to talk, aren't you? So we have a talk. It's really not a talk at all but a conversation between us, a conversation between two friends: friends who are peculiar in themselves, friends who have known each other for a very long time; friends who are not trying to impress each other, who are not trying to convince each other about anything - they are just friends who have played golf together; who have taken walks and looked at the sky and the beautiful evening and the pleasant trees and the green lawns and the beautiful mountains. And they are talking over their intimate problems, problems which they have not been able to solve, issues that are confusing. Living in a modern world, with all the difficulties and turmoil and the vulgarity of it all, they are concerned what human beings are going to become, why they have taken a million years to be what they are now: unreasonable, superstitious, believing in anything, gullible and caught in organizations.

So these two friends, which are you and the speaker, are going to talk over things together. That is, you don't listen to the speaker, you are entering into his spirit, into his enquiry. So, you and the speaker have to exercise your brains as much as possible, not accept anything he says. Be sceptical, reasonable, question, enquire and if you will, together we will take a long journey, not only outwardly but inwardly, into the whole psychical world, the world of thought, the world of sorrow, the world of fear and all the travail

of human kind. And so this is not a lecture to inform, to convince, to instruct. But rather, two together have a dialogue, a sense of conversation, never holding on to one's own particular form of belief or convictions, but exchanging, changing as they go along, not hold on or clutch to one's own experiences, superstitions and so on. So, you are that person, you are that friend with whom the speaker is talking, is having a conversation. So, there is no question of doing any kind of propaganda, nor trying to convince you of anything at all, but on the contrary, asking you to doubt, question, enquire - reasonably, logically, sanely, if that is possible. And as friends, they listen to each other.

Listening is an art which very few of us are capable of. We never actually listen. The word has a sound and we don't listen to the sound, we are always interpreting it, trying to translate the word into our own particular language or particular tradition, but we never listen acutely, without any distortion. So, the speaker suggests, perhaps respectfully, that you so listen. Not interpret what he says or translate what he says into your own particular terminology or according to your own knowledge, but listen. When you are telling a story, a rather exciting story to a little boy, he's listening with a tremendous sense of excitement, curiosity, full of energy. He wants to know what is going to happen. Who is the villain? Who is the heroine? And he will be waiting excitedly to the very end. And as we grown up people have lost all that capacity of curiosity, the sense of energy to find out, the energy that is required to see very clearly things as they are, without any distortion. And we never listen to each other. You never listen to your wife, do you? You know her much too well, or she you. There

is not a sense of deep appreciation, friendship, amity, so that you listen to each other, whether you like or not, but you do listen. And if you listen so completely, that very listening, that very act of listening is a great miracle, because that listening, like seeing, observing, is very important.

We never observe. We observe things that are convenient, friendly. We observe if there is a reward or a punishment. I do not know if you have not noticed that our whole upbringing, education and our daily life, is based on, extraordinarily, one principle - reward and punishment. You meditate in order to be rewarded. You progress in order to be rewarded and so on. So here there is no reward or punishment, we are talking over things together. It's very important to understand this. When one is seeking a reward, both physically and psychologically, in that search for a reward there is also the punishment - if that reward is not satisfying. So, please, can we listen to each other, per se, for itself, not for something else. To listen, as you would listen to marvellous music or the song of a bird, with your heart, with your mind, with all the energy that one has. Then one can go very far. So we are going to talk over together where we left off yesterday evening.

Most human beings, all of us, seek security, and it takes many, many forms. Security is very important. If you are not secure, both physically and psychologically, your brain cannot function adequately, fully, energetically. We must have security. But physical security is denied to millions and millions of people. They have hardly one meal a day. And we, so-called educated, well-to-do people, who have taken various forms of beliefs and so on, are all the time seeking, either consciously or not knowing, a kind of

security which would give us complete satisfaction. But we never enquire what is insecurity. You understand? We want security, and it's necessary both biologically and psychologically: there must be security. And in the search for security we never enquire into what is insecurity. You understand? If we can find out together what is insecurity, why we are insecure, then in the unfolding of it, in the causation of it, security naturally comes about.

Are we together in our conversation? We never enquire why we are insecure. We are always wanting security, the more, the better. So what is insecurity? Why are we insecure in our relationship to each other? In the external world there is tremendous disturbance, turmoil and agony going on in the world. And each one wants his own place, each one wants his own security; he wants to escape from this terrible state of insecurity. So, can we together enquire why we are insecure? Right? Can we do that? Can we do it? Can we go along that line? Not what is security, because your security may be in illusion, in some fantastic, romantic concept. Your security may be in some image, in tradition, or security in a family, in a name. And there is always uncertainty in trying to find security. Right? Can we go along? So why are human beings, you and people like us - we are laymen, not specialists - why are we insecure? What does that word mean? In our relationship to our wife or husband, there is a sense of not complete security, not a complete sense of 'everything is all right'. There is always this background, this sense of a feeling that everything isn't quite right. Everything is so confused, uncertain. So if we could enquire why the human brain is all the time seeking security and it must have security, otherwise it can't function properly. Right? Have you

noticed that? You agree too easily. You nod your heads as though it was something. Please keep your heads still and enquire with me to find out why human beings are insecure. Insecure about what? About not having a job in a country that is overpopulated, like this country, 15 million people are born every year - over populated? And education is rotten in this country. If there is one job, there are probably 10,000 people. And capacity, technological capacity and so on, in all that there is a certain state of enquiry, not only research, but one feels in achieving that, there is certain security. Right? And in a relationship there is always this sense of insecurity. Right? Don't you know all this or am I inventing all this? So what is insecurity? If we were not insecure, we wouldn't talk about gods, we wouldn't talk about security. Because we are insecure we seek the opposite.

Have you ever listened to sound? That crow. Sound. The universe is filled with sound. The earth is full of sound. And we seek silence. Meditation is to find some kind of peace or some kind of silence. But if you understand sound, in that hearing the sound, there is silence. Silence is not separate from sound. You won't understand this because you have never listened to sound. Have you ever sat under a tree when the air is very still, quiet, not a leaf dancing when it is absolutely quiet? Have you ever sat under a tree like that and listened to the sound of the tree? If there was no silence, there would be no sound. You don't understand all this. So, the sound of insecurity, the sound, makes us seek security, because we have never listened to the sound of insecurity. You understand? If you listen to the implications of insecurity, which makes us invent gods, rituals and all that stupid nonsense, if you listen to the

whole movement of insecurity, then out of that insecurity there comes naturally security. But if you pursue security as something separate from insecurity, then you are in a conflict. Right? I wonder if you understand it? Please do understand this a little bit. You know, of an evening when the stars are clear - not in Bombay - when the stars are clear and there is only one star in the sky and there is absolute silence. But you listen; if you listen to that silence, in that silence there is the sound. And, there is no separation between sound and silence, they both go together. In the same way, if you understand insecurity, the causation of it: the cause of insecurity is our own limited, broken psychological state. And when there is a way of living that is holistic, then there is no such a thing as security or insecurity.

So we are going to talk over together, if you will, what is a holistic way of life? The word 'whole', which means complete, the word 'whole' means in which there is no fragmentation, there is no broken up, there are no fragments; fragments as a businessman, as an artist, as a poet, as a religious cuckoo or a businessman and so on, which in our life we have divided. You belong to a special group, with your garlands and strange dress and the other wears some other kind of costume. We are constantly categorizing, putting them into some drawer, so that they are this; they are communists, socialists, capitalists and so on. Now our life, if you observe closely, our life is broken up. Right? Our life is fragmented. And if we understand the nature why we human beings who have lived on this marvellous earth for thousands and millions of years or 1 million year or 50,000 years, why we are so fragmented, so broken up.

One of the main causes of this breaking up into pieces is, as we said yesterday, that the brain is slave to thought - thought being limited, as we went into it yesterday. Wherever there is limitation, there must be fragmentation. When I am concerned with myself - with my progress, with my fulfilment, with my happiness, with my problems - I've broken the whole structure of humanity into me. You understand this? So, one of the factors why human beings are fragmented is thought. Please give your attention to this.

And also one of the factors is time. Have you never considered what is time? According to the scientists, who are concerned with time, it is a series of movements. So movement is time. Right? You understand? Time is not only by the watch, chronologically - time as the sun rising, sun setting, time when there is dawn and the snow on the mountains and the deep valleys, that is also time: the darkness of a night and the brightness of a morning. And also there is psychological time, inward time. I am this: I will become that. I don't know mathematics, but one day I will learn all about it. That requires time. To learn a new language requires a great deal of time: three months, six months or two months. That is also time. There is time to learn, to memorize, to have a skill, and there is also time as the self-centred entity saying, "I will become something else". Right? So the becoming psychologically implies time also. So we are enquiring into what is time? Not only the time to learn a skill but also the time which we have developed as a process of achievement: I don't know how to meditate. I'll sit cross-legged, and one day I will learn how to control my thought. One day I will achieve what meditation is supposed to be. So I practise, practise, practise. Then you become a mechanical monkey.

Because whatever you practise, you become mechanical. We won't go into meditation now because that's a very complex question, which we will talk about later. So, time is the past, the present and the future. Right? Time, that is, the past: all my memories, all the memories, experiences, knowledge, all that man, human beings have achieved which remains in the brain as memory, which is the past. Right? That's simple. That past is operating now in the present. Right? Clear? The past - all the memories, all the knowledge, all the experiences, the tendencies and so on - the background, and that background is operating now. So you are the past. And the future is what you are now, perhaps modified, but the future is the past modified. Right? See this please, understand this. And so, the past modified in the present is the future.

Your tradition as a cultural country for the last three to five thousand years: this vast accumulation of knowledge, culture, all the things human beings have been struggling, enquiring, having a dialogue - all that is smashed in the present, because the economic conditions demand. And the past is broken up, modified and is going to be the future. Right? This is a fact. So, the past modifying itself in the present is the future. Right? So, in the present, if there is no radical change, tomorrow you will be the same as you are today. So the future is now. I wonder if you understand this? You understand this? The future - not the future of acquiring knowledge, but the psychological future - that the psyche, the me, the self, is the past memory, and that memory modifies itself now and goes on. So the future and the past are in the present. So, all time - the past, present - is contained in the now. Right sir? It's not complicated, please. It's logical. So, if the human brain doesn't

change now, instantly, the future will be what you are, what you have been. Right? So, is it possible to radically, fundamentally, change now, not in the future? So we are asking, one of the factors of insecurity is time and thought, yes? Are we together in this a little bit? Are we moving together slightly? One step at a time. It is very simple, this. Don't complicate it. We are the past. There is no question about it. And that past gets modified in reaction, in challenges, in various ways. And that becomes the future. Look, you have had a civilization in this country for three to five thousand years. That is the past. And modern circumstances demand that you break away from the past. And you have no culture any more now. You might talk about past culture, enjoy the past fame, and past long years, centuries, but all that past is blown up, scattered by the present demands, by the present challenge. And that challenge, that demand is changing into an economic entity. So the past being challenged by the now becomes the future. So all past and future is in the now. So all time is in the now. I wish you would understand this. So we are saying that thought and time are the major cause of fragmented human beings.

And also we want roots, identification: identification with a group, identification with a family, identification with some guru, and that is why you put on these strange garments. I know you won't go away from that, but that's your job. So, we want to be identified with a group, with a family, with a nation and so on. And war, the threat of war is a major factor in our life, because war may destroy our roots psychologically, therefore we are willing to kill others. And also we want to be identified. You understand? Identified with a name, identified with a family and so on. So,

these are the major factors of our fragmented lives. Now do you listen to the truth of it or do you listen merely to a description of what is being said and carry the description, not the truth of it? You understand? The idea of it and not the fact of it. Vous avez compris? I mean, you have understood? Say for instance, the speaker says, "all time is now". If you understand, that is the most marvellous truth. And do you listen to it as a series of words and therefore a sound or a word or an idea, an abstraction of the truth as an idea, or do you capture the truth of it, not make an abstraction of the truth? Sir, you understand sir? What are you doing? Live with the fact, or make an abstraction of the fact into an idea and then pursue the idea, not the fact? This is what the intellect does. Intellect is necessary. Probably we have very little intellect anyhow because we have given ourselves over to somebody. Intellect implies, demands, reason, logic and seeing things very, very clearly, to discern. And also the capacity of the intellect is to gather information and act upon that information. And when you hear a statement like this, that "all time is now" and a statement like, "you are the entire humanity, because your consciousness is one with all the others", how do you listen to those statements? Do you make an abstraction of it as an idea? Or do you listen to the truth, to the fact of it; the depth of it, the sense of immensity involved in that? Ideas are not immense. But a fact has got tremendous possibility.

So a holistic life is not possible when the cause is thought, time and the desire for identification and for roots. They prevent a way of living that is whole, complete. Now you hear this statement, then your question will be, "how shall I stop thinking?" A natural question isn't it? Right sir? "How shall I?" I know time is necessary

to learn a skill, language and so on, a technological subject. Time is necessary for research. But I've just begun to realize that the becoming from 'what is' to 'what should be' involves time and it may be totally wrong. It may not be true. So you begin to question, or do you say, "yes, I don't understand what you are talking about but I will go along with it"? Which is actually what is taking place.

I wish we would be very honest to ourselves. Honesty is one of the most important things, like humility. A vain man cultivating humility - you understand? - a vain man putting together humility, that humility is part of vanity. But humility has nothing to do with vanity, with pride. It is a state of mind - brain that says, "I don't know but let me enquire" Never saying, "I know". Do you understand all this? So, now, you have listened to the fact that all time is now. Fact. You may not agree or you may agree. That is one of our dreadful things, agreeing and disagreeing. Why should we agree or disagree? If a fact is that the sun rises in the east, that's a fact. You don't agree or disagree. The sun has set. It is a fact. So can we put aside from our language, from our conditioning, agreeing and disagreeing, so that we can both look at facts? So there is no division between those who agree and those who don't agree. You understand? There is only seeing things as they are. You can say "I don't see", then that's a different matter. Then we can go into why you don't see and so on. But when we enter into the area of agreement and disagreement, then we become more and more confused.

So, the speaker has said our lives are fragmented. That's a fact. Our ways of thinking are fragmented. You are a businessman, earn lots and lots of money and then you go and build a temple - right? -

or give it to charity. See the contradiction. And we are never honest to ourselves - deeply honest. Not honest in order to be something else or to understand something else; to be unquestionably clear, absolute sense of honesty, which means no illusions. If you tell a lie, you tell a lie and you know it and say, "I've told a lie". Not cover it up. When you are angry, you are angry. You say you're angry. Don't find causes and explanations for it or how to get rid of it. So, this is absolutely necessary if you are going to enquire into much deeper things as we are doing now. Not make a fact into an idea but remain with the fact. That requires very clear perception.

Now, having said all this we say, "Yes, I logically, intellectually understand this". That's what you would say. And, 'How am I to relate what I have logically, intellectually understood to what I have heard? What is the truth?' You understand? So you've already created a division between the intellectual understanding and action. Right? Do you see this? So, listen, just listen. Don't do anything about it. Don't say, "How am I to get something? How am I to put an end to thought and time?" - which you can't, which would be absurd because you are the result of time and thought. So you go round and round in circles. But if you listen, not react, not say, 'how?', but actually, as you listen to some lovely music, a call, to the sound of a bird, listen, "that time is all in the now". And thought is a movement, so thought and time are together always. They are not two separate movements; one constant movement. That's a fact. Listen to it.

Then identification: you want to be identified because in identification as a Hindu, or a Muslim, Christian, or whatever it is, you feel secure. That's a fact. And that's one of the causes of

fragmentation of our lives, like time, thought, identification; and also wanting security and therefore taking roots in a particular country, or in a particular family, community, a group. These are - listen to it, don't do anything - these are the factors of our fragmentation. Now, if you listen to it very carefully, that very listening creates its own energy. Right? Do you understand sir? If I listen to the fact of what has been said, and there is no reaction because I'm just listening to it, then that implies gathering all your energy to listen. And that means giving your tremendous attention to listening. And that very listening breaks down the factors of, or the causation of, fragmentation. If you do something then you're acting upon the fact. But if there is merely an observation, without distortion, without prejudice, that observation, that perception which is great attention, then that very attention burns away the sense of time, thought and all the rest of it.

Is it time to stop? It's just an hour, no, not yet, it's five minutes past seven. So I'll stop at quarter past seven.

And also one of the factors of our lives, which we live in fragmentation, is fear. Right? That's a common human factor. Human beings from the moment of time, a million years or 15,000 years ago, they have been frightened. And they've never solved the problem. If you were not frightened at all there would be no gods, no rituals, no prayers. It's our fear that has created all the gods, all the deities, all the gurus and their absurdities. So, can we go into this question, why human beings live in fear and whether it is possible to be entirely free of it, not occasionally, not sporadically but to be aware of the objects of fear and also to be aware of the inward causes of fear. You understand my question? You may say,

"I'm not afraid". But all your background indicates that the background is structured on fear - because you all believe in god, don't you? Thank god there is one at least that doesn't! Or many who may not believe in god. God is invented by human beings because they are afraid: all the rituals, all the fancy clothes priests put on, at the background there is fear.

What is fear? Not what causes fear, which we'll go into presently, but what is fear? Aren't you afraid? If you are really honest, for a change, won't you say, "I'm afraid"? No? Afraid of death? Afraid of losing your job? Afraid of your wife or husband? Afraid of public opinion? Afraid of not being recognized by your guru as a great disciple? Afraid of the dark? Afraid of so many things. We are not talking about the cause, the objects of fear - I'm afraid 'of' something. We're enquiring into fear itself, per se, for itself. I may be frightened - one may be frightened of public opinion. It's about fear. I may - the speaker may be frightened because next year he may not have this large audience and all the absurdities of all that. So, we are asking, what is the cause and what is fear without the cause? Is there such thing as fear without the cause? Or, the word 'fear', the sound of fear, evokes in us fear? You understand? Say for example, communism. 'Communism', if you hear that word you react to it, if you're a capitalist - even if you are a socialist you react to it. And, when you hear the word 'fear', you react to it. Don't you? Of course. Now, is the word creating the fear, or the word is different from the fear? This is not complicated, this is simple. You understand? The word is not the thing. Right? The word 'lamp' or the word 'microphone' is not the actual microphone. The word is not the thing. Right? So I'm asking -

we're asking, the word 'fear' is different from the fact, or the word creates the fact? Vouz avez compris? You understand?

So one must be clear about this. If there was no word as the word 'fear', would there be fear? No, careful! Go into it, sir; go slowly into it. You see, sir, the word 'love' is not that flame. Right? And similarly the word 'fear' may not be actual - the sense of being gripped, living in a sense of nervousness. Do you understand? The fear. You know what fear does to people. They live in darkness. They are all the time frightened, frightened, frightened. And their lives become so shattered and so on. So we are saying, the word is not the fact; the word is not the thing. That must be quite clear. The microphone is not the actual thing in front of the speaker. So, what is the cause or causations of fear?

Now just a minute. I've asked you this question. The speaker has asked you this question: what are the causes of fear and so on? He's put to you this question. How do you listen to that question? Because that question itself has a vitality of it's own, energy of it's own. Right? Because it's a very serious question. It's not merely an intellectual question. Intellect enters into it. But the question itself - what is the cause of fear? - if you remain with the question and not try to find an answer, the question itself will begin to unfold. You understand? Do you understand? No? Sir, suppose I tell you, in all seriousness, "I love you". Don't become romantic. Suppose I say that to you with my heart. How do you listen to it? Do you listen to it, or all your reactions come into it, because perhaps you have never loved at all? You may be married, have sex, children and you perhaps don't know what love is. Probably you don't. It may be a fact. If you loved there would be no gurus, no images, no division.

We'll go into that another time.

So, what is the causation of fear? Listen to it, if I may most respectfully suggest; listen to it. Put that question to yourself and don't try to find an answer. Because if you try to find an answer, which is, "let me find out the cause and then I'll kill it out", that means then you are different from fear. Right? You follow this? Are you different from fear? Or you are fear. When you are greedy, is the greed different from you? When you're angry, is anger different from you? You are anger, you are greed. So you are fear. Of course. If you once admit - not admit - see the fact that anger is you, greed is you, fear is you consequently. But not you have separated yourself from fear and say, "I must do something about it". And you have done something about it for 50,000 years: you have invented gods, puja and all the rest of the nonsense.

So listen to the question and don't react. Don't say, "how?" The word 'how' must completely disappear from our minds, brains, for then you're asking for help, then you are dependent on someone, then you lose all your vitality, independence and sense of stability. So will you put this question to yourself and not expect an answer? Put the question, let the question itself - you have planted a seed in the earth and if the seed is alive, then it will go through concrete. Haven't you seen a blade of grass in the pavement? What extraordinary vitality that blade of grass has, to break through heavy cement. In the same way, if you ask, if you put this question to yourself and hold it, then you will see the cause of it. The cause is very simple. I can explain, that's not the point for the moment. What is important is to put the question and let the question - because you are serious you want to find out how to breathe, how

to live properly, so you've put the question - let that question itself answer; like the seed in the earth. Then you will see that the seed flowers and withers. You understand this? But, if you pull all the time to see if it is growing - you've planted it, some seed in the earth, as we've planted in our heart and mind the sense of what is fear, but if you keep on pulling at it and asking it, then you are losing energy. But you leave the question alone and live with it, then you will see that there is a cause for fear - not the word, not the explanation, but the actual truth of it. The causation of fear is thought and time. Isn't it? I have a job; I might lose it tomorrow. I have lived with pain and it's gone now, and I'm afraid it might come back. Right? You don't know all this?

So, time is the future and the past, as I explained, now. And also thought, thought and time are the two factors of fear. You can't do anything about it. Don't say, "How am I to stop thinking?" That'd be too silly a question. Because you've got to think to go from here to your house, to drive a car, to speak a language. But time may not be necessary at all psychologically, inwardly. I won't go into that now; it's too complicated. So, we are saying fear exists because of the two major factors of time and thought, in which is involved reward and punishment. Now, I've heard this statement made by you. And I have listened to it so immensely because it's a tremendous problem which man has not solved at all and therefore he is creating havoc in the world. I've listened to you, listened to the statement. And you have also told me, don't do anything about it, just put the question and live with it, as a woman wears the seed in her womb, so you put this question. Let that question flower. In the flowering of that question there is also the withering away of

that question. It's not the flowering and then the ending, the very flowering is the ending. Are you understanding what I'm saying?

Sir, learn the art of listening to your wife, to your husband; listen to the man in the street - his hunger, his poverty, the desperation and the lack of love. Listen to it. When you listen, at that moment you have no problems, you have no turmoil; you are just listening, and therefore there is no time in the act of listening.

That's enough for this evening I think, don't you?

BOMBAY 1ST QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 5TH FEBRUARY 1985

Krishnamurti: Several questions have been put. I haven't looked at them. I think it is important to put questions, to really enquire into the nature of the questions, and why we put questions, and to whom do we put the question. Do we put the question to find an answer from somebody, or do we put questions to ourselves? If we put questions to ourselves, from what depth, or superficially, do we put the questions to ourselves? And where do we find the answer to our questions, to our problems, to our various complex way of life? Is it something outside of us or is it something that we have to delve very deeply to find out?

I don't - we don't know what these questions are. We will go into them presently. Is the question important, and does the answer to the question lie in the question itself? I hope we are meeting this question. Is the answer outside the question or the answer is in the question itself? Are you understanding my question? And how do we approach a question? With a desire to find an answer, with a motive, or put a question without a motive. Is that possible? I don't know if we are meeting each other, are we? Or is it too early in the morning? I hope you had a nice sleep.

We're asking whether the answer is outside the question or in the question itself. If it is outside for somebody to answer, then the question is not significant. But if the question is serious, and therefore the question itself has the answer. Right? We're going to find that out, because we're going to investigate the question, not the answer. Can we go along with this?

Suppose one has a problem. We are always wanting to find out the solution of the problem, the resolution of it. But if we begin to understand the nature of the problem, what are the implications of the problem, how the problem arose and investigate the problem, in that very process of investigation of the problem, the solution is in the problem. We're going to do that, may we? We're not going to answer the question. Probably the answer will come out when we look at the question closely.

1st QUESTION: In spite of all my love, care and attention, I don't know where I lack in bringing up my daughter. Good Lord! Can you throw some light on the best way of educating the child?

K: Right? Are you all parents? Probably you are not. If you are not parents you might want to be. We ought to enquire together into what we mean by educating a child. What do we mean by education? We are all very well educated - apparently. And what is the nature of a mother or a father in bringing up the child? That's really the question. You may love the child or you may not. You may want the child, as he grows up, to become an engineer or a scientist, a physicist or to have some kind of career like your own. And generally that's the ambition of parents. Right? Do we see this? And the parents generally want their children to follow their own particular pattern, or establish a pattern of life that is suitable for their livelihood and so on and so on. So we ought to talk over together the question: what is education? Why has education become so incredibly difficult? Why, as they grow up and if they are fortunate enough to go to college and university and get a degree, then search for a job, get married, have children, and the whole circus begins. Right? The whole problem begins.

So the question is, what do we mean by education? Is it a holistic education or only career-minded education? You understand my question sir? For the child, and all the problems of bringing up a child, if one has affection, tenderness, care - we always want to use the child either as a kind of doll - you understand what I am saying? Don't you know what a doll is? Don't we use our children to satisfy ourselves? No? Gosh, you are rather silent this morning. I'm asking, do we educate a child to face the whole problem of life, the whole complex, divisive way of life, or do we educate them to have a good memory, remember a lot of knowledge that they have accumulated during the fifteen, twenty or thirty years of education and then exercise those memories to acquire a skill and a job? And we neglect totally the other side of life, the psychological side of life. And we are asking, is education lopsided or holistic? You understand my question. Right?

What is holistic education? And what is partial education, limited education? The limited education is what is being done now - memorizing, memorizing, memorizing, not learning. There is a difference between learning and memorizing. Memorizing is fairly, comparatively easy: go to a school, learn all about history, geography, physics, science and so on; and you memorize, book after book, what the educator says. So it's stored up in the brain as knowledge, acquired through books and so on. That's what modern education is. And all through life that is in operation. We are asking, why do we neglect the whole area of the psychological field which is immensely important? Right? Is our education merely concerned with earning money, a job, livelihood and so on or is it concerned with helping a human being to live a way of life

in which there is no division as the world and the psychological field? You understand? Is this possible? Is there any school or any university in the world where they are doing this? That is, to cultivate the brain as a whole, not a part of it. Are we meeting somewhere together? We are asking, is it possible for the cultivation of the whole brain, not part of it?

To understand this we have to investigate the whole structure of our consciousness, if you are willing to go into all that. The speaker - he is not saying this out of vanity or some kind of freakishness - has never read any philosophical book, nor read the Gita, the Upanishads and all that business. Why should you? Why should you be burdened with all the knowledge of what previous writers, previous thinkers, previous people who have experienced so-called religious experiences and so on, why should you read all that? Because we are asking, aren't you the story of mankind? You understand my question? Aren't you the history of mankind? Aren't you as a human being the book of mankind. If you know how to read that book, then you don't have to read any other book, except perhaps learn technological knowledge to earn a livelihood. Are we thinking together a little bit?

How do we approach this question: whether it's possible to cultivate the entire brain and not one part of it alone? That's the real question of education. Is it possible for the brain, which has lived over three million and a half years, according to the latest scientific statements, that brain which has accumulated tremendous knowledge, that brain which began with the animal and all the fears and the anxieties of an animal is still within our consciousness. Right? No, don't agree - please don't agree to

anything I'm saying. Just listen to it. Our consciousness, our brain, contains all the animalistic reactions, fears, all that. That's part of our hereditary, because we have come from the ape and so on. And that is part of our consciousness. Right? Just listen to it. You may not agree, but find out. Now, we have been trained, educated to function only with part of the brain. That is, acquiring a great deal of memory, knowledge about particular subjects and with it's discipline to earn a livelihood. Right? To become an engineer, to become a specialized scientist, a physicist or psychologist. Right? We are trained that way, educated that way. And therefore we are only using part of the brain. Obviously. And the other part, the psychical part, is uneducated, is left alone. So our education is lopsided. Right? May we go on?

The poor mother has asked this question, it becomes rather complex. So is it possible, not only to cultivate knowledge, memory and also at the same time or at a different period cultivate, understand the whole psychological content of a human being? You understand? Both of them running together. Clear? Is this possible? The speaker thinks that is the only right kind of education. Not just the one kind of education, but to understand the other side - which is the psychological world - you are mankind, you are the history of man; you are the story of mankind. Obviously. Because you have suffered, you have gone through all kinds of trouble like every other human being, you are one with the rest of the world. So can you read the book of mankind, which is you? You understand my question? Can you, as a human being, not only educated in one direction but also as a human being you are the entire history of mankind; not the history of kings and queens

and dates, but the experience, the sorrow, the pain, all that tremendously complex psychological world - can you read that book as you read an ordinary book? And we are not capable of doing that because we have depended on others to read that book for us. I don't know if you follow all this. Right sir? One depended on a guru, on a priest or a psychologist - unless you are a neurotic, but perhaps most of us are slightly neurotic. Can we read that book without distortion? Because if you are a good scientist or learning the beginnings of science, you have to be very precise, very clear, follow every discipline involved in that particular subject. So similarly, one has to read this book without any kind of distortion. Right? Is that possible? Is it possible for each one of us - not depending on any other to help us to read that book - is that possible, to read without any distortion? You understand my question?

As you see your face in the mirror when you comb your hair or shave, is there a mirror in which everything is reflected very clearly, distinctly, so that the book reflects in the mirror? You understand? You understand what I'm asking? Oh my lord, don't go to sleep, please. Suppose I don't know how to read that book, because my brain is slightly distorted, my prejudice, my nationality and so on. It is distorted. Therefore I can hardly read that book clearly. So can I be free of the prejudices I've accumulated? The book may be full of prejudices - probably it is - full of theories, suppositions. So I must be able to read it without all that, otherwise I can't read it. Right? So is it possible for me to be free of my prejudices, opinions, the conclusions which I recently have gathered - because the book may be full of tradition. You

understand? Therefore I must be free of tradition to read tradition. Vous avez compris? You have understood this? Yes? It's rather interesting if you go into it.

I am answering the poor lady. She loves her child. She wants to bring up her daughter carefully, well educated and during the educational period she acquires all the nonsense of society. Right? She acquires all kinds - you know what is happening in the world, I don't have to go into all that. And she wants to know what to do. We'll first of all finish that 'what to do'.

Do we really love a child? Do you really love your daughter, your son? What does that love mean? If you loved your daughter or your son really deeply, then would you allow that child to grow up and be caught in this tremendous conflicting and insane world? Would you allow your son to join the army if you really loved him? Go and kill another, get maimed? We were taken into a hospital in America by a very well known doctor. It was a hospital very, very few people see, not allowed in. And there were people without arms and legs, without eyes, shattered faces, lopsided, wounded - appalling sight. That's the result of war. And their mothers have said, 'We loved our children', and they end up there, in that hospital. I wonder if you realize all this. Some have gone insane, put in straight jackets. So what do we mean by love? Do you want them, your children whom you love, to enter this insane world? It's a tremendous problem. But you have to enter into that world. You have to have an occupation. You have to earn a livelihood. You can't just withdraw from the world, because you are the world. So, the mother asks, 'what shall I do?' - knowing that society is so corrupt, so extraordinarily unbalanced. Every one is

out for himself, self-interest. And the mother, what is she to do? Or the parent? So does love stop after a certain age? You've sent your child to a school, to a college and perhaps to a university - if you are lucky, if you have enough money - and let him go. We then get him married, and settled down. Right? That's what most parents are concerned about. And this is called love. We are questioning whether that is love at all. I'm not saying anything derogatory or impolite or disrespectful, but we question whether that is love. If you really, deeply loved, it would mean something totally different. There can be no love if there is self-interest. Right? This is a fact. If I am concerned about myself all the time, which we are, how can there be love? You may talk about it, romanticize about it, go to a cinema and see all that nonsense - about love and sex and you know all that business. So one has to go into this question of what is love, what is our relationship to the child, what's our relationship to the world and so on. That's one side of it.

And we are talking about whether you can read the story of mankind, the book that you are - if I can use that word - can you read that book? Not just at the beginning of the book, first chapter or a few lines of it but go through to the very end of it. It is possible only in the mirror of relationship. Right? Because in that mirror of relationship you see what you are, your reactions and responses, not only biological responses but also all the responses of ambition, greed, envy, flattery, insult. You follow? The whole content of your consciousness is revealed if you are very watchful, watching very closely, without any distortion. Then it is a movement, a holistic movement, learning a subject, that subject having its own discipline, like mathematics and so on, and also, as

one is related always in life with everything - I am related to you, I am related to another - so, in that mirror, watching carefully without distortion, that requires tremendous interest and energy. Can this both be done? You understand my question? That is real education. Then you don't have to read a single book about the psyche. You can read lots of books about other things

2nd QUESTION: Why is it that we are not able to sustain attention for more than a couple of minutes?

K: Ask yourself your that question.

First of all, why do you want to sustain something all the time? You want to sustain pleasure all the time. Right? You want gratification. You want certain conclusions to be continuous. You want certain relationships to be lasting, sustained, nourished. Why this desire to have a continuity? You understand my question? You want to sustain attention. Why? Because somebody has told you attention is very important? Or you have discovered for yourself the nature of attention? Therefore you have to enquire what is inattention. You understand? What is important, is not attention but what is inattention, not attending. Right? We have divided the two. You follow? Not having complete attention and also lacking that, which is inattention, not attending. Now which is important? Important in the sense, on which should we look? Is not inattention more important than attention? Would you agree? Because if I understand what is inattention, then there is attention. Right? So what is not-attending?

We are talking over together now, are you attending all the time or only part of the time? Please, just look at it, answer, look at it for yourself, go into it for yourself. Are you really paying attention to

what is being said now, or only for a few seconds or a few minutes and then go off to something else? Is there a sustained attention? Of course not. So it's important to understand why there is inattention.

Is there such a thing as inattention? You understand my question? Are you interested in all this? Inattention is distraction. Right? That's what you call distraction. Is there a distraction at all? I want to think about something and then that very thought goes off to something else, and going off I call distraction. Right? Is not thought itself a distraction? I wonder if you see that. I want to concentrate on this subject and I can do that only for a few minutes, and then thought goes off to something else, and the thinking about something else, instead of what I am supposed to be thinking about, is called distraction. But if I don't call it distraction but follow that. You understand? I'm concentrating on reading a chapter and I watch, I see that thought is also going off to something else. Then I say, that is a distraction. But I won't call it a distraction. To me that doesn't exist at all, personally. To me there is no distraction. Because I follow what you call distraction. I don't say, 'I must read this chapter or these few lines', but whatever direction thought moves, watch it, so that there is no sense of distraction, which means no division. I wonder if you see this. So that there is a watching, attention and non-attention. Then non-attention is attention.

See how we are distracted by words. The word 'distraction' is a very destructive process because you want to concentrate on something and therefore the other, moving away from that, is called distraction. Thought is always moving. It's never static. It's

always in action - whether you are asleep, whether you are awake or day-dreaming or doing something or other - it's in action, it's in movement. And thought is a material process. I wonder if you have understood this. Because thought is based on memory, experience, knowledge and that's stored in the brain and the brain contains millions and millions of cells and those cells hold memories. This is a scientific fact. And they are always in movement. So one begins to discover the brain has its own rhythm, not the rhythm of thought. I wonder if you follow.

Now we're asking, is it possible to watch? To watch, to be absolutely watching all the time? That's really another form of asking, can I sustain attention? Is attention brought about through effort? And if you make an effort, is that attention? That is, practice attention. Lovely idea. Practice, day after day, watching your body, the movements, you follow, all the game you play with, and at the end you say, 'Yes, I've learnt attention'. Is attention a form of acquiring memory about attention? You understand my question? Is attention gathered through practice, through various forms of psychological training or there is attention only, not inattention? If you understand inattention, there is attention. And it's never sustained. Because why should you attend all the time? Then you can look at the stars. And also that requires attention. So, there is no distraction.

Q: Excuse me Krishnaji, may I ask one short question...

K: Come over here.

Q:... with regard to...

K: What sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I would like to understand your question, sir. It's not quite clear.

Q: He wants to put a subsidiary question. He wants to ask you a question.

K: All right, go ahead, sir.

Q: You said that when we see or behave with somebody we can know what we are. But suppose if we are alone. When we are alone and just thinking, then is it not possible to know who we are?

K: Ah, when you are not related to anybody, is it possible to know yourself? Is that the question sir? You've asked the question sir, may I go into it? Are you alone at all?

Q: Yes.

K: No sir, just a minute. Do you know what that word 'alone' means? The etymological meaning of that word 'alone' means 'all one'. (Laughter) Just a minute sir, just a minute; I was only joking. I'm only playing with that word sir. Forgive me. (Laughter) Are we alone? Or you're always related to something? It may not be your wife or husband, you may be single, but you are related. You are related to nature, of which you are a part. You are related to the world. You are related to your mother, to your father, to your - and so on. There's no such entity as being single. Biologically you may be single, physically unrelated, but psychologically you are related to the whole of mankind. And then we say to ourselves, we are lonely - I mean single - and with all the problems of being single. Then I try to have a relationship with another and yet remain single. You understand? I may get married, have children, go to the office and all the rest of it, but I remain single because I am pursuing my ambition, and all the rest of it. So there is no person in

the world, including the most lonely hermit, he's related, related to the past. Right? The tradition, to all the knowledge he has acquired and so on and so on.

3rd QUESTION: Does suffering and enjoyment have any bearing on the previous life and deeds of present life?

K: You are talking about reincarnation aren't you? and also that implies the word karma - cause and effect. Karma, I've been told, the root meaning of that word is action. May we go into this question? Seriously you want to go into it? Not that the others have not been serious.

What is action? Action means to be acting. Right? Not, I have acted or will act. Action means now. Right? Action implies, for most people, a past remembrance, a motive or a future intention or future ideal and so on. Either the past is directing, shaping the action, or the future shaping the action. Right? So that's not action. I wonder if you see this. Right? Action means the doing, the active present. But the active present is denied when you have a motive, a cause for action and a future action. So you are really, when you depend on the future or on the past, you are not acting. I wonder if you see this. For most of us acting is based on memory, on a motive. Let's be quite clear and honest about it. I flatter you because I want something out of you, I love you because you have given me something and so on. You play this game.

Now, the questioner asks, have I lived on this earth before and because I haven't done things properly the last life, therefore I am suffering now, and if I understand what is right action now, next life I have a better chance, a better house, a better wife, better refrigerator. (Laughter) Now, this is really a very serious question.

I don't know if we should go into this.

What is the 'self', what is the 'I' that says, 'I must continue'? That there is a continuity from the past through the present to the future. That's one thing. Then the other is the cause - cause-effect which is part of karma. I have sown a certain seed, good or bad, and that flowers, smells bad or good, and the effect is that. Now, is cause permanent and the effect also permanent? Or the effect becomes the cause? Right? And that has another effect, which then becomes the cause. So causation is a movement. Right? I wonder if you understand. It's rather interesting if you go into it very carefully. The cause is, I suffer from disease, one of the causes. Suppose I've a bad stomach, because I've eaten the wrong food, drank too much and so on. So, if I don't eat properly, the effect is pain. Then I say, that pain must be controlled. I take a pill. But the cause still goes on, because I'm eating the wrong food. So, there is the continuity of cause and a superficial effect. Right? But if I see the cause as eating wrong food, I change it, the effect is health. Health is not a result. It is living properly. I don't know whether you follow all this. Logically it is all this. So, the cause is never permanent or the effect. The effect becomes the cause and so it's a chain, it's a movement. And the question really is, if you're interested, can this movement stop? You understand? This movement, which is, cause-effect, effect becoming the cause and so on, and this movement is of time. Naturally. Right? So I'm asking, need there be any causation for action? Right? You all look so sleepy.

Is there an action, per se, for itself, not for something? To understand that I have to go into the question of reward and punishment. The human being lives on this principle - reward and

punishment - like all animals do. Right? If you've had a dog, you reward him when he does something properly. When you say, 'Come to heel' and you gradually train him through reward and punishment, giving him a biscuit when he comes to you, and you don't give him a biscuit when he doesn't. So he learns to depend on reward and punishment. And then gradually you say, 'Come to heel' - he does. You follow? And on the same principle we work. I haven't done things properly this life or past life. I'm paying for it now but the next life I'll be rewarded if I behave properly. Right? So its reward and punishment. Same principle. Now, can you act, live without a motive, without this principle of reward and punishment? Go into it sirs. See what the implications of it are. Not reincarnation, we'll go into that later. That's a very trivial matter. At least for the speaker - it's nonsense - I won't go into it now. Because one has to go into this question, what is continuity, what is ending and what is it that continues. You understand? These three things are implied, which takes some time to go into. We will go into them in the next two talks.

So I'm - we're asking, is there action without cause? Go into it sirs, see for yourselves how extraordinarily interesting it is, not just whether you believe in re-incarnation - that's rather silly, but to find out an action which has no cause, which has no motive, which has no self-interest. If there is self-interest, it's limited. If there is a motive, it is still further limitation. So action is never complete and therefore breeds problems, like you are doing politically.

So I'm asking, is there an action per se, for itself? There is, which is love. Love has no motive. Love has no reward or punishment. It's love. When there is that quality of love there is

right action. Right action is not born out of clever thought. Right action takes place when there is the sense of holistic love - I can love my wife and love mankind, because it's love. It's not love to one and denied to the others. I wonder if you understand this.

That's real compassion. And when there is that compassion, there is intelligence. And that intelligence has no opposite to it.

4th QUESTION: Is it possible to be aware with all your senses - eyes, ears, brain, nerves, etc., and so on, simultaneously?

K: Anything is possible. But how do we, as human beings, function? With all our senses or only with partial senses? You understand my question? Senses are very important - aren't they? Otherwise you couldn't live, touch, feel, taste, see, watch and so on and so on, hear, with all the senses fully awakened. But our senses are not. They are only partially awake. Right? Because it has been one of the doctrines of religions all over the world, to control your senses. Right? To control your senses so as to have energy for god. Right? Sexual senses, the sense of hearing - don't hear anything which it doesn't say in the book. Right? Don't listen to anything, because it may arouse suspicion, doubt, questions - don't listen. And another interesting thing, have you noticed: those people who live by the book - Muslims and the Christians - are very bigoted, narrow. I hope you do not mind my saying this? And those who have lots of books like Hindus, they play around. They are not so bigoted; they are tolerant; they absorb. And they consider that absorption great capacity, which it is not, it is just indifference. So, is it possible to be aware simultaneously, of all the senses in full action - aware?

Have you noticed a sunset with all your senses? Have you

noticed the movement of the sea, the blue light and the movement of a wave, with all your senses? You haven't. Have you watched your wife with all your senses? No. Now, when you watch with all your senses, what takes place? You can't answer that question, because you have never done it. So we must not say what happens when all the senses are awake, functioning fully, but why is it that we are always partially responding, except perhaps sexually - partially responding - why? You understand? Partial responses of the senses. Why? Is it that we have given importance to one or two senses? Right? I'm asking you. Or we haven't even thought about all this? So if you begin to be aware of your senses, not choosing one sense better than the other sense but aware without choice, the whole movement of senses, not one part of it, but to watch our reaction to every sense, the taste, the hearing, the seeing, the smelling, the feeling, all that.

We live by that. We live by sensation. Right? And thought takes over the sensations. Haven't you noticed it? I don't want to go into all this, but it doesn't matter, let's go into it. You see something beautiful in the shop, a nice shirt, or a nice sari, or whatever you see in the shop. There is perception, seeing, going inside the shop, touching it, which is sensation - right - seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought comes along and says, 'how nice to have that shirt on me, it looks nice'. Right? So thought creates the image of you in that shirt or in that sari. Right? Then desire is born. I wonder if you are following the whole sequence of this? We are always fighting desire. The religions all over the world say, suppress desire, don't fight it, suppress it, get rid of it. You can't. Desire for god is the same as desire for a shirt, sorry! Because both are based on desire.

So, seeing, contact, sensation. And not to allow thought - careful, I'm not saying you can't allow it. See the truth, the moment thought comes and builds an image, then desire is born, which is a fact, simple, observable, a daily fact. Now, sensations are normal, healthy, otherwise you would be dead. And to watch very carefully thought not building an image. You understand? And not letting thought create an image out of the sensation. I wonder if you understand this? I see that shirt in the shop. Then I go inside and touch the material and say, 'What beautiful material, hand made'. And then thought comes along and says, 'How nice it would be if I had it. I'll put it on. Nice blue'. Right? And when thought creates the image, then desire is born. Sensation has no desire. Of course. Sensation. I wonder if you see this? It's really important. Then to be aware of thought making a shape out of sensation, giving it an image, then the conflict of desire. Now, is there an observation, which requires great, clear, correct, without any distortion, without any compulsion, to see thought. You follow? Not allow thought to react immediately, so that there is a gap. You understand? You follow? Do it, do it and see what happens.

Q: May I ask a question sir?

K: Yes sir.

Q: A question further to what you have said that. Why every sensation or ever reaction of the brain is always in terms of a thought?

K: What is it? I haven't understood the question. Why everything turns to thought?

Q: Why every sensation turns into thought.

K: I know, that's what we are saying. Every sensation, why is

thought interfering with every sensation. Right?

Q: Yes, that's the question.

K: Why do you think it does? You answer that question. Don't ask me. I'll tell you later. Don't ask another any question; find out. You are so lazy; that's what it is. We live by thought. Right? That's the only instrument you have now. And thought has created the most amazing things in the world. Thought has brought about tremendous chaos in the world; which is war, separated nations, separated economy. Thought has created religions and separated the religions. Right? So thought has done immense harm in one direction and great good in the other direction, like having better sanitation, communication, marvellous surgery. Have you seen the news - they have invented an artificial heart and implants and so on. They are doing incredible things. So thought is the way of our life. And that thought is very limited, therefore it is creating chaos in the world.

We never ask is there another instrument? Is there another perception which is not thought? Right sir? Now that requires a great deal of going into, not just verbally, but doing it. There is that instrument which is insight, in which there is no memory, no time, no future, it's instant perception. And that perception is action, not separated. I won't go into it now because that takes too long.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I've got a question here.

Q: Can we come out of this world of thought by any effort.

K: What?

Q: Can we come out of this world of thought through any effort?

K: Can you come out of the world thought with effort? Right? Who is the maker of the effort? Does not the maker of the effort, thought also say, 'If I get out of this I'll have a better reward'. You see we put these questions without thinking it out for ourselves. And the speaker is not going to help you. Doesn't want to help you. But we can talk over together. We can have a dialogue together so that both of us see the same thing clearly.

5th QUESTION: I don't follow doctrines and commandments of divine souls. So I feel fear that they may do something wrong to me. I always feel uneasy and live in a fearing condition. Please guide and advise me.

Divine souls doing something wrong to you? Sir, we've got the most extraordinary ideas. Perhaps they are pathological and neurotic - that somebody evil, evil souls, are controlling us, shaping us, telling us what to do. And there are good souls, divine souls, saying, 'Don't do that'. Advising the opposite of the evil birds. Why are we so frightened of curses, of some people doing us harm psychologically, black magic? You know all that dark side of this country. You know it very well - the dark side of this country. Not that the other countries don't have dark sides, but it's not so pronounced. Why are we always caught in this, somebody doing me harm? Aren't you doing harm to others? Aren't you doing harm to those poor people who have one meal a day?

Sir, really the question is, there is good and bad, right? Let's keep to that simple thing. The good and the bad. The noble and the ignoble and so on. Is good related to the bad? Now, careful, don't say, find out. Is the good related to the bad? If it's related then it's not good. Right? So, is the good conjured up by thought? Careful.

So sirs, society says, this is good. The commandment says, 'Don't do this', 'Don't do this', 'Don't do this'. And religions all over the world lay down a moral way of living; don't kill, don't steal, don't do this, all religions have done it. And we do quite the opposite of all that. 'Don't kill', we kill. Right? 'Don't cheat', we cheat. 'Don't have double standards' and so on. We all do the opposite. So why do you bother about commandments, whether they are divine or not divine, whether they are straight from the horse's mouth - you know that phrase? All right, I won't use that phrase. Straight from some saint or some god or other. Why do we accept these commandments? It seems so absurd - which means, trying to live something which is not natural. So, why don't we change what is natural? Not follow commandments. I'm greedy. All right, I'm greedy. And I'm also envious and all the rest of it. I'm envious, which is part of greed. I like to be envious, what is wrong with it. But the commandment says, don't be envious, don't look at another man's wife and so on and all the rest of it. Why am I greedy? That's my problem, not somebody else's problem. So, why am I greedy? Because my whole education is to have more, more, more: more money, more this, more that. Right? Isn't that so? The more, the better, which means comparison, which means measurement. Right? Measurement. I compare myself with you. You are bright, intelligent, beautiful, etc., I am not. So in comparison with you I become dull. If I don't compare with you, am I dull? I am what I am. I can move from there. But if I am always comparing myself with you, I become exhausted, fighting you, jealous of you. Right? So, I won't compare at all. Have you ever done it? Never compare yourself with anything.

You know, if you have been to museums, on one side there is Michelangelo and on the other side some other, and so on. Can you look at that picture without comparing it with another picture? Can you see that old, ancient picture, looking at it without any side distractions, which is comparison? Just look at it. Can you look at your wife and yourself without comparing. Have you ever tried to do this, to live a life without any comparison? That's real freedom, the beginning of freedom, when there is no measurement of your becoming something, except in the business world perhaps - but even then. But inwardly, psychologically, there is no measurement. Which means, that you don't get better and better in violence. You understand? Which is called non-violence. I wonder if you see the joke of this. Better and better in violence - which is what you are all doing. So if the brain, which has been conditioned to measurement, to comparison, can put that completely aside then there is that quality of freedom. And it's only when there is that depth of freedom or just freedom, there is also love in it. It isn't just you are free - that's nonsense. When you are aware that you are free you are no longer free. When you say, 'I know', you no longer know. You understand all this? We'd better stop.

BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 7TH FEBRUARY 1985

Before we answer these questions or explore these questions, how do we approach a question, a crisis, a challenge, something that we have to investigate? How do we approach it? I think the approach matters perhaps much more than the question itself, because if we approach it negligently, casually then the question itself has very little meaning. But if we approach it without any bias, without any desire for the comforting solution or a sense of conquering a question, being top of the crisis, then I think we'd make the question rather trivial and not so serious. So the approach matters enormously. So we ought to really talk over together how we approach, what is our motive, how do we regard, receive any challenge, any question. Right? Let's go into it.

Suppose I have a problem. First I question what is a problem? A problem, the etymological meaning of that word, is 'something thrown at you'; that is the actual meaning of that word, problem - something thrown or something that challenges you. How do we look at that problem? What is our immediate response to that problem? Either it is shrinking away from the problem or trying to conquer the problem. I hope we are all together in this, are we a little bit, though it's rather early in the morning. Or we try to find an answer to a problem that would be circumstantially pleasant, gratifying, or we look at the problem as though it were something new, fresh.

Is any problem old? Is this all right? Can I go on like this? Are we together a little bit in this? Is any problem, crisis, question, is it

something new, or is it a problem that has been repeated over and over again? All right? If it is a repetitive problem, why has it become repetitive? Is our brain repetitive and so on? Right? Are we together a little bit in all this. It's up to you.

1st QUESTION: You often tell us to exercise our brain. And also you suggest to merely listen without acting upon what we listen to. These two statements appear contradictory. Kindly, explain.

You often tell us to exercise our brain. We are exercising our brain most of the time, when you are earning money, you are exercising it all the time. But when we listen to somebody who is saying something totally different from what you think, what you are used to, we hardly listen to a statement made by another which may not be the usual statement. So when the speaker suggested, use your brain, use the entire brain, not just part of it - you understand - and also to listen. He has suggested that we should listen. And he explained what it means to listen. There is not only the hearing with the ear, but also there is a hearing behind the ear. You understand what I mean? You listen to a word. As we said listening is an art. Art also means to put everything in its right place. And to listen requires attention, requires a sense of care, a sense of receiving or listening to something that may have a meaning or may not have a meaning. It may be a false statement and to see, to hear, in that false statement the truth of that false statement. You are following all this? Hearing implies a great deal of sensitivity, not just hearing, translating according to your own pleasure or displeasure or according to what you already know. But to listen as though you were listening for the first time to

something that is being said. That is the art. Like any other art it requires a great deal of capacity to listen. Right? To listen to your wife, to your husband, to a friend, to listen to your children or to a bird and so on and so on, so that one becomes extraordinarily sensitive. That is the art of listening. And he says, the question is contradictory. That is, the hearing and the activity of the brain - isn't it? Is hearing something different from the activity of the brain? Are you interested in this question or shall we skip it?

Have you noticed how our brain works? Our brain, not according to scientists, biologists and so on, but have you ever observed your own brain working? Have you? Why it thinks certain things? Why there is always the repetition of a problem? Why is it prejudiced? Why it holds on to a belief, to an idea and so on? Have you ever watched it in operation? Not you watching it, but as it arises, looking at it. I wonder if you follow all this? Have you ever tried all this? No, you haven't. So let us now, if I may most respectfully suggest, when you are listening to the speaker, are you listening as though for the first time? He uses English words and apparently you and the speaker understand English. Now when you listen to a word, the word has a sound. Right? And the sound is transmitted to the brain. And the brain then translates the meaning of that word and the significance of that word and the comprehension of that word. Right sir? So, are you listening now as though for the first time? Or you have already heard the speaker talk about many of these things, you've probably read or heard the tapes and so on. Can you put all that aside and listen as though for the first time to what is being said? Or look at the sunrise or the sunset for the first time when you look at the sea, so that the brain

doesn't get used to things. You understand what I'm saying sirs? The brain doesn't get accustomed to the sunset, to the sunrise, to your wife, to your husband and all the rest of it - so that everything is new, fresh. That is the art of listening, the art of seeing something as though you are looking at it for the first time. Which means, memory is withheld. This is a discipline, not the discipline of obedience, but the discipline to learn how to look, how to listen.

The word 'discipline' means etymologically a 'disciple who is learning' - not from his master or from his guru or from the one who knows - but one who is learning. That means, as though he did not know anything before but he is now learning. That is the meaning of that word 'discipline', coming from the word disciple. Now if we are learning all the time, then you become the guru and the disciple at the same time. You follow all this? Are you if I may ask, learning from the speaker?

Q: Yes.

K: Are you really learning? Don't bother who said it sir. If you are learning, what does that word mean, learning? Memorizing? Or there is no additive process? You understand what I'm saying? No adding to what you already have accumulated but rather you are not accumulating, but learning, moving. Probably you haven't done any of these things, it's all new. So, learning, hearing and seeing is a great art. To see everything as it is, not only outwardly but specially inwardly - to see things exactly as they are. That's real honesty. In that there is no deception. Because we are so apt to deceive ourselves willingly or unwillingly.

Q: Sir, may I request you to permit spoken questions and a dialogue together, an intimate dialogue. Rather than reading the

written question.

K: What sir? I am afraid I haven't heard it properly.

Q: He wants a dialogue. He's asking for a direct dialogue.

K: You want a dialogue?

Q: Yes,

K: Do you know what that word means?

Q: We'll learn from you.

K: It is a conversation between two people. And to have a really good dialogue with another we must be equally interested or committed to that which we are discussing, having a talk over together, a conversation. That means, you and the other must be on the same level, have the same interest, same passion. Otherwise you cannot have a dialogue. It's good to have a dialogue. I wish we could. But with an audience, with so many people it's not possible to have a good dialogue. It's a marvellous thing if you can do it. I'm not preventing you sir from asking questions. But to have a good, deep dialogue requires that you and the speaker move in the same direction, with the same meaning, with the same immediacy of understanding.

Q: Sir, I want to have a clarification of what you said just now. You said, true or false statements. What is truth and false?

K: Truth? What is a true statement or a false statement? How are you going to find out? From another? What is a false statement? False - and what do you mean by false? Say for example, many people accept - it's a very ordinary example - many people accept that nationalism is a marvellous fact. We must be nationalistic. Is that a false statement or a true statement? How do you look at it? How do you find out? Say for instance, most of you

in the world believe in god. Don't you? All right. You believe in god. Is it a false statement or a true statement? How do you find out? You can believe in anything you like, in any illusion, in any fanciful, romantic, sentimental concept. And belief may not necessarily be true. No belief is. So, how do you find out these things? How do you find out if there is god? To find out you must have a free mind, not a believing mind. You must have a mind that is capable of investigating, looking, doubting, questioning - not be afraid. So fear can create that which is false as true and that which is true as false. Right? This is happening in the world. So sirs, to find out what is true, what is truth, there must be a great sensitivity, a sense of freedom - not just the idea of freedom but actual freedom, freedom from fear and so on. Most of us have many illusions and those illusions have become truth, real. And to be free of illusion is one of the most necessary and arduous work - to be totally free of all illusions, then only you can find out what is true and what is false.

2nd QUESTION: Since you say that there is no such thing as god and you also condemn idol worship, then the question of how we are born and how nature came into existence comes into the picture. Kindly explain.

I don't have to have explain. Scientists say we came from water, from the cells, from the animal, the ape, and all that is part of nature. It has taken three and a half million years or more or less to become a human being - which is what we are now. Either that's so, or you believe god has made us. Right? You follow this question? Either you believe in the scientific theory or the scientific facts, or you believe that god has made us. Right? Or that

there is god in us - whatever game you like to play. The scientists have proved as a fact, that we've come as a tiny cell multiplying itself from the water and gradually becoming earth-bourn, and from the ape we have become what we are. That is, we are part of nature, the whole world is part of us. And if you believe that some creator has made you, that creator must be rather silly, rather blind, idiotic man or woman - because look at us, what we are. (Laughter) Now you laugh, but all the temples, the mosques and the churches are filled with this. We are not made in the image of god but we have made god our image. You understand the difference?

Sirs, to find out, to discover or to come upon that which is not the word, not memory, not tradition, which is not of time and so on, we must understand what we are first. Why we have become like this, barbarious, violent, greedy, envious, money-minded, hating each other, you know all the things that are going on in the world. That's far more important to find that out first rather than to say, who made us? We are what we are now - blind, rather stupid, gullible, frightened, lonely, depressed, sorrowful - all that is what we are. And to understand this whole structure of the human psyche is far more important than merely talk about god, or do some repetitive ritual or go to a temple and worship a piece of stone.

Sir, the speaker doesn't condemn anything. Forgive me pointing this out. He just shows what we human beings are doing. He's acting as a mirror for you to look into. That mirror is not the authority. It has no authority. It's just a mirror. And that mirror, when you see it clearly, understand what you see in that mirror, then throw away the mirror, break it up - don't make another idol of

it or another personal worship, as most Indians are apt to do.

So first, what is important is to find out how we live. Why we are so narrow, limited, so self-centred, full of self-interest. It may sound absurd, repetitive but that is the most important factor. That shapes all our lives.

3rd QUESTION: What is the mind? Is it ever possible for it to look at itself without the perceiver? It doesn't seem to be so simple as looking at a flower without the centre.

All right? Have you understood the question? Yes? Would you kindly tell me?

Q: Yes.

K: What is the mind and what is the brain? Is the brain the mind, or the mind is the brain? That's one question. The other is, is it possible for the brain, for thought to see itself in action, in movement? That is the second question. And is it possible ever to observe, to look, to see, without the perceiver? Right? Those are the three questions involved in this. Are you interested in this?

Q: Yes.

K: Sirs, don't please me. I can get up and go; it wouldn't matter. I hope you are interested in it. Or you're concerned about it - not interested - concerned. Is the mind different from the brain? This is a very important question, because we have discussed this matter with several scientists and all the rest of it. The brain is the centre for all our nervous responses - the centre of all action and reaction. Response and not responding. It is the centre of fear, of jealousy, hate, violence, sorrow, loneliness, anxiety, depression, sorrow and so on. It is the centre of all movement, of time and thought. Right sirs? And that brain is conditioned by thought, by fear, by suffering

and also it is conditioned by knowledge. Right? Are you following all this?

Q: Yes, yes.

K: So the brain which has lived on this earth for over three and a half or four million years - not as man but as an animal, and so on - only within the last million or fifty thousand years it has become a human being, the brain which is contained in the human being now. This is what the scientists say, that this brain has existed eight thousand BC, and perhaps even longer. So this brain is conditioned. Right? That's a fact - conditioned by thought, by time. And it can only act in a limited way, partially. Right? If you are specialized as an engineer, for the rest of your life it's functioning in a particular direction. If you are interested in money it is working in that direction. Right? If you are a scholar, a Pandit, then you'll gather information and your brain is stuck in that knowledge.

So the brain is conditioned by experience, by knowledge, by memory, which is thought and time. This is an obvious fact. Is the mind within the brain? You understand my question?

Q: Yes sir.

K: Is the mind within the brain or outside the brain? I won't go into it - it would take too long - we cannot have a dialogue about this sir. I wish we could.

You see sir, is love within the brain? Answer this question. Is love compassion, not sympathy or empathy or tenderness and all that? Love may have all that. But the brain is limited, conditioned. And if love is within the brain, love is then conditioned, limited. Right? And is love limited? Is compassion, with its infinite intelligence, is it within the brain? Or outside it?

Q: Yes.

K: No sir, don't say 'yes'. Please, this is a very serious question. You have to go into it - one has to go into it very, very deeply. The brain can only find out if it is aware of its own limitation, and realizing, being attentive to that limitation, then it becomes utterly free and therefore quiet. Then the mind has a possibility of contacting with the brain and not the brain with the mind. I don't know if you understand all this? Are you following a little bit of all this?

Q: Yes sir.

K: Really? (Laughter) Do you know what it means sir, to understand your own way of daily living, and see the truth and the false in your daily living, and see how that daily operation, daily existence is conditioned, narrow, limited, based on self-interest? And whether it is possible to be free of that self-interest. And then see what happens - not imagine what might happen. All that requires, either you take many years or capture it in one instant. This is a very serious matter because the mind is an extraordinary thing if you go into it, if it exists at all, that is, if love exists at all. Love is not conditioned. I can love my wife or my father, mother or my son and yet that perfume can be always there, it's not personal.

4th QUESTION: For the understanding of human problems such as fear, loneliness and sorrow, your statement, 'the observer is the observed', seems to be all important. However, the logic of that statement doesn't seem to go beyond the intellectual level. Why is it that certain facts remain mere concepts?

What do we mean by understanding, the word 'understanding'?

When you say, 'I understand', what do you mean by that? Do you understand the meaning of the words, or do you mean understanding the implication of the words, which is the sound of the words, or you understand it so-called intellectually? That is, you have understood the meaning of the words and the meaning remains as a concept in the brain. Right? So understanding, does it mean merely a verbal comprehension or an understanding? Which is, you have investigated, observed, searched, questioned, doubted and you come to a point, say, 'Yes, I've got it'. Which is it when you use the word 'understand'? And that's our difficulty. You hear a statement, as we have made it just now, and you make from that statement an abstraction - the juice of that statement - and then make it into an idea. And the idea becomes all important, not the fact. Right? Are we together in this, a little bit? Aren't you doing that now? Aren't you, when the speaker says, 'What do you mean by understanding', is it merely words grasping the meaning intellectually, the significance, the verbal connotations and so on? You grasp it intellectually - which is only a very small part of understanding. Intellect has a part, but when that part becomes all important, then you neglect every other part. So, when you understand something, that understanding is action - not just understanding. Say for example, I understand the nature of violence, not only physical violence but the whole complex nature of violence. I not only understand it, I see the consequences of all violence, and the implications, the different forms of violence. I look at the whole of it, not just a part of it; how we escape into this fanciful idea of non-violence. I include all that and look at it. Then, when the looking takes place, you are giving attention to it and

therefore going beyond it. Right?

Now, 'For the understanding of all human existence, problems, such as fear, loneliness and sorrow, your statement 'the observer is the observed' seems to be all important.' Let's go into that, shall we? The observer and the observed. Have you ever looked at the moon, the full moon or the new moon? The beauty of a new moon, the slender sliver of light in the western sky or the full moon of the other night? Have you looked at it? When you look at it, who is looking at it? Please, follow this if you don't mind, a little bit. Don't be bored, just follow it. I look at that new moon. Do I look at it as though for the first time, or I look at it saying, 'That's the new moon, it's going to be a full moon in a fortnight's time'? So, I immediately put what I see into words. Right sir? Can I look at that new moon without the word? Right? Because the word is not the moon. The word 'moon' is not the actual moon in the sky. But we, when we look at something, our immediate reaction is to put it into words. This is obvious sir. When I look at my wife, I say, 'she's my wife'. We never look at her as though for the first time, without the word, without the memory, without all the implications of a wife or a husband. So can you - to make it very simple - can you look at a tree or a flower without the word? Have you ever tried it? Have you ever done it without the word? Then you will see how the word distorts the fact. Right? When you say, 'she is my wife' or 'he is my husband' or 'girlfriend' and so on, that very verbalization of a human being - who is living - you have put that human being into a word. Therefore that word is limited. You understand all this? Are we understanding a little bit of all this?

So can you look at something without the word? Can you look,

as you are sitting there, looking at this figure, can you look at this figure without the word, without the image, without the reputation, without all that nonsense? Can you look at him? Is not the word the observer? Do you understand it? Is not the word and the image, the memory, is not all that the observer? Is not the background of being a Hindu with all the superstitions, with all the beliefs, with all the implications, or if you are a Muslim with all that background. It is the memory that gives the observer as though it was different from the thing observed. Right? Are you following this a little bit? Are we wasting time? So can you look, observe, without the background, without the past memories impinging upon the thing being observed? When you do that there is only that thing which is being observed. There is no observer observing, seeing the thing observed. Have you understood this? Sir, when there is a difference between the observer or the one who witnesses, between the observer and the observed, when there is a division between the two - as we said before - wherever there is division, there must be conflict. Right? And to understand why human beings live in conflict from the moment they are born till they die, is to find out why this division exists between the observer and the observed and so on, or is there only the thing observed.

Sir, what we are saying is, wherever there is a division there must be conflict. That's a law. An eternal law. Where there is separation, a division, a breaking up into two parts there must be conflict. And that conflict becomes ultimately war, killing people. As is being shown now in the world, in America, in Russia, in Lebanon, the Muslims, the Islamic world and the non-Islam world,

they are in conflict. So to understand and so be free of conflict, really be free of it, is to understand why the observer becomes so dominant, separate from him, or her, the thing being observed. Right, sir? When I observe, if I am married or have a girl friend, there is a division between us, an actual not only physical division but traditional division, the authority of the parent, the authority of someone, so there is division always in our relationships and therefore there is always conflict between human beings. There are very few human beings in the world who have a relationship in which conflict doesn't exist. And that conflict exists because we have separated the observer from the observed. I am different from my anger. Right? I am different from my envy, I am different from my sorrow, therefore being different, there is conflict. That is, 'I must get rid of sorrow'. 'Tell me how to overcome sorrow'. 'Tell me what to do with my fear'. So there is conflict, conflict all the time. But you are sorrow. You are not different from sorrow, are you? You are not different from anger, are you? You are not different from your sexual desires, are you? You are not different from the loneliness you feel - you are lonely. But we say, 'Yes, I'm lonely but I must escape from that'. So I go to the temple or be entertained and so on. You are not different from the quality of which you are; the quality is you. I am anger. I am sorrow. I am lonely, depressed. Now, before, when I separated, I acted upon my sorrow. You understand? If I am lonely I then escape from loneliness, try to overcome it or analyze it and try to fill the loneliness with all kinds of amusements or religious activity. But if I am lonely, I can't do anything about it. Right? You understand this fact? No? Right? Please tell me. If I am lonely and I am lonely - not, I am lonely as

something different from me - I am that. Before I acted upon it, now I can't act upon it because I am that.

So what happens when the observer is the observed? You understand? When the anger is me, then what takes place? Have you enquired into this or you just say, 'Yes, I am the observer and the observed'? Meaningless. But to find out or experience, go into it and find out if anger is always different from you. That has been the tradition; that has been the conditioning, saying, 'I am different from my anger', therefore you acted upon it. But if when you realize you are anger, then what do you do, what happens?

First, all conflict ceases. Right? Are you following this a little bit? All conflict ceases when you realize you are that. I am brown - finished. It's a fact. Light brown or dark brown or purple or whatever colour it is. So you eliminate altogether this divisive process which brings conflict in yourself.

And why is it, the questioner asks, that we make an abstraction of a fact? The fact is I am anger. I am jealous, I am lonely. Why do we make that into an idea, an abstraction of it? Is it easier to make an abstraction rather than to face the fact? Because I can play with the idea. I say, 'Yes, this is a good idea', 'This is a bad idea', 'Convince me about it', 'Not convince me'. You follow? I can go on. But when there is no abstraction but the fact, then I have to deal with it. And then I separate myself and then say, 'I am going to do something about it'. But when one realizes there is no separation - you are that, you are 'what is: you are a Hindu, you are a Muslim, you are a Christian; you are a business man, you are ugly, you are brutal; you are all that - then you have eliminated altogether the sense of division in you and therefore no conflict. Do you know

what the brain is like when there is no conflict? When the brain is in perpetual conflict, as most people's brains are, what happens to that brain? It's wounded, right? It's wounded, hurt.

Q: May I ask you one question?

K: Sir, I am in the middle of a... Sit down, come up here sir. Sir, poor chap, he's come all that way, let him ask a question - a little later sir, let me finish.

Probably you have lived so long with conflict, with pain and sorrow, fear, and this conflict, you've said, 'It's part of my life. I'll accept conflict', and you've gone on that way. But you've never enquired what conflict does to the brain, to a human being, to the psyche. You know it's being perpetually beaten. If one is constantly beaten, physically, do you know what happens? Constantly bombarded with conflict, what happens to the brain? It shrinks. It becomes very small, limited, ugly. That's what is happening to all of us. So the fairly intelligent man asks, 'Why should I live in conflict for the rest of my life'? So he begins to enquire what is conflict. Conflict must exist where there is division - inside as well as outside. And this division basically, deeply, fundamentally is the 'me', the observer, and the thing observed. Two separate activities going on, which is not true, because you are anger, you are violence. So if you come to that point and realize that the observer is the observed, then there is a totally different activity going on.

Now sir, what did you want to say?

Q: You are telling me, I am the anger because the anger is a condition of my mind. And sorrow is also a condition of my mind. Happiness and unhappiness, anger, these are all conditions of my mind. Because I know my mind. Because I am not my mind. My

mind is different from me because it is my mind.

K: I understand sir.

Q: Mind is entirely different from me.

K: Yes.

Q: So I know the conditions of my mind. Because this is in some sense in happy conditions, it is sometimes unhappy conditions, it is sometimes sorrow conditions. Because when I get one thought previously in the world of memory...

K: Yes sir.

Q:.. I may recollect.

K: Yes sir, yes sir.

Q: Immediately my mind goes on recollecting that memory.

K: Yes sir, yes sir. Why? I understand it very well. Do you want to come here and give us a talk?

Q: Sir, what I mean is, if I know my anger, it will not be anger. When I won't identify...

K: Yes sir, yes sir. Come over. Bring him up on to the platform. Now give them a lecture, sir. (Laughter).

Q: No, no, sir. Excuse me sir.

K: Say it.

Q: No, no sir. Sir when I know my anger, it is not an anger. Why? Because I am knowing my anger. When I identify myself with anger, immediately the action will come out. Is it correct or not? Please understand me, I am not discouraging anybody.

K: Try to understand sir, we were...

Q: Mr Krishnamurti, don't misunderstand.

K: Sir, sit here quietly.

Q: No, no, because I just...

K: Sir, sit here quietly, Sit down sir. Now that you are here, sit down. It's time to stop.

Sir, you've heard what K has been talking about this morning. You've heard various responses, various answers to questions and we go away rather confused, not clear. But if we listen to each other - I've listened to this gentleman, really listened, and there is no conflict between the speaker and himself, because he's listened, he know what he has to say. If we could just for one day or one hour, see what conflict is, why we human beings are caught in conflict, with all the pain and the anxiety, loneliness, all that - then perhaps we may be able to live a life with a brain that has never been harmed, never had any wound, any shock, so that it's a free brain. And it's only then that perhaps the mind - which is love - can contact the brain. That's all.

3RD PUBLIC TALK BOMBAY 9TH FEBRUARY 1985

May we continue with what we were talking about last Sunday?

We were talking about a holistic life, a way of living that's not fragmented, that's not broken up as our lives are, but to find out for ourselves a way of living that is holistic, that is whole, not fragmented, not broken up, not splintered. And we went into that question fairly deeply. We saw what were the causes of this fragmentation of the human brain. And also we talked about various factors in our social, moral and religious lives, that we have broken it up, as Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists and so on. Religions have been greatly responsible for this catastrophe of human existence. And we talked also about time, time being not only the past, all the memories, the accumulated experiences and so on, modified by the present, and continuing into the future. That's our life. And we have existed on this earth according to the biologists and archaeologists and so on for over three and a half million years, and during that long interval of so-called evolution we have accumulated an enormous amount of memory.

And we also talked about the limitation of memory, and therefore the limitation of thought. And that limitation of thought has broken up the world geographically, nationally, religiously, as the Hindus, the Muslims, the Christians and so on.

As we said the other day, this is not a lecture - lecture indicates to inform and to instruct, we are not doing that. You are not listening, if I may most respectfully point out, to a series of ideas, conclusions. But rather we are both together, you and the speaker,

are taking a journey as two friends, talking over not only family problems but the world problems and so on. So this is as much your responsibility to listen to carefully as that of the speaker to say things clearly so that both of us understand what we are talking about.

And we are going to talk over many things, not only this evening but tomorrow evening, we are going to talk over together order and disorder, pleasure, love, sorrow and if we have time, death. These are all rather complicated questions which we all have to face in our daily life, whether you are rich or poor, or officials, a series of government officials, you have to face this problem of existence in which our lives are in a state of disorder, which is fairly obvious. Our lives, our daily lives, are in disorder, which means contradiction, saying one thing, doing another, believe in something and actually moving in a totally different direction from what we believe. And this contradiction creates disorder. I wonder if one is at all aware of these problems. Apparently there is going to be more and more disorder in the world on account of not only bad governments, economic conditions, social disorder and always the threat of war, which is becoming more and more imminent, more and more pressing. And all the governments are buying armaments all over the world, even the tiniest nations are buying armaments.

So there is, as you observe throughout the world, a great disorder. And our lives also, our daily lives are in disorder. And we are always pursuing order, not only governments, law, and so on, we want order because without order human beings will inevitably destroy themselves. I hope - one hopes that we are sharing the

questions together. That you are also thinking about this question together, thinking together, observing together, listening together, having a dialogue in which you are participating. So it is not a matter of gathering some few ideas and conclusions, but together find out why we live in disorder, and can there be total order in our lives, and therefore total order is society. Society is brought about by us, is put together by us. Our greed, our ambitions, our envy, this individual concept of freedom, which we shall go into presently, this has brought about a great deal of disorder, a sense of individuality. Please listen, together let us listen to what is being said, actually listen. Not interpret, or resist, or defend, because we are not attacking anybody, we are merely observing what is going on in the world, together.

So in our lives, as we live it now, after all these millions of years, we still are in disorder. And man has always sought order because without order one cannot possibly function freely, holistically. Right? So to find out what is order, not a blue print, not something that you put into a frame and follow it. Order is something that is active, living, not conforming to a pattern, either the pattern being idealistic, historical dialectical conclusions, or religious sanctions. All religions throughout the world have laid down certain laws, certain sanctions, commandments, but human beings have not followed them at all. So we can put aside all those ideological conclusions. And also put aside your religious beliefs which have nothing to do with daily existence. You may conform, follow certain laws laid down by religion but that brings about also great bigotry, and so on.

So what is order? And is it possible to find out what is order

when our brain is confused, disorderly? So we must first find out what is disorder, not order because when there is no disorder naturally there will be order. Right? So we must enquire together, together please, what is disorder? Why we live in disorder? One of the causes of this disorder, perhaps the major cause, is conflict, which we talked about in the last three talks, we won't go into it much more deeply this evening. Where there is conflict there must be disorder, not only between man and woman, but between nations, between the religious beliefs, faiths, conformity, there must be disorder. And one of the major causes of disorder is this concept, this illusion that we are all individuals.

As we said in the previous talks, we must question, doubt, doubt what the speaker is saying, question what he says, not accept anything from anybody, but question, investigate, not resist. If you merely resist what is being said, which may be true or false, then our conversation comes to an end. If two people are talking over together their problems, if one is resisting then conversation ends. But if both of them, not persuading each other, not informing each other, not trying to influence the other, but together amicably, because they are friends, go into this question whether we live in this illusion that we are all separate individuals. The communist theory - most of you perhaps know it already - is that we are the result of a whole series of the environment, so change the environment then human beings change. Which is absurd altogether, because they have shown it - the Russian totalitarianism has pointed out very clearly the dominance of the few making them believe, controlling their thinking and so on and so on, has not brought about the end of individuality. On the contrary.

So we are going together to find out, because as we said that is one of the major causes of disorder in our life, each one thinking he is free, each one thinking his own fulfillment, his own desires, his own ambition, his own private pleasures. We are going to find out together if that is a fact, or a long established respectable illusion. May we go into this together? Together. Not accepting, nor denying. It's foolish to say, "I agree with you" or "disagree with you". Because you don't agree or disagree about the sun rising and the sun setting, it is a fact. You never say, "I agree with you, the sun rises in the East". So perhaps you could put aside the sense of agreement and disagreement. But together carefully without any bias or resistance, enquire whether there is actual individuality, or there is something entirely different. All right? Pull up your socks and let's talk over together.

Our consciousness has been the result of a million years, or more. Our consciousness contains all the animalistic, primitive essence. Because we come from the animal, from nature, so deep down in our consciousness one will find that there is still deeply the responses and the fears and the desire for security of the animals. That is part of our consciousness. Right? And also our consciousness contains all the innumerable beliefs, faiths, reactions and actions. Our consciousness is fear, pleasure, various memories, sorrow, and searching for something, to possess complete security. That is all what we are. You may think you are part of the divine, that is also part of your thinking. So all that consciousness we think is each one, it belongs to each one of us. Right? You all think, religions have maintained that you have separate souls - in Christianity, and Hinduism, and the various other forms of

religious activity. Now we are questioning the whole of it. Do you not share the sorrow of the rest of human beings? All human beings throughout the world have various forms of fears, various forms of pleasure, they suffer as you suffer, they pray, they do all kinds of absurd ceremonies, as you do. Seeking stimulation through ceremonies, sensation, as you do. So we share the consciousness of all humanity. So you are the entire humanity. Right? Logically first see it. Logically every human being on this earth, whatever religion, belief, and so on, they suffer, every human being on this earth suffers, deeply or superficially, evading suffering and so on, we will go into that presently.

And this consciousness which we have considered mine, personal consciousness, is not a fact, because as we pointed out, every human being living on this marvellous, beautiful earth, which we are carefully destroying, we all are one because we all go through the same problems, same pain, anxiety and loneliness, depression, tears, laughter, contradictions, conflict between man and woman, husband and wife. Even in Russia this goes on.

So are you individuals in your consciousness? Because that is what you are, your consciousness. Whatever you think, whatever you imagine, whatever your tendencies, aptitudes, talent, gifts, faculty, it is shared by all other human beings, exactly similar to you. This is a logical fact. And logic has a certain place. One must think clearly, logically, reasonably, sanely, but it is based on thought. However logical one may be thought being limited - we have gone into it several times so we won't go into it this evening - that thought becomes reasonable but it is limited. So one must go beyond thought, beyond the necessity of the limitation of reason.

So you are the entire humanity. You understand? You are not an individual. You either listen to that statement, that is, that you are the entire humanity, you are humanity, not an Indian, or all the rubbish of that. And when you listen to a statement of that kind, that you are the entire humanity, do you make an abstraction of it? That is, bring about an idea of the fact. You understand? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is another. Is this clear? The fact, which is that we have thought that we are individuals, our religions, our daily life, our conditioning, has made up believe that we are individuals. Somebody like the speaker comes along and says, look carefully, is that so? First we resist it, and say, what are you talking about. First we push it aside. But if you carefully listen, and as two friends are listening to each other, then you hear this statement that you are the entire humanity - how do you hear that statement, the sound of it? Do you make out of that statement an idea, away from the fact? Right? And pursue the idea? I don't know if you are following all this. Somebody please tell me. Do you understand?

The word is not the thing. Right? Which we went into. The microphone, the word microphone is not the actual think in front of the speaker. So you hear you are - because you are your consciousness, with all its reactions and actions, and that consciousness is shared by all humanity, because every human being goes through desperate loneliness, sorrow, pain, as you do - so you are the entire humanity. Now how do you listen to that statement? Do you reject it? Or do you examine it? Do you investigate that statement, or merely say, well, what nonsense? What are you doing, not tomorrow, now? What's your reaction?

Because this is a very serious thing, that you are the entire humanity. Either you listen to the depth of it, the sound of it, the beauty of it, the immensity of it, with its tremendous responsibility. Or you treat it superficially, verbally, and say, yes, I understand it intellectually. But intellectual comprehension has very little meaning. It must be in one's blood, in one's guts, and out of that comes a total sense of a different quality of a brain that's holistic, not fragmentary. It is the fragment that creates disorder. We, as individuals, have fragmented the human consciousness and therefore we live in disorder.

Sir, when you realize that you are the entire humanity, that is what love is. You will not kill another, you will not harm another, you move away from all aggression, violence, and the brutality of religions.

So our consciousness is shared, is one with all humanity. You don't see the beauty of this, the immensity of it. You will go back to your own pattern, thinking you are all individuals, fighting, striving, competitive, each wanting to fulfil his own beastly little self. Right? So it means nothing to you because you go back to your old way of life. So it is much better not to listen to all this. If you listen to truth and you don't act upon it, it acts as poison. You understand this? That's why our lives are so shoddy and superficial.

And also we must talk over together why man not only lived in disorder for thousand and thousands of years, but also why man is perpetually seeking pleasure: pleasure in possessions, pleasure in achievement, pleasure in power, pleasure having a status, a symbol, not only sexual pleasure, and that pleasure is maintained by constantly thinking about sex, imaginary pictures, making

images. Which is, thought gives pleasure, sensation is turned into pleasure. I wonder if you are following all this?

So we must understand what is pleasure, why we seek pleasure. We are not saying it is right or wrong. We are not condemning pleasure, as we are not condemning desire. Desire is part of pleasure. The fulfillment of desire is the nature of pleasure. So we ought to talk over together not only the nature of pleasure but also what is desire. Desire may be the cause of disorder, each one wanting to fulfil, achieve his own particular desire. You understand all this? Are we taking a journey together, or the speaker is going on talking to himself, or walking by himself? This is supposed to be a gathering; a gathering is a gathering of people who are concerned with serious matters, not with entertainment, not with intellectual games, but we are concerned with our lives, our daily monotonous, boring lives, trivial lives, shoddy lives.

So please together we are going to investigate if desire is one of the major causes of disorder, and desire in its fulfillment, in its achievement, in any direction, gives pleasure, gratifies. So we ought together investigate, explore, what is desire. Not condemning it, not escape from it, not try to suppress it, as most religions have said, suppress desire - which is absurd. So let us look at it. What is desire? When you put that question to yourself, what is desire, probably most of us have not thought about it at all. We have accepted it as a way of life, that it is a natural instinct of man or woman, and we say, why bother about it. Except those people who have so-called renounced the world - which they never have - and those who enter into monasteries, organized monasteries and so on, there they try to sublimate the desire with the worship of

a person, a symbol and so on. So please bear in mind we are not condemning it. We are trying to find out together what is desire, why man has been for a million years, not only physically, biologically, but also psychologically caught in the trap of desire, in the network of desire. Right? Will you investigate with the speaker, or just listen to the speaker, while he investigates, explores on his own?

You know how easy it is to be caught in explanations, in descriptions, and we are satisfied with commentaries, descriptions, and explanations. But we are not doing that here. We have to explain, we have to describe, we have to point out, put it in the framework of words. But desire is one of the most complex things to understand, not intellectually but profoundly. So we are going to find out, together what is desire? Don't look to me. I'll explain, I will go into it, but you have to go into it too, not just say, yes, I agree, or disagree, that's silly. But to find out the nature of desire, the construction, how desire is put together, what is the origin of desire, the beginning of desire. Every animal on this earth has desire. Every human being is caught in this network of desires; and feels unhappy when his desires are not fulfilled, and when those desires are not fulfilled, whether those desires be ideological, religious, or platonic, or merely physical. What is the origin, the beginning of desire? The speaker will describe, not analyse. There is a difference between analysis and perception. Analysis implies the analyser and the thing to be analysed. Right? Right? The analyser and the thing he is going to analyse, which means the analyser is different from the analysed. Are they different? Suppose I am the analyser and I am envious, and I begin to analyse

why I am envious, as though I am different from envy. But envy is me. Right? Envy is not separate from me. Greed, competition, comparison, all that is me. So we are not analysing. But we are looking, hearing, and the process of learning. Learning is not merely accumulating memory. That is necessary. But learning is something entirely different, it is not an accumulative process. You are moving, never recording, fresh. I won't go into that now, that takes us in a different direction altogether.

So together we are observing what is desire, what is the origin of desire, why human beings are caught in it endlessly. If you have a little money, you want more money; if you have a little power, you want more power. Right? And power in any form, whether power over your wife or your children, politically, religiously, it is an abominable thing, it is evil, because that is nothing to do with truth. We will go into that.

So what is the origin of desire? We live by sensation. If there was no sensation, both biologically and psychologically, we would be dead human beings. Right? We live by sensation. That crow, calling, that is acting on the ear drum, nerves, and translating the noise into the cry of a crow. That is a sensation. And sensation is brought about by hearing, or seeing, then contact. Right? Must I explain all these silly things? You see a nice garden, beautifully kept, the green is rich, perfect, there are no weeds in it, that lawn has been kept going for four hundred years. It is a lovely thing to watch, to see. Then the seeing, then if you are sensitive you go and touch the grass. That contact - seeing, contact, then sensation. Right? You are following this? Seeing a lovely garden, a nice car, a nice tree, and a beautiful man or woman - seeing, contact, then

sensation. We live by sensation. It is necessary. If you are not sensitive, if you are dull, you are half living - as most of us are. So sensation, then what takes place? Take a very simple example: you see a nice sari, or a shirt in the shop, you see it, you go inside, touch it, and there is the sensation of touching it, you say, "By Jove, what a lovely material that is" - then what takes place? Do you understand? There is seeing, contact, sensation; then what takes place after that? Are you waiting for me to tell you? You see, sirs, please do listen to this. If you see this for yourself, not being told by another, then you will become the teacher and the disciple. Oh, do understand all this. But if you repeat, repeat, repeat what somebody has said, including the speaker, then you remain mediocre, thoughtless, repetitive. So let's go into it.

There is seeing, contact, sensation. You see that nice car, one of the latest cars in Europe, not here. There are no beautiful cars in India, except those imported from abroad. You see a beautiful car, you touch the polish, the shape of it, the texture, then out of that there is sensation. Then thought comes and says, how nice it would be if I got that. How nice it would be if I got into it and drove off. Right? So what has happened? Thought has given shape to sensation. Right? You are following this? Thought has given to sensation the image of you sitting in that car driving off. At that moment when thought creates the image of you sitting in the car, at that second desire is born. All right? Have you understood this? Desire is born when thought gives shape to sensation, gives an image to sensation.

Now the question is: sensation is the way of existence, it is part of existence, to be sensitive. And we have learnt to suppress, or to

conquer, or to live with desire with all its problems. Now if one understands this not intellectually but actually, that thought gives shape through the image, at that second the origin of desire is there. Then the question arises: is it possible to see the car, which is sensation, touch it, but not let thought create the image, so keep a gap? You understand? Do you understand this?

You see sir, one must find out also in this question, what is discipline. This country is the most undisciplined country in the world, part of the world. You spit all over the place, you are untidy. Discipline, what is discipline, because it is related to desire? So let's talk about discipline and we will come back to desire afterwards. The word 'discipline' comes from the word disciple. The origin, the etymological meaning of that word is one who is learning, a disciple who is learning from his master. Learning, not conforming, not controlling, not suppressing, following, becoming obedient. On the contrary: learning from observation. That is you are learning what is desire, learning about it, which is not memorizing it.

So most of us are trained, especially if you are in the army or in all that business, trained to discipline according to a pattern, copy, follow, obey. That's what you are all doing. And that's called discipline, hoping that discipline will bring about order. But if one is learning, which is the root meaning of that word, then that very learning becomes its own order. You don't have order imposed by law or anything else.

So where thought gives shape to sensation by giving it an image, at that second desire is born. And to learn, to find out whether it is possible to allow sensation to flower and not let

thought interfere with it, to keep the division - I won't use the word 'division' - to keep them apart. Will you do it? You can't, you have never done all this. Then you will find out that desire has its right place. And when you understand the nature of desire there is no conflict about it.

We ought also to talk over together what is love and sorrow and death. Shall we go on? Do you want the speaker to go on? Are you sure? Of course you love to hear somebody talk! Sirs, please this is much too serious all this. It affects your daily life, it is not something you intellectually play with. It concerns your life, not somebody else's life. The way you live. After all these million years, look what our lives are, how empty, shallow, how violent, brutal, inconsiderate, thoughtless, and all the rest of it. Look at it. And all this has created such havoc in the world. We all want to have high positions, achieve something, become something. And looking at all this, there is great sorrow, isn't there? Doesn't every human being in the world whether highly placed, or just an ignorant villager, doesn't he goes through great sorrow. He may recognize the nature and the beauty and the strength of sorrow, but he goes through pain, like you do, and mankind has gone through sorrow for a million years. They haven't solved the problem. They want to escape from it. They want it organized.

And what is the relationship of sorrow to love and death? Can there be an end to sorrow? This has been one of the questions mankind has asked for a million years. Is there an end to all the pain, the anxieties, to the grief of sorrow? Sorrow is not only your own particular sorrow, there is the sorrow of mankind. Historically speaking there have been five thousand years of war, every year

there has been somebody killing somebody else, for their tribe, for their religion, for their nation, for their community, for their individual protection and so on and so on. Have you ever realized this, what the wars have done? You are fighting the Muslim, the Pakistan and the Hindu. Have you ever gone into the question of wars that have created havoc, how many millions have cried? How many millions are being wounded, without arms, without legs, without eyes, even without a face. You people don't know anything about all this.

So is there an end to sorrow and all the pain therein? And what is sorrow? Don't you know sorrow? Don't you? Are you ashamed to acknowledge it? When your son and daughter, and somebody whom you think you love, are taken away, don't you shed tears? Don't you feel terribly lonely? You have lost a companion for ever. We are not discussing about death. But this immense thing that man goes through and never having a solution, an answer to that. Without ending sorrow there is no love. Sorrow is part of our self-interest, it is part of our egotistic self-centred activity; self-interest. I cry for another, for my son, brother, mother. Why? Because I have lost something that I am attached to, lost something which gave me companionship, comfort and all the rest of it. And with the ending of that person I realize how utterly empty my life is, or how lonely my life is. And then I cry. And there are many, many thousands of people ready to comfort me. And I slip very easily into that network, into that trap of comfort. Whether it is the comfort of god, which is an image, put together by thought, or the comfort of some illusory concept, idea, but it gives me comfort, and that's all I care. But I never question the very urge and desire

for comfort, whether there is any comfort at all. One needs to have a comfortable bed, that's all right, a nice comfortable chair. But the urge, the desire for comfort, we never question if there is any comfort at all, psychologically, inwardly. Or is it an illusion which has become our truth? You understand? An illusion can become our truth? I wonder if you understand this? The illusion that there is god, that god has been created by thought, by fear. If you have no fear there is no god. But god has been invented by man through fear, through loneliness, through despair, wanting this everlasting comfort. So we never question if there is comfort at all. Which is, deep abiding satisfaction. Because we all want to be satisfied, not only with the food that we eat, satisfied sexually, satisfied by achieving some position of authority and therefore having comfort in that position, in that state. Don't you know all this?

So we must ask if there is any comfort at all? If there is anything that will be gratifying, satisfying from the moment we are born until we die. Don't listen to me, find out. Give your energy, your thought, your blood, your heart, to find out. And if there is no illusion, is there any comfort? If there is no fear, do you want comfort? Comfort is another form of pleasure. Yes, sir, this is a very complex problem of our life. While we are so shallow, empty, filled by other people's knowledge, by books, we are not independent, free human beings to find out why we are slaves. This is not a rhetorical question, it is a question each one of us must ask. And in the very asking and the doubting there comes freedom. And without freedom there is no sense of truth.

So we will continue tomorrow afternoon with the question of death, and perhaps go into this question of sorrow, what is a

religious life, what is religion, and is there something that is totally sacred, holy, nothing invented by thought. We will go into it tomorrow, not that the speaker is inviting you to come tomorrow. He doesn't care two pins if you come, or don't come. It's your life.

BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH FEBRUARY 1985

We have a lot of ground to cover this evening so we won't go back and repeat what we have said during the last three talks.

Yesterday evening we were talking about sorrow and the ending of sorrow. With the ending of sorrow there is passion. And very few of us really understand or go deeply into the question of sorrow. Is it possible to end all sorrow? This has been a question that has been asked by all human beings, perhaps not very consciously, but deeply they want to find out, as we all do, if there is an end to human suffering, human pain, and the ending of sorrow. Because without the ending of sorrow there is no love. And to go into this question very seriously: when there is sorrow it is a great shock to the nervous system, like a blow to the whole physiological as well as psychological being. And we generally try to escape from it, taking drugs, drinks and every form of religious escapism. Or become merely cynical, or accept the things as they are inevitably.

And to go into this question very deeply, seriously, is it possible not to escape from it at all? Perhaps my son dies, and there is immense sorrow, shock. And I discover that I am really a very lonely human being. And I cannot face it, I cannot tolerate it, so I escape from it. And there are many escapes - religious, mundane or philosophical. This escape is a wastage of energy.

As we said, we are talking over things together, you and the speaker are looking into this matter of sorrow and we are together taking a journey, not the speaker alone. If we do not escape in any

form from the ache, the pain of loneliness, the grief, the shock, but remain completely with the event, with this thing called suffering, is that possible? If we hold any problem, hold it, not try to solve it, try to look at it. Before you there is a precious jewel, exquisitely hand cut and so on, a beautiful thing, one keeps looking at it, one doesn't want to escape from it. The very beauty of it is so attractive, so pleasurable, we keep looking at it. In the same way if we could hold completely without any movement of thought or escape, hold it, then that very action of not moving away from the fact brings about a total release from that which has caused pain. We will go into this a little later.

And also we should consider what is beauty. This is very important. Not the beauty of a person only, or go to a museum and see the marvellous paintings and statues and man's most ancient endeavour to express his own feelings in stone or in paint, or in a poem; but also if we ask ourselves: what is beauty? Beauty may be truth. Beauty may be love. And without understanding the nature and depth of that extraordinary word beauty, it is inevitable that we shall never be able to come upon that which is sacred. So we must go into the question of what is beauty.

We are not talking about the beauty of a person, the face, a beautiful sari, a lovely tree, and the ancient paintings. When you see something greatly beautiful like a mountain full of snow against the blue sky, what actually takes place? When you see something extraordinarily alive, beautiful, great majesty, for a moment, for a second, the very majesty of that mountain, the immensity of it, drives away, puts all the self concern, all the problems, at that second there is no 'me' watching it. The very

greatness of that mountain has driven away for a second all my self concern. Surely one must have noticed this. Then you say, how extraordinarily beautiful it is. There the majesty of that mountain with that snow, and the beautiful line against the blue sky, that very majesty puts aside for a second the 'me'. Have you noticed a child with a toy? He has been naughty all day long, which is right, and you give him a toy and for the next hour until he breaks it up he is extraordinarily quiet. Which is, the toy has absorbed his naughtiness. The toy has taken him over. Similarly when you see something extraordinarily beautiful, that very beauty absorbs us.

That is, there is beauty when there is no self. You understand this? When there is no self-interest, all the travail of the self, without being absorbed, or shaken by something extraordinarily beautiful like a mountain or a valley in a deep shadow, without being taken over by the mountain, is it possible to understand the beauty without the self? Because where there is self there is no beauty, where there is self-interest there is no love. And love and beauty go together. They are not separate.

And as we said, we have to cover a great deal of ground this evening. So we ought to talk over together, what is death. That's the one certain thing which we all have to face, whether you are rich or poor, ignorant or very full of erudition, that is the certainty of every human being, they are all going to die. And we have never been able to understand the nature of death. We are always frightened of dying, aren't you? And we hope for continuity after death. So we are going to together find out for ourselves what is dying, because we are going to face it, whether you are young or old there is one certain thing in life.

And to understand death we must also enquire what is living. What is our life? Are we wasting our life? By that word 'wasting' dissipating our energies in various forms, dissipating by specialized professions. Are we wasting our whole existence, one life? Are we wasting it? People who are rich say, yes, we have accumulated a lot of money, it has been a great pleasure; or if you have a certain talent. A talent is a danger to a religious life - talent being that which is a gift, a faculty, an aptitude, an aptitude in a particular direction, which is specialization. Specialization is a fragmentary process.

So one must ask oneself whether one is wasting one's life. You may be rich, you may have all kinds of faculties, you may be a specialist, a great scientist, or a businessman, at the end of life has all that been a wastage, all this travail, all this sorrow, all the tremendous anxiety, insecurity, the foolish illusions that man has collected, his gods, all the saints and so on, has all that been a waste? You may have power, position, at the end of it, what? Please, this a serious question that one must ask oneself. Another cannot answer this question, except yourself.

So we have separated living from dying. This dying is at the end of one's life, put it as far away as possible, a long interval of time. But at the end of a long journey we die. And what is it that we call living? Earning money, going to the office from nine to five, overworked, either in a laboratory, or an office, or in a factory, and there is endless conflict, fear, anxiety, loneliness, despair, depression, this whole way of existence which we call life, living? Is that living? This enormous travail of man, his endless conflict. And to that we hold. This living is called pain, sorrow, anxiety,

conflict, every form of deception, corruption. Where there is self-interest there must be corruption. And this is what we call living. And we know that. We are very familiar with all that, that is our daily existence. Nobody can cheat us from that.

And we are afraid of dying. Which is, letting go all the things we have known, all the things that we have experienced, gathered, the lovely furniture that we have had, and the beautiful collection of your pictures, paintings, and death comes and says you can't have any of those any more. And we cling to the known, afraid of the unknown. We can invent reincarnation, that we should evolve next life. And we never enquire into what is it that is born next life. What is born next life is a bundle of memories. Because we live by memories, we live by the knowledge acquired or inherited, and that knowledge is what we are. The self is the knowledge of the past experiences, thoughts and so on. The self is that. The self may invent there is something divine in one but it is still the activity of thought, and thought is always limited, as we talked about it the other day.

So this is our living, this is what we call life - pleasure and pain, reward and punishment, this is our life. And death means the ending of all that, the ending of all the things that we have accumulated, enjoyed. And we are attached to all this. One is attached to one's family, to all the accumulated money, to knowledge, to the beliefs that one has lived with, to the ideals, we are attached to all that. And death says, "That is the end of it, old boy." Now the question is: why has the brain separated living - living which is consciousness and so on - and death, why has this division taken place? Does this division exist when there is

attachment? Please, as we said, we are talking over things together. We are sharing the thing which man has lived with for a million years, the living and the dying. And so we have to examine the thing together, not resist, not say, yes, "I believe in reincarnation, I live by that, to me that is important" - then the conversation between us comes to an end. But if we really go into the question of what is living, what is wasting one's life, and what is dying.

One is attached to so many things, to your guru, to the accumulated knowledge, to the memory of one's son, daughter and so on. That memory is you. Your whole brain is filled with memory, not only memories of recent events but also the memory of the deep abiding memory of that which has been the animal, the ape, we are part of that, that memory. And we are attached to this whole consciousness. Right? That's a fact. And death comes and says, 'That is the end of your attachment.' And we are frightened of that. Frightened of being completely free from all that. And death is that, cutting off everything that you have got. We can invent, you can say, yes, I'll continue next life. Therefore what is it that continues? You understand my question? What is it that in us there is this desire to continue? Is there continuity at all, except of your bank account, going to the office every day, a routine of worship, and the continuity of your beliefs. But they are all brought together by thought. And thought has been limited, and so creating conflict. We went into all that, we are not going to go into it now.

And the self, the 'me', the ego, the persona, is a bundle of complicated ancient and modern memories. Which you can see for yourself, you don't have to study books and philosophies and all that. You can see it for yourself very clearly, that you are a bundle

of memories. And death puts an end to all that memory, and therefore one is frightened.

Now the question is: can one live in the modern world with death? Not suicide, we are not talking about that, but end as you live all attachment, which is death. Right? I am attached to the house I am living in, I bought it, I have paid a great deal of money for it, and I am attached to all the furniture, the picture, the family, the memories, all that. And death comes and wipes all that out. And can I live everyday of my life with death, ending everything everyday? Ending all the attachments, that's what it means to die. But we have separated living from dying, therefore we are perpetually frightened. But when you bring life and death together, the living and dying, then you will find out there is a state of the brain in which all knowledge as memory ends. But you need knowledge to write a letter, to come here, to speak English, to keep accounts, to go to your home. You need knowledge. But to keep knowledge as something not entirely occupied in the mind. We were talking the other day with a computer expert. The computer can be programmed, and it stores that memory. And also the computer can put aside all that memory in a paper, or in a list, and keep itself empty so that it can be reprogrammed or instructed further.

So can the brain use knowledge when necessary but be free of all knowledge? That is, our brain is recording all the time. You are recording what is being said now. And that record becomes a memory. And that memory, that recording is necessary in a certain area, that area is physical activity. It's obvious. And can the brain be free so that it can function totally in a different dimension? That

is, every day when you go to bed, wipe out everything that you have collected, die at the end of the day. Do you understand all this? You hear a statement of this kind, that is, living is dying, they are not two separate things at all - you hear that statement, not only with hearing of the ear, but also you hear it, if you are listening carefully, you hear the truth of it, the actuality of it. And for the moment you see the clarity of this, and later on you slip back, you are attached, you begin to be - you know, all the rest of it. So is it possible for each one of us at the end of the day to die to everything that is not necessary? To every memory of hurt, of your beliefs, your faith, your anxieties, your sorrow, end all that everyday? And then you will find you are living with death all the time, death being the ending.

One should really go into also the question of ending. We never end anything completely because we end if there is any profit in it, if there is any reward. To voluntarily end without a future assumption that there is better. And it is possible to live that way in the modern world. That is a holistic way of living in which there is the living and dying all the time taking place.

And then we ought also to talk over together what is love. Is love sensation? Is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love put together by thought? Do you love your wife, or your husband, your children, love? Is love jealousy? Don't say, no. But you are jealous. Is love fear, anxiety, pain, and all the rest of it? So what is love? And without that quality, that perfume, that flame, you may be very rich, you have all the sense of power, position, importance, all that hierarchical outlook on life, without love you are just an empty shell. So we ought to go into this question of love.

If you loved your children would there be wars? If you loved your children would you allow them to maim themselves through wars, kill others, and so on, hurt others? Can love exist where there is ambition? Please you have to face all this. But we don't because we are caught in a routine, in a repetition of sensation as sex and so on. So love has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure, with sensation, and so on. Love is not put together by thought, therefore it is not within the structure of the brain. It is something entirely outside the brain, because the brain by its very nature and structure is an instrument of sensation, nervous responses and so on. And love cannot exist where there is mere sensation. Memory is not love.

And also we should talk over together what is a religious life, and what is religion. Again these are very complex questions. Man, human beings, have sought, have enquired, long before, something beyond the physical, beyond the everyday existence of pain, and sorrow, and pleasure, he has always sought something beyond. First in the flowers, the thunder was the voice of god, then he worshiped trees, stones; the primitives still do, the villages far away from these ugly beastly towns, they still worship stones, trees, small images. And man wants to find out if there is something sacred. And the priest comes along and says, "I'll point it out to you, I'll show you", as the guru does. And the rituals, the fancy dress of the western priests, the rituals, the repetitions, their worship of their particular image; and you, you have your own images, or you don't believe in any of that, you say, "I am an atheist, I don't believe in god, I am an humanitarian". But man, you and the speaker, always want to find out something that may be

beyond time, beyond all thought.

So we are together going to enquire, exercising our brain, our reason, our logic, what is religion, what is a religious life. Is it possible in this modern world, not become a monk, and organized groups of monks. So let us enquire into it. When we are able to find out for ourselves what is really a truly religious life, and that can only be found out for ourselves when we understand what religions actually are, and put aside all that, not belong to any religion, to any organized religion, to any guru, to any psychological so-called spiritual authority. There is no spiritual authority whatsoever. That's one of the crimes that we have committed: we have invented the mediator between truth and ourselves.

So when you begin to enquire into what is religion, and in the process of that enquiry you are living a religious life, not at the end of it. The very process of looking, watching, discussing, doubting, questioning, having no beliefs, no faith, in that process of investigation you are already living the religious life. We are going to do that now.

We seem to lose all reason, all logic and sanity when it comes to religious matters. So we have to be logical, rational, doubting, questioning, all the things man has put together about god, the saviours, the gurus and their authority, everything completely aside that is not religion, that is merely the assumption of authority by the few. Or you give them authority, you give them authority. Have you ever noticed where there is disorder, socially, politically, in human relationship, out of the disorder, if it is not resolved, comes a dictator, a ruler. You have recently had examples of this: in Italy

there was Mussolini, Hitler, that mad man, and so on. Where there is disorder politically, religiously, in our life, we create the authority. You are responsible for the authority. And there are people who are too willing to accept that authority.

So together we are going to look at what is religion. Where there is fear man inevitably seeks something that will protect him, safeguard him, that will hold him in a sense of certainty, complete security because he is basically frightened. And out of that fear we invent gods, out of that fear we invent all the rituals, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion. All the temples in this country, all the churches and the mosques are put together by thought. You may say there is direct revelation, but you never question, doubt that revelation, you accept it. And if one uses logic, reason, sanity, and all the superstitions that one has accumulated, all that is not religion obviously. Can you put all that aside to find out what is the nature of religion, what is the brain that holds the quality of religious living? Can you, as a human being, frightened, not invent, not create illusions, but face fear? Which we talked about the other day: fear can be suppressed completely psychologically, when you hold it, remain with it, not escape from it, when you give your whole attention to it, it is like a light being thrown on fear, a great flashing light. And then that fear disappears completely. And when there is no fear there is no garland, then there is no rituals, everything becomes unnecessary, stupid; that is irreligious, the things that thought have invented become irreligious because thought is merely a material process based on experience, knowledge, memory, which is a material process. And when thought invents the whole rigmarole, the whole structure of

organized religions, which have lost completely - they have no meaning at all. Can you put aside all that, voluntarily, not seeking a reward at the end of it? Will you do it?

When you do that then one begins to ask: what is religion? And is there something beyond all time and thought? You may ask that question, but if thought invents something beyond that question then it is still a material process. We have said that thought is a material process because it is sustained, nourished in the brain cells. The speaker is not a scientist, but you can watch it in yourself, watch the activity of your own brain, which is the activity of thought.

So if we can put aside all that voluntarily, easily, without any resistance, then you inevitably ask: is there something beyond all time and space, is there something that has never been seen before by any man, is there something immensely sacred, is there something that the brain has never touched? So we are going to find out, if you have done the first step, which is wipe away all this rubbish called religion. It is because you have used your brain, your logic, your doubt, your questioning.

Then what is meditation? Because that's part of so-called religion. What is meditation? To escape from the noise of the world? To have a silent mind, a quiet mind, a peaceful mind? And you practise systems, methods, to become aware. Systems, methods, a mould to keep your thoughts under control; sit cross legged, repeat some mantra. I have been told the meaning of that word etymologically means, ponder over not becoming. And that's one of the meanings, and absorb, put aside all self-centred activities. That is one of the root meanings of mantra. But we

repeat, repeat, repeat, and carry on with our self-interested ways, our egotistical ways. So mantra has lost its meaning.

So what is meditation? Is meditation a conscious effort? You meditate consciously, practise in order to achieve something: to achieve a quiet mind, brain, to achieve a sense of stillness of the brain. What is the difference between that meditator and the man who says, "I want money, so I work for it" - what is the difference between the two? Both are seeking an achievement. Right? One is called spiritual achievement, the other is called mundane achievement; they are both in the line of achievement.

So to the speaker that is not meditation at all. Any conscious deliberate, active desire, with its will, is not meditation. So one has to ask: is there meditation that is not brought about by thought? Is there a meditation of which you are - the speaker was going to say of which you are not aware. You understand all this? Any deliberate process of meditation is not meditation. That is so obvious. You can sit cross legged for the rest of your life, and meditate, breathe and all the rest of that business, and you will not come anywhere near the other thing, because that is a deliberate action to achieve a result. The cause and the effect. But the effect becomes the cause, so it is a cycle in which you are caught.

So is there a meditation that's not put together by desire, by will, by effort? The speaker says there is - you don't have to believe it, on the contrary you must doubt it. You must question it, as the speaker has questioned, doubted, torn it apart. Is there a meditation that is not contrived, organized? To go into that one must understand the brain, which is conditioned, a brain which is limited, and that brain is trying to comprehend the limitless, the

immeasurable, the timeless - if there is such a thing as the timeless. And for that sound is important to understand. Sound and silence go together. So if you don't understand sound, the depth of sound, but we have separated sound from silence. Sound is the word, sound is your heart beating, the universe is filled with sound - universe in the sense, the whole earth, all the heavens, the million stars, the whole sky is filled with sound. Obviously. You don't have to listen to scientists about it. And we have made that sound something intolerable. So we want to have a brain that is quiet, peaceful. But when you listen to sound, the very listening is the silence. Silence and sound are not separate.

So meditation is something that is not contrived, organized. Meditation begins at the first step, which is to be free of all your hurts, psychological hurts, to be free of all your accumulated fears, anxieties, loneliness, despair, sorrow. That is the foundation, that is the first step. And the first step is the last step. If you take that first step then it's over. But we are unwilling to take that first step because we don't want to be free. We want to depend, depend on power, other people, depend on environment, depend on our experience, knowledge, we are always depending, depending, and we will never be free of all dependence, all fear. And therefore the ending of sorrow is love. Where there is that love there is compassion. And that compassion has its own integral intelligence. And when that intelligence acts, action always is true. There is no conflict where there is that intelligence.

You have heard all this, you have heard the ending of fear, the ending of sorrow, beauty and love, but the hearing is one thing and action is another. You hear all these things which are true, logical,

sane, rational, but you won't act according to that. You will go home and begin all over again, your worries, your conflicts, your miseries.

So one asks, what is the point of it all? What is the point of listening to this speaker and not living it? In the listening and not doing is the wastage of your life. If you listen to something that is true and not act, you are wasting your life. And life is much too precious, it is the only thing that we have. And we have also lost touch with nature, which means we have lost touch with ourselves, which is part of nature. You don't love trees, the birds, the waters and the mountains, you are destroying the earth. And we are destroying each other. And all that is such a waste of life. When one realizes all this, not merely intellectually or verbally, then one lives a religious life. Not put on a loin cloth, or go round begging, or join a monastery, that is not a religious life. A religious life begins when there is no conflict, when there is this sense of love, when you can love another, your wife or your husband, but that love is shared by all human beings, it is not given to one person and therefore restricted.

So there is, if you give your heart and mind, brain, there is something that is beyond all time. And there is a benediction in that, not in temples, not in churches, not in mosques. That benediction is where you are.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH FOUR STUDENTS 2ND JUNE 1985

K: From childhood until now and what you are going to do in the future. So we will begin with your background: you are French, you are from the Philippines, you are from India, and you from Argentina. Four different nationalities, four different backgrounds, four different conditioning.

So shall we begin: I am going to ask you, if I may, what was your father and mother like? How did they treat you, as a toy when you were a baby and when you were a child, or they might have treated you with a great deal of affection, care? What's your background? Because after all that background does condition your thinking partly, and also it shapes your way of life. You see you gradually fall into a certain pattern.

So we are going to begin to talk over together, if you will, if you don't mind, what was your childhood like and what were your parents like - if you can remember. I personally can't remember a thing about my youth, a little bit, very vaguely, my childhood, my mother and father. I can't see them, what they would look like. But my thing is different. So I would like to ask you. Begin with India, or would you like to begin with you?

What were your parents like?

A: Shall I begin right from the beginning?

K: Yes.

A: As far as I can remember?

K: As far as you can remember, of course, you can't remember when you were born!

A: I'd like to think that I had a happy childhood.

K: Not 'like to think', but actually. Let's understand each other right from the beginning. It is better to deal with facts as they are - right? Not imagined, romanticized, hope, or say "I thought it was like that", but actually, factually, so that we can go from fact to fact - you follow? Not bring any kind of imagination, fantasies and so on. Would that be all right?

A: Of course.

K: Right?

D: It is difficult because I am talking about memories, about the past and I always get mixed up. I mean I am not sure how it really was.

K: You can't remember?

B: Well I think mine is quite a simple case sir, so I might start with myself. Although I live in the Philippines now I was actually born in Hong Kong. And as far as I remember, I remember nothing about what happened when I was in Hong Kong.

K: How old were you?

B: When I was in Hong Kong? I was there for eight years, for the first eight years of my life.

K: So, what was your eight years like, if you can remember it? With your father you were naturally.

B: No, my father was in the Philippines.

K: Then you lived with your mother?

B: Yes, and my brothers and my sister.

K: Your father was in Hong Kong?

B: Yes.

K: Then what was your relationship to your mother, to your

other brothers and sisters, and what were you feeling like? How did your mother treat you? Get your background clear - you follow?

B: She wasn't working then. Well at one time she had to do some work but not much. So her main job was to look after us.

K: So what was your relationship to her, and her relationship to you?

B: Well, as a mother to her child. We were very well looked after by her. And as far as I remember I was very happy with her and with my brothers.

K: Was she merely looking after you, or was there a great deal of affection, care, responsibility - you follow? - as a mother. Mothers are always much more important than the fathers - right? Because specially in India they look after you. Mothers are the last people to eat.

A: In my case my father looked after me for a long time.

K: A little bit louder please.

A: In my case my father looked after me for a long time.

K: With you, absent?

A: No, he looked after me.

K: What about your mother?

A: Both.

K: Both.

You are not answering my question quite. If I may repeat it again. Unless you are very clear what your background is, from childhood, as far as you can remember naturally, that background, that conditioning, or that past from the beginning, when you can remember, shapes one's mind gradually, the brain, and then you get caught in a pattern. You are a Brahmin.

A: Yes, I come from a Brahmin family.

K: You were born as a Brahmin family, and they have certain traditions, certain superstitions, a certain kind of way of living. Probably not too orthodox - right? Or were they very orthodox?

A: No, they weren't orthodox at all.

K: There were not. So they were more or less stepping out of tradition.

A: Yes.

K: What was their feeling about you? How did they treat you? What was their feeling about you? And your feeling about them? Did they love you? Or just looking after you? You understand what I mean by loving, caring, hugging, putting you on their lap, looking after you, saw that you slept properly, that you had the right foot, that you weren't too rough, or too gentle, you know, taking care of you greatly. How many sisters and brothers did you have?

A: None.

K: So you were the only child?

A: Yes.

K: So did they spoil you?

A: You ask me a difficult question sir. I don't know.

K: Go on sir, answer my questions. Because I will tell you why it is important. Do you see the importance of it?

B: I am not sure sir.

K: That is, if you are not brought up properly, properly in quotes, we will go into that, what it means to be brought up properly. If you are not brought up properly your life begins to be twisted somewhat - right? You either don't care for the world, you become more and more self-centred, more and more concerned

about yourself, your happiness, your way of life - you follow?
More and more self-interest. When you are quite young that self-interest isn't too prominent, too defined but as you grow older it becomes stronger and stronger and then you assert yourself, or are aggressive and all the rest of it - right?

So I am asking you what was your background, not only environmentally but also financially, also your relationship with society, how you related to nature, when you looked at the trees what you felt like, when you saw a deer - probably you never saw a tiger. I have seen them but that was in the wild, that is fun. So what was your relationship to the whole thing, to the whole of life, to the trees, to the grass, to the flowers, and to your parents? You understand what I am saying? Isn't that important to find out for yourself?

A: You were talking about being brought up properly.

K: Properly. I will tell you what I mean by properly. You had the right number of hours to sleep, right food, since you were a Brahmina you probably didn't eat meat, probably, now of course all that has blown. You were kept very clean and your clothes were washed regularly, you had clean clothes, and you slept in the right place - maybe on the floor but it was clean - you follow? Was there, say in India, a traditional background? Or not at all? Or it was becoming very modernized?

A: If one lives in urban India it is quite modernized, westernized.

K: That means what? Did you eat meat?

A: Well at times yes.

K: So you see what I am trying to get at? You understand? In

the old days my father and mother, they were very strict, they never ate meat, fish and so on, never smoked. So the whole tradition is changing tremendously. So in other words economy is changing and therefore you are forced to accept what everybody is doing - right? Meat, smoke, alcohol, you know the whole thing.

A: Like everywhere else.

K: Yes. So is your brain also becoming ordinary, like everybody else? Enquire. I am asking you, don't say yes, or no, find out. Let's enquire. Right?

B: Sir from what you said about being brought up properly...

K: Properly, I have explained that.

B: Properly, yes you have explained that.

K: Real affection, real sense of when you are young you must be protected, that you learnt to be gentle, to be quiet, to have a certain modesty - you follow what I mean? The whole of that kind of thing.

B: Well in that case, sir, I didn't have that. And also I was living in a city.

K: In a city, of course.

B: And I think many of us, probably many of the children nowadays are in that environment.

K: That is the environment. But all that has made a tremendous impression you, did it? Or not at all?

B: Yes, some of it.

K: So what is your background? You understand me? What is the conditioning of your thinking, of your feeling, of your emotions? You understand what I am talking about?

B: Yes.

K: What were they like? What are they like now? And in relation to the past? Of course what you are now is what has been - right? Right? So what were you like? And what are you now? You can't be something totally different now from what you have been - right? So trace it out from the beginning, from the time you remember until now. Trace it out, take time, go into it.

B: Well I must say it was quite narrow then, my outlook of life was quite narrow then.

K: Are you judging from now? From now you are saying it was narrow?

B: Well sir I was in a city, probably I didn't have much contact with nature, as you said. It is quite important. And also I was only living with my family. And from what I see of my mother now, I am sorry to say but you know her whole life was to bring us up and she expects us to look after her when she is old.

K: Of course. Probably the whole of the East, Asia, there is no social security, therefore the sons have to look after the mother, therefore they have to have several children and so on.

You talk to me, don't keep quiet.

C: I can remember when I was young I wasn't really thinking about nature, thinking about looking at a tree, or thinking very much. I was just living.

K: Were you living in the country?

C: No I was studying in Paris.

K: I want you to go further back. When were you studying in Paris, at what age?

C: Well I was born in Paris and I stayed until I was seven.

K: In Paris?

C: Yes.

K: That means what happened in Paris to you during those seven years? You see please understand what I am trying to say: trace it out, think it out, look at it as though you were looking at a picture which is yourself, you understand? At a series of movements, series of actions, series of feelings, all that has led you up to now. Right? You mightn't want to talk about it, that I understand. You understand what I am trying to say? Go on.

A: Well I went to an ordinary school in Delhi, where you had say twenty-five, thirty students in a class, and the teacher would write something on the blackboard.

K: But before that I am asking.

A: Well I went a school at the age of two.

K: Good Lord!

A: Indian children are sent to school at the age of two or three.

K: Why? Find out, you see you are not enquiring. At the age of two? That I can hardly believe.

A: Yes, to a nursery school.

K: To nursery school.

A: Nursery school where you just play with other children.

K: I understand. Not school then, it was really a kindergarten.

A: Well you learnt the alphabet and...

K: A creche.

A: Well you learnt your alphabet and numbers then.

K: What, as you grew up, trace it out, I can't repeat this over and over again, trace it out. Trace the whole thing from when you begin to remember until now so that you are very clear for yourself. You might not want to talk about it, I understand that. But if you say,

sorry, I won't talk about it, that's all right. But if you want to go into it, either you express it, put it into words to convey to others, or you are tracing it out on your own - you follow - and may not want to talk about it.

A: Sir, I think it is easy to tell you what happened but it is difficult to say what one felt when one was young.

K: Quite right.

A: It is very difficult to say how I felt about my parents.

K: I understand that. Now tell me a little more.

A: I don't know how to proceed. Do you want to know what happened?

K: Yes, what happened, say, for instance, when you were five. You remember when you were five. Then at that age until twelve - right? What were you thinking about? What was your feeling about others? Or about your father and mother?

A: I can remember that I was mainly thinking about going to school and not liking school very much but mainly there were my parents telling me the things I should do and the things I shouldn't do, and the school also.

K: Go on, I am pushing you.

D: I remember I was in a Catholic school run by priests.

K: Where? In Buenos Aires?

D: No, in the north west of Argentina.

K: Tell me where.

D: Well the city is called Tucuman, next to the mountains. And I was in this school run by priests. I remember I was quite influenced by what they said and sometimes I used to feel very scared when they talked, and they said that if I lied I would go to

hell. But on the other hand at home my father usually said all that the priests said was rubbish; and then sometimes I paid attention to the priests and sometimes I paid attention to my father.

K: May I ask another question? Was learning, writing, reading, was it a problem?

A: No.

K: No, just a minute. Say for instance, you went to school, you were told to study a book, or whatever it was, to read, to write clearly. Did you make that into a problem?

A: No.

B: Well no. I think it was something that we had to do and we were doing it.

K: You had to do it, was there any feeling of not wanting to do it, or wanting to do it?

B: Well in the beginning there might be that feeling of not wanting to do it.

D: I don't think that could have come up. I don't think that I would have thought that maybe I could not do it, so there wasn't this feeling of not wanting to.

K: You are not quite clear, you are not answering.

D: Well I am saying I don't think there was.

K: You have to learn mathematics, right, all of you? Did you make mathematics as a problem, or you were forced to do it? You understand the difference? Was it a problem to you, was it something you felt my gosh I don't want to do it but you had to do it?

A: Well we didn't have any other choice in a way. When you had to go to school you had to follow those classes.

K: Was it something disturbing? Something you kind of struggled to learn so that it became a problem to you?

A: I would say it depends on the subjects in a way. You are saying mathematics, for me it was a problem. Other subjects were no problems.

K: This may be a little too serious. Have you got problems now? Something which you have to resolve?

D: Yes, I would say, yes I do, sometimes there are some things and I feel, oh that's a problem, what can I do?

K: So why do you call it a problem?

D: Well I think...

K: Just listen to my question first. I may be wrong, don't accept what I am saying, or anything. Is your brain, brain, inside the skull, has it got many problems?

A: By itself, the brain by itself?

K: Problems, mathematics, marriage, sex, what are you going to do tomorrow after you leave here - you follow what is your future? Isn't that all something that disturbs you? Or you merely live day by day?

A: No, very often one has to think what one is going to do in the future.

K: Yes.

A: After I leave Brockwood.

K: Does that create a problem in you? You are frightened, you become anxious, you say, my god, life is so monstrous - you follow what I mean - it is so frightening, so dangerous, what am I going to do? Or you just think I want to do that, I am going to do that? Nothing else.

A: I don't know what to do.

K: Right. We will come to that presently. What I am trying to find out - you are not helping me, you are not tracing out your life. So to put it differently, you don't know your conditioning - right?

A: What do you mean by that?

K: I told you. I mean by that conditioning, the tradition, the school, the various subjects you had to learn, and the background of your father and mother, what they were like, and what they told you to do and not to do, their superstitions, or their belief, or their faith imposed on you - you follow? All that shapes your brain. Right? Because they are older, they are more influential, they know better than you and I do - right? So they say you must do this, you must not do that, and they scold, or beat you up. So all that shapes your brain slowly - right? You understand what I am saying, no? Agree? So that gradually becomes your conditioning. Then your conditioning becomes still more when you have to take a special subject and become a specialist - right? As a carpenter, gardener, or scientist, or a doctor and so on - right? So gradually your brain becomes narrower and narrower - you follow? Are you aware of this?

D: Well I don't...

K: Wait. Listen to this. Are you aware of this taking place in you?

A: Why do you say it becomes narrower?

K: If you don't like that word narrow, it becomes limited.

A: You mean because I have to choose something that I have to do?

K: When you say, I want to do that, that's my life. So gradually

you concentrate on that - right? You don't take life as a whole. You understand what I am saying? It doesn't mean that you must know all about playing the piano, or some instrument, that you must know all what the scientists are saying, all the books. I don't mean that. I am trying to point out, if I may, where there is self-interest, whether in specializing or in having some skill, linguistics, learning many languages, they are all good but if there is self-interest it becomes... you understand? You understand what I am saying?

A: But we are not aware of it.

K: First listen to what I have to say. Where there is self-interest, me first, my interests first, what I want to do, I am free to do what I think, I will rebel against my parents - you follow - I will do what I think is right. My prejudice is as good as your prejudice. I hold to my opinions - right? My conclusions. All that is self-interest in different ways. That self-interest has enormous consequences - right? If I am interested only in myself and I marry somebody and she also has self-interest - you understand? It is a mutual self-interest.

A: So would you say there is self-interest in a human being right from a very young age?

K: Probably. My book, my toy.

A: Well before you can say, this is my book?

K: I don't know. No, I have read somewhere some scientists have discovered, they may change tomorrow, they generally do, they said the baby knows who the friends are of the mother. The baby knows with whom the mother is friendly, of whom she kind of resists or is nervous, or frightened or emotional. The baby has a

feeling about it. Probably, I don't know, I have read it, it may be wrong.

A: So self-interest could be acquired, or it could be genetic.

K: Find out, first, I am asking you, don't ask me.

A: I am wondering if that is so.

K: Find out. Rather, you know what self-interest is, don't you? That self-interest can express itself in prayer, in worship, and devotion to somebody - right? And also in knowledge - right? In certain capacities, as a painter, as a musician - right? It hides itself in faith, in belief - right? Right? So we know where self-interest is, it is fairly clear. Do you know where it is not? Careful, careful, don't answer yet. Where it is not. We know where it is, right?

D: It seems to be pretty much everywhere in humanity. It seems to be almost in every human being.

K: I know all that, we know that.

A: It seems to be in almost everything I do.

B: Sir, it also seems something natural.

K: Find out. You see I am asking you to enquire into all this, if I may.

A: I don't know what self-interest is not.

K: Find out. Do you see it hides in most subtle ways, and the most cruelest ways? When I use you and you use me, it is the most... right? So we know where it is, where it hides, where it kind of subtly moves along. It may be worshipping nature - you follow? It is extraordinary subtle. Right? I am not talking about all this, I don't want to talk. You are making me talk. You are not answering my questions. I will finish it.

You know where it is. If you have examined closely, if you

have observed very carefully what is happening around you, what is happening, you follow? Self-interest seems to be so extraordinarily dominant. And you also know it is very, very subtle, social health, social activities, helping people - you follow? And the gurus with their blah - you follow?

A: Very often we don't notice it.

K: Therefore find out where it is not. We will come to that presently. You haven't told me - not to me - you haven't discovered for yourself what your background is, what your conditioning is, why you think this, why you don't think that - you follow? Go into it.

D: It is difficult to define what one's background is. I mean it feels that is what I have lived, you know.

K: Yes, that is what I am asking you. That is your background.

A: But sir, if you ask what did you feel about it, I cannot say. I can't remember.

K: All right. Then tell me what were the facts, as far as you can remember, as far back.

D: That would be a very long story Krishnaji.

K: Yes, a long story, go on, we have got time. You see that is where you begin to learn about yourself - right? What you are, what you feel, why you feel, what you think, why you think - you follow? You begin to learn your reactions. You begin to learn about your own way of looking at it, prejudices, all that, you begin to learn about yourself, which is very important - right? You really agree? You really see how important it is to know yourself? Do you? Not what other people say - right? To know all the corners of yourself, all the caves, all the undergrounds, all the shadows, you

follow, your whole being. You know mathematics, obviously, or history, or geography, or some technological subject, or you have some skill in some musical instrument and so on and so on. But apparently you don't seem to know about yourself, which is far more important than learning how to paint, or how to dance, which is necessary too but you follow what I am saying?

B: Why do you say that sir?

K: What?

B: It is more important than...

K: Obviously sir. I am asking you, tell me. What do you think?

B: Well you see we spend most of our time learning mathematics or...

K: I know. So are you also learning about yourself?

B: Well as far as I remember, not before.

K: Not before. Now to learn about yourself you have to trace what you were ten years ago, what you are now isn't that the result of ten years ago? Enquire into it.

A: Sir, I was brought up to believe in god, not so much by my parents, but by my friends, my cousins, my uncles, my aunts, to believe in god. And...

K: Yes, most people do.

A: Yes.

K: Move from there.

A: And I never really questioned that.

K: When did you begin to question that? Do you question it now?

A: Yes.

K: Now when you question what takes place, how do you

question it? Why do they believe in god? What is it that makes them believe? You ought to be asking all these questions.

D: It seems to be an easy way of living, you know if you say there is god and he will send this to us and he has arranged things, so you put the reference in god.

K: Yes, so what do you say?

A: You want something to hang on to.

K: What do you feel?

C: Now?

K: What do you feel? You see the vast majority of mankind believe in god - right? In different ways - right? In the Asiatic world it is the Buddha, the Hindus have many gods and the Christians and the Muslims have only one, and what is your feeling about all this?

C: This feeling we have about it, wouldn't it come from the feeling the parents had about it?

K: So you believe too?

C: No.

K: Why?

C: Well my parents told me you believe if you want, you don't believe if you don't want.

K: Yes, what do you feel about it.

C: Well I personally don't believe in it.

K: You don't care.

C: No, it is not that I don't care but I...

K: You are indifferent.

C: Well I was in a Catholic school for a while so I saw you know how they go to church, how people when they go to church

and all what happens when they pray, and their singing, and repeating many things. I didn't really see the point of doing that.

K: So is that part of your background, that you saw all this?

C: Yes.

K: And you say what a circus it is, what a nonsense it is, or how marvellous it is? You follow? What was your... you are not doing it. What do you think about all this, the wars, the terrorism that is going on, one group fighting another group, like in Lebanon - right? You follow? Christians against... what is your reaction to all that?

A: I feel frightened sometimes when I think of it.

K: Frightened of what?

A: Well that one day the world could blow up, maybe.

K: So are you concerned about the world, or about yourself in the world?

A: Myself in the world.

K: That means self-interest.

A: Yes.

K: You see I am trying to push you. You don't investigate. You know in Brussels, that horrible thing that happened, forty two people were killed, what is your reaction? You saw that, you must have seen it on television, or read it in the papers, and what do you feel about it? What do you feel about having to depend on your background - you follow? So you have to enquire into your background. So unless - that is what I am trying to ask - unless you trace it out very carefully, step by step, so that you know what your actions are, what your feelings are, why you think this way, what your prejudice is, you follow, you begin to learn all about yourself.

And then you find that by Jove, I am conditioned as a Argentine, as a Catholic, as a Hindu, or what nonsense all that is. You begin to learn about yourself. Right? Isn't that important? Careful, don't answer. I am asking you a question: isn't it important to know about yourself?

A: Why is it so important?

K: I am asking you. Look, I am asking you: isn't it important, of really great importance that you should know about yourself? I am asking you the question.

D: Well, I don't know.

K: What do you mean you don't know?

D: I am trying to think what the importance of that would be.

K: Why do you give importance to mathematics? Or geography? Or your 'A' and 'O' levels? Learning more and more about history - you follow? You think that is important and you say this is what.

A: Because I have been taught to see that that is important.

K: So I am asking you, do you consider this as important, to know yourself?

D: Well Krishnaji you have been saying that it is important.

K: I am asking you, don't tell me what I said, I know what I said.

D: Well because of what you have said then I sort of think that well maybe it is because you said that.

K: Find out if it is important or not. Forget what I have said.

B: It is true, even though we have heard what he has said, it seems we don't go into ourselves maybe because we don't see the importance of it.

K: You see what has happened to your four, you haven't learnt the art of enquiry - right?

A: Well, what is the art of enquiry?

K: I am showing it to you. The art, learning what you were as a young girl, how you looked at things, what is your feeling to your parents, to your environment, slowly begin from there, find out, what you are now. So that - I am not going to tell you! You tell me. I am asking you a question, an examination. You have considered acquiring knowledge about various subjects as tremendously important - right? Why?

A: Because everybody else around me thinks so.

K: Of course, everybody wants to smoke, everybody wants to drink beer.

A: That is what happens. You tend to do something which everybody else does.

K: Why? Enquire. You see you are not doing it.

A: Well you are just like everybody else. You tend - everyone does the same thing and no one tries to...

K: Then you are becoming - you see again you want to belong to a group.

A: But you are not aware of it.

K: Wait, wait. Find out. Don't say there is no other way. Find out.

A: Yes but I don't want to be alone.

K: So find out why you don't want to be alone. Is it fear?

D: Yes.

K: Is it that you want to belong to a group, feel safe.

A: It feels secure.

K: I mustn't tell you all these things. You tell me.

A: Yes, sir, it does feel safe to be part of a group.

K: So you are frightened, or nervous, or feel the danger of not belonging to something, to a group, to a country, to a tribe.

A: To my family.

K: And to a nation - right? Do you see the consequences of all that?

D: Yes.

K: He should know there was war in Falklands. And they are at war - right? Killing I don't know how many thousands. Which is, a particular group of people wanting that land and another group says no, you can't have it, and they go and kill each other - right? What do you think about it?

D: It seems foolish to think that one would kill because of a piece of land.

K: Yes. Now wait a minute. Why are people attached to this, to a particular group, a particular British, or the Argentine, or the French and Algiers? You understand? The Hindus and the Muslim.

A: Does self-interest come into this?

K: Find out. See. Enquire. Don't ask me. I'll tell you.

D: If the self-interest didn't tell you to belong to this group, you wouldn't have the groups then you wouldn't have the problem.

B: And we also said we want to be safe.

K: I won't tell you, go into it. That's why I have been saying please learn the art of it.

A: We often think enquiring is asking a whole lot of questions.

K: To yourself, not asking others.

A: No, no, to yourself as well.

K: Are you doing it?

A: I want to know is it just asking any question that comes to your mind, or is there such a thing as...

K: Yes about yourself. Not what kind of kite or what kind of bird that is, that comes later. You know probably you have studied a great deal, books, you know what chemistry is, you know what the whole nature of history is - right? Geography and mathematics and science, and all the things you know very well, you have been brought up in it, educated - right? You give tremendous importance to that. And you say, well the other thing doesn't matter - the other thing being what you are, why you are. What's the future of you? Learn.

D: Krishnaji, I think we do think about it and we are somewhat worried sometimes about the future, but it is difficult to find an answer, about the past or the future, I find I seem not to be able to answer this question sir.

K: Because you haven't enquired old boy. Don't ask the question, find the answer for yourself.

B: Sir, somehow there are blocks to going into oneself.

K: Why? Why?

A: Sir I don't want to ask these question at times because I am afraid of finding out something that I don't like.

K: So find out why you are afraid. What is fear? You see?

A: Yes.

K: It is no good standing at the edge of a pool and say, I can't swim, I can't swim. I can't swim. You learn from a professional, or you temporary get in little by little - you follow?

B: Sir, could we find out what the blocks are?

K: Find out!

B: I mean now.

D: Well she mentioned fear, just now.

K: Yes, she mentioned one of them.

D: One of them.

K: She said fear and wanting to be safe - right? Now find out what it means 'wanting to be safe'. Safe from what?

D: Somehow it is not wanting to move because you don't know what is somewhere else.

K: Yes. So is your brain becoming limited through fear? So you say, by Jove, I don't know, so I went even and look at it.

A: Or I have been hurt before and I don't want to be hurt again.

K: So take hurt. Why are you hurt? Who is hurt? You see? Please learn step by step. You didn't know history but you learnt, you spent time, book after book or somebody telling you. So this way go step by step and learn.

B: Is there a teacher, sir?

K: Is your brain active in a certain direction, knowledge, books, examinations, 'A' level, 'O' level and you want a job - you follow - at the end of it, or not. Why don't you spend a little time over the other side?

A: I am not sure I have seen the importance of knowing oneself.

K: Why? Why don't you see the importance of it?

D: In one way one doesn't feel important if there are so many other people too, you know, and they are also doing the same, then you feel, well I can't be that important.

K: From what you have told me you are really following the hurt. All right find out why you are following it.

A: Like we said before, sir, I want to belong to something.

K: Then go into it, learn.

A: Why do I want to belong?

K: Yes. And see the consequences of belonging. The consequences are separation - right? One group against another group - right? One tribe against another tribe. Gradually build up a nation, and this nation against that nation - right? This nation represents one ideology, and this group represents another ideology, so ideologies are fighting. For that you kill millions - right? So follow it up. Is this the way to live after a million, or two million, or fifty thousand years, is this the way to live?

D: Well somehow we have done it so much that it doesn't seem different. It seems that that is what we want, it is done and that is in our nature to do that.

K: All right. If you say it is my nature to be cruel.

D: Well I don't say it is my nature. But you say people are like that, people have wars, you know.

K: All right. Then live violently. You see what I am trying to say. I am saying, find out, not from me or from somebody else, find out for yourself. You haven't said a word.

C: I have listened.

K: That's just it!

B: Sir in learning mathematics we have our teacher - right - to teach us. Now in this area...

K: Then they keep on telling about you.

B: Are they two different things?

K: Of course. There you are being informed about history - right? What kind of wars, what kind of kings, what kind of society

- right? History, what does that mean? What is history, the meaning of that word?

B: The history of human beings.

K: Yes. The history of human beings. You are the history of human beings. You are a human being. It is all about you. Not only you, about the whole. So you are not learning to enquire, that's is what I am saying. Right?

A: It seems so sir. I find it difficult.

K: This is not only one talk, we are going to have a series of discussions, if you are willing. If you are willing we are going to have a series of discussions, every Sunday morning we will go at it. But you must also, if I may suggest, go into it, not just say, "Well I will wait until Sunday morning." Go into it, find out. I give you - not I give you - you are given a whole week to see if you can pass the examination!

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION WITH FOUR STUDENTS 9TH JUNE 1985

A: Self-interest and how that lead to conflict.

K: And also we began by talking about childhood memories, conditioning. Let's talk about it a little bit.

A: We were wondering if we could discuss further this question of looking at ourselves.

K: Looking at ourselves. Is that it?

B: Yes, well we were talking about our background.

D: Last time we were trying to talk but I think...

C: Well we were not really sure whether we should talk about ourselves or if we should just talk about more general...

K: Talk about yourself, about your family, about your background.

A: We found it quite difficult to talk about all that, to go into specific details of how we were brought up.

K: So you found it difficult?

A: Yes.

K: Shall we start there?

D: It is a difficult point.

B: Is there a different way to do it sir?

K: The last time we met we were talking about, weren't we, about your backgrounds, your upbringing, your childhood, your education. And all this in various forms has conditioned you: newspapers, magazines, television, politics, economics, climate, food. Talking about food are you all very healthy?

D: Fairly healthy.

K: Good strong bodies? Or you are all rather floppy, sloppy, feeble?

A: I don't think...

K: Have you got a good strong body that can play tennis or run - I used to run five miles a day at one time. Can you do all that? Or you are all rather lazy about that kind of thing?

A: No I think we can all do some exercise quite well.

K: But do you do it?

A: Yes, sir.

K: Yes? Good. You have good food here.

A: Yes, very good.

K: Of course! Very good food. And is your brain working properly?

A: Properly?

K: Properly in the sense, acute, sharp, clear, not muddled, confused.

D: I think sometimes we do get confused.

K: Not sometimes. You know if you say sometimes then it is most of the time!

D: Yes, yes.

A: We try to be clear sir, but most of the time one is confused.

K: No, I am asking you is your brain clear, alert, active, not chattering, I don't mean that, active, full of vitality? You are quite young. How old are you?

A: Seventeen.

K: And you?

B: Twenty six.

K: And you?

C: Eighteen.

D: Seventeen.

K: My gosh! You have got a long life ahead of you. And so is your mind, is your brain very alert?

C: What did you mean by alert?

K: I will tell you. Watching the birds, the trees, the grass, the flowers, and the flight of those wood pigeons. Have you watched the flowers?

A: Yes sir.

K: The shape of the trees, the sound when the strong wind is there have you heard the trees? And also have you heard when the trees are very quiet? The other day it was absolutely motionless - right? I don't know if you watched all this. And there is a certain quality of silence, and the sound of a tree. I won't go into all that. But do you have such a brain that is watching, looking, observing, feeling, or is it all casual?

A: More often it tends to be casual.

K: Casual in the sense it doesn't care. You don't mind what you think, what you feel, there is not self awareness, a critical awareness of oneself.

A: Perhaps this relates to what you mentioned the other day about looking at oneself.

K: I am coming to that.

A: Do you think we could go into that?

K: Yes I am going to go into it. But first one has to have, doesn't one, I am asking you, don't listen to me merely, I am asking you shouldn't you have a very good brain, not just being clever, I don't mean that, or having a lot of degrees behind your name. But a brain

that is watching, listening, looking, weighing, impersonal - you follow - all that. Or are you all the time thinking about yourself? About your background - Oh, I have been brought up wrongly, my father is a little bit odd and so on. So is there a critical self-awareness?

C: No sir.

D: No I don't think so.

K: No. Not selfishness, I don't mean that. Self-awareness in which you don't choose, say this is good, but to be aware. You understand what I am talking about? Right? If you are not, why aren't you?

A: I tend to get distracted.

K: Distracted?

A: Yes.

K: Now wait a minute. Is there such thing as distraction? Careful, think it out with me. I am asking you why do you call it distraction?

A: Because I am trying to pay attention to a certain thing but then my mind wanders and I start thinking about other things.

K: All right. Just a minute. You are studying a book, some particular subject - right? And as you are looking at it your mind goes off - right? You have sudden thoughts. Why? Why do you call it distraction?

A: Because there is something that I want to do.

K: But if you have other kinds of thoughts that is part of your being, part of your brain, so why do you call it distraction?

C: Because we don't accept those thoughts that come about while we are reading.

K: So don't you pursue that for a while?

C: Because we want to read, you see.

K: I know, just a minute, just a minute. Listen to what I am saying. You want to concentrate on a particular page. As you are concentrating, looking at it you have other thoughts - right? Now why don't you pursue the other thoughts and not call it distraction? You follow what I am trying to say? Don't call it distraction.

A: I tend to see them as unimportant compared to what I have to do.

K: But you want to read that page, you want to learn that subject and other thoughts interfere, why do they interfere? Just go into it slowly.

B: Well maybe it could be our problems that...

K: No, don't make it into a problem. Just look at what I am saying. I want to look at that clock, I am watching it and other thoughts come in. The moment I call it distraction I have separated the whole process of thinking - right? You understand what I am saying?

C: No, not very well.

K: When I am reading that page, I am thinking, observing, looking, seeing how the word is spelt and so on.

A: I am not sure I am even doing that sir when I am looking.

K: No, you may read very quickly, or it may be a very difficult subject, so you have to read carefully - right? As you are reading carefully there is a second or two when this other thought comes in. That interference you call distraction.

A: Yes.

K: Why do you call it distraction? I know what you are going to

say but find out why do you use that word? You are attracted by that page, or that particular subject, or you are watching the tree, or bird, other thoughts come in. Why do you call it distraction? It is the whole movement of thought, isn't it?

A: Yes, but I don't see it as that sir.

K: See it now.

A: Yes.

K: It is a whole movement of thinking - right? Thinking about the subject you are reading, memorizing, because unfortunately you are going to pass some examination therefore you must be prepared, and a thought arises. Give a second to investigate that thought and come back so that you begin gradually to learn how to look at yourself. You understand what I am saying?

B: Sir, what do you mean by investigating a thought?

K: Just a minute. I am polishing my shoes, which I generally do, and a thought arises. For a second or two or a little longer I want to find out why it comes - right? Right? I find because that is also worrying or it is this, it is something else, so for a minute or two I say wait, why I am thinking that, is there some interest in this when I am polishing my shoe? Right? You follow? I am interested in polishing my shoe, I am making it as clean and as nice looking as possible. So there is not this terrible word distraction. You are then aware. You are learning a subject, your mind is active and - you follow - you are active.

A: Sir you seem to make a difference between concentration and attention.

K: Oh rather, we will go into that presently, that is a little more complex. Wait a minute, wait a minute. If you could drop that

word 'distraction' from your brain, see what happens - you understand? See what happens if you don't say, "By Jove, I am distracted, I must pay attention" then you are creating conflict - you understand?

A: You mean there are two different movements going on?

K: Yes. I must concentrate but also I must... you follow? Can you drop altogether from your vocabulary 'distraction'? Learn - right? You are learning, therefore there is no distraction. I don't know if you follow that - right? You are learning about that page, you are learning about why that thought arises, why it interferes. It means probably you are not interested in that particular subject but there are other interests inside you. So begin. You understand? And you agree, or not?

A: Yes sir.

K: You see it? No, see it, not I am teaching you, learn about it.

B: Sir it seems you are using the word 'learning' in a different sense.

K: Yes, I am learning. I am learning about that page, that subject - right?

B: But that learning, sir, is accumulation of knowledge.

K: Wait. Don't go too far ahead. Go step by step otherwise you will enter... I am learning about the subject. I am also learning why there are these other thoughts that come into being. So the whole movement is to learn - right? I am learning about that subject, that particular page, and also I am learning about why thoughts arise. So it is a whole movement of learning. He asks: what is the difference between learning and accumulating knowledge - right?

B: Yes.

K: Wait a minute. What do you say? Do you see a difference? Careful. Do you see the difference between accumulation, acquiring, acquiring, acquiring - right? - and not acquiring, which is the movement of learning, more and more, learning. There was a very famous painter, I believe, not I believe, Goya, Spanish. He said when he was ninety, or ninety two, "I am still learning". You understand? He never said "I have learnt". Right? So do you see the difference? I am not saying you should, or should not, but do you see the difference between acquiring knowledge, memorising - right - not only to pass exams but to have a certain skill which you can use to write, earn a job, earn a livelihood - right? Do you see the difference between that and learning?

A: No, sir I usually tend to mean the same thing when I say learning, as accumulation of knowledge. I don't see what you mean.

K: What do you say sir?

C: Well there seem to be one learning where you receive many things and you read and you hear, and the other one you experience.

K: All right, I will put it this way: you have accumulated a lot of things in your house, in your room - right? And that accumulation is you. You have collected a lot of memories, a lot of pain, a lot of fears, then you become a slave to what you have accumulated.

A: Which is a slave to myself.

K: Yes, collecting. Whereas there is no freedom. There is freedom when there is learning. I wonder if you can capture this. You tell me what you mean by learning. You tell me. Forget what I have said. But what do you mean by learning? You learn - tell me.

Be simple.

D: Sir, yes. I find that I learn in order to know so I am accumulating memories, so that I can remember something, that is what I do when I say I am learning, you know.

K: You are learning to drive a car.

D: Yes.

K: And the instructor tells you how to hold the wheel, what are the pedals, all the rest of it, he informs you. And then he tells you start slowly and you begin to learn how to drive a car. It may take you three weeks, or a month, or a week and so on - right? In the process what has been happening to your brain? Just look at it carefully before... don't answer. It has taken you three weeks or much longer to learn how to drive a car.

A: I have acquired a skill.

K: You have acquired a skill, which means what?

D: Well you have become used to...

K: Tell me slowly. You keep quiet.

A: I have become familiar with certain things.

K: Go on, tell me more.

A: It has become sort of automatic, a reflex because if you drive a car it is the same things that come out every time that you do it.

K: So what has happened? You have learnt how to drive a car, you have learnt how to shift the gears, how to put on the brake and how to accelerate, and you listen to the engine, how it is working, and also you are watching, the road, keeping to your side and so on. And also you are watching about three hundred yards ahead of you-right? So you are taking the whole thing in. The road, the wetness of the road and so on. In doing all that what has happened

to your brain? Answer me. All right, take something: you are all learning mathematics, aren't you?

B: Yes.

D: Yes.

K: Some kind, not too... so when you are learning mathematics, or history, you are accumulating information - right? Right? And you are storing that information, the brain is storing it - right?

A: As memory.

K: As memory. And you use that, to get a job and so on, you use that. When you learn how to write, you are doing the same thing, which is it becomes almost automatic - right? But driving, you can't do quite automatically. See the difference.

B: You also have to watch.

K: You have to be very careful. You are going about fifty, fifty-five, or sixty, or more, you have to be very careful. You can't remove your hands from the steering wheel and talk with gestures, you have to watch. See the difference in the two?

D: And still the watching seems to be somewhat automatic. When you travel in the car you...

K: Yes, it is almost automatic. I don't like to use the word 'automatic'

D: Mechanical.

K: Like mechanics or something - right? And you call that learning. Right? You call learning how to write, about mathematics, chemistry and so on. In that process it has taken you ten years, or fifteen years, or twenty years, during that time you have accumulated a lot of knowledge. And that knowledge almost becomes normal. So the brain then becomes mechanical.

A: You mean we are so used to it.

K: Used to it, you have learnt about your subject. You are an engineer, or chemist, you are learning. And then you move along - right? But always the basis is previous knowledge. You may add to it - right? But still the basis is knowledge. So enquire into knowledge.

A: Knowledge seems to be...

K: Learn, learn from what I am saying. Learn, find out what you mean by knowledge. What is knowledge? Enquire. Learn. Move. Is it like a computer? You know how a computer works. More or less. I don't know either but you programme it - right? So there are people who know how to programme and they need supplies and so on, it tells you. Are you like that?

D: Well that is what it seems sometimes.

K: Just listen first before you answer.

A: Yes sir, because I too acquire certain bits of information, I play around with them and use them in the way that I want to.

K: So are you being programmed?

A: Yes.

K: Don't be shy sir, go on.

B: I am not sure that I am even aware of that process.

K: Are you, find out. I am asking you now, not next day, or later on, but I am asking you now, find out if you are being programmed, as a Filipino, or as Hindu, or as a Christian, or something else, which is you are being told from childhood, you are a Filipino, I am a Hindu, she is a Christian, and she is a Hindu or a Brahmin, and he is from South America, Argentina, so you are being programmed. If you are a Catholic you have been

programmed for two thousand years. Right? See the fact. I am not saying it is right or wrong. And she is a Hindu of a certain strata of society called the Brahminas, and she has been programmed to say, "I am a Brahmin", or "I am no longer a Brahmin". Right? It is the same process, isn't it? You have been programmed as a Hindu for the last three to five thousand years. Hindu is from the word Indus, the famous river - I won't go into it.

So you are being programmed - right? It may be necessary - right? I am being programmed when I learn how to dance, how to play football, or cricket - right? I have learnt. You follow?

A: So when I use a certain bit of information that I have about you, would you call that programming as well?

K: If you use that knowledge of what you have learnt about me and that becomes a memory then it becomes a barrier, you then don't look at me afresh.

A: Every time I see you I remember what I have...

K: Of course, all the images you have built about him and so on, or her. And that image prevents you from looking at him afresh - right? You are meeting all this?

A: But still you have to remember certain things.

K: Of course. I can't each time ask you what is your name, it sounds silly.

A: But then you have to make a certain...

K: Find out, learn. Don't say I have to make a certain... go into it and find out. You see you are not doing it.

A: There seems to be...

K: Wait, wait. Are you learning from what I am saying? I am saying, asking you, are you learning from what we have discussed,

or are you just passing it by? When we said that you are being programmed - right?

A: I can see that sir.

K: Is that a fact to you? Not - you see the difference between a fact and an idea? Be quick. Don't take time. Look, that clock is a fact, fact, but it is a complicated fact, there is a lot of mechanism, originality, inventing, there it is in front of us. You can touch it, you can feel it, you can almost smell it, you can't quite taste it, but it is a fact. Right? You don't make that into an idea, it is a clock, or a watch. Right? Now I say to you - just listen quietly - that you are being programmed - right? Is that a fact to you, or an idea that you are being programmed? You see the difference?

C: When we look at it, when we look at all the processes that has programmed us we can see that it is a fact.

K: So it is not an idea?

C: No.

K: Wait, wait, I'll show you. When you have a toothache it is a fact. You don't say, pretend, or have an idea that you have a toothache.

C: By the fact...

K: Have you listened?

C: Yes. By the fact do you mean something that exists.

K: Not only exists. Now wait a minute. I am asking you: find out for yourself whether you are being programmed. Right? When you say, "I realize that, that is a fact that I am being programmed", it is not an idea - right? Are you paying attention?

B: Yes.

K: Wait, go slowly. I say to you, just listen carefully, you are

the world and the world is you. Is that an idea or a fact? Careful!
Sir, look at it carefully. Is that statement that you are the world and
the world is you, is that a fact to you? Or an idea, a Utopia, a
feeling how marvellous - you follow?

B: I think it is an idea, sir.

K: Yes. Why? Why do you make it into an idea? I will go
further: to you is it an idea or a fact? Your thinking, your anger -
careful, careful - your jealousy, your fears, your antagonisms, you
follow? Is that a fact or is it an idea? Now you are going to find it
awfully difficult. Go into it, learn.

A: It is a fact that this organism exists over here.

K: The organism is a fact.

A: Yes.

K: I have got a thumb, you have got a thumb.

A: Yes.

K: You are short, I am tall, or I am short, you are tall. That's a
fact. Right? You didn't create that tree, thank god! Or the tiger. But
you created this room, not you, but you created this room - right?
Now enquire, learn, move further. I am asking you to learn about
yourself, what you think, what you feel, then go on, learn.

D: Krishnaji, when you say learn about yourself, I mean
sometimes I think I do that but that is just memorizing, what I like,
what I would like.

K: So, who is the 'I' that does like, and dislikes? You
understand? Go on, I am pushing. I like her, I don't like you -
right? She is a friend, you are not my friend. And I am angry -
right? Is anger different from me?

C: No.

K: No, why do you say no?

D: It is part of me, I could say.

K: All right, part of you. Pleasure is part of you, fear is part of you - right? Pain is part of you and so on. Do you put all the parts together and make it whole? You understand what I am saying?

A: That is me, all those little parts put together.

K: Is you.

B: Yes.

K: Therefore what does that mean? You are all that.

A: Yes

B: Yes.

K: Wait, careful, don't agree so quickly. You are not different from all that. Right? Are you different from anger? No, of course not. So you are anger. Right?

Now I am going to look at myself - we are coming to that - right? I can see myself in the mirror when I shave, or comb my hair. The mirror reflects the face which is me - right? So can I look at myself as clearly as I see my face in the mirror? Have you listened? Listen, listen. Can you do it? Will you do it? Or will you find out how to look at yourself?

A: Is there something which would reflect myself?

K: Find out! You said, you all agreed, or saw for yourselves, anger is you, pleasure is you, being frightened is you. So you are a bundle of all this. Your background, your reactions, "Oh, I've had a terrible childhood" but you have had a happy childhood. All that is you.

A: But why is it that I tend to separate all those?

K: Now find out why.

A: I don't like to think...

K: Listen, listen. Just listen before you answer too quickly. Why do you separate yourself from all that? Is it tradition?

A: Partly.

K: Not partly. Don't use the word partly. See. Is it tradition, is it habit, is it your culture, your religion?

A: It is all that.

K: So what does that all mean?

B: It is another programme, isn't it.

K: No, go on, what does all that mean?

A: All the experiences that I have had.

K: You are just repeating.

A: No, sir.

K: When you say, when I ask you why you separate, and I said to you, why do you separate when you know now, probably you have not thought about it before, that anger is you - right? That is a fact. Why do you separate it? Separate anger as though it was something different from you? I asked: is it tradition, is it habit, is it your particular culture, which means go further, good and bad, the good fighting the bad and the bad fighting the good. Follow? Follow all that up.

A: These are things that we have been told since we were young.

K: Yes, therefore when you separate you are being mechanical, because you have been that that is all right.

B: That is why he said we just repeated all this.

K: Right? So have you understood?

C: I am not very clear about it.

K: You are not clear. Let's make it more clear so that you become clear. You look at that tree in full bloom, green leaves, rich, look at it. Look at it. Turn your face and look. Right? The breezes play with it, it is almost dancing. Right? How do you look at that tree?

C: What do you mean how?

K: What do you see?

C: Well I see the tree.

K: Of course you are not that tree. Right? Now do you look at yourself that way?

C: No.

K: No, naturally. Because you are not that tree. But when you look at yourself, how do you look at yourself, as though you were separate and looking?

A: Yes sir because I like to think I am not afraid, or the fear is not me.

K: So you have separated yourself from your fear, from your anxiety, from your etc. Right? I asked, you why? Why has mankind, including you and me, why have we separated anger from me?

A: Because we have again been programmed to think that anger is bad.

K: That's all. Now can you not be programmed and look?

A: You mean keep away all that we have been conditioned to do?

K: Of course. If I have been told from childhood to say you are separate from fear, therefore fight it, conquer it, be courageous, therefore avoid it - you follow? - and so on. So from childhood I

have been conditioned, trained, educated to look at fear as though it was something apart from me. See what the result of that is, the consequences of this separation. Careful, don't answer me. Look at it first. See what it does. Right? I call myself a Hindu, if I do, and you are a Muslim. I have been programmed, you have been programmed to be a Muslim, Allah, and all the Koran - right? And I have been programmed in a different way, as a Jew and an Arab. And we will kill each other. This is the consequence.

A: Of that separation.

K: Of this separation. Right? So when I call myself a Jew and you call yourself an Islam, following the Islam tradition, we are separated from each other. Which means that separation brings conflict between us - right? I believe in Jihad, you know what that word means, holy war, I become a martyr getting killed, it's marvellous. And you have been programmed and don't kill, suppose - right? Or you have been programmed as an Arab and I am Jew so we fight. See now, relate it to when you separate yourself from fear there is a conflict there.

A: But why does that happen?

K: I told you.

A: No, but why do I want to separate myself? It seems quite deliberate that I want to separate myself from all this.

K: Because then you could control it, then you can suppress it - right? Then you can run away from it, or transcend it. It's a conflict.

A: But where does that get me?

K: It has led you nowhere but you like that, it is tradition, you follow it mechanically.

A: Or on the other hand you reject it mechanically.

K: Mechanically. And become lazy, lethargic, don't care - you follow? So have you learnt the consequences, the result of separating yourself from fear?

C: What if we were not aware we were doing it?

K: Just take ordinary fear, when you are aware of fear.

C: Usually we are not.

K: Oh yes you are aware of fear, somebody comes and slaps you, it is natural.

C: Yes, but there are many other feelings that we are not aware of.

K: I'll begin with something that you can get hold of, not aware of everything. That will come very much later - not later, if you learn about it. Go on. So do you actually see the consequences of separation? I a Jew, my tradition goes back to four thousand years - right? I am the chosen people, etc. I worship the nameless and so on. You an Arab, Muslim, Islam, Allah, and we fight. Why? I have been programmed, you have been programmed - right? And we think we are separate. My god is separate from your god. Is that so? It is a fact. I am British - right? And you are Argentine. So I go to Falklands and kill you. Right? And this we have been doing for thousands of years - right? Right?

A: At one level I see the destruction that it has been causing, but at another level I still contribute to it. Why does that go on?

K: We will come to that presently. You are going ahead.

A: No.

K: Yes. First see the consequences of separation in yourself, and actually what is going on in the world. I am British, you are

French. Only water of twenty-two miles separates us. I am a British businessman, I manufacture better than hers, and so on. The vanity, you follow?

A: That happens between two friends too.

K: That is what I am saying. Go into it. First see what is happening in the world, then relate what has happened to yourself. Right? Unless you have a criteria for the outer you can't then judge, value, look. Careful. You are not listening. Look, the ideology of the Soviets, which is what they have made of Marx, Lenin, Stalin - right? - and the whole democratic world - right? So ideologies separate. Learn. So they are fighting about ideologies, which is what? An idea society should be this and so you have the Politburo dominating the whole world, Russia.

A: Society should be what I think it should be.

K: That's it, exactly. Or what we all think. It is self-interest. Right? So see the consequences of separation.

B: Sir but what would stop all this going on?

K: Sir, I am not trying to stop what is going on. First I must see what is going on in me because I am contributing to all this, by calling myself a Hindu, you are a Philippine, she is French and he is Argentine, she is a Muslim - you follow?

A: Why do I blame it on another person, I don't seem to see that I am responsible for it too?

K: I don't blame anybody. I say this is what humanity has done to each other - right?

A: No, sir, I am saying when I think I am an Arab and that you are a Jew I put all the blame on you.

K: Of course, for various reasons.

A: I don't see that perhaps I am responsible as well.

K: I want that land which belonged to me about a hundred years ago, or two hundred, or four hundred years ago, and the Israelis say, my dear chap I used to own this land, all this enormous land, long before, four thousands years ago - right? So I am asking you to look at the result of separation in me, I am different from anger therefore I fight anger, control it, suppress it, or transcend it - right? There is separation going on in me. And so I create the world in which I live. Eh? Clear?

A: Yes.

K: The society is created by me.

A: By several me's.

K: By you, my grandfather, my great grandfather, we are all me first, and society we have created it. Unless there is a change here I can't change there. You are not talking, you are just saying yes.

A: You said change.

K: Find out.

B: What do you mean by that?

K: Not what I mean. Don't ever 'what do I mean'.

A: You used that word sir.

K: I am asking you: do you actually in your heart, in your brain, see the fact of what separation does? I get married, all the sex and all that. And I am ambitious, very, or aggressive, I want to get on, make money - right? Have a good job, good car, I want to advance; and my wife also wants to do the same thing in a different direction. Right? So we are already separated - right? So the consequences of that separation, I may enjoy my sex and all that, the comfort of a house but we two are separate, therefore we are at

loggerheads with each other - right? You understand?

C: Yes.

K: Don't say yes. Do you actually see this as a fact? Or do you say I quite agree with you, let's get on?

D: Krishnaji, my problem is that I can see it happening outside, I can see it happening to the other people, but somehow I find it hard to see it in myself.

K: Why not? Don't accept anything hard and remain hard, let it remain as though it was a hard thing. See what it does. See what is happening in the world first. Argentine and England. It is very simple.

D: Well I can see that.

K: See what is happening to you when you separate yourself from your fear, from your reactions, from what you do - you follow? It is exactly the same thing.

C: There are two conflicting movements going on.

K: Conflicting movements of which you are.

C: That I am both those movements?

K: Of course.

C: Gosh!

K: Do you see that? I won't move from this, if you don't mind. As long as it is not actual in you, that you, when you separate you are bringing contradictory movements in yourself, and therefore conflict. I don't see why it is so difficult for you to see this.

C: When you say that we do the same thing with our anger, for example, we want to push it away, we want to suppress it, and we do the same with someone from another country. We say, he is English so I want to...

K: Separation, you understand?

C: Yes.

K: Division. I am British and you are French. Right? I have had a tremendous Empire, so I am better than you! I am very proud of my tradition, so are you. We both worship a symbol, Christian, but we are willing to kill each other, economically, and all the rest of it, for various territorial purposes - right? England had a great interest in France at one time. And so on.

A: Why do I think I am better than everybody else?

K: It is part of your vanity. Part of your aggression, part of your tradition. The other day on television, did you see, "German reliability and the British know-how"! You understand? As though the Germans didn't know the know-how, but we British only know the know-how, they are very reliable but we are... - you follow? The sense of separation, the sense of vanity. The Germans know as much of the know-how as you and I do otherwise they couldn't put a car together: or the Americans also say they have the know-how, we are better.

A: But where does that come from?

K: Find out.

A: Is it there in us from the minute we are born?

K: A little bit probably.

A: You mean genetically?

K: My family is better than yours.

A: When I am a baby I don't think that.

K: Not that. But it begins slowly.

A: Over the years.

K: The traditions, they say, you are British, behave like a

British. Be proud of your tradition. You had a tremendous empire, now you are reduced but you still remember.

C: But even when you were a child and your parents tell you, because when you are young everyone says how wonderful he is, look he is doing this and that, and then you become proud of it.

K: So are you learning from this discussion, from this dialogue, are you learning, or just memorizing? See the difference? If you say, yes, I have learnt but I don't want to change. It is all right to carry on as I am. I like conflict - right? I like this struggle. Then carry on! That's what the world is doing anyhow. And you may be frightened to stand alone.

A: Yes, yes.

D: Do we know how to stand alone?

K: So, sir, please I am asking you most respectfully, learn from all this. Don't fall back and say it is my old tradition - right? Be aware of all this.

A: So we looked at learning was not, but what is this movement?

K: Why do you ask me?

A: Because I don't know.

K: We have spent an hour and you are still asking what is learning and what is memory.

A: No, I said we spoke of what learning is not, that it is not memory, that it is not accumulation of knowledge.

K: Therefore find out what it is.

A: I don't know.

K: Move. Don't say, I don't know and remain there. I told you, Goya after painting until he was ninety-two, or ninety, he said, "I

am still learning". It is a marvellous statement if you go into it.

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD CONVERSATION WITH FOUR STUDENTS 18TH JUNE 1985

K: Last time we met I think we were talking about, as he pointed out, what is our relationship to what is happening in the world - right sir? You know what is happening in the world - terror, terrorism, and those who are terrorized; the purpose of terrorism is to terrorize. And they are hijacking, killing people, innocent people, or any type - it doesn't matter. And there is a war going on in Beirut and there is Bangladesh, you know all about it. And you know what is happening in South America, the Falkland war? And there are people celebrating the Falkland war here and moaning in Argentina - right? And also there is this Star Wars - you have heard about it? Tremendous scheme. So that - I won't go into the details of it - so that the atom bomb and the neutron bomb will be obsolete. Right? Seeing all this, not only intellectually but actually, as a fact, what is your relationship to all that? To national divisions, to economic, to racial, to all that has happened in Brussels and so on, what is your attitude to all this, how do you react to all this?

A: Sir, when one reads about all this in the newspapers, or hears about it, or sees it, one seems to get stuck with the question of how does one respond?

K: I am asking you. How do you respond to all this? What is your reaction, what is your feeling, what is your instinctive or immediate response to it?

D: I think my response, at least sometimes, is thinking I want to keep out of it as much as I can, you know, try to keep away.

K: All right, if you try to keep out of it, can you?

D: I don't know.

A: Do you mean not contribute to the mess?

D: Well I mean I try to make no difference between where people come from.

K: That is fairly simple.

D: Yes. But from there I don't know what else to do.

K: It is recognized and it is fairly easy to do that. But at a deeper level, if there is such a deeper level, what do you feel about all this? The wars, the antagonisms, the economic divisions, super powers and the terrible things that are happening - hi-jacking, people who have nothing to do with anything being bombed, killed in Israel the bombs are thrown on buses, children, women - you follow? How do you...

A: I often think, what is it that makes man do all that?

K: No. You are the man, and also you are the woman.

A: Yes, it is part of me too.

K: What is your relationship to it? You are not answering my question.

B: Well sir I get the sense that there is something not quite right about it and you know I ask myself...

K: What do you mean 'not quite right about it'?

B: Sir I mean not right, this killing, this bombing, the war going on.

K: Yes, proceed, tell me.

B: I don't feel it is right and yet I am not sure if there is something I can do about it because nobody seems to be able to stop it.

K: Do you want to stop it? Do you want to indulge in violence?

B: No, sir.

K: Right? Then you are not a violent human being. Or are you limiting violence to terrorism, killing, limit it there, limit it so that it is something - right? But violence is much deeper than merely, not that it is right to kill another human being, but do you feel violent? If we are really honest.

A: Sir this is where I see your contradiction because I...

K: Contradiction between what?

A: At one level I do not want this violence to continue but in my own life I or any individual seems to continue with this.

K: So do you take the responsibility, you as a human being living on this earth, do you take the responsibility and say, "I won't be violent"? Or do you indulge sometimes in violence, sometimes not - you follow what I am talking about? Which is it?

C: It seems to be the only thing we can do.

K: Will you do it? Not "it seems the only thing we can do", but will you do it? Will you say, "I won't be violent" and go into the question of what is violence, how to be free of it and so on, will you undertake that journey? Or just say, "I don't want a part of all this, I want to keep out". But how can you keep out? When you go back to Argentina, you are going to take an aeroplane and you are going to pay so much and that goes part of it to armaments, part of it and all the rest of it. You can't keep out.

A: But then I get stuck with the question of how do I not keep out?

K: No, first, I will tell you. I am asking not how to keep out, that is a wrong question, you can't keep out.

A: But I am saying that is the immediate reaction that one has.
How do I not do this.

D: Well you can't not do it.

K: No, I am asking you, will you take the responsibility, seriously, passionately, and say, let's go into the question of violence and I will see I will not be violent, and therefore you will not elect a violent leader - right? A politician, that is what has happened the world over. Therefore I am asking you as human beings, will you stop your own violence?

And what is violence? Come a little bit, begin to discuss with me. What do you consider is violence?

B: When you hurt another person.

K: Begin at the lowest level or the highest level. Begin somewhere. You hit me. You rob me. You murder me. You do all kinds of things to me - right? That is only a part of violence, isn't it? Investigate, go into it, go on, explore together, don't keep silent.

A: When I feel angry with you.

K: That's right, when you feel angry. Go on.

A: When I feel hurt.

K: Yes. Not only when you don't want to be hurt, but also when you want to hurt others. Don't say...

A: Yes, that is included.

K: So go on.

C: When you want to protect yourself.

K: Partly.

C: If countries are at war.

D: And jealousy seems to be violence.

B: And competition.

K: You go on talking, tell me - don't ask me. What do you think is violence? And will you undertake the responsibility to see that you, as a human being on this earth, will not be violent? What does it mean? And also what does it mean to be non-violent? Right? You understand? That's what they are talking about: Tolstoy and Gandhi, and India has been preaching non-violence.

A: But that seems to be non-violence in one particular sphere.

K: Go into it. Don't say, 'that seems'. Go into it, find out if you are violent. And then enquire what is violence. You said, anger, so you will not be angry.

D: But Krishnaji, can you say that? I mean it seems even a violent statement because you are trying to contradict something that is there, you know.

K: Find out. I understand that old boy. But I am asking you, will you undertake not to be violent? Therefore enquire what is violence.

A: Sir I find myself reluctant to say that I will not be violent.

K: That is not the point. You just now said, careful, careful, that you living on this earth as a human being, see all this, terrible violence, since human beings lived on this earth, and it is getting worse and worse and worse, more dangerous - right? I asked you what is your reaction, what is your responsibility to that. He said, "I would withdraw". You see, you can't withdraw - right? When you take an aeroplane, or buy a stamp, or anything, food, you are helping the whole system of violence to continue - right? Clear? If that is clear then what is your part in this? Then you must ask: what is violence? Right? Before you say I can, I cannot - right? Now what do you consider violence?

C: Often we are violent when we have a quick reaction that we don't control. We react immediately and we don't see it.

K: Begin simply. Begin at the physical level. The reaction is also part physical - right? Begin. There is a physical violence, isn't there? Hitting somebody, throwing a bomb at somebody, throwing another under the train, or throwing a bomb at forty thousand feet over a town - right? Those are all physical actions - right? Do you want to contribute to that, or you say no, I don't want to do that. I don't want to kill another human being for whatever reason. At present I don't want to kill. I have thought a great deal about it, and I have gone into it, physically I won't kill. I don't know what I will do later, I mean next year, but so far I am very clear. Would you say that?

B: I think we can say that.

K: No, not can, will you do it?

B: Yes, sir, but when it comes to something about anger, it seems it is quite a different matter.

K: Face the different matter. It is no good talking about not being violent - right? Talking about, theorizing, discussing, like they are doing now. Will you as a human being physically not hurt another?

C: Are you saying that each moment we should watch it?

K: I am asking you this. Don't translate it into something else.

A: Yes, sir, I can say that for now.

K: You will not hurt another, physically.

D: Even if you are attacked?

K: Wait, wait. That is a supposition.

D: Yes, I know.

K: If I have been all my life non-violent, I don't know what I will do. If I am attacked I don't know what I am going to do. But my brain has been thinking about this, living it and perhaps it will act like that way, or it may not - right? So leave the future alone. That's a trick to escape from this fact - right?

So physical violence. Are you psychologically violent?

A: When I compete with fifty other students in an examination...

K: Don't begin, be careful. Step by step. Don't jump to something.

A: I am not jumping sir, I am saying when I took an examination in Rishi Valley, I was competing with thousands of other students.

K: So do you say psychological competition is part of violence?

A: Yes, sir.

B: Yes.

D: Yes.

K: She is uncertain. Competition, not examination, but any form of competition. So will you not compete? I am better than him.

C: Does that mean not taking exams?

K: Just a minute, we will come to it. First get the principle of it, the feeling of it. Not to compete - right? Because that is part of violence - right? Would you agree to that? You have said that. So will you eliminate, or look at it and see the nature of competition, the wholeness of it, the entirety of competition?

A: All right, let's begin.

D: Let's look at it now.

K: Begin. Go on. Go on. Competition, from childhood, your

mother says you are better than your brother, more beautiful, you have got much better outlook and so on. So will you stop comparing? Comparing is a form of competition, not between two materials, between this cloth and that cloth, between this woolen trouser and your corduroy trousers and so on. Deeper. It is a much deeper problem. Can you live your life without any comparison? Except you compare with two cars, etc. Right?

A: What does it mean to live without comparison?

K: Find out. Don't ask me. That's theoretical.

A: I am just asking the question.

K: Begin.

A: But it seems that's where I get stuck.

K: Don't get stuck. Move.

A: I keep thinking what if I gave up comparison, what if I stopped competing, what if - all that.

K: That means, if I do this I will get that.

D: I just get stuck with the question before: how do I get rid of competition, how do I not compare?

K: Careful, careful! The moment you say if I do this, will I get that? Then you are functioning between reward and punishment.

D: That is the way we have functioned for many years.

K: Therefore pursue it further. Therefore would you say: understand the depth of comparison, you know, the full movement of comparison, and say, sorry I understand it, therefore I won't do it - right? You know very well fire burns therefore you won't touch fire.

A: But we don't see it in the same light.

K: That's the whole point.

D: I don't understand it, I don't understand the whole problem of it.

K: So look at it carefully, don't come to any conclusion. Go on! You have never thought about this, that's the difficulty, or looked at it. Right, let's begin.

We agreed all of you, I think, that comparison is a form of violence. But you have to compare - right? Between two pieces of cloth, between two poems, between two carpets - right? And so on. Better washing machine than the old one. You have to compare. But psychologically will you go on?

A: What does it mean to psychologically compare?

K: It means I am better than you.

A: When I make a judgement about somebody.

K: No, no. I am not talking about judgement. You see how you function?

A: No, I am asking sir.

K: I know. I am asking you a question and then you counter that by another question.

A: No, I am not asking you to answer this question.

K: Don't ask before you have answered my question. Right? I am not being rude. So will you enquire, look, into the whole nature of comparison by beginning psychologically why do you compare? Why do you compare yourself with her, or with him, or with the whole school, or with your brother, why?

C: We have been taught to compare.

K: So you are being educated to compare?

C: Yes.

K: So your reactions, go on, further into it, are mechanical.

Right? Like a computer that has been programmed - right? You know how. A little of it, like me, a little of it. You repeat.

C: Well the comparison comes just by itself.

K: Of course. You repeat. Right? Do you see how your brain becomes mechanical, has become mechanical?

A: Repeating patterns.

K: Stick to one thing at a time. You told me that - you told K rather that comparison is a form of violence. You all agreed. Don't go back on it. And I said it is necessary to compare between that lamp and that lamp - right? That camera and another cheaper camera.

A: Yes it is.

K: That is necessary. But psychologically, inwardly, why do you compare? And he says, and she said, "Oh, it is a reaction, a natural reaction". I said, is it natural, or is it cultivated? Natural being as a baby I grow up, that is natural.

C: It is more something we have been taught to do. Comparison.

K: Between baby and you?

C: No, no, no.

K: You are not listening.

C: To compare, we have been taught at school and everything.

K: Yes, you are educated to compare. We have said that. Which means your brain has been conditioned, educated, trained to compare - right? From that we said a computer, which is programmed will repeat. It may invent its own repeat, you follow, further but it is repetition. Now you are also trained to compare, I am better than you, I am taller than you, I am more clever, I'll get a better job - right? And so on. And much more subtle than that, we

are trained, educated, programmed to repeat. Now will you stop that? Will you see the reality of it? That is, how your brain has become mechanical, routine, it is repeating, saying the same thing over and over again: "I can't do it, I must do it, it is too difficult for me, I don't understand, tell me all about it".

D: That is all that my brain seems to do, Krishnaji.

K: Wait, wait. I know.

A: But that is exactly what is happening, sir.

K: I know that. That is why I am repeating it, I am telling you.

B: But can we...

K: Wait sir. Look at it, see how your brain is working.

B: Yes sir. Can I say something?

K: You can say anything you like!

B: Well we said that we were educated to compare. We agree that we are educated to compare.

K: Conditioned.

B: Yes but can we educate ourselves not to compare?

K: Find out, don't ask me.

B: Well you seem to know sir.

K: I may know, I may not know. But find out, question, doubt, ask yourself. Now I have been brought up to compare, suppose I have been brought up, I haven't been, but suppose I have been, compare myself with somebody else much nobler, much more - you follow, all that nonsense. Now why do I compare? Why? You say that is progress - right? That is evolution.

D: Also Krishnaji, you are asking why, there doesn't seem to be a reason. It is just being done constantly.

K: I know, I said that. I have been told from childhood, from

babyhood, I am a Catholic, baptized, you know all the rest of it.

And I say, "I am a Catholic".

D: Yes.

K: My parents are, I am also. Go on.

D: That is all that my brain knows.

K: Of course, of course. Of course it works that way. So I said you are mechanically functioning - right? So go on.

A: Sir, I think I also want to compare because when I think I am nicer than somebody else I get a certain pleasure out of it.

K: That's it. So you want a reward from it, which is pleasure - right? See the consequences of it, that is, if I don't get it I get punished, I feel hurt, I feel angry, I get depressed - right? I feel, Oh, gosh I am so small - you know. All the depression, all the anger, jealousy - right? All that goes on. All my life. Right? Do you want to live that way? I am just asking for you to find out. Not say, I don't want to live that way - right?

So you have said comparison is one of the factors of violence - right? Will you go into it in yourself and say it is my responsibility not to compare? Or see the whole movement of comparison and therefore end it? Not end it, it will end it self. You understand? Like a water spouting out of a pipe when there is no volume of water behind it, it stops. You understand?

B: Does that mean, sir, you don't compare?

K: Don't ask me what I do, that's not the point. I can tell you, yes I never have compared myself with anybody, not that I am vain and feel very holy, it doesn't occur to me. Don't accept it because I say it, I may be deceiving myself. I have gone into this very carefully. I say I have never done it. It doesn't mean a thing. It

doesn't make me into a hero!

A: Sir, when I say that I see that comparison leads to violence, I doubt to what extent I see it.

K: That's right. Then find out what does it mean to see.

A: Yes.

K: I am asking you a question.

A: Because there seems to be some kind of an intellectual seeing, a bunch of words and we see it. But we get stuck in that and it doesn't seem to carry on further, beyond that.

K: Why not? Is it your brain refuses to look in that direction? Is it laziness? Is it a form of saying, well it doesn't matter, everybody compares - you follow?

A: Sir, I don't think I want to give up all that has happened in these past eighteen years.

K: All right, keep it.

A: That is what is preventing me.

K: All right, keep it and be violent. You want both.

A: That is the contradiction.

K: I know, I know. You want to have the cake and eat it! You understand sir?

C: Yes.

B: Well can you find out what does it mean to see?

K: Go on. See, observe - right? What does it mean? I see actually what is going on in the world - right? Actually see, newspapers, television, magazines, books - right? Lectures, for and against. I see what KGB are doing, I see what the Palestinians are doing under different names, different guises, different motives. She hides against somebody else. I see it very clearly, all that, don't

you? Right? Why? Why do you say I see that very clearly?

A: I am not sure that I see it very clearly.

B: It is outside of us, sir.

K: Don't you look at television?

A: I do.

K: Haven't you heard or seen in the newspapers the latest hijacking, TWA, what they are doing? You don't see that? See it in newspapers, they talk about it.

A: Sir, he asked a question earlier. I would just like to go back to it. What does it mean to see?

K: I am asking you.

A: But you were using the word all this time and I was getting confused.

K: You mean to say you don't see what is happening? You don't know what is happening?

A: I do.

K: Therefore you understand. You understand there is a tree there, there are these lamps here. These lamps, those trees, the carpet, the chairs, are as factual as the TWA hi-jacking - right? You see that? You hear it.

A: Yes.

K: That is one form hearing, seeing. You can't doubt it.

A: No.

D: No.

K: You can't doubt if he is sitting there.

A: No, not at all.

K: So do you see it, do you hear it, do you know it as a fact - right? As a fact. Right? Are you clear?

A: Yes sir.

K: Right. Do you know as a fact that comparison is a factor of violence? As a fact, not as an idea. You understand sir?

C: Yes.

K: As a fact those lamps are there, these chairs are there, the carpet, the shape of the room, those are facts. You can't immediately change the roof, you may tomorrow. So do you see equally clearly, objectively, that - what were we talking about?

B: Comparison is part of violence.

K: Yes.

D: Krishnaji, can I say how I see it? I see that comparison...

K: I will tell you why, you are asking me to repeat, repeat, I object to that. My brain says why haven't you moved? You understand? You ask the same question over and over again.

A: Well that is because I am getting stuck.

K: No.

A: Yes, sir.

K: Why do you say, you see, or hear, or observe, or read that there is a hijacking going on, starving people, the dirt, the squalor, the annoying thing, the dignity of it, they may be killed, the aeroplane may be - you follow? That is very factual. Do you see it as a fact in yourself that comparison is part of violence? I am not going to repeat it again. I personally can't keep on repeating, repeating.

D: I can see that the comparison that other people do is violent but it is very difficult to see that I am being violent.

C: But if you compare yourself with someone and you may think that he is better than you and then you will feel angry, or

ready to do something to him so that he is not as well as you are, or something like that.

K: Just a minute. What is your difficulty? I am asking - we are asking a very, very simple question, what is your difficulty?

D: I think my difficulty is that...

K: Stop, stop, I am not going to listen to you. Stop first. Listen to the question and see the meaning of the question and then find out, and then answer. But you jump to answer immediately.

A: Sir you asked what is the difficulty.

K: Yes, what is the difficulty? You see the clock there very clearly, that is a fact, thirteen minutes to one. Right? Why don't you see as clearly, as definitely, as accurately, that comparison is part of violence?

A: My difficulty is that I tend to say what if. I say if I stop comparing I should be non-violent. But that is what is happening.

K: Why? Because you want a reward.

A: Yes.

K: So you are then not observing the accuracy. I want it to be at ten minutes past one so that I can have my lunch. Then I am not observing, I am not listening.

A: That is why when I say, I see, I doubt it.

K: How can you doubt?

A: No, no, not the clock.

K: Why do you differentiate between the two?

D: Well Krishnaji you made a difference between them.

K: You see you don't even listen, take the trouble.

D: I was going to say that, for instance, you said you can compare between a material and another material, but not

psychologically.

K: I don't say anything. I didn't say don't compare.

D: No but...

K: Don't put me in a position and then attack that position. I am asking you, why don't you see as clearly as you see that clock that comparison runs on? Why don't you see it? You are young, your brain is somewhat young, you have already come to the point, "I don't know, I can't do it, you tell me". That's is an old man's game! People all over the world are saying they want leaders - right? You also want that. And I say please don't put me in that position.

A: No, sir I am not asking you for an answer.

K: You are.

A: No, no.

K: You are stuck.

A: I am stuck.

K: All right, be stuck. I doubt if you are stuck.

A: You doubt it? Why do you doubt it?

K: Because you keep on repeating it.

A: That is being stuck.

K: Therefore I don't know. It may be mere gramophone recording.

D: Well I think that is what she calls being stuck, you know. It is repeating it.

K: You are not stuck when you are hungry are you, you rush there? Go on, find out why you see something very, very clearly, the moment you move, or move away from that physical fact you get driven to feel, "oh, I don't know, I am stuck, I am afraid" - you follow - you play that game. So find out what you are doing. Why

you are doing it.

A: Often I don't know if I can trust what I feel.

K: It doesn't matter. Don't trust. Why should you trust?

A: No, that is why there is this feeling of I don't know, the uncertainty.

K: Because you are uncertain of yourself.

A: Yes.

K: Therefore find out why you are uncertain. Yes, you agree, but you stop there.

D: Then why don't we want to see things?

K: Whom of you are asking that question?

D: Myself.

K: Ask it and find out the answer. You see what you have been doing for eighteen or twenty years. Asking somebody to tell you what to do. Right? And the other extreme is, I don't want you tell me, I'll do what I like. Right? Agree? With the hippies it began, and it is going on in different ways. I will do what I want to do, who are you to tell me? The hierarchy I disapprove of - you follow all that?

So, I am asking the same question, you haven't answered it.

A: Sir I find it difficult to answer it.

K: No, you haven't even heard the question. That's what I am doubting. You see that clock, now six minutes to one. I have repeated the same thing for twenty minutes, or less or more. So your brain is refusing to move from a position. You don't say, all right, I am going to find out why I see that very clearly and I can't see this fact. Fact, that comparison is one of the factors of violence. That is a fact. Why don't you see that, hear it, taste it? Feel that -

why don't you? Oh, you say, "I'm stuck". You don't say that with your examination - right? When you are being examined for an hour you don't say, "Sorry, I am stuck".

B: Sir I think one of the reasons is that we are frightened of what is going to happen when we have moved.

K: Find out if you are frightened. What might happen is not a fact. So you want a reward, you want to be told, you want to be patted on the back, encouraged, push, push, push. And I say, I am sorry I am not pushing.

A: What I don't see is what I am heading towards, then I feel frightened, that's why.

K: Sorry I am not listening to you. You have repeated this ten different ways.

B: That is what I said too.

K: Reward, I am frightened, I have been brought up that way, I know I am being programmed, yes, and you repeat that in different ways. So I say please go on I am rather bored with this. I am not. You know. So you tell me why you see something physically very, very, very clearly, and psychologically you say "I don't know what you are talking about".

A: Something is blocking me from seeing it.

K: Eh!

A: Yes sir.

B: With me it is the same, we know what blocks her.

K: Wait. Answer her.

C: Is it because you are expecting an answer?

K: She says I am blocked.

D: Once again we find excuses.

K: Who is blocking her?

D: Herself.

A: Myself.

K: Find out who is yourself.

A: I don't know.

K: Don't say you don't know. Repeat, repeat. You are all so very lazy. You know if I want to see what is on the other side of that hill, I walk up there and look. But you sit comfortably and say, tell me all about it.

A: No, sir, I don't think I am saying that.

K: More or less you are saying that. I am blocked from climbing the mountain, I am sorry I am frightened of climbing the mountain, something is blocking me from climbing the mountain.

A: But that is how it is.

K: Of course it is. And you say how it is.

A: I am not saying that I should remain with that.

K: Therefore move.

A: But then I get stuck with the question, how do I move?

K: Get up off the chair and go.

A: But I don't see it as simple as that.

K: It is as simple as that if you look at that clock and why you can't see it equally clearly. It's very simple but you are refusing to see it. If you want me to go deeper into it I will. But careful, I am not programming you! Right? I am not telling you what to do, what to think, how to get up from the chair and walk up the hill. I won't enter into that game. Right? But if you want me to go into it, for you to observe your own brain, expand it, break it down, look, change and do something, don't say I don't know.

Now I will tell you: can you look at that tree without the word? Look at that tree and find out if you can look at it. Just observe it. Not say that's a tree and give it a name, etc. etc. Right? Can you do it?

A: No.

K: Why?

A: Because as soon as I look at that book, the word book comes.

K: Back again. I am asking you something: look at that tree, look at that thing that is outside the window and don't call it a tree, but look at it. Or look at that thing on the shelf and don't call it a book but just look. Do you find that terribly difficult? Eh? No. You don't. Right? But she does.

A: Yes, I do.

K: I know you do.

D: Well Krishnaji to tell us to look at it you are naming it.

K: Naming, you have said something. Naming is not observing. I don't bother to look, she is my wife. Oh I have lived with her, had sex, and blah and she is just my wife. But I have never looked at her as a human being - right? Look at her, what she thinks, what she feels, what she - you follow? Just look. Right? But you don't. And don't say I am stuck! It is a very simple thing to look at that tree without the word. Find out why the word comes out so quickly, and says, tree. That's a tiger. A snake.

C: Because we have a general idea.

K: No, don't answer it yet. Find out. You have already answered it. Why do you name these things so quickly. Right? "My father, my mother was like that", and already you have got images - right? That is all I am preventing - not preventing - that is what is

happening. You are not free - I won't go into it - you are not free of image making. That's a book.

A: I want to identify things.

K: No, no. You see you have already gone ahead. You don't begin simply. I know you have a clever brain.

A: No, sir, that doesn't seem to be simple.

K: No, no, listen to me carefully. The Indians are pretty good at this kind of game.

B: Can we let Krishnaji go on for a while?

K: You haven't even learnt a very simple fact. Look at that thing without naming it. You don't even begin with that, you have already become complicated. You don't say, now let me look, take time. Can you look at anything silently? Your father, your mother, your friend, your husband, anything, the terrorists, look silently to find out. You understand? That may change the whole thing. But you are not even willing to do it. Then you will ask me, how am I to be silent. I am blocked.

So go into all this patiently, not take years, I don't mean that. Because you are young, you have a long life ahead of you - right? If you don't begin to learn now when you are young, you will say, I am stuck, at the age of fifty - right? Oh, I can't solve this problem. And I go to a psychiatrist, or to the priest, or get depressed, or hit my husband, get annoyed with him - right? This is going on. So begin from now, as you are young, to look at something without naming it. Then you will begin to learn why you name. Sirs, this is very important to learn this simple fact, very simple fact. Look at your prime ministers, your politicians, and look at them, the rulers of the world, right? You will learn, you will feel, you will

understand something so enormously important. Naming may be a factor of self-importance, a factor of security - you understand? Go into it all. Don't be lazy, that's all. Don't ever, ever say, I'm stuck, because nobody is going to help you. I know you want to be helped but nobody is going to do it. They will be fools. The gurus say, come with me, sit with me, you will be all right, you feel happy. Don't enter into all that. Enquire. Put your energy into it.

I am afraid this has to be the last. You are going away, or coming back? You will be next term here, you are sure?

A: Yes.

K: I am just asking.

B: Yes.

C: I am coming back.

K: So we may meet again - right? And don't begin to tell me you are stuck. You have two and a half months, or three months.

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 24TH AUGUST 1985

I am sorry it is such bad weather! What do you expect of the speaker? One would, if you don't mind, take counsel together, take consideration together, weigh things together, observe what is going on in the world together, think together, and deeply be involved with what we are talking about with each other. It is not the speaker alone - you are all speakers and learners like the speaker. So we are together deliberating. To elect a pope it took three days. They deliberated before, balancing, weighing, considering and so on: at the end of three days they chose a man who is called his holiness, the father. And together we have nearly ten days.

Deliberation implies not only to consider, to weigh, to think out together, and also go into the problems very deeply, slowly, carefully, knowing one's own prejudices, one's own crankiness about food, clothes and so on, so that you are not only listening to the speaker but also listening to your own reactions and prejudices, determinations and vows and all the idiocies that one has - if you will forgive me. So that together seriously, not separately, not divisively, not you taking one side and the speaker on the other but together observe what is going on in the world. Not only in the world of this particular country but also all over the world, politics, economics, the scientists, the socialists, the liberals and so on, conservatives - I forgot to add them - and all the rest of it. So this is not a weekend camping affair but rather very serious - not church seriousness, churchy seriousness, but rather seriousness that

continues not only during these days that we are here together but also afterwards when you go away from here, when we all separate.

And in deliberation there is also a decision, a view to decide and then act. All that is implied in that one nice word. So together, seriously, not merely intellectually, not romantically, sentimentally or fantastically but together look at what is happening to all of us.

One wonders why you are all here and I am here. You have taken a lot of trouble, to set up a camp, bring all your children and dogs - have you got dogs too? And all the young children and boys and girls, you have taken a lot of trouble to come here, expense, the boredom of travel, transport, all the things involved in this. And we also must bear in mind when we are deliberating together there is no outside help. It is a deliberation. The speaker is not trying to help, or trying to impress, convince, cajole, pressure and all that. We can leave that to the politicians, to the newspapers, to television, and the churches all over the world, whether they be temples, mosques, or the churches in the Christian world. So we are together, without any pressure, any persuasion on the part of the speaker, or on your side not taking one particular point of view, and holding on to that. We are both together examining, investigating the extraordinary problems that we are faced with, dangerous, and one does not know what is going to happen in the future, there is immense uncertainty, chaos and the world is becoming more and more sinister - if you have travelled, if you have read, if you have met some of the politicians, the prime ministers and so on.

So we are going first to look at the world, not my world, or your

world - the world that is happening in front of us, the things that are going on in the scientific world, in the world of armaments, the race that is going on, the politicians holding on to their particular ideologies, fighting for that. You know, all the rest of it. How do you, if one may ask, approach these problems? Not only one's own particular problem but the problems that challenge, that require a determined action, how do you approach these problems? The scientific world, the biological world, the world of economics, the world of social inequality, social immorality? We know all this, how do we approach it? As a British? As a Frenchman? As a Hindu? Or a Muslim and so on? If we approach it with a particular point of view, or with some trained - biologically conditioned, then our motive is known or unknown and therefore your approach will be limited. This is obvious - right? If I, if the speaker is holding on to his India and all that rubbish, then he will look at all the world with all its complicated problems from a particular, narrow view. And so his approach will be conditioned, his approach will be partial, self interest and so on. So his approach will always be, to all these problems, very small, very limited. That is clear.

So one is asking, we are asking together, how will you approach these problems? - not a particular problem, whether it be yours, or your wife's, husband's and so on, but the problems, a problem. How do you approach a problem? Which is, how do you approach a challenge? Something you have to face, answer and act.

What is a problem? According to the dictionary meaning it is something thrown at you - right? Something that you have to face and answer. Not that time, circumstances, pragmatically respond, casually, or with a certain sense of smugness, or with certain

obvious conclusions. How do you come to it? We are deliberating together, there is not the speaker sitting on the platform, which he doesn't like anyhow. It is not a personal thing at all. He has got a name and all the rest of that business. Personality doesn't enter into this at all, you can brush that completely aside. So in what way do we come to face the problem? So we will have to ask what is a problem.

Why have we so many problems? All our life from the beginning to the end, from being born to dying, we are crowded with problems, we are worn out by problems - worry, anxiety, uncertainty, and the perpetual conflict, struggle, pain, anxiety, all the rest of it. So shouldn't we together find out how to deal with problems? That is the first question.

We know each one of us has a problem of some kind or another - health, old age, or some disease, incurable, terminable, or some psychotic problems, or some fantastic illusory cranky problems, which we call religious problems! [Laughter] - and so on. So please let's together find out why from the beginning of our existence, when we are born until we die, there is this constant resolution of problems. Right? Can we go into it together? Not the speaker explains and you accept or reject, but we are debating together, deliberating together, weighing together, together. As we said, what is a problem? A problem is something thrown, it is a challenge, to which you have to come to it, apply your brains, one's activity, not just nervously respond to it, your whole brain is involved in this. Right?

From childhood we have a problem, how to read, when you leave home you feel nostalgic, homesick, and you when you are in

a school you have to learn to write, read all the terrible books. And that becomes a problem - right? Right from childhood, when you go to school, college, university and so on. If you are a labourer that becomes a problem. You know the whole of life is a problem. So our brains are conditioned from childhood to the resolution of problems - right? We are in agreement? Are we together in this? Not I am explaining, you are accepting. We are together on the same boat. You may row faster, you may have more strength, more skill, others may be weak, but we are in the same boat. So is that clear? Our brains from childhood are conditioned to problems, we live with problems. That is obviously very clear - right? Sexual problem, the problem of relationship, the problem of power, status, position, authority and dominating, obeying and disobeying, you know, the whole movement of life. So can we listen - or hear - to our own conditioning, conditioning, trained, educated to live with problems? And in the resolution of one problem you create other problems, which the politicians are doing so remarkably well. And we are doing the same. So is it possible - we are deliberating together, please don't listen to the speaker alone - is it possible to be free of problems first, the brain, and then tackle problems - you understand? Yes, is it possible? I don't know and you don't know.

So we are enquiring into that first. We have many issues in life, very, very complicated. The whole personality, the whole activity of the brain, the feelings, the sentiments, the urges, the attachments, we have got so many of them. And we never seem to resolve any of them, but gradually wither away, die. So it becomes very important, doesn't it to you and to all of us, whether the brain, which has been trained to live and take share part, active with

problems, can that brain, please think this out together, not me alone, can this brain have no problems at all and therefore tackle problems? You understand? It is only the free brain that can understand problems, resolve problems. Not a brain that is crowded with problems. The scientists are crowded with them. They are first human beings and then scientists. The human beings have problems and the scientists with their theories and all the rest of it have their problems - right? So it is a constant movement or a continuous chain of problems. Right? Now, how can we resolve this? Can you, we together, resolve this question, which is very serious because we are facing a very, very dangerous world. They are playing, the politicians on one side, the ideologists on one side, and the other side with their immense sense of power and so on, both sides, are waiting - right? Right? Mounting armaments, race. And we are caught in the middle of it. All right Sirs?

There is immense poverty, of which this country, or you don't know. Immense poverty, degradation, corruption, and so on. We will talk about gods later and all the religious organized structure called religion with their ceremonials, mediaeval dresses and so on.

So we are asking each other whether our brains can be free to resolve problems. Bien? You have to answer that, don't keep still. What will you do? Whatever you do will be another problem - right? You say I will do this, I won't do that, I will believe this, I won't believe that, this is true, this is false, I pursue what I want. All that creates more problems - right? So it behoves us first to find out whether our brains can be free of problems, to understand and resolve problems. Right? Don't look at me. Perhaps one has not thought, or gone into this question. One would ask, "Give me time

to think over it. Let me carefully observe, look and then decide." If you allow time, that is, I will think about it, I will weigh pros and cons, where it is necessary to have problems, where it is not necessary to have problems, and so on. If you take time over it - right? - what happens? You answer. What happens if I take time over some problem which has to be resolved immediately, instantly? If it is not possible to resolve it instantly there will be other problems creeping up - right? Right? So will you instantly solve the problem? Solve the question, the challenge, that your brain which has been trained for so many years to live and move among the problems, so that your brain is never free. Isn't that the first problem? Because we have got to face several complicated issues as we go along. Why we human beings all over the earth, which is extraordinarily beautiful, why we have lived two and half million years on this earth, or more, or less, psychologically, subjectively, we have changed very little, we are still barbarians in the real sense of that word. Why haven't we moved away from the set pattern after all these million years? That is a problem. Why the world is divided into nationalities, into religious activities, why the world has been fighting each other, killing each other, the appalling things that wars have done from the club too, the atom bomb, why we are going on still like that. Why we elect these politicians. Why we are so frightened of the future. We have got many, many problems - right?

So it is important to understand it appears, if you will permit it, that each one of us talking to each other, weighing, considering, what shall we do? What will you do? Of course if you are stuck on diet, or yoga, or some kind of fanciful imaginative cranky thing,

then you are lost obviously. You are hooked on something. But you will never solve any of the problems. So what shall we do together, knowing that there is no help outside - right? Knowing you can attend all the camps in the world, all the gurus in the world - the speaker is not a guru - or come here, nobody can help, except physically, otherwise nobody can help us - your husband, your wife, your girl friend and so on, or the police, or the future scientists - you follow? Here we are. So can we put aside altogether the idea of wanting to be helped, wanting to be told, wanting to follow somebody, believe in something. All that becomes irrelevant when you have got to deal with something actual. The actual is what we are, the multiple problems, the tears, the laughters, the agony, the anxiety, jealousy, hate, the psychological hurts, wounds.

So what shall we do together, not separately? Right? We can't live separately. Even the monks organized with their abbeys, monasteries in the Western world, they depend on each other. In the Asiatic world, especially in India, the monk is by himself wandering all over the earth, all over India. And they have their problems. I don't know if you have ever followed a group of monks. Once the speaker was following a group of monks in India, in the Himalayas, and they were chanting, reading their books, never looking at the beautiful stream that went by, heard the song of that stream, the flowers, the extraordinary skyline with snow, mountains twenty five thousand feet, never looked at all the beauty of the earth. They were just concerned with themselves and their little gods! So please answer this question about yourself: whether your brain can be free so that you can understand, dissolve

problems. If one sees that it is not - that it is actually conditioned - right? Which one sees it, not be told about it, not read something in a book, or convinced by another, but if one sees directly for oneself that our brain is so conditioned - right? Can we do that? Don't... Sir, we are going to ask questions on Tuesday - or is it Tuesday, yes Tuesday. Because if you all ask questions now - you don't mind Sir?

Can we do it? Can we talk over together, deliberate together, weigh, consider, is our brain, are we aware of it, our brain living with problems? Not as an observer looking through a microscope, either the right way or the wrong way, but to be aware of it, that our brains are so terribly conditioned to live with problems. The speaker hasn't to repeat it over and over again.

Suppose I am not aware of it, I never even thought about it, I never heard such a thing before is possible or not possible. But you have raised a question - right? And my brain being fairly active, not too dull, not hooked to something, my brain then begins to say, can the brain observe its own activity - you follow? You understand what I am saying? Can the brain be aware of its own limitation, conditioning? As you observe yourself in a mirror when you shave, or do up your face - sorry! - can you so observe your brain? Not as an observer looking at something - right? If you observe as an outsider, the outsider is also the observed - right? There is no difference, the outsider, and the insider. Clear? You don't say when you shave your chin that you are looking at your face from the outside, you are there in the mirror. You might have difficult hairs to cut but you are there, your image is you - right? You don't say, "Well I look different there from me", you are what

you are. So can the brain become aware of itself, its thoughts, its reactions, its way of living? Because that is the centre of all our activity - right? Do we realize that? It is the centre of all our nervous responses, all our reactions, all our conditionings, our feelings, our pleasures, pains, fears, anxieties, loneliness, despair and the search for love, all the rest of it, it is there. Right? If - when there is no understanding of that what can I do? Anything I do will be meaningless - right? I wonder if you capture all this? Never mind.

So are we aware of the activity of the brain? Why you think such a thing, what your reactions are, why you are so cranky, psychopathic, why you cling to something, why is there this loneliness, the sorrow, the pain, the grief and the anxiety, the uncertainty? Right? We are deliberating together, please. What shall I do if I am not? [Tape turns over] I know I am not. I am not aware of myself, myself being the brain, the thing that is restless, the thing that is always living in shadow valleys, and deep valleys, that is always seeking self interest, whether it is in the name of god, in the name of love, in the name of social reform or seeking power, position, there is always the background of this element. Are we aware of all this? If I am not, what shall I do? Help me! Sorry - I forgot that word! I am not asking your help but let's talk it over.

We have sought help from everybody, from books, from priests, from psychologists, from politicians, from every angle, every corner, we have sought help. And that help has been useless because we are what we are now, we may have changed a little bit here and there but actually we are what we are. In spite of all the

help, in spite of all the leaders, the gurus, the ancient prophecies, the ancient books - oh, for God's sake - right? So could we put out altogether from us the idea of seeking help? It doesn't mean you shouldn't be here and I shouldn't be here. You know when you see a beautiful thing, you look at it, take delight in the glory of a something beautiful, but you never say, "Well I will never come back here again." On the contrary. You come back to look at it often. Not that you are going to be helped by looking at the mountain - the beauty of it, the simplicity of an extraordinary sight.

If my brain is not aware of itself, which is an extraordinary problem, where you are aware of your own thoughts. That is, is thought aware of itself thinking? You understand? This is not intellectual. Do you understand my question? I wonder! Can your thought be aware of itself? Right? If it is not then what will you do, or not do, to become completely aware of every movement of thought? Pray? Ask? You can't do any of those things. So can one remain quiet and watch? We mean by watch, to observe without a single movement of the word, the picture, the symbol, which is in essence thought. Can you observe first? Observe without a single activity of the past? Go on Sirs, come with me. Can you observe? Can I observe my pain, physical pain? You understand my question? Can you observe your physical pain, be aware of it? Not say, well I must rush to the doctor, take a pill, take this, just be aware of it. Psychologically be aware of it without any movement. Can you? And in the same way observe the activity of the brain, not with lots of words and denials or assertions, just to observe. Have you ever observed your wife or your husband, or your girl friend, really observed, not with the images you have built about

her, or him, then that's - those images are not observation, they are merely projection of the activities which you have gradually built up which becomes the image between you and her and him and so on. So one is not actually observing.

What is the relationship - can I go on? - between observation and love? Is love merely pleasure, merely a desire, a constructed thought? Is there division in that love, as I love you and nobody else? Or I love you but I am jealous of you - right? So is that love? We will go into that when we talk about all these things. But we are now asking when there is perception, and that perception can only take place when there is no motive - right? If I have a motive in that perception, in that observation, then that motive controls, shapes, moulds, the perception. So is there an observation without any motive? Motive generally is deeply hidden self interest.

So we come to another very complicated problem - issue rather, or any other word you like to use - how far, how deep, is the self interest? To what lengths can it be abandoned? Where do I put a stop to it? You understand? Or is it possible to live in this modern world without any self interest - you understand - the whole spectrum of it? How deeply can the brain be free, absolutely free of self interest? Or in what ratio to the activities of life, daily life? Or merely superficially be without self interest? You understand? The whole depth and the shallowness of self interest. It is a very complex problem this. And if self interest, which is the beginning of all corruption - right? Do we see that? It is the beginning of all corruption. It is the beginning of all divisive process, which is corruption. It is the beginning, or the origin of conflict - right? So how far, how deep, or how shallow, can conflict come to an end?

Not making it a problem, then we are lost again. Can conflict ever end between human beings? Though they are very close to each other, or very far from each other, can conflict, struggle, the pain of it, can it ever end? Go on Sirs, please. What do we mean by conflict? Conflict essentially is a distortion. Conflict in any form brings a distorted point of view. Conflict is essentially disorder. Right? Are we together, deliberating this, weighing it, considering it, with a view to act? The word means that. So can conflict end? So the brain is then free and can fly. The brain has immense capacity, immense. And we are restricting it, narrowing it down with self interest and conflict. So can conflict end?

Why is there in us this divisive element? You and I, we and they, we are this and you are that, what is the origin of it? Is it this contrariness of desire? Is it the opposing elements of thought? Is it the ideal and the fact? The 'should not be' and 'what is' - you understand? So is it conflict begins when there is this dualistic process in all of us? Please we are going together on the same path in this, we are together on the same boat. Are we aware of this central fact that in all of us there is this dualistic forces at work, the good and the bad - right? This is an important question. Is the good related to the bad? The speaker is putting a lot of eggs in one basket this morning, a lot of things together, which is part of our life. We have only four talks and two questions and answers, we must cram everything we can into these talks, these deliberations. Are we aware of this central fact? We are always - our morality is balanced between the good and the bad. So one has to ask is the good related to the bad? Is the noble related to the ignoble, and so on? When one is rather cowardly and the desire to be courageous,

that courage is it really courage, or partly born out of cowardice? You understand my question? So we are asking together the bad, what is the bad? And what is the good? If the good is related to the bad then it is not good - right? We said - we are together in this? If - when, rather, not if, when that which is beautiful is related to that which is ugly, then the beauty is born out of ugliness - right? Then it is not beautiful. I don't know if you are following. So if the good is born out of that which is not, then that good is partial, it is not whole, so it is not good.

So morality is not the balance of these two. Right? I wonder if you see this? So can one be free of this duality, the dualistic process? This question, the good and the bad in conflict with each other, has been there for forty, fifty thousand years and more. You see those paintings in the ancient caves, both in France and in other parts of the world, the good is always fighting the bad, and the bad is fighting the good. You know all this. And the outcome of that fight, that struggle, is considered the highest morality. Right? The good can never be related to the bad. Love cannot be related to hate, to anger, to jealousy. If it is related then it is not love, it is part of pleasure, desire and so on.

So can we live on this earth, some of us for God's sake, can some of us, or all of us live without a single conflict? You can't answer this question, but let the seed of that question operate. You understand? If the seed is alive, not just the theory of it, then it has its own tremendous vitality, not your thinking about it, not saying, "Well I must understand what the devil he is talking about". But if the seed that the good is totally unrelated to the bad... let, if one may suggest, let that seed grow. You have planted a seed in the

earth, the peach tree, or whatever it is, you have planted it, an oak. You don't pull it up every day to see if it is growing, you leave it in the earth and let that question, if it has vitality, energy, then that very question begins to grow, act. You don't have to do anything, the thing itself is moving. Can we do that together? You help to plant a seed and I dig the earth. It is a work together. It is not you plant and I cultivate but together. So the question has tremendous significance in itself, not the answer, not the result, but the question: is it possible to live in this world with all the complications, without a single shadow of conflict? You have planted it in your brain, let it remain there, let it see what happens. So we are asking: have you planted that seed? That means have you, has each one of us listened to the question? Not only with the hearing of the ear but the actual fact of it. The fact that we have lived on this earth for two or three million years, or forty five thousand years, not certainly four thousand years, which the fundamentalists like to think. We have lived on this earth for so long. And we are still living in conflict. And as this is a very serious question, not only with the brutal conflict of war but conflict between ourselves. I must understand what does he mean. He doesn't mean a thing. He means we are together. And is the seed, to live without any conflict, planted deep, in the deep valley of the brain, so that there is soil there, much richer soil than the soil of the earth. And from there it can grow, the answer, the decision, the execution of it.

I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it? May I get up?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 25TH AUGUST 1985

Lord, there are so many people here, in this bad weather! May we continue where we left off yesterday? I am sorry you are standing out there, Sirs, in the cold. We must do something about this long marquee. A circus tent perhaps! [Laughter] I don't mean that as an insult. Sorry! [Laughter] I am glad we can laugh together.

As we were saying yesterday, this is not a one man's talk. It is not one dog barking, but rather we are deliberating together. That word has a great deal of significance: to weigh, to balance, to consider, take counsels together, in view to act, in view to bring about a decision and action. That word has depth and together this morning, and the following mornings, we are going to have a deliberation together. It is not one speaker, or one personality, but rather that we are altogether looking, observing, seeing things as they are, taking counsel together, thinking over deliberately, actually, not theoretically or having innumerable beliefs, but rather going into all these matters together. The matter is our life, our daily, it may be boring or exciting, emotional or sentimental, romantic, caught up in great deal of imagination, fantasy, or clinging to one or two beliefs. If one does any of these things then deliberation cannot be possible. Because we are going along the same road, the same boat, same path, same sense of together coming so that we can build together. If that is very clear we can go into many things which we have to do this morning, the two Tuesday and Thursday, Saturday and Sunday, there are a lot of things to talk over together.

There is no authority here in these talks, in these dialogues between us. The speaker has unfortunately to sit on a platform and that doesn't give him any authority. It is not a personality cult. It is not something that you will think over together and act later, but together now sitting in this marquee we are going together to explore and in that exploration acting.

We were talking about conflict yesterday. All the terrible things we are involved in, murder, terrorists, and all the wars that are going on between ideological structures and the ideological beliefs, both religious, political, but nobody seems to take into consideration the whole problem of the world. Each country, each spot, and special boundaries of their own country are in battle with other countries, economically, the threat of war and all the terrible things that are taking place in the world. And this morning we ought to consider all these matters.

First of all did we see the marvellous clouds this morning? The extraordinary light and the beauty of them. The sense of glory. The extraordinary blue sky. And we ought to consult together what is love and what is beauty? What is time and thought? And if we have time this morning we will talk about fear.

So we are going to go into the question of what is beauty, love, time and thought and fear. Fear of falling ill, fear of not being really well. We will go into that later. But first we ought to consider together what is the nature of beauty? We are going to talk it over together. Please don't wait for the speaker to explain. This is a question put before each one of us, as all the other questions which we are going to put together. What is beauty? And what is the relationship of that to thought and time and love? A

beautiful cloud, a lovely sunset, the early morning when there is only one star in the sky and those trees that are full of all that you can see in that tree, the sound, the whisper, the movement of the leaves and the enormous strength of a trunk. And you see the earth, not from the air, you are too high, but the earth, the enormous sense of power, great valleys, mountains, the blue sky and the outlines, or the lines of the great mountains with their snow caps. When you look at all that, and you look at your wife and your husband, those lovely children that are hopping about on this place, what does beauty mean to each one of us? Does beauty depend on our own particular point of view? To our own sensitivity? Or beauty is the pictures in the museums locked up? Or a poem, specially by Keats, Odes? And you see a sentence in a literary book, so-called popular book, and that one sentence is enough to open all the doors. So for each one of us, what does beauty mean? Is it the face, the body, the sense of tenderness towards another, the sense of generosity, the giving, the great pleasure in seeing some of those marvellous paintings? So are you waiting for the speaker to tell you what is beauty? Or is beauty - is there when the self is not? You understand? When I am not worried about my own problems, my own misery, depression and worry and all the travail of life which is centred in me, which is the me, and that me is not, even for a split second, when the brain is quiet without any sense of limitation, is there then beauty? Or only then is beauty? Are we talking over, having a deliberation together? Or are we agreeing with the speaker? "Yes, that sounds very good. That explanation is what I want. And according to that explanation and description catching a glimpse of something, I will have that memory of that."

Then one asks: is memory and the continuation of memory, the whole movement of memory, does that help in the apprehension of that which is beautiful? Or remembrance has nothing whatever to do with it? We are in accord? Sir don't... Is there beauty in our life? The sense of generosity, the sense of, not forgiveness, there is nothing to forgive, the sense of highly sensitivity? So we are saying belief, comparison, the worry and the problems have nothing to do with beauty. It is that sense of quality, absence of the self, the me, the persona, all my background which is the me, when that is not then there is the other. This may sound impossible, but is it? Are we talking about something extreme? Or it is the common lot of all of us? That we all go through great periods of suffering, agony, despair, depression, every kind of emotional upheaval and there are rare moments in our life when all that has slipped away from us, and we see something that is beyond all description. It does happen to all of us. And that becomes a memory. Then we pursue that memory. We want something more, continuous of that which we have a glimpse of. Then that memory becomes a block, then that memory destroys everything else. Relax, and just take it quietly.

If that is somewhat clear because we are deliberating, taking counsel together, then we ought to talk about a very complex problem of time. Time as hope, time as the whole events and the happenings of our life, as the past. Time as the movement of memory, time according to the longevity of one's life, time as living on this earth and dying. Time by the clock, the sharp second in a quartz watch, the sharpness of that second. Time as psychological becoming, "I am this but I will be that. I am

unhappy, one day I will be happy. I will understand one day. I don't know but I will know. There will be peace on earth some time later but not now." So time is a very important factor in our life. Time as memory, time as evolving to something else, surrounded in heaven by angels. May I tell a joke here?

Two people are in heaven with their wings and halo. One man says to the other, "Why do I feel so awful when I am dead?" Understood?

So: time is a factor in our life. It is an important part of our life. And we think in terms of time. Time as what we have been, what we will be, what is and what we will be - right? I have been that, I am this now, but I will be something else in the future. This movement is the movement of memory, knowledge, experience and so on - right? This constant movement between the past, the present and the future. This is very important in our life. Time creates lots and lots of problems. I am looking for - one is looking forward to something, to a holiday in Spain, or the lovely Sicily, and so on. This movement, has it a stop? We are talking, taking counsel together. Has this everlasting movement which seems to last from the beginning of one's life until one dies, has this movement ever a stop? Please we are putting this question for you. Let the question answer the answer, not what you will answer. Do you understand that? The question is very important. The question is: does time, this movement, this cycle in which all of us are caught endlessly, for two and a half million years and more, as we have lived on this earth, can this movement, can it ever end? Or is a human being eternally caught in it? Not scientific fiction, or some theory about time, or some fantastic otherness, but we are asking a

very simple and direct question to each other. The question is important because only then something totally new can take place.

So we are asking: can time ever stop? Time as old age, and in old age one becomes slightly gaga. Senility takes place. That is rather an interesting subject that. Who is senile? The young, only the young up to forty, thirty and the rest are all senile? Or the old people only are senile? What does senility mean to all of us? The more they ask this question of ourselves. What is senility? You go to a church, specially when the cardinals are performing, it is a marvellous sight, a beautiful sight, so carefully worked out, so precise, so dignified, marvellous robes and colour. If you have been to one of those cathedrals in Rome where the cardinal is performing there is this repetition. Is repetition the indication of senility? Does it only lie with the old? The same habit, the same way of thinking, the perpetual going to the office and work, and work, and work, in the mines, in the seas and the submarines and aeroplanes. And the same relationship between each other, the repetition, sexually, or getting accustomed to each other, so that there is no sense of feeling that you are entirely alone on this earth. Our brain is caught in repetition. Repetition has its own security, its own safety, protection, but when psychologically you keep on remembering, remembering and acting in the same old pattern and method, and practice, naturally that is a form of senility - no? Don't please agree. It is not a matter of agreement or disagreement. One wishes we could put those two words away from us - agreeing and disagreeing. But seeing what is actually taking place in us. And to observe the habits we have formed over long years, the conclusions that we have, politically, religiously and so on. The conclusions,

the end, this is what I have understood, I stick by it and so on. Is that not a form of senility? And is it only the senile movement takes place only with the old?

So we are talking about time. The past going through the present, modifying and continuing. The past is rooted, taken deep roots and gets through the present through challenges, circumstances, pressures and so on, but it is still the past. And the future is the past, modified. So the future is now. Are we together? Yes? Isn't it? If the past, which we are, two and a half million years or more, or less, there is the enormous space between that long past and the present. The present is what we have been and what we are. That is a fact. And that past gets moulded, shaped, pressurized, goes through every kind of travail, anxiety and so on, but that past continues in a different shape, in a different form, in a different variety of ways and that becomes the future. So the future is now. Right? Are we together in this, or do we need further explanation?

So is there - is the whole movement, the past, the present and the future is contained in the now? Because that is what we are. And that is the whole movement of time - right? And we are asking will that movement ever stop? Otherwise we are bound to this everlasting time-binding quality of this movement, the past, the present and the future. And we escape from that question by talking about heaven, hell, the future, away from all this. So in the now, now as you are sitting in the now, all time is contained. The past, modifying itself in the present and the future. In this cycle, which is the now, can that movement stop for a minute, for a second?

Then one asks: what is timelessness, in which time doesn't exist

at all? The scientists can give different definitions to time: it is a series of movements from second to second to second, but that is just a theory, just an acceptance of something which is, or may be in our life. But that isn't good enough. If we set aside all theories, all beliefs, the fact is that in our lives, not the time of the sunrise and the sunset, and the new moon and the full moon. The heavens have their own order, their own sense of timelessness. But all that has nothing to do with our actual daily, boring, lonely, despairing life, and joyous occasionally. So is there an end to time?

And then we can ask, only then, what is timelessness? We can talk about it, we can discuss but those discussions, words, theories have no meaning at all. And what is the relationship of time to thought? The speaker is not asking all these questions. You are asking all these questions. What is the relationship, the actual relationship between thought and time, and the relationship of time, thought, to fear? And their relationship to love? This is what we are concerned with - right?

So what is thought, which is so important, which is so deeply in the deepest valleys of our brain? What is thought in our life? Thought, thinking. Please ask this question of yourself. All this has nothing to do with religions, with all that circus that goes on, with the gurus, with spiritual authorities - think of those two words together, spiritual authority! It seems such an abomination, an anathema, to put those two together.

So all our life and action is based on thought. And you say emotions are not thought. Is that so? We are so gullible, aren't we? We accept everything so easily. Somebody like the speaker says something and you say yes, or no, there is not our own thinking,

clear, objective, non-personal observation of everything. We are full of knowledge of other people, we don't know our own deep twisting valleys of the mountains of our life. So what is thinking? Are we again waiting for the speaker to explain everything? And then you agree or disagree? All that is only partial, not complete. I will wait for someone else to complete it. You understand? Look at our brains, how it works. We go window shopping spiritually. Collect a bit here in this marquee, then go to another marquee - it sounds funny doesn't it? [Laughter] [Tape turns over] We are always collecting like a magpie, or those pack rats, and we don't know anything about our own capacity, not skills. A capacity that is not based on experience, it has nothing to do with knowledge. We will talk about all that, if there is time.

So what is thinking? You are sitting there and the speaker is on this unfortunate platform and we are both thinking. What does that thinking mean? He says something and the question is put to you and the brain begins to become active, it is being challenged, it is being driven, pushed, pressurized and then it wakes up and says, yes, or no. And so we go on. We never dig into ourselves, which means we depend on so many things, so many books, so many professors, so many gurus, or leaders. So here we are without a leader, without help, without any kind of circumstantial, pragmatic sustenance, you have to find out what is thinking, what is the origin of all thought, not a particular thought which obviously has a cause. And what has cause can always be overcome. If I have a cause for pain one can deal, one can go to a doctor, or anti-doctors, whatever you like, the quacks and the latest anti-medicine and so on. One can get over it because you discover the cause. So what is

the cause of thinking? If you understand, one understands the cause then you can put it aside. You understand? If we don't find the cause but merely accept an explanation which is not the actual cause, then we go on skipping along, picking up here and there. So we are together going to find out for ourselves, not the speaker tells you and then you play with it, but for oneself one finds out. The speaker may explain, go into it, as he has done on several occasions. He has been doing this for eighty years. So it is not a game with him, it is not a habit, or senility. [Noise of rain] Ah, it is raining! Or hail. Please come in, come inside Sirs. There it has gone. I don't know if you noticed this morning, early, there wasn't a single cloud in the sky. But we are in Britain! So close to the Atlantic.

If one can discover the cause, the *raison d'etre*, the root of it, then either it is possible to unroot it and let it die, wither away, or you have not, one has not discovered for oneself. [Noise of rain] Rains are blessed things in certain parts of the world, they pray, they long for rain. Right? Here it is perpetual! So the cause of anything, the cause of a headache, the cause of a cancer, they haven't discovered it yet but they will probably, the cause of senility, the cause of fear, not a particular form of fear but the root of fear. If one can discover the cause, the effect has no meaning, then the cause will die. That is what we are going to find out together: what is the cause of thought, thought being associated with remembrance, with memories, the images that thought has built together, put together. What is the cause of all this? It appears to the speaker - please don't accept it, this is a deliberation. It took three days to elect a pope and we don't have to take three days.

What is the cause of this? Is it experience? Is it the experience that gives knowledge? And the knowledge is stored up in the brain as memory and that memory reacts as thinking? Is all thinking based on that, is it so simple as that? If thinking is based on familiarity, thinking based on memories, of course if we had no memories you wouldn't think - right? Let's be very, very simple. Because the very simplicity is the - it is very subtle, the more simple you are the greater the subtlety - not in clothes, I don't mean that, putting on some kind of silly robe, or having a garland round your neck and all that. That is not simplicity. To have a very clear, sensitive, observing brain, watchful, not frightened. We will go into fear presently. Forgive me!

So is thinking based on experience, knowledge, memory, thought? So thinking is always based on knowledge. The more knowledge you have the more you think. Science is adding every day more and more and more - right? It began with a simple club, then it became the archery, then it became the gun, then the ultimate is the atom bomb. All that is based on accumulated knowledge - right? Step by step, or a sudden jump but still within the field of knowledge. So thinking is essentially, however simple it may sound, based on experience, knowledge. We are asking can that thinking stop? Otherwise we are caught in this? That means can there be a state without a single memory? A single thought?

And the relationship of time to thought and the relationship between man and woman, the relationship of husband, wife, children, girl friend and so on, the relationship, the closeness, the feeling for each other, is that based on thought? Please we are asking this question. The question itself is important, not the

answer. So relationship, thought and time. Right? I am married to you, for various reasons, sexual attraction, dependence, companionship and all the rest of it. And as we live for a day with each other, or ten of fifteen, or hundred years, we get used to each other. We have built up the memories, the images about each other. This is obvious, isn't it? And that memory, those images, are the realities, not the woman, or the man, or the children, or... the reality is the image that I have built about her, and she has built an image about me. These images are the realities, functional realities, but not actual relationship. So thought is the basis of our life, business, working the mines, or in a laboratory and so on and so on. All the things that the priests have put together, the rituals, the beliefs, the wafers and all the things that are in the temples and mosques, all put together by thought. And thought therefore being based on knowledge, is everlastingly limited, partial. There is no complete thought, it is impossible. Right?

So if one - if there is not recognition of the fact that thought is completely limited - your worship, your prayer, your belonging to this guru or that guru, for God's sake, all this is so terribly trivial. Don't get angry please with me. So if thought is limited and obviously it is, you may think of the unlimited but it is still limited. You may think of the eternal and all that, it is still put together by thought. And we are saying: can that thought, time, come to an end? Probably you have never asked this question and you are faced with that question, and you can't answer it because you haven't delved into yourselves deeply, examine, looking, observing which is different from analysis, just observing the deep valleys of one's own life and brain.

From that we should go and enquire into what is fear. Is fear related to time and thought? What is fear? Fear of being ill. We have all been ill haven't we at one time or another. The earth is crowded with doctors and pills. We have all been ill. What is the value or significance of illness, of which you are so frightened? Please. What is the significance of being ill? Has it any meaning at all? Or when fear interferes with illness do you learn anything at all? Or can one look at that illness quite objectively, not immediately identify oneself with that pain, that illness? And then battle with it, wanting to be healthy and so on. So fear of being ill, if one allows illness not to the extreme point of illness, then it has a great significance, it indicates a great deal, it opens the door to many things. But when there is fear all the doors are shut tight. And we are now enquiring also what is fear? Fear of losing pleasure, fear of tomorrow, fear of darkness, fear of one's husband or wife, fear of your gurus, of course, otherwise you wouldn't follow them, fear of not having his peculiar enlightenment. Think of a guru having enlightenment! Fear of so many things, neighbour, war, the terrorists, and all the things that the priest have put together for two thousand years in Christianity, and all the things that ancient India has put together, three to five thousand years. There are all kinds of extraordinary traditions in India, I won't go into it now. They are really quite extraordinary, some of them.

So there is the fear of heaven and hell, fear of the most trivial things of our life. So we are going together to look at the cause of fear. As we said, if one can discover for oneself the cause, then you can deal with the cause. Then you can end the cause, if you

observe very carefully, the cause, then that very cause comes to an end. You don't have to do anything about it, just to observe the cause as you observe something external, like as you heard the rain on the canvas a few minutes ago, you hear it and if you hear it quietly it tells you something, it has its own music.

So what is the cause of fear? Fear of illness, fear of death, fear of a hundred little things. Fear inhibits freedom. As long as there is any particle of fear about anything there is no freedom. It is not to be sought in some other place, though the pastures may be greener across the field, but the multiplication of this fear is growing more and more and more on us and sitting down here seriously and considering together, taking together what is the causation of fear, then we can go into it if you are serious, concerned, with the ending of fear. First we must deal with the psychological fears, not the external fears, that comes later. If the psychological fears are ended completely then you will deal with physical fears entirely differently, not the other way round. It is so obvious, isn't it? That we want to be fearless outwardly, therefore we divide the countries, beliefs, dogmas and all that childish business. But if we begin to see the root of fear psychologically, inwardly, not as separate person with my fears, but fear as a whole because every human being on this earth goes through fear. Even the gurus, even the priests, even the highest authority in Christendom, they have all fears. All over the world every human being has fear of death, of lacking love and oh, dozens and dozens of fears. And because we have fears we are not ever free, so it behoves us to examine very closely, not analytically because then you separate the analyser and the analysed, then conflict begins. Right? Where there is division

there must be conflict. That's a natural, eternal law. Look what is happening with the miners and those who own the mines; the separate countries, like England, France, Germany, Russia, fighting, fighting, fighting; the Arab and the Jew - you know Sirs, this is so obvious. So not to belong to any country. Of course you have to have a passport. The speaker has an Indian passport but he is not an Indian. They have given him a diplomatic passport - but he has put that diplomatic where it belongs.

So fear is common to all of us, like pain, like anxiety, like sorrow, uncertainty, the demand for power, position, prestige, every human being has this seed of fear. We are not talking about a particular fear but when one grasps the whole content of fear, the root of it then you can deal with the particular, that becomes utterly unnecessary. So what is the root of fear? Please don't wait for the speaker to explain. The root of it because it is in us, not in heaven, or in the priests, or in the things put together by thought of man. Is it time? Is it thought? Is it some unknown factor? If it is an unknown factor that man is cursed with this fact which has existed for man for two million years or more or less, and that long evolution has not solved this problem, he has escaped from it, worshipping gods, following somebody, all that business. So can we, this morning, sitting under this marquee, deliberating together, find out the cause and end it? End it now, not the day after tomorrow. If you end it now you are an amazingly free man, or woman, or whatever it is. You are then really free. And that freedom alone can open the door to truth.

So we are asking what is the root of it? Is it thought? Is it time? Don't please accept a thing that the speaker says, and don't follow

his words, or his gestures, or his clothes, go into it. It is necessary to have passion to have that tremendous energy to discover anything, not just acceptance and all that, and handing over yourself to somebody. It is nothing to do with all that immature stuff. Because it is a very serious question. So is thought and time responsible? Or is time thought, which is one, not separate, is that the root of it? It is the root of it, isn't it? I am not - if one is afraid of death, that fear of ending, which we will go into another time, if that ending takes place then one is frightened with the known. So is thinking, thinking, the root, which is time, is that the root of it? Of course. It is obvious if one points it out. If we need not think and there was not time, there is no death, no fear.

So the question arises: can thought/time stop? Only then there is the end to fear. But one has to see it for oneself not take it from another. We are not beggars. Nobody is giving or taking. Nobody is stretching his hand out to you to move. You have to have this energy and that energy has its own capacity. So the speaker is saying, with which you don't have to accept or reject, just observe him saying that fear can end psychologically completely, wholly, when there is no thinking and time. That question itself, to find out the cause of fear, and finding it out for oneself hold that cause, stay with it, then the very staying has its own energy. But if you run away then it is like playing a game with yourself. So is it possible to end this fear now, psychologically, so completely so that you are a free man?

And we will talk about other things, like pleasure, sorrow, death and meditation and religion and so on. But if fear doesn't come to an end completely the other things are meaningless. You may sit in

meditation, put on special robes, follow some person, all that has no meaning. What has meaning is the ending of fear. And when you discover the cause, like thought and time, remain with it, hold it, stay with it, don't let it escape from your hands. Then the very observation of that is the ending of that psychological fear in which there is no attachment to anything.

I am sorry to have talked so long. May we get up?

BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 27TH AUGUST 1985

A lot of questions have been put. We can't possibly answer all of them. These questions have been chosen, not by the speaker, by others. I haven't seen them, and you haven't seen them either. Probably some of you wrote these questions.

If I may most respectfully ask you, I am putting a question to you, why are you here? This is a serious question as you have put to the speaker several other questions. Why each one of us is here in this not too nice a weather, windy, and one hopes that you are comfortably seated, but why? Not that you are not seated comfortably but why are we all here? Is it out of curiosity, nothing better to do? I am asking these questions most respectfully, not in any sense of impudence. Are we here to be stimulated, to be challenged, to have more energy, or release energy, or merely intellectual flirtation - that is a good word! Or romantically, sentimentally, or some kind of help, wanting to be helped by another? If one put all these questions to oneself what would be our answer? You might just as well ask the speaker why he is talking. Is it a habit? Is it he feels happy facing an audience, fulfilling and that he needs an audience? All these questions must not only be put to oneself but also to the speaker. And if we explore into that why we are doing what we are doing, with all this trouble, travail and the anxiety and fear of all life. And if one doesn't find an answer why the speaker is going on the various continents talking for the last sixty, seventy years, is it a habit to him? He has tested it out, kept quiet for a year and more. And also at one time he talked

behind a curtain [Laughter] to the audience and he felt rather silly [Laughter] and so he went before the audience. He has tested this out very carefully, whether he depends on another to fulfil, to be, to become, to feel famous, all that nonsense. Why in his return he is asking you, if he may respectfully, why we are all here. Is it old age because we have nothing else better to do? Is it that we really deeply want to understand ourselves. He is only acting as a mirror in which each one of us can see ourselves as we are, not be depressed or elated to discover what we are. Is that mirror clear, sharp, every feature of it is so - without any distortion. And if that mirror is clear and you see oneself exactly as one is then the mirror is not important. You can break the mirror without feeling any lack of luck! And if you can answer that question it is rather serious, why we behave as we do, as each one of us does, why we think in a certain pattern, why we follow somebody, the crazier the better, why we store up all the things that one has said, that others have said, why there is nothing in ourselves that is ourselves. And to discover what we are, ourselves, that deep rooted seed, not only the cultural seed, the traditional, the religious, all the outgrowth of all that but go very, very, very deeply in oneself to find out the origin of all things. Not the cells and all that, not the genes that one has inherited but much beyond all that.

Shall we go into that a little bit? What is the origin, not the biological and evolutionary process, the origin of all things? This demands, or asks, what is creation? What is creation? Who created all this, the marvellous universe, everything living in it and out of it? What is the origin of all that? Do you want to go into all that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Sure? Why? [Laughter] For an amusement? In a form of entertainment, something new? I am afraid it is not anything like that.

Our brains have extraordinary capacity, extraordinary, not ordinary, but beyond all ordinary things. When one observes all the technological world, what they have done and what they are doing, and what they are going to do, tremendous advancement. The brain has this capacity. The computer is going to take over more and more all our activities, more or less, except sex and probably it can't look of the stars of an evening. But it is going to take over all our activities, may bring about a new industry, new way of living, without electricity, it may depend on light. They are having great competition, America and Japan, tremendous competition. And we will all be slaves to that god - the computer. So we are saying the brain has an extraordinary capacity but that brain has been restricted, narrowed down by our education, by our self-interest. I know you will hear all this but you will do nothing about it. That's all right too. And that very brain which has evolved for centuries, millions of years, that brain has become what it is now, old, tired, with a lot of troubles, conflicts and misery. That brain, which is the centre of all our existence, all our being, which is the future and the past, we went into it the other day, and this brain wants to find out what is beyond all this, what is the origin, the source, the beginning. Can it ever find out? You understand my question? Can it ever find out what is the source, the life, the beginning of all creation, of all things, not only ourselves but the tiger, the marvellous trees. Have you ever been very close to a wild tiger? No. We have been very close, almost touching it, wild. And who

brought all this about - the exhaustible - inexhaustible nature and the rivers, the mountains, the trees, the lawns, the groves, the orchards and us? How will you find out? Please ask this question of ourselves. How will you, ordinary human beings like us, find out something which science, biology and bio - something or other, and the people who are digging into the earth finding new cities, how will you find out? By following somebody? By making some gurus inexhaustibly rich? How will you go into this? That is my question to you. Who will answer it? Are you waiting for the speaker to answer it? Or invent a new god who says he created it? That invention, that imagination is still part of the brain.

So how will you find out? May I leave you with that question? What will you give to it, give in the sense, your energy, your capacity, your enthusiasm, your passion, your whole time to find out? Or will you treat it like something, "Oh, I am too busy today, I will think about it tomorrow", or it is a question to put to the old not to the young generation, we are too young to think about all that. How much energy will you give to it? Not seeking energy or releasing energy, that is all too childish.

May I go on with these questions?

1st QUESTION: At various times we have had mystical and spiritual experiences. How can we know if they are illusions unless we know reality?

At various times we have had mystical and spiritual experiences. How can we know if they are illusions unless we know reality?

How do you answer such a question? If it was put to you, how do you approach it, what is your reaction to it? How do you come

so close to it that the question itself unfolds? You understand? The question itself begins to evolve. If you are merely seeking an answer it is already determined - right? Are we seeing this together? To find an answer if fairly easy, but to delve into the question, to see all the complications of that question, it is like having the map of the world in front of you, seeing all the countries, the capitals, the buildings, the hamlets, the rivers, the ocean, the hills, the mountains, the whole of it. How do you look at this question? Not the answer. Perhaps the response to the question may lie in the question.

So at various times we have had mystical and spiritual experiences. What is an experience? I am just asking each other. What is an experience? And who experiences? Right? I may have had, or are having some kind of mystical experience. Before I use the word mystical or experience, what do I mean by experience? And does experience involve recognition? Right? Does it involve a sense of something happening to me from heaven or from some place, or something or other which I call mystical, which is not the daily experience but something totally outside, which happens to me? And I call that mystical or spiritual. I like, if one may, stick to those two words - spiritual and experience.

Is there an experience without an experiencer? You understand my question? Are we together exploring into the question or are you waiting for the speaker to explore it? So we are walking together, step in step, slowly or fast but we are together step by step - right? We agree to that? If we do - not agree - we are friends talking over these problems. I have had a spiritual experience, suppose, and what do I mean by those two words? Experience,

something new, something that I have already had renewed, or something that is happening to the experiencer - you understand? And if the experiencer is experiencing and that experiencing is a form of recognition, that is the remembrance, identification and so on to that which I call experience, then there must be in that feeling that I have already known it, otherwise I couldn't recognise it. That is fairly simple, isn't it? I don't want to labour the point. It is fairly clear. As long as there an experiencer experiencing then it is something that is happening to the experiencer, something separate, something which is not ordinary, which is not a daily boring, habitual experience that one has - right? Are we playing the game together? So as long as the experiencer is there, every kind of experience, call it mundane, or spiritual, or holy, or sacred, or releasing energy, and all that stuff that goes on, mostly nonsense, then what is important in this process - experiencer, experiencing? What is most important is the experiencer - right? He is gathering. So when there is an experiencer it gets more and more subliminally egotistic, more and more "I know a great deal which you don't know. I have had marvellous spiritual experience. I am illumined. Poor chap you are not, come with me. Give me all your money then you will be quite safe." [Laughter] They are playing this game, I assure you. "Surrender yourself. Put on the beads which I give you." - and all that rather silly game that is going on in the world.

And what is spiritual? Religious? Something holy? Something unexpected? Something totally out of the ordinary? Why do we want something totally outside the daily life? Go on, please answer this question. Which means something totally different from our

daily life. Then we are bored with our daily life, the habits, the loneliness, the despair, the attachments, you know, power and all the rest of it. We want to avoid all that and invite heaven, which is called spiritual. We can deceive ourselves so enormously - right? We have the capacity to deceive ourselves incredibly - right? What has - Christianity is based on belief and faith. Sorry, I am not trying to hurt anybody, just pointing out. Two thousand years. And you go across the ocean to India and there, three thousand years, five thousand years old. The same process of selling god. Why do we have to believe all this? Because we are frightened? We want to know the unknown and so on. We don't have to go into all that.

So what is illusion? And what is reality? You follow? Are we following this question? The questioner says: how can we know if they are illusions unless we know reality? Then we have to examine what is reality? What is reality? The real, the actual, is you are sitting there, the speaker is up here, unfortunately. And reality is nature, that tree, that animal, that dog, the marvellous earth, the blue sky about us. Reality. Right? Reality, I have feeling for my wife, husband, sister and so on, and so on, the whole movement of recognition. And the actual. Right? We are together in this? The actual, you and the speaker are sitting now, twelve o'clock. That is actual. There is wind. I hope it won't rain. And the actual is the nature, the birds, the rivers, the water and so on. And the questioner says: I can't know what is an illusion unless I know reality - right? What is reality in ourselves? Is there anything real in us? Actual? Or is it all a movement, change? The other day in Switzerland when we closed Saanen Gathering altogether, no more, some people came up and said to us, to the speaker, "We are

so sad we have closed it." And the speaker said, "When you are sad it is about time we closed it." [Laughter] You understand? We closed it. So nobody wants a change. Few people want fundamental change.

And the questioner says, "If I knew reality then I know what is illusion." So we should look at illusion, the word. What is illusion? The word itself, in a dictionary, means something you play with - ludere. Something you invent, enjoy yourself, I am god, I am whatever it is, I am Napoleon, or I am such a great man. You play with something that is not actual. One has pain, a despair, a sense of tremendous, unaccountable loneliness. That is actual, precise. And we create an illusion that somebody is going to help us, somebody is going to fulfil our lives, make us feel not lonely. That is all illusions. The actual fact is one is desperately lonely.

So it is fairly simple to see for oneself, if one wants to, what is an illusion, what is reality and why this craze for experience. We have had sexual experience, thousands and thousands of experiences. Everything going from here across the field, you see the birds, the house-martins and so on, that is an experience, but you don't call that spiritual. I see you sitting there, it is a challenge, it is moving. So what is important in all this is why the experiencer invents all this. You understand my question? Why the experiencer has become so important. Is there a period where the experiencer is not? That is the real question, not what is reality, what is illusion, what is experience and all the rest of it, but is there a period, a length of time, a space, where the experiencer, the observer and so on is not? Then you don't want experiences. You understand? There is nothing. You see that is a word. The word nothing - sorry

I am not a dictionary - means not a thing. Not a thing of thought - you understand? Not - nothing means there is the end of time and thought. That is where there is no experiencer at all. That is the real thing, not all this.

May we go on to the next question?

2nd QUESTION: Is illness due to simply to degeneration or abuse of the body, or does it have some other significant?

Sorry, I am reading it badly. Is illness due simply to degeneration, or abuse of the body, or does it have any other significance? You understand?

The questioner is asking: has illness any significance at all? Right? You tell me! We have all been ill at some time or other in our life. Paralysed, accidents which break our body, every kind of illness we have known. Society, modern society is producing more disease than ever - right? You read the papers and so on. Has it any benefit? Does it make us understand deeply why we become ill, what is health, and why we cling to health and not to illness - you understand my questions? Am I talking to myself? Am I? Really I am surprised you are listening. Or you are sharing with it? You are sharing what we are talking about together? We are at the same table eating the same food. You may eat loudly and another may eat gently, but we are sharing the same food, at the same table, at the same time. So the speaker is not talking to himself.

We have all been ill. And we don't put up with it a little bit. Immediately doctor, pills, the whole circus begins. We never stay with it a little, see what is implied, how you meet pain. You understand what I am saying? How do you meet pain? I know how you meet pleasure, that is fairly simple. But pain, not only physical

pain but the psychological pain, [Tape turns over] the getting wounded psychologically, hurt, how do you meet it? Psychological hurt is a form of illness - right? I wonder. If I get hurt because you are rude to me, or you say, "You are a silly ass", I get hurt. That is a form of illness. But physically if I get hurt there is a doctor, there is somebody to do something about it. I want to avoid the psychological pain and also I want to avoid, run away from the physical pain, unless of course you have terminal cancer and all the cancerous agony. I hope none of you have it. So we never stay with something and see what it is like. Or put up with it. You understand my question? Are we together, sharing the same food?

Far more important in all this is psychological pain - right? The pain of being wounded, hurt, the feeling of deep agony inside. That's a great illness, to which we don't pay not too much attention. If we paid great attention to that, to the inward pain, in different forms, and nobody can heal it. There is no pill, no guru, no book, no gods, no ritual, nothing will stop that pain. And if you don't run away from it, and if you really deeply stay with it, it has immense significance - right? It has - then you penetrate into something that goes beyond all self, self-interest. The outward then, the outward pain can be dealt with - go to a doctor, put up with it, that becomes secondary. When the speaker was ill some doctors gave to the speaker heavy doses of antibiotics. And after a while he has paralysed for a month, completely paralysed. You understand? Everybody have to carry the body, put it in a bath and all the rest of it, comb his hair, shave and all that, for a month. Don't sympathize please. I am not asking anything from you, I mean it. Neither your money, except to have this marquee and other things, he doesn't

want a thing from you, neither your praise nor your criticism, nothing to do with your pocket. So this is not an invitation for sympathy, or, "How could you put up with it?", and all that stuff. I am just saying there it was for a whole month. "That is the end," I said to the person who was with me. All right. But slowly the antibiotic effect went away and he was all right, and he is still living. So if one stays with something, with pain, not too long of course, if it is really very, very painful then you are unconscious and all the rest of it.

So it has, if you will go into it for yourself, it has some significance, and that significance depends on each one. How you face life, how you look upon it, in what manner you receive it, in what way you react to it, how you respond to all the things that you are faced with in daily life, not on Sunday mornings. So if one observes as you observe a lovely tree, or a pigeon on the flight, observe yourself closely, it is an extraordinary thing what it reveals.

3rd QUESTION: What is my responsibility toward the present world crisis?

What is my responsibility toward the present world crisis? Of whom are you asking this question? What is my responsibility, your responsibility? Why do we use the word responsibility? To be responsible. To be responsible to keep your body clean - if you have hot water, or not too cold a water. You are responsible for your children. The professors, the teachers, the educators are responsible for educating the children. Why do we use that word responsible? You understand my question? If you eliminated that word, what is your responsibility in a world crisis, my

responsibility and your responsibility, if you cut out that word responsibility because that word implies you and responsibility - you understand? If you cut out that word then would you put that question? It is my duty to kill for my country. It is my duty as being a Russian, or an American, or a British citizen, to fight for my country and god and all the rest of it. If we could put away that word altogether from our brain, then how do you deal with it? Duty, responsibility, I must, all those words. If you put away those words, what happens? It is a very interesting question - right? What takes place when this duality, which is implied in responsibility - right? Are we together a little bit? The word responsibility implies I am responsible for you, for my children, for my wife, for my boss, for my job, etcetera, etcetera. I am responsible to represent God to you. And if I totally forget that word, not forget, put away that word entirely. [Drops the paper with the questions on.] Sorry! [Laughter] As that paper went down similarly banish that word from our whole being. Then what takes place? Go on Sirs. Have you put away that word? No. We never - you see you hear something but you don't act about it. I am not responsible for Brockwood. I don't feel - the speaker doesn't feel that way. I am not responsible to tell you anything. But if that word is not, which means there is no I and responsibility to you, there is only you and I - right? Then what takes place? Come on Sirs.

Has love a responsibility? Go on Sirs, please shout, something about it.

Audience: It is unity.

K: If love has no responsibility then what takes place? If love is not attachment which is implied in responsibility, then what takes

place?

[Responses from audience, inaudible]

K: Don't use - please don't say something, if I may most respectfully point out, don't say anything that you have not lived, worked, to find out. If I love you, if the speaker loves you and the word is not, the word responsibility, duty, attachment and so on, then what is our relationship? Go on think it out. You are not waiting for my reply. I - the speaker is not going to reply to that question. It is really a very, very serious question.

So all this implies do we love anything? Love, having something which is not dualistic, "I love you". I have answered the question. I have not answered, the question has evolved.

4th QUESTION: Does asking for guidance necessarily prevent understanding? Cannot seeking help be a means of discovery of ourselves? If not what is the sense of listening to you, K?

Does asking for guidance necessarily prevent understanding? Cannot seeking help be a means of discovery of oneself? If not, what is the sense of listening to you, K? There is no sense.

[Laughter] You are not listening to K. If you are actually truthful, you are not listening to K. You are listening to see whether you agree or disagree. You are listening, in the process of listening you are translating what he says to your convenience, to your conditioning. You are listening not to K but to yourself. K is not talking about something extraordinary. There is something extraordinary far beyond all this but he is not talking about that now. You are listening to yourself - right? As we said earlier you are seeing yourself in the mirror. And you can distort the mirror. Or say, "I don't like the mirror, I don't like what I see" and break

the mirror but you are still what you are. So you are listening not to K. You are not trying to understand what K is saying. You are actually listening to yourself. If you are listening to yourself for the first time that is the greatest thing that can happen. But if you are listening to K, X, Y, Z - no sorry not X, Y, Z - if you are listening to K then they are just a lot of words, a lot of reactions and so on. That is so utterly, if one may respectfully point out, utterly meaningless, unnecessary. You have listened to so many things, listened to the preachers, to the books, to poems, you have listened to the voice of your wife and husband and the girl and so on, or you are casually listening. But if you give all your attention to listening, hearing, not only with the ear but hearing much more, much deeper, then you will listen to everything. And you will listen to what K has to say, either you live with it, it is real, true, actual, or it is something verbal, intellectual and therefore very little meaning in our life.

And the questioner says, does seeking, asking for guidance necessarily prevent understanding? Understanding of what? Chemistry? Mathematics? Some philosophical concept? Understanding Gorbachev? What do we mean by understanding? Please I am not, the speaker is not trying to be rude, or he is rude - sorry, he is not trying, he is not rude, just asking. What do we mean by that word understanding first and we can then relate that word to understanding - to bring about understanding through guidance, through seeking guidance. First what do we mean by understanding? To understand. I understand French because I know some French and the speaker understands Italian because he knows that. So there is an intellectual, verbal communication -

right? That is one form of understanding. We use common language, you speak English and the speaker speaks English, and the verbal communication, if we mean the same thing and not give to the word different meaning - like Alice says, Alice in Wonderland says, "I give to the word what I want, the meaning I want" - you can do that too but communication becomes rather difficult then. So what do we mean by understanding? A verbal communication? Intellectual comprehension of a concept, of an idea? Or understanding means actually listening to what another is saying, not try to interpret, not try to change it, not try to modify it, actually what he says, not only intellectually, with all your being, with great attention, then it is not merely intellectual, or emotional, or sentimental, all that kind of stuff, but entirely you are there. Then there is not only verbal communication but non-verbal communication.

And the questioner says, asks, does asking guidance prevent, necessarily prevent understanding? Right? Why do I want guidance? About what? You answer me, those of you who follow these gurus and all the rest of it, churches and temples, what do you mean by guidance? Another fellow human being in different robes, with beard or non-beard, specially from Asia, India included, why does one want guidance? Are you being guided now? Be simple Sirs. Are you being guided now? Or are we together investigating, exploring, communicating, saying, "I don't understand what you are saying", and I say, "I'll explain it" and then you explain something to me and I say, "Yes,". We are moving together, there is no guidance. You understand? Are we.? We have had guidance galore, every newspaper, every magazine,

every preacher, every priest throughout the world is guiding us, telling us what to do, what not to do, think this, don't think that, surrender yourself, oh, don't listen to him, he is a reactionary - you follow? We are being guided, shaped, moulded, all the time. Consciously or unconsciously. Here we are not guiding anybody, like two friends talking over things together. That is totally different. And guidance prevents understanding, in the deeper sense of that word, because I can't understand myself first. Look at myself, you are guiding me all the time, do this, don't do that. I am not looking at myself, I am listening to what you have said. That means you become the authority, I become your slave, whether psychological slave, or slave to some other factor. These gurus with their ashramas, their places, become concentration camps. They tell you what to do, how to salute, all that tommy rot. I am not condemning, it is so.

So if we don't seek guidance at all, which actually prevents understanding of ourselves, then cannot seeking help be a means, or discovery of ourselves - good God, need we go into all this again? Why can't we be simple? Not in clothes, I don't mean that. Simple. See things as they are. Look, face things actually as they are, instead of all this labyrinth of maze? Why do we have to go through all this? Except the doctor, that is a different matter. Psychologically we are talking about. Why can't we be very, very simple and look at things as they are. Is our brain so incapacitated, so cunning, so desperately devious, that it cannot see things, what is in front of their nose or eyes? If you are very, very simple psychologically, then that very simplicity has immense subtlety, much more subtle than all the cunningness of the brain. But we are

never simple. If it is raining, it is raining. I am lonely - not the speaker - one is lonely, that is a fact. Why all the circus round it?

5th QUESTION: Could you please explain what is total vision? Is it an extension of our normal brain function? Or does it imply something totally different?

Could you please explain what is total vision? Is it the extension of our normal brain function? Or does it imply something totally different? To be very simple: do we see anything entirely? Do we see, not trees and nature, all that, do we, each one of us, see your wife, see, actually see, not imagine, all the images, simply see? Do I see partially, because I have so much prejudice, so much fear, so much anxiety and all the rest of it, so I never see somebody entirely - right? To see something wholly, holistically, if I may use that word, completely, wholly, in that seeing there is no contradiction, it is so. Understand? Right? There is no contradiction in seeing what is actually going on. I am angry. I am impatient, exhausted. To see that simply. But the moment I bring in the fact, "Oh, I shouldn't be. I am like this. I am exhausted. I am exasperated." - excuses. Right? Can I see myself wholly as I am? Can I see the whole map? A map is put in front of each one of us, a map of the world, with various colours, with various flags, various prime ministers, various presidents, all the cuckoodom that is going on. There it is in front of me, in front of us. Can I look at that whole map as a whole? And it is not possible to look at that whole map if my attention is on Britain. Or if my attention is on Russia. So my attention then is directed to one point. You follow? So this sense of direction to one point, or self-interest prevents the holistic, the outlook - the seeing of the whole thing. It is simple. Right? But if I

am stuck to, or my roots are in this one particular corner of the earth then I can't possibly see the whole thing. If I am always thinking about India - thank God I don't, I never do - if I am always thinking about India, what is happening, why I am an Indian, why am I poor, why am I this, you know all the rest of it, how can I diddle somebody, or believe in some particular god, or something or other, I am there, stuck, I can't see the whole of it. Right? It is as simple as that. So I naturally when I see the truth of it I say, what nonsense.

Not only seeing holistically - we must stop - but also there is much more to seeing than that. Observing without any words, without any interference of thought, just seeing. First of all visually, then inwardly seeing everything as is. And from that seeing we can go much further, then you ask what is insight. Seeing something absolutely to be true and acting at that moment. I won't go into all that now. It is time to stop. But all this requires investigation or observing without analyser into what one is. And from there you can move infinitely, boundlessly. There is no beginning or end there.

May we get up?

BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 29TH AUGUST 1985

There are many questions, and there are seven questions here. And they have been selected carefully. I haven't read them. Others have read them and chosen them. I hope you don't mind.

Before we go into these questions may we talk over something together? We are so easily influenced, not only by the box there, in each one's room, by the books, by the newspapers, magazines, by the past traditions. As you heard probably last night Jerusalem existed five thousand years ago and there were parts of India further still. This long tradition, or short tradition of a single day, or a single afternoon on your drive or your walking in the woods, all these influence us, not only the genetic process in each human being, the heredity, the whole existence seems to be a process of influencing each other - the air, the pollution, the beauty of the earth, everything around us, and even you sitting there and the speaker is here, we are influencing each other. We are telling us, each one of us, what to do, what to think, we put pressure on each other through beauty, through a lovely poem, or a personal relationship. It is a constant process, it appears, of being moulded, shaped, put into a form. And we proceed for the rest of our life in that narrow path, narrow way and that seems to be our way of existence. And one wonders if it is at all possible to be totally free of influence, to find the origin, the beginning of all things which must have no cause or an effect, it must...

So is that possible? You understand? We are talking over together. We are not trying to influence you, or you are influencing

the speaker. We are two friends talking over together, in the same boat, in the same way, path, not spiritual and all that kind of stuff but ordinary, a path that goes through the woods, dappled light and the beauty of the earth and the trees. And is it ever possible, we are asking each other, to be free of all influence: the past of which we are, and that past has a tremendous influence on us, the long tradition of the so-called religious books, the old poems, the ancient literature from the Iliad to the ancient Hindu? And one asks oneself, as you are asking as I am asking, whether it is possible to really be free of all this and something totally original? Not the repetition, repetition of guru and disciple, the follower and the followed with their peculiar dresses and all that kind business. Is it possible? Please give your attention a little bit to it. What do you think? Is it possible? Or not possible? If it is not possible, or if it is incredibly difficult and therefore we choose the easiest way, follow the old pattern only in different colours, different beads, different leaders, teachers, gurus and so-called enlightened birds! [Laughter] I am sorry. And so on. Is that at all possible? Or are we doomed for ever to remain in this state of being impressed, shaped, moulded, conditioned?

And what would you do if it is at all possible? How would you set about it? In what manner would you approach this question? Perhaps that may be the real question, the most important question. Because we are so gullible, we invent so many reasons for doing that, for following, leading, surrendering oneself to something that is so convincing, satisfying, so handing over all the so-called world responsibility to another. This has been our lot. And knowing all this how would one come to, see what actually is and see what one

can do? Not just talk about it, you may be influenced by your wife, husband, girl and so on.

Isn't it necessary to have a great deal of doubt? What do you say? Isn't it necessary to have a certain quality of scepticism, not only about others but about oneself, about one's desires, convictions, belief, faith and definite directive purposes? Can we question all that, doubt all that and see how far that doubt, how far the sense of asking, demanding, enquiring, can go? Could we do this together? Not that the speaker is leading you, or you are leading with your convictions the speaker, but together, I mean together, enquire into this.

The computer, as we said the other day, the computer is going to do all our efficient work, probably better than we do. It will invent new gods, a new system of theology, a new way of living, which is the industrial age is over, nearly, and the computer age will come in. These are all facts. We are not saying something abnormal, non-factual, or imaginary. This is what is going to happen to all of us. They are inventing such colossal interference with the brain.

So we are asking: could we go into this question together? Knowing that we need scepticism, doubt and doubt is very energizing and cleansing. Will you do it? Doubt one's own experiences, one's own attitudes, prejudices, agreements, disagreement, all that? And doubt, like a dog on a leash, some times if it is the right place you must let the dog run, freely, jump, otherwise the dog becomes rather tame and...

So scepticism also has its right place, not a particular place, it has its own quality of rightness. "Oh I won't doubt that because I

belong to that, but I will doubt everything else. "We were talking - we used to have a great many friends at one time, Communists. Don't be shocked. And they would go so far and no further, like the Catholics, like the Protestants, like the Hindus, Buddhist monks, so far, beyond that is mystery, or beyond that is impossible. So doubt must be kept on a leash and allowed to run also. Can you do that? Can we do it together? Doubt about your gods, your gurus, your experiences and so on, the whole background of human experience, human endeavour, human conclusions, the whole bundle of it. And begin to enquire into that bundle. And see how far actually, not theoretically, actually in one's life, daily life, how far you can go with this doubt, this enquiry, this passion behind it.

Shall we answer the questions or would you like to go on with what we were talking about?

How far, how deep, is knowledge essential? Not only knowledge of books and what others have said, but knowledge about ourselves. Knowledge is always limited - right? You can see what the scientific knowledge is doing, is achieving. Little, adding, adding more and more and more. What is added to is always limited, naturally. Are we understanding? If I am adding something all the time, as knowledge, what I am gathering slowly, that which is gathered slowly is limited always because there is more, more, more. Right? So knowledge is always limited. And those who invent, "Oh, yes we can go beyond knowledge." They have gone into this question in ancient India and invented the idea - I won't go into it, not worth it. And knowledge is our background. That background is guiding us, shaping us, telling us what to do. Or you have an intuition - a favourite word that! - but that word too is

rather dangerous because it may be your wish sublimated, becomes intuition. But it is still your wish, your desire. So what place has knowledge in daily life? I am sorry the speaker is asking all these questions. Probably you won't answer, you will just listen and carry on. But if one actually listens and goes into it, what place has knowledge in life, in daily life? When you write a letter you have to have knowledge. When you speak English you have to have knowledge, or French, or Italian, or whatever it is or Russian. And when you do business, when you telephone, when you do everything physically you have to have knowledge. How to drive a car. And also knowledge in relationship. One recognizes one's wife, one's husband and girl and all the rest of it. It is the recognition, it is part of knowledge. And what place has knowledge in relationship? Can I go on? Or you are amused by all this? What place has knowledge between you and another? Or what place has knowledge? I know my wife. Or my father, mother, husband. When we say "I know", knowing is knowledge - right? What place has that in daily life between my wife and my husband, between the man and the woman? Please what place your knowing her, what place that knowing has in your relationship? Is knowledge the impediment in relationship?

Audience: Yes.

K: Just a minute, don't say yes. It is so easy to say yes and then what? If I say to myself, "I know my wife", what do I mean by knowing her? My previous sexual experience, my irritation about her, and her anger with me, her saying "You have been very good today, nice and kind. Let's go to dinner" - and all the rest of it. All that builds up an image about each other. This is a fact. And when I

have built up sufficient image I say, "I know her". She says, "I know my husband, his quirks, his idiocy, his goodness" and all the rest of it. All that is knowledge. And we are asking in relationship what place has that? What place has knowledge? Or, it has no place at all. Is love knowledge? The remembrance of your sex, of your - all the rest of it, the background which you have built up in that particular relationship and that knowledge is divisive. Isn't it? Gosh, you are all asleep. It separates. I with my ambition, greed and all the rest of it, and she has hers. She wants to fulfil and I want to fulfil. So we are - we may meet together in bed but like two rails that never meet. Do we face this? If you are married do you face this? Or if you live with a girl do you face this fact? Or one doesn't want to look at facts.

So please find out for oneself, actually in relationship what knowledge is, what your experiences are, and whether it is a hinderance in relationship, or a factor that helps you live together somewhat comfortably, somewhat happily, but keeping a careful distance from each other - right?

May we go on to our other questions? Good Lord, it is nearly twelve.

1st QUESTION: K says there is no path to truth. Is the faculty to see this outside myself? My consciousness and means of perception are entirely within me. How can I go without any means or tools towards the unknown goal? What will give me the need, the energy to move in this direction?

K says there is no path to truth. Do you accept that? There is no path truth. Is the faculty to see this outside of myself? My consciousness and means of perception are entirely within me.

How can I go without any means or tools towards the unknown goal? What will give me the need, the energy to move in this direction? Good Lord! [Laughter] There are so many things in this question.

First of all, as we said the other day, the answer is not outside the question. The answer is not outside the problem. The answer is in the problem, in the question. Please let's talk that briefly over. We are always try to find an answer, satisfactory, outside the problem, that is convenient, that is happy, that is pleasurable and so on. If we could put aside all this rather escaping from the problem, if you could look at the problem. Look at this question together. K says there is no path to truth. Why do you believe him? Why do you accept it? Why do you repeat it? K says. Who is K to say it? What right? Or is it a reaction? You understand? Because he sees so many paths to truth - as many ? as many ? I won't go into that. As long as there are human beings they have different opinions. So it may not be true. Let's first find that out.

There are the various Christian paths - right? The Catholic, the Protestant and the various divisions of Protestantism, innumerable, many of them. And there is the Buddhist, several paths according to the Buddha, one never really knows what the Buddha actually said, or what the Bible says, one never knows. So. Then there are the Tibetan paths - right? There are the Buddhist paths, the Muslim, with their divisions. So all these paths are spread out before you to truth, whatever that may mean, to God, to illumination, to enlightenment and so on, there are dozens of paths - right? How will you choose? How will you choose which is the right path? Please tell me.

Audience: You have to know yourself.

K: Somebody says you have to know yourself. So why bother about paths? Why bother about truth? Why bother about what K says? Why don't you know about yourself? And how will you know about yourself? What manner? How will you look at yourself as you will look at yourself in a mirror, how would you look at yourself? It is easy to say look at yourself. Socrates and ancient Greeks and still further ancient Israelites, and still further ancient Egyptians and so on and so on, the ancient Hindus, they have all said in a different way, "Know Yourself". And there are these paths in front of us. And we all want to achieve truth, whatever that thing is. And all these paths lead to that. That means truth is fixed - right? Must be, otherwise there would be no path to it. It must be stationary, it must have no movement, it must be dead, then there can be paths to it. [Laughter] No, no don't laugh, this is what we do. So somebody like K comes along and says, look, don't bother about the paths, it may be like you are on a ship with a rudder and you move, find out, learn, move, move, keep on going, find out. Not become stationary and make truth something permanent - right? And we want something permanent. Permanent relationship, I am attached to my husband, wife, I want it permanent. We don't admit any change. Right? And we are changing all the time, both biologically as well as psychologically, but we want to remain with something that is completely satisfactory, permanent, enduring, giving me security. And as I find there is really no security, then I have truth as the permanent entity towards which I am going. And there are all the disciples, gurus and the priests, all help you to go. I don't know where but they help you.

So using one's own capacity to reason, capacity to have logic, see things step by step, and not escape any step. Or, that is much more complicated, see that which is true, accurate. Well that is a different matter.

So the questioner says what are the tools necessary to reach truth, which is pathless? The moment you have tools you have already created the path - right? Do you see this? No? The moment I have a means to do that, to achieve that, the means then becomes the tool and I have already got the truth towards which I am working - right? So the moment you have a tool, a means, a system, then you know what truth is, therefore there is no point in having a tool. I don't know if you see? Do we see this? Or is this too illogical? Or too dastardly reasonable? The means is the end. The means is not different from the end. Right?

So. Another question in this is: my consciousness and means to perception are entirely within me. What do you mean by the word consciousness? You don't mind going into all this? It is fun if you go into all this. Not only the understanding of one's own brain's capacity but also to delve. You dig very deeply to find oil, go through all that trouble, and we won't even spend a second doing this in ourselves, for ourselves. So what do we mean by that word consciousness? Is that consciousness different from you, from the me?

Do you get bored by all this on a lovely morning, instead of being on a golf course, or on a walk or something? Since you are here and we are here, let's go on! What do you mean by consciousness? Books have been written about it by experts. And we are not experts - right? Let's understand this. You and the

speaker are not experts. God forbid! Not professionals.

Professional gurus, professional followers with their peculiar dresses and all the rest of it. We are just enquiring together, like two friends. What do you mean by consciousness? All that you are, isn't it? Your consciousness is made up of all its content - right? Anger, jealousy, faith, belief, anxiety, aspiration, all the innumerable experiences that one has had, all the accumulation of all the little things of life, and also suffering, pain, insecurity, confusion, and the desire to escape from all this, and find something enduring. And in it also there is the fear of death, and enquiring what is there beyond. Right? All that, this vast bundle, is our consciousness - no? No? Yes? Go on Sirs, there is no disagreement about this. Don't be nervous. We are our consciousness. And the content of consciousness makes up the whole entirety of consciousness, whether it is higher consciousness, lower consciousness, the desire to expand consciousness, and all the rest of it, it is still within the field of consciousness - right? And that consciousness is me. There is no me without that. So when you say me is different, my consciousness is different, then you have a battle with it, struggle, conflict, all that ensues.

So our question then is: is it possible to first to discover for ourselves the content, to see the content? That is fairly easy. The habits, the way you comb your hair, the habits of speech, of thought. It is fairly simple to observe those. And also to become aware of one's own conditioning as a British, as a Frenchman, as a Russian and etcetera, etcetera. It is also fairly easy to see our various religious inclinations - Catholic, Protestant, Hindu,

Buddhist, following something or other - you follow? - that is fairly easy. But to go beyond that. We don't need an aqualung, you have to go very deeply, but to go very deeply one must understand the superficial thing first, whether it is possible to free from influence which conditions us - right? Is it possible? Find out. Work sir, don't listen. Work at it. Put your tremendous energy into it, you have got tremendous energy, you don't want more. It took you a lot of energy to come here. Use some of that energy, if one may respectfully point out, use some of that energy to go into this. [Tape turns over] When you want something you go after it. That means one has to be not quite indolent, one has to be a little active. And there is nobody to help you, no tool, no instrument, no leader, nothing to help you. You must really become helpless to find the real thing. I don't know if you understand what I am talking about? If you are helpless, actually helpless, that means there is no help whatsoever from anybody, from any book, from any person, from any environment, then you are in that state of real helpless, then something else takes place. Then you begin to see things.

The questioner says, asks: what will give me the need, the energy, to move in the direction of truth. Direction of truth. That means it is already over there [Laughter] I am not laughing. I am not disrespectful or cynical, but it is like that, when we use words like direction it is already there. It is already preconceived, already existing there because of your conviction or somebody told you and so on. Truth is really a pathless land. And that can only exist when fear and all the rest of it is not.

(2nd) Questioner: I am afraid to change. If I change what will happen afterwards? I am paralysed by this. Can you talk about this

problem?

Delighted! I am afraid to change. If I change what will happen afterwards? I am paralysed by this. Can you talk about this problem? Why is one afraid of change? What do you mean by that word change? One has lived in this house across the lawn for about nearly twenty years. One becomes attached to that particular room, to the nice furniture up there - right? One becomes attached. That means what you are attached to is what you are. If one is attached to that good old furniture, you are that furniture. So we are afraid to change. I am attached to that room. But fortunately the speaker travels a great deal. That is only an excuse.

So what does that word imply? Change from 'what is' to 'what should be' - right? That is one change. Or change according to my old pattern but remain within the pattern, going across one corner of the field, I say I have moved, have changed, but it is still within the same field, barricaded, barbwired - right? Going north, east, west, south is change. Why do we use that word? Biologically one is told there is constant change in the blood, constant movement, change, one cell dies another cell takes its place, or a series of molecules and so on. There is this constant change going on physically. And we are afraid to change. Could we drop that word change? Change implies time - doesn't it? I am this, I will change to that. Or I have been that and some event will come along, take place, and that event will change me and so on. Change implies a movement in time - right? We went into the question of time the other day. Should the speaker go into it again? Time. It is a very complex thing time, very. I won't go into it, this is not the occasion.

So if we could drop that word change, or revolution, or

mutation, which the speaker has used all these words, if we could drop all those words then we are only faced with 'what is' - right? Not 'what it should be'. But only face 'what is'. I am angry. That is 'what is'. I am violent. That is 'what is'. But to become politically or religiously non-violent is a change. To become non-violent when I am violent takes time. In that interval I am sewing the seeds of violence. That is all so simple - right? So I remain with violence, not try to change it. I am angry. That is a fact. There are no excuses for anger. I can find a dozen excuses for hate and anger but those enquiries in why I get angry is another escape from anger - right? Because I have moved away. So the brain remains with 'what is', then see what happens. That is, I am jealous of you. Not me. I am jealous of you because you look so much nicer, cleaner, good taste, you have got good brains and I am envious of you. Out of that envy comes hate. Envy is part of hate. Envy is part of comparison. I would like to be like you but I can't. So I become rather antagonized, I feel violent about you. So I remain with 'what is'. That is, I see I am envious. There it is, I am envious. That envy is not different from me. Right? Envy is me. Right? So I can't do anything about it. I hold it. I stay with it. Right? Will you stay with it? Not escape, not to find out the cause, or the reason, or go beyond it. I am envy. And see what takes place. First there is no conflict obviously, if I am envious I am envious. It is only conflict exists when I don't want to be envious. I wonder if you follow all this? No matter.

So if I stay with it I have got tremendous energy - right? Energy is like light throwing on something - focussed light on something. Which then becomes very clear. And that which is very clear you

are not afraid of, paralysed. It is so. You understand? I hope.

So what is important in this question is not to escape, not to make an effort, just to remain with 'what is'. If I am British I remain with that. See what happens. How narrow it becomes. Sorry if you are British, forgive me - or French or Russian, or whatever it is. The thing itself begins to show its whole content.

3rd QUESTION: How does one meet aggression and psychological attack from a close relative from whom one cannot escape? [Laughter]

How does one meet aggression and psychological attack from a close relative from whom one cannot escape? Are we all like that? I can't escape from my guru because, you know, I have committed myself to him or her and I have give up all my money to him. Sir, don't laugh this is taking place now.

Somebody sent an article in French, highly amusing, so laughable, really funny, which says, How To Become a Good Guru! [Laughter] It is very cleverly written and I hope it will be printed in English.

Psychological attack, what does that mean to be attacked psychologically, inwardly? When you are with a close friend or relative, psychologically, inwardly, there is always pressure going on between the two. You know all this I don't have to tell you. Always trying to do something about the other, attacking subtly, physically or through innuendo, or through subtle word, gesture, you are always trying to push the other into a certain pattern - right? This is common to you, isn't it? Now the questioner says, what is one to do? I am living with you in the same house and you are bombarding me, I am bombarding you, not only with words

and gesture but even a look, a feeling of irritation and so on. How will you, what will you do not to be wounded, not to be pushed around psychologically? You may depend on that person financially. You may depend on that person for various psychological reasons. And the moment you depend you become a slave - right? The moment you are attached then you are a goner! Don't look, if I may suggest, at somebody else, but let's look at ourselves. If I am attached to you as the audience then I'm lost. Then I depend on you for my satisfaction, comfort, reputation, for my physical well being too. But if I don't depend on you, I have to find out why I don't depend on you. That means not only on you, I don't depend on anything. I want to find out if it's true. I may not show it to my close relative. I want to find out for myself whether it is possible living in the same room, same house, husband, wife, relative and so on, to be totally impregnable, not build a wall around oneself, that is fairly simple. You understand? I can build a wall round myself and say sorry and be polite about it, soft about it, and very affectionate but it is still a wall. That means limitation. So is it possible for me to live vulnerably? Go on, think it out Sirs. And yet not be wounded. Highly sensitive, not be in any way responding according to my attachment. You understand? Go on Sirs, think it out. And if one is dependent on another financially, that becomes rather dangerous. Most of us are in this position. Do you want me to go on with this?

If I am dependent financially on you, God forbid, I am not, but if I am dependent on you, what happens between us? You then have the whip in your hand. Not only financially but go further into it. Is it possible to live with another on whom I am financially

dependent and know I am dependent because I can't do anything else - right? I can't start a new career. If I am quite young I could probably do it but if I am sixty, fifty, or even seventy or ninety, then you can't do it, start a new career. So then what shall I do? Go on Sirs. What will you do?

So where do I draw the line of dependency? You understand my question? Psychologically I won't depend. For myself I won't depend on anybody, or on anything, or on any past experience and all the rest of that rubbish. There is no dependence. But if one is dependent financially where do I draw the line so that being rather oldish, you say, "Sorry I have to put up with it." - right? I have to put up with it I can't start a new game. So how far, how deep is that line? You understand my question? Is it just superficial? You understand? Or the line has great depth? Obviously very superficial. Oh, I don't mind. Right? So what is important in this question is if one understands it rightly, freedom. Freedom is absolutely necessary. But I depend on the milkman, on the supermarket, postman and so on, otherwise psychologically I don't depend. I must be very clear on this. So I draw the line very, very superficially without any depth.

Oh Lord!

4th QUESTION: Some people seem to pick parts of what you say that fits their problems or interest and then discard the rest. What do you say to this?

Some people seem to pick parts of what you say that fit their problems or interest and then discard the rest. What do you say to this? I don't have to say anything about it. What do you say? We are dealing, aren't we together, with the whole of life, not just part

of life, whole of it, both psychological world, which is immense, not just physical reactions and nervous responses, and memories and all that, that is part of the psychological structure but it is much deeper than all that. If you can go that deeply. So we are dealing not only with the psychological world but the violence that exists in the world. The tremendous violence that is going on, killing for the sake of killing, for the fun of killing, not only with the gun but also destroying people when they obey somebody. Careful please. That means obedience - right? It is a dangerous subject, please listen carefully, not take part of it and say, yes he is against the army. We are dealing with the whole phenomena of life, not parts of it. Which the scientists are doing, which the doctors are doing, which the priests are doing, and the educators are doing. We are concerned with the entirety of human life. And if you like to pick parts of it, it is up to you. And that part will be satisfactory, or say it suits me, that is enough for me. That is also perfectly right. But if we are concerned with the whole of life, not only one's own particular life but also the life of human beings throughout the world, the immense poverty, incalculable poverty of which you don't know, the indignity of it, the corruption of it. And all the religious circus - sorry to use that word - all the religious nonsense that is going on in the world, tremendous big business, enormous work, Rolls Royces, Rolls. You should read this article or memorandum on How To Become a Good Guru. The tremendous work of these people. And if you are concerned with the whole humanity, which is you are also humanity - right? You are humanity, not humanity is there, you are different. You are humanity. Not British, French, Russian. We are human beings first,

not professionals after, professionals after, first you are human beings. And we human beings have separated ourselves and that is why there is chaos in the world. It is only war in Lebanon, who cares? There is a war in the Far East, Afghanistan. Awful Russians and so on. But if you feel deeply that you are the entire humanity because you suffer as they suffer, you shed tears, they too do. You are anxious, you laugh, you have pain, and they too have all this, whether they are rich or poor. They are corrupt and so are we in a different way. They are corrupt because they want money, food, and they will do anything to have food and money, anything. So we are the entire humanity. If one realizes that marvellous thing, which is the truth, then you will not kill another, then there is no division between this country and that country, then your whole life is different. If that is what you want. If you want to pick parts of it, go to it. Nobody is putting pressure on you not to pick a part of it to satisfy your little demands, or big demands. But if one actually, deeply, honestly, without all the ideological nonsense, the real fact that we are entire humanity, prayers, non-believers, the Muslims, the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Christians, we are one. We all go through tremendous travail. Therefore this search for individual freedom, individual becoming and so on becomes rather childish - for me anyhow.

5th QUESTION: There are many accounts of people following a particular discipline who come upon the immeasurable. Are they self-deluded? Or have they come to this somehow despite their efforts? Or is there another explanation?

There are many accounts of people following a particular discipline who come upon the immeasurable. Are they self-

deluded? Or have they come to this somehow despite their efforts? Or is there another explanation? It is nothing to do with disciplines, with effort. You may disagree, you are perfectly right to disagree, or agree but let us both understand what we are talking about, each of us. You may belong to a particular discipline, Buddhist, Hindu, Tibetan, Christian, certain abbot, certain guru, all the rest of it, follow certain discipline, order, do everything everyday at 2.0 o'clock in the morning, or early morning, pray, do this, discipline. And through that discipline some people say they have understood or realized the immeasurable - right? The questioner says - who become the immeasurable. Are they self-deluded? What do you say? The word discipline, according to the dictionary, means to learn, to learn. The disciple learns, not from a master, learns. That is, he is learning, not conforming, not imitating, not obeying. He is learning. Learning itself has its own discipline - right? I don't know if you understand.

There is this quality of learning, not memorizing and repeating. Right? That is, most of us accumulate knowledge and memory to do certain functions, certain skills and so on. So learning there is implied accumulation and according to that accumulation of knowledge acting. And that knowledge can be increased more and more, or becomes duller and duller, more and more accustomed - right? So most of us are memorizing in order to have a skill. To live in this modern society you must have some kind of skill, in the factory, in the mines, in the business, or at the altar, some kind of effort, some kind of discipline there. And they keep on repeating day after day, day after day, day after day. You see them in the churches and temples and mosques, repeating the same old stuff.

And it is not learning. They may say, yes we are learning, but that is rather meaningless if you repeat, repeat, repeat.

So can discipline, which is conforming, imitating, obeying, towing the line, can that lead to the immeasurable? Immeasurable means that which is not being measured, which cannot be measured - right? It is beyond all measurement, all delineation, the line. It seems, for the speaker, that is not possible, because the brain then is conditioned to a routine, to a certain particular form, and the very essence of that limitless, to comprehend - not comprehend it - to see what it is, requires immense, incalculable freedom.

Therefore what is freedom, not all this? Freedom. There are two kinds of freedom. Freedom from. Freedom per se, for itself. I can be free from fear. There can be freedom from fear - right? That freedom is conditioned because it is free from something. And is there a freedom which is by itself, the thing itself? And it is only that freedom which requires compassion, love, and that freedom is that supreme intelligence which has nothing to do with the intelligence of thought. And to come to that one has to be free from all fears and all the rest of it. If that interests you, put your energy into it. You have to put your life, your house in order, complete order, not neatness, not polishing the furniture. That is part of it. But the house, the inner house, the deep house that has no foundation, no roof, no shelter. You can't invite the immeasurable - it then becomes a plaything. You can't lay down the path for another to follow. It is not to be put into words. We measure everything with words. We call it the immeasurable. It certainly is not. It is something entirely different.

Sorry. I had better stop. May we get up?

BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 31ST AUGUST 1985

Those people have appealed for cooperation and for money and also may the speaker join in that appeal. I repeat to you: to talk over things together.

We have talked about time, thought and fear. And as we said this is not a lecture about a particular subject intended to inform or instruct. This is a conversation between you and the speaker. Together we are going to look at all the things that we consider are important in our life, our daily life, not only our life as a businessman, or a doctor, or a professor, or a scientist, and so on, or if you want to belong to that group, gurus. We are not concerned about others, but rather we are going to have a conversation in which there is no authority, in which there is no specialist. We are all laymen. And together we are going to talk over what we have done in the past two talks and questions and answers, and also we are going to talk over this morning, which is rather rainy and windy, I am sorry, it was a lovely day yesterday, and we are going to talk over together about freedom, self-interest, pleasure, pain, sorrow and love, this morning. And if there is time, we will also talk about death, if that is all right with you.

As we said previously, we are rather a serious group, at least the speaker is. He has been at it for the last seventy years or more. And just attending a couple of talks, or reading some printed words is not going to solve our problems, it is not going to help us. And the speaker is not trying to help you. Please be convinced of that, assured that the speaker is no authority and therefore he is not a

person to whom you can turn to be helped. There are others who might help you. And if you want to be helped then, if one may point out most respectfully, you leave your problems to be solved by others, and they will solve them according to their desires, self-interest, their power, their position and all that business. So we are ordinary laymen talking over together. We are going to enquire together, face the facts, not the ideas about the fact but facts. And not ideologies, they are meaningless. Not about theories, speculations, who is illumined, who is not, who is - what? - nearer God than you, but together we are going to go into this question of freedom, what relationship has freedom to time and time to thought and action. Because we live by action, everything we do is action, not a particular action, either in the business world, or in the scientific world, or in the speculative world called philosophy. But rather we are going to look at things as they are.

There is a great deal of anarchy in the world, chaos, disorder and who has brought this about? That is our first question. Who is responsible for all the mess that we have in the world, economically, socially, politically and so on, all leading up to war? There are wars going on, terrible wars now. And do we each one of us realize not intellectually but actually in our daily life, the house in which we live, not only the house built by man outside, but the house inside. Do we realize how disorderly it is, contradictory, how very little freedom we have? That word freedom also implies love, not just freedom to do what you like, when you like, where you like. But we are living on this earth, all of us, and each one is seeking his own freedom, his own expression, his own fulfilment, his own path to enlightenment, whatever that be. His own

particular form of religion, superstition, belief, faith and all the things that go with it, with authority, hierarchical authority, politically, religiously and so on. So we have very little freedom. And that word, which is so freely used by every psychopath and every human beings, whether he lives in Russia, where the tyranny is appalling, or in so-called democratic world, every human being inwardly, consciously or unconsciously, needs freedom, like every tree in the world needs freedom to grow, to have that sense of quality of dignity, love.

And what is the relationship of freedom to self-interest? Please we are talking things over together, you are not, if I may point out, listening to a speaker, listening to a man on the platform. He is not important at all. And the speaker really means this, he is not important, the speaker. But perhaps you might give your ear to what he says as two friends talking over things very seriously. We are asking what is the relationship between freedom and self-interest? Where do you draw the line between freedom and self-interest? And what is self-interest? What is its relationship to thought and to time? Please, all these questions are involved in freedom. Bearing in mind that freedom is not fulfilling one's own ambitions, greed, envy and so on. What is the relationship of self-interest with regard to freedom? You know what self-interest is? Self-interest may hide under every stone of our life - right? Are we talking together? Are you quite sure we are talking together? Not somebody higher up but we are all sitting on the same level.

What is self-interest? Can one consciously, deliberately, enquire into that? How deep, how superficial, where it is necessary, where it totally, completely, has no place at all? You understand my

question, we are together questioning. Self-interest has brought about a great deal of confusion in the world, a great deal of disorder, confusion, conflict. Whether that self-interest be identified with a country, with a community, with a family, or with God, with the beliefs, the faiths and so on, it is all self-interest, seeking enlightenment - for God's sake, as though you can seek it. Also in that search there is the self-interest, and also there is self-interest when you build a house, have insurance, mortgages. And the self-interest is encouraged commercially. And also by all religions, they talk about liberation but self-interest first. And we have to live in this world, we have to function, have to earn money, have children, be married or not married. And living in this world of the twentieth century how deep, or how superficial, is our self-interest? It is important to enquire into this. Self-interest divides people - right? We and they, you and I, my interest as opposed to your interest, my family interests oppose your family interests, your country, my country in which I have invested a great deal of emotion and physical interest for which I am willing to fight and kill, which is war. And we invest our interest in ideas, faith, beliefs, dogmas, in rituals and so on, this whole cycle. At the root of it there is a great deal of self-interest.

Now can one live in this world daily, clearly, with self-interest where it is necessary - please I am using this word carefully - where it is physically necessary and psychologically, inwardly, it is totally abandoned? Is that possible? You understand? Are we together? Is it possible for each one of us living here in a very, very complex society, competitive, divided by agreement and disagreement, faith opposing another faith, this great division that

is going on, not only individually but collectively, and living in this world where do we draw the line between self-interest and no self-interest whatsoever psychologically? Can we do that? You can talk about it endlessly as we like to go to talks and lectures and listen to somebody, but here we have to observe together, you have to not only listen to each other verbally but also deeply, inwardly find out extensively, not just my self-interest, extensively, wholly, where self-interest lies. And inwardly, psychologically, can one live without any kind of muttering of self-interest, of the self, the me, which is the essence of self-interest? Another can't explain, or say this is self-interest, this is not self-interest, that would be terrible. But one can find out for oneself either very carefully enquiring step by step, hesitantly, not coming to any conclusion and find out for oneself. Because there is nobody who is going to help us. I think we must be completely assured of, nobody is going to help us. They may pretend and you may pretend, but the actuality is after these two and half million years, or forty thousand years, we are still seeking help, and we are stuck. We are coming to the end of our tether.

And in the enquiry into self-interest we have to go into the question also: what is freedom and freedom implies love, freedom does not mean irresponsibility, doing exactly what one wants, which has brought about such a mess in the world. And also what relationship is self-interest to thought? We went into the question of time the other day, and also thought, thinking. Shall we go into it briefly, what time and thought - need we? It is no good repeating it over and over again, it gets rather monotonous, for the speaker at least. So he has to vary the words, the special phrasing, the silence

between the phrases, all that is implied not to be bored for the speaker. But if you merely listen to words, words, words, and not act then we will be left only with ashes.

Time, as we said, is part of evolution, of the brain, two and a half million years. Time is also sunrise, sunset. Time also is hope - I hope, one hopes. Time also is remembrance. Time is also all the knowledge, experience that one has gathered, which is knowledge, both scientific, personal, collective, racial and so on. Time is tradition. And thought is based on knowledge, which is the outcome of experience, whether that experience be personal, collective, racial or traditional, it is still knowledge. And knowledge is always limited either in the infinite future or infinite past, because knowledge is essentially put together through experience, adding more and more and more to what already has been known. That is what the scientists are doing. That is what we are doing, adding more and more. So knowledge is always limited, always. The past, present and future. And time is a process of this accumulation called knowledge. We needed time to go to the moon, time to think it out, time to cooperate collectively and so on. So time/thought are not separate, they are one single movement. All right? Are we going together? Or it is all just words?

So time is not only the past, the present and the future, the present modifying the past and therefore the future, the future of tomorrow is what I am today. So now, that is the moment that you are sitting there as you are listening, as you are paying perhaps attention, the now contains all time. So if one really deeply, profoundly understands that then change is totally meaningless. You are what you are now. And to remain with that, not say, "Well

I hope to change it, I will become this. I am violent but I will be later non-violent." - you understand what we are talking about? We are together in this? Don't be puzzled, it is very, very simple. It is really terribly simple if you come to look at it. I am violent today. I have been violent for the last two and a half million years, so have you. We have been violent - right? We have tried to cover it over with words, with explanations, with logical conclusions but we are still violent, killing each other, hurting each other both physically and psychologically, competitive, barbarous - right? We are violent people. All that is going on in the world - throwing bombs, the terrorists, all the horrible things that are happening to the animals, to other human beings. Don't you know all this? Right? We know all this. We are violent people. If there is no transformation now, now, at this moment, at this second, tomorrow you will still be violent - right? That is logical, reasonable. Do pay a little attention to this if you don't mind. If I am angry, hating, antagonistic now, I will be the same tomorrow - right? It is obvious. So the now contains the past, the present and the future. So any change implies a movement in time - right? I am this but I will be that. That means time, which means I have really not captured the significance of time. But if I remain with 'what is' completely, without any single movement away from that, that which I observe, hold, stay with, is me. Violence is not separate from me, I am violent. Anger is not separate from me, I am anger. Greed, envy, I am that. But we have separated it therefore there is conflict. This is all very simple, I don't have to... It is clear between us somewhat? Not I am making clear to you. You are making the thing clear for yourself so it is not you understand what is being said, or the speaker explains what he

means, or you can say, "I don't understand you". You are not understanding the speaker, you are understanding yourself, you are looking at yourself, if you are not too depressed, if you are not too lazy, if you are not too concerned with superficial things.

So time/thought, self-interest and in all this cycle there is no freedom, obviously. Where there is self-interest there can never be freedom. It is so obvious. So simple if you look at it. And the more simple it is, the more subtle, the more extraordinary depth it has.

We also ought to talk over together the whole acquisitive, pleasurable, gratifying process - all right? You are willing to go into all this? Don't say, "Yep!" It is like digging in the earth to find gold, you don't find gold scratching the earth, superficially scratching, you have to dig, you have to go down very, very deeply. Not up in the air, in the sky but you are the entire humanity, as we said the other day. So you don't have to look for another to help you, or to help you to dig, or to go into yourself, you are that, you are the whole mankind because what you think millions of others think, think, not what they think about, thinking. Thinking is common to all mankind, whether they are scientists, whether they are Buddhists, or Tibetans, or God knows what else. They all think. They all have pleasure, sexually, or pleasure in attachment, in position, pleasure in achieving position, money, glory, fame and all that business. And all human beings whatever race, colour, prejudice, religion, they all go through pleasure, pain, anxiety, uncertainty and sorrow - right? So it is not your particular sorrow only, it is not your own particular pleasure, it is the pleasure of mankind - right? We have always sought pleasure, physically, psychologically, and if we do not find it there we invent something

extra-territorial, little green men! Sorry to laugh about it. Pleasure in acquisition, possession, I possess you, you possess me - think it over, look at it. And that pleasure is always clouded over with fear. So pleasure, fear, self-interest, time, thought are all one movement, not separate movements - right?

And also we ought to enquire into what is suffering, why man from time beyond time has suffered? They have done everything on God's earth to escape from suffering, not only physical suffering but much more important psychological suffering. And in spite of all religions, one particular religion worshipping death, suffering, as they do in Christianity, and other religions having other escapes, they have never - man has never, or woman has never solved this problem. They bear with it, they tolerate it, they get crippled by it, they become psychopathic, shed tears and suffering is common to the whole lot of us in different forms. Either it becomes exaggerated, or you just shed tears and keep it to yourself and carry on. And there is always this killing of each other - right? Thousands, millions upon millions have shed tears, the brutality of it all, the insanity of war, building armaments while millions and millions starve - I don't have to go into all that. It is all very clear. One nationality fighting another nationality, another group of human beings like yourself, you may call yourself British, Indian, or other label, but you are human beings first.

So we are asking is there an end to war, end to suffering? Not to war. As long as we are separate, as a family, as a community, or a clique, as a nation, religious and so on, this division is going to create always perpetually conflict. You and me. We and they. This is our game we have been playing. First tribal, limited, and now it

is global. So we are asking ourselves is there an end to sorrow? Put this question seriously to yourself. Because without - where there is sorrow there cannot be love. There can be sympathy, pity, tolerance, empathy but generosity, pity, sympathy is not love. Love may contain all that, or have all that but the parts don't make the whole. You can collect all the sympathy, empathy, kindness, generosity, friendship but that is not love.

So is there an end to sorrow? And this requires immense, a great deal of energy to go into it, not just say, "Well I will think about it." Thinking may be the factor of sorrow. My son is dead and I have got his photograph on the mantelpiece or on the piano in a silver frame, I remember. Remembrance is a process of thought. Of course. Thinking how we enjoyed the sunset together, how we walked in the forests, laughing, skipping, and he is gone [Tape turns over] but the remembrance of him goes on. And that remembrance may be the factor of sorrow. I don't want to admit my son is dead, gone. To admit such a fact is to admit utter loneliness. And we don't want to face this fact of being utterly by oneself. And so I look for another. I rely for my happiness, satisfaction, sexually or otherwise, look to another. And I play the same game over and over again. But I have not ended sorrow, not I, the speaker, but we have not ended sorrow. Sorrow is not only self pity, self-interest, but also the loss of that which I have had, the loss, the failure to fulfil, to achieve, to gain something which I have worked for, not only physically but psychologically, inwardly. All this is implied in sorrow and much more. And we are asking of ourselves, nobody is putting this question, or demand this challenge to you but you are asking this of yourself, whether

sorrow can end? Not only the sorrow of oneself, where it is there in oneself but also the sorrow of mankind, of which you are. That means no killing of another, no psychologically wounding another. Yes Sirs! As we said, where there is sorrow there can't be love, which is a fact.

So we ought to enquire or look - not enquire, but look what is love? That word has been so used, so spat upon, dirtied and made ugly. "I love my country", "I love my god", "I am devoted, I pray for love." - right? "I am not loved but I want to be loved" - the love poems. Is love sensation? Please ask yourself all these questions. Is love a continuation and remembrance of pleasure? Is love desire? You know what desire is? May I go into it briefly? What is desire, by which you are driven and driven, torn apart, what is that thing called desire? Not to suppress it, not to transmute it or do something with it, but what is the movement of desire, how does it come about? Are you putting these questions to yourself, or do you want the speaker to explain? For God's sake! Let's go into it.

We live by sensation, whether physical sensation or psychological sensation. Sensation is part of response, part of comparison and so on, sensation, I sense, feel, I sense the atmosphere, good or bad. Sensation - right? That sensation comes about through seeing, touching, hearing and then what happens after sensation? Oh come on Sirs! Thought comes in and uses that sensation as an image - right? I see a nice house, or a garden, or a nice picture, or furniture, or a nice woman and there is sensation, the seeing, the observing. The observing, contact, then sensation comes. Unless there is sensation we are paralysed, as most of us are! We are paralysed if we don't have sensation, in our legs, in our

hands, all the rest of it. So sensation, then what happens? Thought takes sensation and makes that into an image - right? I see you beautifully dressed, clean, healthy, bright, good, good brain and all the rest of that. I see that, the way you talk, the way you do this and that and so on. Then thought says, I wish I were like him, or her. At that moment desire is born - right? Sensation, then desire - then thought giving shape to that sensation. And if there is an interval between sensation and thought then you can go into it much more, but not now. You understand? Are we somewhat together in this? You see Sirs, our difficulty is we are so complex in our thinking, so want to find out, always looking, looking, looking, finding an answer to problems, solutions and how am I to do this. We are never simple. Not physically, for God's sake, don't reduce it to having some food, or little clothes or food or eating one meal and all that. What is that kind food called? I have forgotten the name of it, you know, from Japan, what is the name of it?

Audience: Macrobiotic.

K: Macrobiotic, that's it. Go crazy on that. [Laughter] As one goes crazy about Yoga and all the rest of it, T'ai Chi, you know. We are not playing. This isn't a fantasy. This is something you are hooked in. This is our life, our everyday lonely, ugly, little life.

So what is love? Can love exist where there is hate and fear? Where there is competition and comparison? Where there is conformity, agreeing or disagreeing? Go into all this Sir. Or is love nothing to do with all this? Is love something in the brain, inside the skull? Or is it something entirely beyond thought and time? And where there is self-interest there cannot be love. Obviously Sirs. You can see all this for yourself. Then what relationship has

love to sorrow? And can love be compassion, not only I love you, you love me. Love is not yours or mine, it is love. Right? I may be married, have children, sex and all the rest of it. In all that there may be tenderness, generosity, politeness, kindness, yielding, tolerating, all that is not love. So compassion and love are not separate, they are one. And can one live like that? You understand? Can one have this in one's life, not in abstract moments, or in moments when you are sitting by yourself on the sofa, or walking in the woods, a flash, a scent, a perfume, that seems for a second to transform your whole existence. Can we live our daily life with that perfume? For that compassion has its own intelligence, not the compassion of a man going out to India or to Africa and do some missionary work, or helping the poor desperate poor, that is not love. Where there is love there is absolute freedom, not to do what you like, not to assert yourself, or convert others. All that kind of silly stuff.

So that intelligence is not the intelligence of thought - right? One needs a great deal of intelligence, a tremendous lot of intelligence to go to the moon, or to put a submarine together, to build a computer - right? That is partial intelligence. The scientist, the painter, the poet, the ordinary person who bakes a bread, that is part intelligence, it is not complete intelligence. And that holistic intelligence, the whole quality of that intelligence can only come about with the ending of sorrow, and love, and that acts, not the action which is partial brought about by thought and time.

May we get up? Or shall we sit still? We can't hold hands but we can sit quietly for a few minutes? Shall we?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good. Not meditate. Sit quietly. [Long pause] Will you kindly get up then the speaker will get up.

BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1985

The speaker also would like to make an announcement and I hope you will take it seriously. This is not a resort. There is a swimming pool, tennis court and it is becoming too popular, too large. There are people trying to interpret what K is talking about and he has always been saying, please don't interpret, not interrupt. So please bear in mind we are going to make it much more orderly, strict and not make it into another resort for amusement place. Though it has been announced several times that music that goes on, what is called music, Bong(?) is it?, thumping on the drums and so on went on until half past ten last night. So please be courteous, careful of others and also, if one may point out wherever K goes he is a guest, whether he is India, in America or here, so one must behave like a guest. Respecting others, considering others, having some kind of order and not let it become much too big as it is becoming. We are going to do something about all this for next year.

May we go on with other things? We were talking about various problems of life, of our daily, monotonous, rather pleasurable lives that are full of fear, anxiety, antagonism and so on. We went into the question of time/thought. And yesterday - was it yesterday morning?, yes, by Jove, sorry - yesterday morning we talked about the ending of sorrow, what it implies, what is the nature of sorrow and all the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the depression, the uncertainty, all that is implied in sorrow. And in certain parts of the world they worship sorrow, pain. And we have never been able to end sorrow, not only the sorrow of one's own life in different ways

but also the sorrow of the world as a whole. All the terrible wars that are going on, what is happening in Lebanon and South Africa, and the Communists world, total totalitarianism where you are forced to think along a certain line, preparing on both sides war, the atom bomb ultimately. And that is what is going on. And millions and millions have been slaughtered in the name of God, peace, country, some ideological concept, theories. This has been our lot and we have endured all this for millions of years. And we are, through long evolution we were barbarous once, savages, and when one looks at it, what is happening now, we are still barbarians, we are still inwardly violent, inwardly concerned with ourselves and nobody else, concerned with our own pleasures, problems, and so on. We never seem to realize that we are the world, and the world is us. This is not a theory, this is not something that you think about and come to a conclusion, ideologically, or as an Utopian idea, but it is an actuality in daily life. You are the world and the world is you. One wonders how many of us realize this fact, actually realize as we realize physical pain, as we feel when we are affectionate, tender, quiet. This is an obvious fact that you suffer and the rest of mankind suffers. You are violent, the rest of mankind suffers, violent. When you intend to do something for yourself and you want to fulfil that you are becoming violent like the rest of the world. We went into all this during all these talks, not only during the past seventy years - I am sorry to point this out - but also now. We actually don't feel, realize in our heart and brain that we are the rest of mankind. When one actually realizes this fact, not a theory, not an idea, but the actual daily fact then there is totally a different way of living. You don't

belong to any country, no religious group, no spiritual authority, or those who want to interpret what K is talking about. And when you really feel that you are, you are actually the rest of mankind you will never kill another, you will never psychologically consciously, or unconsciously, or deliberately want to hurt another.

Please, this is all very, very serious, this is not just for a Sunday gathering, a sermon, or a lecture. We are together in the same boat. We are together understanding the world and ourselves, and our relationship to the world. Not our responsibility, our relationship to the rest of mankind. You all may be well fed, well clothed, houses, flats, and a nice garden, or live in a slum, but there are millions and millions of people who are starving, deliberately races are being killed, tribes are being killed. And as long as we don't feel all this, merely accept it as an idea, a conclusion, we are going to create a monstrous world, which we are creating it already. And we are that which is happening.

And this morning we ought to talk about other things too, concerned with our life. We talked about compassion, love and that compassion has its own intelligence, love has its own intelligence, not the intelligence of clever thought, calculation, remembrance but when there is compassion, which can only come, or be, when suffering ends. We talked about that a great deal. Unfortunately the speaker has published books about it all and it is not merely remembering what he has said, or what he wants to say, the actuality of that feeling of compassion, and that can only come when there is the end of sorrow and when one actually, in one's being, in one's heart, mind, feels that he is the rest of the world, doesn't belong to any sect, any group, any guru, any church,

mosque or temple. One will listen to all this, or read about all this, which K has talked about for so long, and you say, "Yes, marvellous ideas. He has very good reasoning, logical but..." - and you can add many buts to that. We carry on and thereby lies more conflict. Hear one thing, you agree or disagree, or see the truth of it, and wanting to live up to it, and so begin again conflict.

So we went into conflict a great deal during these talks here. And we said as long as conflict exists love cannot be between man and woman, between people, nations, communities, enclave and so on. Our brain which has evolved through long years and time, that brain has extraordinary capacity, each one's brain has extraordinary capacity. We have used it in the world of technology, the world of computers and we have never looked at the psychological world which is far more important, the subjective, the whole psychological process that goes on inwardly. We have never looked at it, we have never gone into it, not according to others, even including K but we have never, or superficially scratched on the surface. And therefore we never put to ourself fundamental questions. And we are now talking over things together, not the speaker is saying something and you just listen and when you leave the tent forget all about it and pick it up ten years later. This is your life and our life and if one wants to treat one's life seriously, or flippantly, or casually, it is up to you.

And we talked a great deal about freedom too, freedom from anxiety, sorrow, pain, and all the travail of life. And also there is another kind of freedom. A freedom which is per se, for itself, not because you want to be free from something, that is only very partial freedom. There is a freedom which is completely whole, not

partial.

And this morning we should also talk about death. Right? We have talked about so many other things. Death is not a morbid subject on a dark morning, or a dark night. People have written books about how to die happily, how to accept it naturally, how to let the body go - you know, they have been talking about it, writing about it endlessly. And we are now, you and the speaker together, please together, he is not talking to himself, he is not lecturing, he is not talking about something which you have to understand and therefore have interpreters who will tell you what K talks about. And that is going on in this place too which seems so absurd.

We ought to talk over together this very important, serious, very, very great thing called death. All right, shall we go on? Please bear in mind he is not talking to you. We are talking to each other. He has no authority - and I mean it. He has no sense of superiority, he will tell you all about it. But together we are going into it. If you will. If you don't want to it is all right. That is all right too. Nobody is imposing anything on you, directing you, telling you what to do, or what to think. Right?

What is death? And when we ask that question we ought also to consider what is continuity? And also what is ending, something that comes to finality? The ending, continuity, time and death, or thought - right? All these are involved when we ask that question: what is death? Time, thought, the urge, the demand of continuity and also when we are wanting continuity we also should enquire together into what is ending? And is there a beginning? All these are involved in this question of what is death, not just oxygen, lack of oxygen to the brain and pops of, or kicking the bucket, or

whatever you like to call it. It is the whole concern of man, the way he lives and the way he dies.

So we are enquiring together what is death? Why death is associated with sorrow. You are following all this? The speaker is not leading you, he is not persuading you. I am bored with telling you that! So what is death? You must take the whole of it, not just dying. You must take the being born, living fifty, forty or sixty, seventy, ninety, or going a little further on, you have to take the whole of it, not just what is death? That is rather a silly question to say, what is death and then weep about it, or frightened about it, or worship it, as Christians do. The Indians, the former ancient Hindus exploded all over Asia, as Greece exploded over the western world, and they had their theories, including Pythagoras and others of reincarnation which we will talk about presently.

So we have to consider not only what is continuity, what is ending, what is time and thought involved in this process, which means we have to enquire what is living, first, not what is dying - right? We are together in this. I won't repeat that again. So what is living? What do we call living? From the moment we are born through the long period which we call life, living, what takes place there? - not just part of it but the length of it. From childhood we have problems, the children sent to school have a problem immediately, how to read, to write, how to learn mathematics and later on chemistry, biology, that all becomes a problem. They are educated in problems. These are all facts, not the speaker's imagination. So our life from the beginning is a continuous problem, struggle, pain, anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, faith, belief, gods and the perpetual repetition of rituals, what is called

religion, the worship of a symbol, and faith, belief, success, failure, sorrow, pain. All that is our living. An actual fact in which is included pleasure, sex and all the rest of it. This is what we call living. Go to the office from nine to five, or factory nine to five, or enter a shop and sell books, clothes, food and so on. This is our daily monotonous so-called disciplined life. Would you and I disagree about that? Or do we see it as a fact? - not as descriptively accepting, but it is the actual fact of our life. Right Sirs? And we have not understood that. We have not gone into it and see if one can live totally differently.

But there is always death. There is a very good Italian proverb but I won't go into it, which says, "Everybody will die, I know. Perhaps I will too!" [Laughter]

So first what is it we have to grasp, understand, go into, resolve? Life, the daily living, or the dying? And besides why are we so terribly concerned about death? The speaker was walking once in the shaded road in India and he heard a chant behind him as he was walking towards the sea. And there was a dead body being carried by two men and his eldest son carrying the fire in front of him, in front of the body. That's all, not all the fuss and hearses and flowers and you know. It was a simple thing and it was really rather beautiful. The son crying and chanting in Sanskrit, walking towards the sea where he was going to be cremated. And the fuss the western world makes about death, Rolls Royces, enormous amount of flowers and so on. So what are we concerned with? Living or dying? Please we are talking to each other. Which is most important for us to grapple with, put our teeth and our whole energy into it?

Talking about energy, there are those people who want to release energy - right? Part of it is acupuncture, part of it is various attempts to increase the energy that we have, and so on. What is energy? It took energy to come here, a great deal of energy, put up a tent, come in a car on a rainy, windy day, get all the things together to come here. That took a lot of energy. You may brush it off and say, "I will go" - but to decided to go, to come, to drive a car, to put up a tent, to sit here and listen. That requires a great deal of energy. And we want more energy. We don't know how to use our own energy. You have got plenty of energy when you want to do something. They have been to the Moon, all the technological energy that is demanded of everyone; it takes energy to talk, to think, to have sex, everything, life is energy but we, through our self-interest, our specialization, through our demand for success, and fears and all that, we have restricted that energy. We have made it so small, so particular, so minuscule. Sorry! And our brains have been narrowed down by specialization, by, you know, all the rest of it. So there is energy. When we understand ourselves that energy explodes, then you have tremendous passion, not just passion for something, the flower of passion which never withers. And that can only come when there is compassion.

So what are we concerned most about, death or living? Living is, as we said, a series, a succession of conflicts, struggles, pains, sorrow, and all the rest of it. This is not a gloomy picture. You can paint it more beautifully in colours, descriptively make it more attractive, but this is a fact. So shouldn't we understand life first, the living, and then come to understand what is death? You understand? Not the other way round. What will you give, not

financially, what will you give to find out how, in what manner one can live totally differently? - not pursue some other quacky nonsense, a new painting, new poems, new dances, and all the rest of that immature, childish stuff. And the speaker is not intolerant, he just sees all this going on. So can we realizing what our life is, the actual life of existence on this earth, bring about a mutation, not a change, complete reversal, whatever it is, the thing that one has lived is living, is completely ended and something new can take place?

Therefore we have to enquire together into what is continuity, what is it that continues in our life, living? Memory, is it? Continuity, a series of successions of events, experiences, the me, the persona, the ego, is a bundle of memories. One mightn't like that idea. One wants something more than mere memories, and wanting more, something beyond memories is another formation of memories - right? One is not satisfied with this memory but wants some other memory. So this continuation, which we call living, is a series and successions of events, memories, experience, all that bundle is you. And continuity is that which is known. How scared we are of something ending to all that. One has lived a long life of experience, knowledge, one has travelled all over the place, God knows why but one has, and you talk, judge, evaluate, you know all that. And we never enquire what is continuity and what is ending? Ending voluntarily something that you hold dear - you understand my question? Are we asking each other that question? Suppose one is greatly attached to a person, to a conclusion, that conclusion however historical, dialectical, Marxist, Leninist, bla, bla, all that, one is attached to all that like a limpet. [Tape turns

over] Can one voluntarily, easily, let go? That is what death means. You don't argue with death. You don't say, "Please give me another couple of days so that I can do everything orderly", it is there at your door.

So can one understand continuity and give to that continuity an end? You understand my question? To us attachment means a great deal. It is the most satisfying common experience to be attached to the earth, to certain beliefs, certain dogmas, certain rituals, certain habits and so on. One is greatly attached to a house, to furniture, to a habit. Can one become aware of it and end it completely in that awareness? Not the day after tomorrow but now as we are sitting here, becoming aware of all that, the explanations, the reality, not the description but the fact of this constant demand for continuity. Sexual continuity, the continuity of possessions, continuity of family, continuity of one's deep experiences, all that coming to an instant end. That is death. So not wait for death when you are sixty, eighty, ninety, but end it each day, live with death. Don't be... the speaker is saying something tremendously involved in this, not just a lot of words put together. To live with something, a life that is constantly ending everyday, every minute so there is no continuity of the past, or the future. There is only this ending which is death. And to live that way. Go on Sirs. Don't think about it, see the truth of it. Thought is not - can create, put together a lot of things but thought cannot deceive death. So if one realizes the immense significance of living with that ending which is called death in our daily life then there is real transformation, real mutation even in the brain cells, because the brain cells carry all our memories, all the past and all the rest of it. So can we live that way? Not pretend, not

"I must make an effort" - you don't make an effort to die! Unless you jump out of the eighteenth floor and you say, "So far, so good" [Laughter]

And also we should talk about together what is religion, what is the nature of the brain that lives religiously? Religion has become very important in our lives. You may be atheists, you may say, "Well it is all nonsense, some stupid priest preaching about some nonsense." You may shun all that but yet there is this inward demand, inward saying, "After all, what is all this about, this living and dying, this pain, this anxiety, what is it all about? Who created it? God? Nature? The first cell?" and so on. So religion is concerned not with all the rubbish, circus that is going on, whether in Rome, or in England, or in Benares in India, or in the Buddhist countries, it is all put together by thought, and therefore very, very, very limited. So we have to ask what is religion and creation? What is creation? Is there a difference between creation and invention? We were talking the other day with an excellent doctor, really first-class doctor, not a doctor who makes money but good doctor with a good brain. He was saying there is a certain part of the brain that can always be activated. I may be misrepresenting, careful, don't accept entirely what the speaker is saying about that. There is a certain part of the brain, he mentioned some technical word which I didn't know, that as one gets ill that gets a little bit dull, as one gets older that gets still more dull. And whether that inner part of the brain can be revived, made alive - right? Don't accept it. Don't go to sleep. We were talking about it - I won't go into it now because it is too complex. So what is invention and what is creation? Religion is concerned with this. And can the

brain, which is conditioned, shaped, moulded by all kinds of things, community, what you read, what you hear, all the priests that been promulgating some ideas, some worship, some gods, all that has conditioned our brain. Can our brain, yours and... our brain, can that brain ever understand what is creation? Or it is based fundamentally on knowledge, which is experience, gathering, learning, memorizing and so on? Can that brain understand that which is not measurable? You understand? Are we somewhat together in this?

We measure - right? We measure, which means compare, judge, evaluate, we are always comparing ourself with something else. Comparing one painter against another painter, one poem against another poem, or Beethoven against Bach and so on, Mozart, let me include Mozart in it. So is invention - is not invention based on knowledge? Please we are talking about it together. If there is no knowledge there is no invention. We must have a background of knowledge to find something new, is that creation? Or is creation something totally out of time and thought? This has been one of the problems, probably the greatest problem of a religious brain, religious quality. We will never use the word meditation any more. I hope you don't mind. That word implies also measurement in Sanskrit as well as in etymological dictionaries. Measurement. Not only measurement of cloth and all the material things, but also measuring ourselves against something. Measurement was invented by the Greeks and probably before them, and that without measurement there is no technological world. And we carry on that same principle in ourselves, we are always measuring how we are today and hope tomorrow will be the same or wish it to be

different. It is always comparing, judging, evaluating. And the word, that word which has become so mutilated by the gurus who have brought various forms of meditation - we won't discuss that word any more because it has become a stupid word. Sitting in a certain posture, breathing in a certain way, concentrating, and all that - making tremendous effort to achieve what? Some carrot before the donkey?

So we should be concerned with not how to make the brain still, that is fairly easy. But to be concerned with total attention, not attention to or about something, the quality of attention, which is different from concentration, entirely different. Concentration is effort, focussing on one thing, or several things, which becomes a habit like the pilots in the air. So is it possible to be attentive? And in that there is no hypocrisies, no pretensions. You are attentive. And in attention there is complete silence, when you attend. And in that attention there is no border, it is attending. There is not, "I am attending", there is only attention. Please consider, take counsels together about this.

So what is creation? Not the first cell, nor how we ? and all that. We have said God created all this. On the contrary we have made God our image, out of what we are we have made that poor chap up there! We have given him all the qualities which we lack, mercy, charity, love, omnipresence, intelligence, and all the rest of that business. What is creation? Can the brain, which is the centre of all our nerves, all our activity, all our existence, however small it is, can that brain understand the immensity of creation? Or there is something beyond the brain. Now careful please, don't accept anything the speaker is saying. That is the first thing one has to

learn, never accept anything so-called spiritual. That's sheer nonsense. There is no spiritual authority. The authority of a doctor, scientist, that is a different matter, the policeman has authority, especially in Switzerland! Tremendous! We were caught in it once! Is the brain capable of really seeing that which is not measurable? We can talk about it, we can invent it, we can say there is the immeasurable, all that means a lot of words. But we are asking a different question altogether: can the brain, which is made up of time, memory, thought, experience, all the rest of it, can that brain ever understand that which is limitless? You understand my question? It is really... Or there is something else which is the mind, not the brain. Don't invent, then we are lost. We are asking each other: is there something which we will call the mind for the moment, we may change the word, is there a mind which is not the brain? Is there such a thing which alone can see that which is immense? And then that mind can communicate to the brain, but the brain cannot communicate to it? You have understood? We are asking each other. The brain as we know has been made very small, though it has got immense capacity. The computer is something extraordinary. It is going to probably take over our lives, that is probably the new industry. The computer will shape our lives. It is already doing it quietly, slowly, we are unaware of it. We have talked to a great many of these experts, computer experts who are building it. They are not concerned with what happens to the human brain. You understand my question? They are concerned with creating it - not creating, building it - that's a better word. When the computer takes over our lives what happens to our brains? They are better, far quicker, so rapid, in a second

they will tell you a thousand memories. So when they take over what is going to happen to our brains? Gradually wither? Or be thoroughly employed in amusement? In entertainment? Please face all this for God's sake, this is happening. All the long sports record on the television, it is getting longer and longer. They spend ten minutes on cricket, and two minutes on what is happening in South Africa. So the entertainment industry is taking over. Please face all this. And religious entertainment, that has taken over too. So we are being entertained all the time. And we treat meeting here as part of that. I assure you it is not. It is terribly serious all this.

So can the brain ever understand the universe? It can say Venus is so much gas, so much etcetera, etcetera, but the description, the quality, the taste of it is not Venus, the beauty of it, the extraordinary quietness of it. And can our brain, to understand all that immensity be quiet? - not everlastingly chattering, chattering, chattering. Can that brain become extraordinarily simple and therefore extraordinarily subtle? And if that brain is capable of that subtleness, that immense sense of great simplicity, of time/thought and all the rest of it, then perhaps that mind which is not the brain can communicate to it. Then the brain cannot communicate to that obviously. And we are doing our very best to communicate with that, doing all kinds of tricks, all forms of controls, sacrifice, taking vows, taking - right? And that thing can never - one can never touch it. And the religious mind, religious brain always has the background of great silence and solitude.

We have finished. Will you kindly get up so that I can get up too?

THE ROLE OF A FLOWER BROCKWOOD PARK A TV INTERVIEW OCTOBER, 1985

Interviewer: For years people have invented and endured all kinds of disciplines, deprivations and discomforts in the hope of achieving enlightenment. Spending a week under canvas in Hampshire hardly ranks with some of the great sacrifices that litter the history of practically every religion. The atmosphere here at Brockwood Park is that of the international camp site. The only ceremonies and rituals performed are self- imposed. The man that more than three thousand people have come to hear has rejected all of the panoply and dogma imposed by organised religion, he has even rejected the role for which he was groomed, Messiah. He is Jiddu Krishnamurti.

Listener: I have come to hear Krishnamurti.

Interviewer: You are first in the queue, how long have you been waiting for?

Listener: Since about ten fifteen last night.

Interviewer: Why was it important to get there quite that early?

Listener: To be close.

Listener: He invites one to have a conversation with him. He is always saying, can we discuss together, this, that and the other, and this is an invitation really to participate. And that you can't do if you are a quarter of a mile down the tent.

Listener: He is very profound, and I think if you can listen to him something in your brain might start happening.

Listener: It probably shouldn't be necessary to come every year, once you've heard it you've heard it, but it's like looking at a

mountain or a tree, it's good to come.

Interviewer: Now in his ninety-first year Krishnamurti has been described as one of the greatest philosophers and teachers of all time, a role he can hardly have anticipated fifty-six years ago, when to the profound shock of his devoted followers, he announced he was not the Messiah, and dissolved the organisation of which he was the head.

Krishnamurti never refers to himself as, I, always as K, or the speaker. So what is the role of the man they have come to hear?

Krishnamurti: What is the role of a flower? It just exists. And those who like to go and look at it, smell it and like it, say, what a beautiful flower it is, it exists.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti presents a calm and conventional exterior, with a stunning lack of pomp and ceremony he sits, very upright and very still on a hard straight backed chair, and talks without notes and without preparation for at least an hour. Looking at this slight unassuming figure it is hard to believe his bizarre and extraordinary history. He was born in 1895, the eighth child of a Brahmin family, the highest caste at a time when the system was rigidly observed. He was very close indeed to his mother, who, before he was born, said she had a premonition that he would be in some way remarkable. She died when Krishnamurti was ten years old and the family moved to Adyar, near Madras. It was here living in extreme poverty that he was spotted by Charles Webster Leadbeater, a leading figure in the Theosophical Society. Theosophy was a world movement which embraced all religions. They believed that following on Buddha, Krishna and Christ the world was ready for the next incarnation of the Messiah. Its

president, Annie Besant was a flamboyant figure, who fought uncompromisingly for a whole range of social reforms in Britain and India. Krishnamurti must have looked an unlikely candidate, undernourished, with crooked teeth and a vacant expression. But Leadbeater said the child had an aura of unselfishness, he was the chosen one. Mrs Besant adopted him and began grooming him for his future role by bringing him to England.

One of the first people he met was Lady Emily Lutyens, wife of the architect Sir Edwin, a committed theosophist she took him straight to the heart of her family. Her daughter Mary, now aged seventy-seven is Krishnamurti's oldest friend and his biographer. She remembers vividly the moment that Krishnamurti and his younger brother Nitya arrived in London.

Mary Lutyens: These two little boys arrived in England, my mother saw them and took enormous pity on them. They were wearing European clothes for the first time, they were in Norfolk jackets and shoes which pinched them, they looked miserable, shivering with cold, and she mothered them.

Interviewer: How did you feel about him?

Mary Lutyens: I didn't think he had a brain, that he was very simple, very simple minded. It's absolutely staggering to me looking back what he can do now, what's come out of him now. I just can't believe it sometimes. You wouldn't really think that every single thing he says, it may appear to be like Buddhism, it may appear to be like this, that or the other, it may be a certain bit of the Sermon on the Mount, I don't know, but he would know it, he had never read it, so everything he has discovered for himself. And what amazes me is what he has found in himself from that very

vacant, certainly very unintelligent young man.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti and Nitya were introduced to a rich and aristocratic Edwardian London. Of the two brothers Nitya was considered the quicker and brighter. His death some years later was to affect Krishnamurti deeply. Over the following years the brothers travelled all over Europe, to America and Australia. Theosophists everywhere eagerly awaited the day when Krishnamurti would assume the role for which he was destined.

Krishnamurti had a fascination for all things mechanical. He taught Mary Lutyens how to drive; the relationship blossomed. Was she in love with him?

Mary Lutyens: Yes, I had been in love with Nitya, tremendously, he was the love of my life and then I suppose I was in love with Krishna after Nitya's death. He wrote wonderful letters and unfortunately I destroyed all his letters to me.

Interviewer: Was there a point at which he ever really believed that he was going to be the new Messiah?

Mary Lutyens: Yes, definitely. He did believe. And there was a wonderful occasion when we had all been in Sydney under Mr Leadbeater and we came back for the Jubilee convention at Adyar, that was its fifty year, I suppose, in 1925, and it was rather expected that the Lord would speak through him for the first time. And I was there and he was speaking at 8.0 o'clock under the banyan tree, it was a wonderful place, and he was talking about when he comes - which he used to talk about in those days, when he comes - and he suddenly changed to saying, 'I come' and it was an absolutely thrilling moment.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti was extremely grateful to all those

who had such a trusting faith in him. He tried his best to please them, going to huge Theosophical gatherings, and undergoing, for him, the torture of getting up and speaking in public. Obviously the Theosophists influenced him but it seems only superficially. All the time he was working out his own philosophy, his own view of how to arrive at the truth. The time bomb had begun to tick. In 1929 at a vast gathering of Theosophists at Ommen in Holland it exploded.

Mary Lutyens: I think it was in the morning he spoke up and said, I am now going to dissolve the Order of which I happen to be head. You can go and join another Order if you want to, I don't want followers. If there is one person who understands it can do more good than all these three thousand people here. And it was a big and very rich organisation and he gave it all completely away, all the land, and all the property and the Castle Eerde that had been given, he gave it all back to the owners. And he divested himself of all property. One of the things, the very lovely speech that he gave on that occasion, was to say, Truth was a pathless land, you cannot get to it by any path whatever.

Interviewer: In what became his most famous speech, Krishnamurti said, 'This is no magnificent deed because I do not want followers, and I mean this. The moment you follow someone you cease to follow truth. I am concerning myself with only one essential thing, to set man free. I desire to free him from all cages, from all fears, and not to found religions, new sects, nor to establish new theories, and new philosophies.' The speech was such a shock to many of the followers that they turned away from the man from whom they had expected so much. Others took a

different view; today one of those early devotees travels every year from New Zealand to hear him speak, Basil Gossage.

Basil Gossage: To some it was a very traumatic experience, the end of the world. In my own case I thought, well, if K has got the - pardon the phrase - the spiritual guts to do that, to say, I am disbanding the Order, it is not necessary, truth is a pathless land, I thought, well he'll do me. At least he is one hundred per cent honest. That's been born out over fifty-five years.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti has developed and expanded his teaching but he still rejects all organised religion.

Krishnamurti: You see we are now trying to impose morality on people. Right?

Interviewer: Many religions have tried.

Krishnamurti: I know, I know. They have failed. Why?

Interviewer: You tell me, why?

Krishnamurti: Because they are based on some belief which has no value at all, on some dogma, faith, and do this, don't do that - that's what religions have done.

Interviewer: They would say they are all different ways, different paths.

Krishnamurti: Ah, that's all the good old game, different paths. Because I am a Hindu and I say, that's my path, you are a Christian and you say that's your path. It's nonsense. Path to what? They say to god, to truth, as though fixed, god and truth are stationary.

Interviewer: Aren't they?

Krishnamurti: A living thing can't be stationary.

Interviewer: The people who come to the gatherings are a disparate bunch of all nationalities, rich and poor, no one ever

counts how many come and though there is a collection no one is charged admission. If they have anything in common it seems to be an intellectual rather than a spiritual approach to life, though Krishnamurti teaches that too much thought is one of man's biggest problems.

Are they expecting you to be their authority, do you think?

Krishnamurti: Partly. And partly also they want somebody to tell them what to do.

Interviewer: They must be very disappointed when they don't.

Krishnamurti: Yes. Not disappointed, they say, well what the devil is he talking about. Or, say, I must understand what he is talking about. You are not understanding somebody, you are understanding yourself.

Listener: I feel I understand intellectually, but actually in my life I think it is rather limited. I mean the actual - it hasn't changed me completely, that's what I mean. When I hear him I think I understand completely what he is saying in terms of the words he uses and so on, but it doesn't have its corresponding effect in my life.

Interviewer: Why is that?

Listener: I don't know, I think the self seems to be so strong, and one resists it so completely.

Listener: He really is nobody. And if we could understand that completely that might change our lives. But we don't.

Interviewer: What do you get out of coming then?

Listener: Pardon?

Interviewer: What do you take away from a week here?

Listener: That's the whole problem, we all want to have

something, that's the problem. It's understandable though but that's our problem, we are greedy, we want it. And may be that works too. If you really want it you might get it.

Interviewer: It being what?

Listener: If you don't really want it you won't get it.

Interviewer: It being what?

Listener: I don't know, what do you want?

Listener: It depends how you listen. He is very repetitious if you don't really listen and you are just aware of the words and the superficial meaning; whereas if you really listen, you can say that the bird singing in the garden is repetitious, the blackbird sings the same week after week, but if you really listen it's always new. And the same thing with Krishnamurti, if you really listen it's new.

Krishnamurti: There is an art of listening, when you listen to Beethoven or Mozart and so on, you listen, you don't try to interpret it, unless you are romantic, sentimental and all that, you absorb, you listen, there is some extraordinary movement going on in it, great silence, great depth and all that. So similarly if you can listen, not only with the hearing of the ear, but deeply, not interpret, not translate, just listen.

Interviewer: When they all leave the tent and they say, what he really meant was.

Krishnamurti: Then you are lost.

Listener: I remember when I listened to him for the first time it was nearly impossible because I couldn't accept what he was saying.

Interviewer: Why?

Listener: Because it's very strong, he throws you back to all

your things you can't accept. You see you are greedy, you are jealous, you are all that, and you know you are. But when he throws you back at this you say, no, I don't like to see that. Now after some years I got very used to look at this because I wanted to, because it got really very much easier to accept it than running away from it because if I run away from it I got always more fear and fear because the thoughts go round and round. So now I would say I don't know if I understand him, but I understand myself a little bit better.

Krishnamurti: Our brain is very limited. Our brain is so heavily conditioned by the scientists, by propagandists, by religion, by all the historical events, whether it is Lenin or somebody else, our brains are conditioned. And we live in that condition. Right? And that conditioning is creating havoc in the world.

Interviewer: Is there a way out of that?

Krishnamurti: Yes there is. That requires a great deal of enquiry, you cannot just say, well, tell me in two words.

Interviewer: People have tried to say in two words things like, love one another, turn the other cheek, but there are no easy solutions?

Krishnamurti: Of course not. But you see, is there an easy solution for a blade of grass that grows in the cement? There is a path there, and you see grass pushing, pushing, pushing, if it has life it goes through. Right? A blade of grass. As our brains are terribly limited, our life is limited. Right? And can that brain which has evolved through millennia, can that brain radically change?

Interviewer: Do you think that he is very insulated and protected by this life style, that he doesn't really understand the

problems that most people face.

Mary Lutyens: I think he does, but I think he feels that they make problems where there needn't be problems, by not actually seeing what their problems are. I think people do make problems that aren't necessary. And I don't see that it makes him any - they expect him to dress, perhaps some people, in sack cloth and ashes, and grow his hair and his beard, but does that really make you a more religious person?

Interviewer: Is it possible that someone could come here to one of the talks, hear what you say, hear in himself, or herself, the truth and then go away and live in this quick result, quick society. Can the two co-exist?

Krishnamurti: Of course. This has been one of the questions that has been troubling people. Can I live in this monstrous society, immoral, corrupt and all the rest of it, with complete honesty by myself? Of course you can. So you have to ask, what is society. Right? Is society different from me? Or I am society? I don't know if you follow this.

Interviewer: Yes.

Krishnamurti: I am society, I have created the awful thing. I am part of it. Society is not different from me. Right? So I don't reform the outer circle, social reform, you know all the political game that is going on. First I put my house in order - my house, deeply, my house in order, and then there will be order out there. If you and I, all of us who are listening, put our house first in order we have created a new society.

Interviewer: It's a message that Krishnamurti believes could radically change the world in which we live, even if only a few of

the thousands who listen actually understand. What happens in the tent is intended to be a conversation, but only rarely do the audience actually respond. They sit almost as rigid as the speaker, grappling with his often enigmatic utterances. Few of them probably have any idea of Krishnamurti off stage, of his love of good clothes and pleasant treats.

Mary Lutyens: You should see him when he comes to London.

Interviewer: Why?

Mary Lutyens: How elegant he looks then.

Interviewer: What does he like to do when he comes to London?

Mary Lutyens: He goes to his tailor, and he comes up for the dentist, and we always have lunch at Fortnum and Masons in a very quiet place at the top, the fourth floor, and to get his hair cut. Otherwise he hates London.

Interviewer: A lot of people would be horrified to think that someone that is preaching self-effacement, self-discovery, actually enjoys all those material and worldly things.

Mary Lutyens: He doesn't tell you to give up happiness, or to give up joy. I mean if you enjoy doing something, for goodness sake do it.

Interviewer: Krishnamurti leads a life untroubled by money worries, like the queen, he has distanced himself from it, owing none and handling none. His personal expenses are met by friends and the organisation of all the books and conferences is done by the Krishnamurti Foundation, a registered charity. The conference is held in the grounds of the Krishnamurti School; here in an enormous marquee K plays host.

Krishnamurti: I have forgotten the name of it, you know, from Japan.

Listener: Macrobiotic.

Krishnamurti: Macrobiotic, that's it. Go crazy on that! As one goes crazy about yoga and all rest of it.

Laughter is part of seriousness. Right? If you don't know how to laugh and look at the sun and the trees, the dappled light, you are not quite human being. If you are merely churchy serious on Sunday then it is not serious. Laughter, smiles, that sense of humour, enjoying good jokes, not vulgar, but really good jokes.

Interviewer: The jokes Krishnamurti makes in public go rather sparse, but they along with everything else he says is enshrined for ever on videotape. Modern technology is giving an advantage to Krishnamurti denied to past gurus, philosophers and messiahs. Every interview he does, every speech he makes, is recorded and left unedited. Immediately after his morning speech at Brockwood for twenty three pounds people can buy a copy of the event. So even after his death there need be no interpreters. What impact do you think having the videos will have on the future?

Listener: May be we can avoid that it is going to be spoilt, the original. Like we talked about a little while ago, may be the whole Christianity would have been different if there had been videos in the time of Jesus Christ.

Interviewer: What do you think will happen when he dies?

Basil Gossage: I don't know. There will be interpreters, there will be people who will want to build organisations, but the beauty of it is we have these video tapes. They used to mistranslate the Bible, didn't they, say he said this, he said that, but the video tapes

can't lie, they are there for posterity. It will go on with the individual, it must do.

Interviewer: How long are you going to carry on doing it for?

Krishnamurti: I have been asking people around, friends of mine, I say, the moment I am gaga stop me! I don't know. I have got plenty of energy, because you don't carry all the burden of the past - which is very nice.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 29TH DECEMBER 1984

We would like to point out that this is not an entertainment, either emotionally, romantically, or ideologically. And this is important to understand, if you will. We are not propagating any ideas, ideals, no system, or philosophical concepts or theories. We are going together to not only investigate but also to observe without analysis, without prejudice, without any kind of previous conclusions, observe very carefully, objectively what human beings throughout the world have become.

Psychologically after - according to the scientists and archeologists and biologists and so on - we have lived on this earth for perhaps a million years and definitely between forty five and fifty thousand year as human beings. During this long interval of time we are, after this so-called evolution - not only biologically but psychologically which is much more important to understand than biologically - it appears that we are as barbarous, as cruel, as vicious, hurting, violent, superstitious as we were fifty thousand years ago. We have perhaps become more sophisticated in our superstitions, in our worship, in our temples, in our churches and mosques and so on, but essentially we are what we have been many thousands of years ago. Religiously we are broken up, we belong to various sects, gurus, believing all kinds of rot. And also we have broken up the earth geographically and nationally. You are all Indians, I believe, or you are all British, Catholics, Americans or Russians. We are tribal worshippers. These are all facts. We are not exaggerating. These are obvious perceptible,

objective realities.

And we have had wars for the last fifty thousand years. There you took a club and killed a man, now we have evolved, you can kill millions and millions with one bomb. We have progressed technologically. Technologically we have advanced tremendously, incalculably, and there is no end to technology - the most complicated machines, the computers, and the terrible things of war. But as human beings we are what we are: narrow, bigoted, superstitious, petty, concerned with ourselves. And in all this self-interest is the major factor of all the people in the world.

One hopes that you are listening to all this carefully. Not that one must accept what is being said, one must have a certain quality of doubt, scepticism, question, demand to find out, not remain in our own petty little aggressive believing, and not believing, worshipping our petty little gods whom we have invented. We must look at the world as a whole, holistically, not as Hindus, Buddhists, Tibetans, you know, all that business. Can we do this? Because we have reached a point in our evolution where there must be tremendous change, otherwise we are going to destroy ourselves, not only through wars, through poisonous gases. We have had an example of it recently in this country. We are very deliberately destroying the earth, the earth which is so beautiful, so productive, that is nourishing us.

And also we have lost touch with nature, with the trees, with the flowers, with the vast valleys and the dark rivers. It means nothing to us. We are so willing to cut down any tree for our convenience, especially in this country, desert is spreading because of lack of fuel, over population and so on. These are all obvious, daily facts.

And so we have reached a point as human beings where we must wipe the slate clean and begin again. We mean by 'beginning again', not looking back into history - history after all is the story of ourselves - and that story of past humanity is in us, in each one of us, it is a vast complex book, which is ourselves, each one of us. This book we must read for ourselves, nobody on earth or in heaven can teach you how to read that book, nobody can help you, including the speaker - most emphatically. Because we have all been helped down the ages; various teachers, various gurus, various faiths, complicated sophisticated theories, and we want to be helped, not only by the psychotherapists, which is perhaps natural, but also we want to be helped from the outside, some outside agency, from a book. If you observe yourself very carefully I am sure you want to be helped. Don't you? Don't you want to be helped? If you really faced it, looked at it, you all want to be helped. And that's why perhaps you are here, to solve your problems, to find a new way of living, to find truth through somebody else, how to meditate, what to think. You all want to be helped. That's why temples in India are increasing, vast sums of money are spent because you are seeking help from an outside agency called god, which you have invented, and there are others who are willing to help you: the priest, the analyst, psychologists and the various gurus.

One hopes that you are actually listening to all this, not just putting it out of your mind not to listen to all this. Because when you are helped you become weak. One has the energy, the capacity to read the book, which is the history of mankind, which is yourself. This is very serious what we are saying, so please don't

brush it aside. There is nobody that can help you except yourself. You can join any society, any community, form a little clique, a set, accept some theology, hoping for salvation or hoping your problems, daily problems of life, the strife, the struggle with the pain, the anxiety, the sorrow, and all the travail of mankind. We have always looked to others to help us. You have invented the masters, you have invented every kind of theory, ideal, gurus, gods, and none of them have helped you actually. You are still in pain, you still have problems, not only technological problems which are fairly simple to solve, but also psychological problems, the problem that is within the brain, the problem of the psyche, the problems of our relationship with another, the problems of ending fear, sorrow, anxiety, uncertainty. We want to find what happens after death, and the fear of death. And we have worshipped, prayed, believed, had deep faiths, and none of that has helped us. They may cover us, they may help us to escape from ourselves. And we have done that excellently, to escape from ourselves.

We have reached a point when we must not only see these facts as actual, not theoretical, but also totally, completely rely on ourselves, because nobody on earth or in heaven or in hell can save us. That's a fact. You may not like to believe it because we like comfort, both physical as well as the comfort of certainty, the comfort of clarity. But we are confused human beings. Our brains have been programmed to be a Catholic, to be a Protestant, to be a Hindu, to be a communist and so on and so on. One wonders if you actually realize all this, not verbally, not something as though it were out there, but actually in ourselves.

And one wonders whether one is serious at all. The word

'serious' has many meanings: to apply whole heartedly to something, to something that is very serious, earnest, that demands a great deal of attention, that demands a clear, objective, non-personal brain. Whether one is capable of all this. When you want money, when you want power, status, you work, you become a businessman, a lawyer, and if you will, a politician. You work, see how many hours you spend in a factory, or in an office, perhaps for fifty years in an office, and you spend enormous energy. And that very same energy you are unwilling to look at yourself, read the book of yourself. Right? Would you consider all this? I know you will come back tomorrow if you are willing or if you want to, not to be harangued, not to make you clear, nobody on earth can make your brain clear, sharp, awake, not to accept anything, so that you begin to question your own thoughts, your own activities, the way of your relationship with your wife or husband or a friend.

So can we go together - the speaker means together, you and the speaker examine our existence, our daily existence. And that existence is very, very complicated. There is no immediate answer. Oh yes, there is! There is an immediate answer to all our problems. Don't wait for me to explain it. I'll explain, I'll go into it. But one must see for oneself the immense space of time which is called evolution. And evolution has not solved anything except biologically, technologically. It hasn't solved our human problems, psychological issues. (I am sorry there is that noise, which is modern civilization and vulgarity. You can't stop it. They have voted and they are now free to express themselves.)

You see most of us believe in gradation, gradual. Of course we need time to learn a language, to learn a skill, to become an expert

in programming a computer. There you need gradual process of accumulation of knowledge. There time, gradation, gradualness, is necessary. But psychologically, inwardly, we carry the same principle. That is, gradually we will achieve brotherhood, which is nonsense. Gradually there will be international naming of all nations. This gradual process is the extension of the technological knowledge, to be achieved gradually. Right? Is this clear? No? Sir, don't you have to learn, don't you have to have time to learn any skill. You need time, many months to learn really a new language. And that same sense of time, gradation, gradualness is carried over to the psychological world: we are this but we will become that. Right? We are violent now, but give us time we will become non-violent. Which is, you accept time as a factor of change. The speaker questions that, doubts that. Because we have had time, we have had forty, fifty, hundred thousand years, you have had a long time, human beings, and they have not changed; they are still self-centred, they are still anxious, uncertain, seeking security, fearing death, fighting each other, killing each other for an idea. If you don't like something which the neighbour does you kill him. The terrorists. All this is the result of long centuries of human existence. Right? This is the result of gradualness, it is called evolution, psychological evolution.

Are we clear on this matter? At least what the speaker is saying. You may not accept this. But as we said, we are together examining it. Examining the whole question of psychological evolution. Right? Are we together in this? Or are you just going off with your own thoughts, occupied with your own problems? Or are we actually listening to the obvious fact that time has not solved

any of our human problems - time being evolution, psychological evolution. Perhaps biologically you have reached the point, there is no further progress, or evolution, you can't develop a fourth arm. But you have gods with a dozen arms. So we are saying clearly, definitely, psychological evolution doesn't exist at all. You understand? That's why if you see the truth of that, the actuality of that, that you who have lived on this earth for fifty thousand and more years, we are still as brutal, violent, suspicious, accepting theories, this tremendous self-interest in the name of god, in the name of meditation, and so on. That self-interest was at the beginning of time and now. So time has not changed us. Evolution, psychological evolution has not brought about a radical revolution psychologically. We have had revolutions physically: the communist revolution, the Bolsheviks revolution, the French revolution and so on. Physical revolution has not changed a thing. Look at the communist world, Russia: they have got elitism and so on. I don't have to tell you all that, you know all about it.

So do we actually clearly see this? As I said, time has not changed us, gradualness is not going to change us. That's a fact. So we have to enquire very carefully into the nature of time and thought. What is time? Please question all this, don't accept anything, from your books, from your literature, from your sacred Upanishads and all the rest, don't accept a thing but find out for yourself, because that brings freedom. It is only in freedom, complete freedom psychologically, that there is truth. Freedom, beauty and truth are together, they are not separate. They are interrelated.

And so we are together, please don't go to sleep, we are

together, you with your brain, look, listen, to find out if what the speaker is saying is true. Don't accept a thing. Doubt, examine.

First of all our brain is conditioned to the idea of gradualness. That's a fact. And so we are going together to question, doubt, which means put aside everything that you have thought about time: time as a means of psychological achievement, psychological becoming something, you meditate in order to find and so on, psychologically, inwardly, subjectively, inside the skin as it were.

So we are going together to examine carefully what is time. Because we are used to time: time when you are living and time as death. Right? The long interval between life and death, living and death, which is many years, or one day. So what is time? Time by the watch is totally different: time as sun rising and sun setting, the time of the new moon and the full moon, the time that is necessary to climb a hill, time to paint, time to write a poem, time to talk. We are talking not of that time, not the chronological time, but the whole concept, the feeling, the inward sense of 'I have time to evolve, to become, to reach, to achieve'. We are questioning that time, not the time by the watch, chronological time. Right, is that clear? If that is not clear please we cannot go any further. Perhaps some of you will pay a little attention to what is being said. I hope all of you will.

Time is the past: all our memories, all the incidents and experiences, the pain of a thousand yesterdays. That is the memory, all that memory we carry in our brain, that is the past. Right? The present is now. The 'now' is you are sitting there, I am sitting here. But coming to this meeting, to this talk, sitting here, is the result of your past memories. Right? So time, the past modifies

itself in the present and goes on into the future. Right? This is our life: past memories, which are carried in the brain, in the very brain cells themselves, and the past slightly adjusts itself to the present, modifying itself, slightly changing itself, and the past goes through the future. Right? This is clear, simple. The past is now, modified slightly, and the future is what we are now. Right? Are we seeing this? The future, tomorrow is the future, tomorrow is what we are now, so tomorrow is now, psychologically. Don't go to sleep, sirs, please. This is a serious matter. Please apply your brain, your energy to find this out.

The past is now. And the now is the future. Right? I am angry today, if I don't change that anger, the root of anger, I will be angry tomorrow. So tomorrow is now. So the future is now. Right? Do you see this? Not as a theory, not as something you hear vaguely, inattentively and perhaps you have come here because of some silly reputation, but this is a very important question, because man, and the scientists too, have thought of time as a series of movements, which is so. But we are talking of the inward sense of being, the inward sense of demanding 'I will change gradually'. That is what we are questioning, doubting.

So we are saying that the past, slightly changed in the present by circumstances, by sociological changes, economic, and so on, slightly modified, and goes on tomorrow. Tomorrow therefore is what we are now. Right? Do please see this. Therefore there is no future for me, or for you, to become something. Right? You are what you are now. After thousands of millennia upon millennia you have become what you are. And we look to time, tomorrow, a thousand tomorrows to find out, or to become something. So now,

the present, contains all time. Right? See the fact of it. All the now, that is what you are now, whether you are young, or a student learning a language, learning mathematics, geography, history and all that business, and what you are now, as a human being, inwardly: your anxieties, your fears, your sorrows, your pain, your uncertainty, that is what you are now. And if you don't change now completely, tomorrow will be exactly the same, slightly modified but you will be what you are. Right? If you doubt what the speaker is saying about time, examine it quietly, take time to look, forget all that you have learnt about time, that is, gradualness. The speaker is saying there is no gradualness at all, because you are the past with all the accumulated memories and you are now what you have been, and if there is no fundamental change now you will be exactly tomorrow what you are. You will be afraid, you will have no security, or you want security, gradually you will find it, all that business.

So if there is no tomorrow psychologically then what is change? You understand my question? Let me look at it, I'll put it differently. I don't know why you don't capture it quickly. It is a fact. Why don't you take it to your heart and see the truth of it instantly? Our brains are so dull, so mechanical, so repetitive, so accustomed to our particular pattern of thinking. So we are saying if all time is now, which is immense reality if you understand it fully, then what is change? I am violent today, I have been violent for the last thousand days, thousand years, million years. And I have invented, or the clever people have invented non-violence. That is, something there to be achieved. And my tradition, my conditioning says, work for it, struggle for it, be aware of your

violence and so on and so on, you know all the inventions. And then one day you will become non-violent. This has been preached by all your gurus, and your mahatmas, and your gods; and the speaker is saying you have had time psychologically, and you haven't changed, therefore gradualness has no meaning at all. That's an actuality. So how do you end violence immediately, instantly? Right? That is the question. Are we listening? Do you want to find out?

Are we all working together as the speaker is working? Are you working actually with your brain to find out? Or are you merely so used to talks, so used to being told, waiting for somebody to help you to understand the nature of time? I must go on, otherwise it is no good.

We are asking: I have been violent, I am still violent, violence is not merely physical but it is also much more psychological. Imitation, conformity, except in the physical world, in the psychological world conformity, imitation, acceptance, obedience is a form of violence, because you are denying the truth of your own understanding. So can this violence, with which one has lived for millennia, end now completely, because if there is no complete ending of it tomorrow I will still be violent? Clear? Now is that possible? We are asking you that question: is that possible? Psychologically with all the implications of violence, aggression, self-interest, the division of class, division of religions, nationalities, economic divisions and so on, all breeding violence, can all that end completely now? The speaker says, yes, it can end now completely. And you wait to hear, you want to know how. Right? That's one of the most horrible things on earth to ask 'how',

psychologically. Because if you ask 'how' then there are a thousand people who will help you or tell you what to do. So please, if I may most respectfully, friendly, point out, don't ever ask 'how'. I can ask a carpenter how to hold a tool, I can ask him about the nature of the wood; if I want to study medicine I have to find out, I can ask others; but inwardly the sense of understanding one's own being, existence, in that understanding there is no 'how'. So please most respectfully don't ask, 'how. If you ask 'how' you will never be free, because freedom is necessary. So we are going to find out, discover for ourselves, not be told, whether it is possible to change, end violence completely now.

What is the nature of attention? Now we are sitting here together, fortunately the rain has stopped, we are sitting here together and listening to somebody speaking. Are you listening actually? Find out, sirs, are you actually listening? That means as a child listens to a good story, he isn't thinking about anything else, he is listening, he is so curious, so excited, wants to know who is the hero, who is the hero and who is the villain. He is full of curiosity, attention. Are you like that? Or you listen casually, pick up something here and there and at the end of it say, 'I don't know what you are talking about. Would you kindly repeat that again'? Or are you, if I may ask most politely, are you listening at all, not interpreting, not comparing, but giving your mind, your heart, all your energy to find out; listening. That is attention. Attention is like a flame. Right? Attention is like turning on a very, very bright light. And you need that attention, that complete attention in which there is no resistance, not saying, 'I will attend', 'I must learn how to attend' - which means gradualness, therefore you are not

attending. Do you see all this? I wonder - one wonders if you are taking the same journey together.

So we are saying, violence can end completely with all its implication; how to live in this world without violence, without aggression, without competition, without beating somebody in your success, without hate, anger, all that violence - which is all violence - can end if you give complete attention. Attention is like a flame that burns out violence. And that attention is now, not tomorrow, not the next moment. You will say, 'Yes, I'll take it home and think it over. I understand what you mean verbally but it hasn't entered my being so I will go home and think about it'. Then when you think about it you are not attentive. Right? You think about it. Attention means now: to what you say, how you say it, whether it is double talk, say one thing and do another. So we are saying this violence, which is only one of the various complexities of human existence, that violence can totally end when there is complete attention. Please do it now as you are sitting there. Don't do it tomorrow, there is no tomorrow, psychologically. There is tomorrow because you have got to go to the office, or whatever you are going to do, but psychologically, inwardly, there is no tomorrow. That's a most marvellous thing to discover for yourself.

And where there is total attention there is no self, there is no centre from which you attend, there is only attention. Therefore that attention has no limit, it has no border, because in that attention there is no resistance. Attention is not something to be achieved. You attend.

Can we go on? Are you tired? May I ask, are you tired? Why not? Have you merely listened to the words, to some idea, some

concept, or have you worked, worked in the sense watched yourself, see what you are thinking, feeling, your reactions to what is being said, therefore your whole energy is now attentive. And your brain must become tremendously active. So shall we go on? If you keep silent, I will keep silent. What we are going into next is not only what we have dealt with, time, which is so tremendously important - you understand what it means? That all existence is now. All enlightenment is not in the future, it is now. All meditation is now. Do you understand the depth of that? For god's sake.

You know our brains are the most extraordinary things. The speaker has discussed this with scientists and others. Our brain has infinite capacity. Look what it has done in the technological world: it has gone to the Moon, it has invented a bomb that can kill millions of people at one blow, it can destroy the earth; and a great surgeon, see what extraordinary things he has done, new heart, new liver, and so on. And also look at what man has done in communication, the rapidity of a telephone call to New York, or California, in a minute. Extraordinary capacity the brain has. Right? Agree? Do you see the extraordinary capacity? And that capacity which is so immense has been limited by our self-centredness.

Corruption doesn't begin with black marketing, passing money under the table, bribing. That's a mere symptom. Corruption begins when there is self-interest. So, sir, when there is concern with your own achievement, with your own passion, with your own urges of desire and so on, when there is self-interest the root of corruption is there. And corruption as self-interest is limiting the psychological

capacity of the brain. You understand, sirs, all this? The mirror in which you see yourself exactly as you are, the mirror that reveals everything about you. A good mirror doesn't distort. And that mirror exists, not outside; that mirror is your relationship with another, with your wife, with your husband, with your boss, with your servants, if you have them, unfortunately. That mirror is the most marvellous thing in which you see yourself. And if you pay attention to that mirror, completely watching every movement of thought, every movement of selfishness, every movement of desire, which we will go into presently, then that mirror not only shows what you are but you can then go beyond, much deeper. For the brain has the capacity to delve infinitely.

Truth is something that is not fixed, therefore there are no paths to truth. Right sirs.

MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 1ST JANUARY 1985

Krishnamurti: I wonder what we mean by a new year. Is it a fresh year, a year that is totally afresh, something that has never happened before? When we say something new, though we know that there is nothing new under the sun, when we talk about a happy new year, is it really a new year for us? Or is it the same old pattern repeated over and over again? Same old rituals, same old traditions, same old habits, a continuity of what we have been doing, still are doing, and will be doing this year.

So, is there anything new? Is there anything that is really afresh, something that you have never seen before? This is rather an important question, if you will follow it - to turn all the days of our life into something which you have never seen before. That means a brain that has freed itself from its conditioning, from its characteristics, from its idiosyncrasies and the opinions, and the judgements, and the convictions. Can we put all that aside and really start a new year? It would be marvellous if we could do that. Because our lives are rather shallow, superficial, and have very little meaning. We are born, whether we like it or not we are born, educated - which may be a hindrance too. Can we change the whole direction of our lives? Is that possible? Or are we condemned forever to lead rather narrow, shoddy, meaningless lives. We fill our brains and our lives with something which thought has put together. This is not a sermon. Probably in all the churches of the world, New Year will be - and in all the temples and the rest of it - they will continue in the same old way, the same

old rituals, pujas and so on and so on. Can we drop all that and start anew with a clean slate and see what comes out of that, with out hearts and minds?

There are all these questions here. I haven't seen them. Why do you question somebody else? Why do we have problems which we cannot solve for ourselves? Why do we seek help from outside? Not that we should not put questions, we should put questions, we should demand, we should doubt and all the rest of it, but from whom do you expect an answer? There are these several questions here. But I don't know what they are. But can we not solve these questions, these problems, for ourselves?

What is a problem? A problem according to the dictionary meaning, is something thrown at you. The meaning of that word etymologically means something thrown at you, a problem. We never look at a problem anew because our brains are conditioned to the resolution of problems. May I go into it a little bit? From childhood, a child has a problem: how to read, to write, goes to school and there he is educated to resolve problems. You know all this, don't you? Don't look surprised. It is a rather rainy morning. You understand my question? From childhood, they are trained to have problems. They go to school and there are dozens of problems. They must learn how to read, and write, how to do mathematics. And later on geography and history, and the examinations. It all becomes a problem. And so the brain is conditioned to solve problems because it has been trained from childhood to have problems and to find answers to those. Do we understand each other, a little bit at least?

Suppose I have a problem. First of all, I never ask, 'Why do I

have problems?' Whether it is problems of relationship, problems of occupation and so on and so on - specially psychological problems. My brain from childhood has been educated, conditioned, cultured, to have problems. Do look at this, please. And then, all life becomes a problem. What to do, how to act, what to think. About death, if there is life after death? Our whole brain is conditioned to not only having problems in itself but also problems put upon it. Right? So it is continuously having problems. So life as a whole, whether science, mathematics, or physics and so on, all becomes a problem because our brain is conditioned to problems.

It is not important to solve problems but to have no problems at all with regard to the psychological world and the brain. You understand? Am I making myself clear? If not I'll go into it very carefully. Only a brain that has no problems can solve problems. That is, only a brain that is free from problems can go into problems and resolve them, but if the brain itself is conditioned to live with problems then it can never solve any problem. Politically - look at the world - what is happening. They are solving one problem, in the very solution of that problem, another problem arises. Because the politician's mind is like ours, conditioned to problems. I wonder if you understand this? It is fairly clear. So the question then is, is it possible for the brain to uncondition itself and to have no problems at all. That is, if a problem arises, solve it, but not with a brain that is already conditioned to problems.

Suppose I have no problems - as a matter of fact, I don't have any. Not that I'm old, but I don't feel like having problems. It's as simple as that. So my brain - I'm not talking about myself, but I am talking about somebody else, I am talking about K, somebody

outside sitting here. So it's not a personal worship. As long as I have problems, I can never solve any problem. Do we see that? Then my question is: can I be free of this condition of having problems first and then resolve problems? You follow? So my question is: can my brain uncondition itself so that it is free and being free it can solve problems. Not that in the solution of one problem, another problem arises. It is the end of a problem.

Suppose K hates somebody (I hope not) - hates somebody, that becomes a problem. And my brain being conditioned to problems, asks, 'What can I do about hate? How am I to stop it? Can I control it? Can I suppress it? Can I run away from it? I must be kind. I must be generous.' Which all becomes a problem. You follow? It goes round and round in circles with problems. But K is asking himself whether the brain can be free of all problems, sexual, relationship, problems of god, problems of rituals, problems of nations, war, peace. So that it is completely free of that. Is that possible? Please put that question to yourself. Is it possible to be so completely free of problems, in which there is no offence or defence?

K says it is possible. Don't accept it, because if has no meaning for you if you accept it, it is the assertion of some idiot, and may be utterly wrong. So you have to investigate your own brain so that it is really free of problems. Then the question arises: who is to free the brain from its conditioning? Then we say, it must be an external agency, god or a guru or some angel, or some ideology or an authority. In the very process of asking is it possible to free from its own conditioning, in that very asking of that question we invent a guru, an authority. So I won't ask that question. I wonder if

you understand all this. I won't ask that question. I'll say, 'Who is it that is asking that question, whether it is possible for me to be free of my conditioning, who is it that is asking the question and who is it that is going to answer?' I've put aside all authority, all gurus, all books, all gods, all angels, all outside agency because they have no meaning. Then I ask myself, 'Who is it that is putting the question and who is it that is going to receive the answer?' We are working together in this, or are you just being silent?

Now comes the complication. If you are willing to be prepared for complication, we'll go into it. Now most of us put a question and then wait for an answer. And if the answer is not convenient or comfortable or if it makes one rather shy, we put it aside. So you ask a question and you wait for an answer. And the answer is according to your background. Right? That's clear.

Now, put the question and leave it alone. That is; I've put the question whether my brain can be free of all problems so that it can resolve any problem that comes. A problem is a challenge, challenge of death, challenge of grief, fear and so on. I've put a question and if the question is serious, as it is, any reply to it will be according to my conditioning. Right, sir? You are rather uncertain.

My brain has been educated to problems. Right? And if I put that question, is it possible for the brain to be free of all problems, the immediate response is, 'Oh, it is not possible', or 'It is possible'. Then 'how'? So asking the question 'how' is creating another problem. 'I prefer that guru instead of that guru', 'I prefer that book to that book.' So I am caught in that. So what I do is to put the question and it's a very serious question 'Is it possible for the brain

to be totally free of all problems?' That's a tremendous question. And I won't seek an answer for it. That very question becomes tremendously important. Do you understand? That very question has its own vitality. I wonder if you understand all this? Are you doing that with me? That is, I have put the question, I don't seek an answer. Careful sir, this requires great attention; not just say, 'I have put the question' and just wait. I have put the question in all seriousness and therefore with all attention, and I leave the question alone. I'm not interfering with it, I am not saying, 'What is the answer?' If the question is serious, and has tremendous vitality, significance, then the question itself begins to answer. Not - I answer or you answer. Is this clear? Are you doing it now?

We are talking of psychological questions, not technological questions like, 'Will I have a job, will I pass my exams?' and all that kind of thing. So the question is important. Not the answer. Because if the question has great urgency, great intensity, passion behind that question, then that very question will flower and answer, or wither away.

But what we do is, 'Can I uncondition my brain? Is that possible? Tell me how.' Then that becomes a problem. Have you understood? Can we go on?

There are several questions here. I don't know what they are. Serious or flippant or meaningless. Who is going to answer those questions? Have you put these questions in order that K should answer or you have put the question and the question must be investigated, not the answer, because in the question lies the answer, not outside the question. I wonder if you understand.

I want to know if god exists. Not I, K, somebody else wants to

know if god exists. How will you find out? If you're really honest, if you are really serious, belief, faith has no place, or tradition, 'I believe in god.' 'I believe I should be very tall', is as good as that. I want to find out if god exists. Which means I must have a brain that is capable of putting aside all that has been said before, whether in the Upanishads, the Gita, or some other book, the Koran or the Bible. The brain must be totally free to find out. Like a scientist. If a scientist is investigating a hypothesis, he cannot say, 'I remember these things. I will find the answer.' He must be free to investigate. So, is my brain free? Not if there is god or not. Right? Is your brain free? Or frightened, anxious, lonely? As long as those factors exist, you will never find out. So god is not important at all. But whether there is freedom to find out. Can we go along together in this?

1st Question: I want to get at what you're saying without any stress, strain or effort. How can one do this?

K: First of all, this is a wrong question because you are asking 'how'. In so-called ethical, moral and if one can use the word 'spiritual' questions when you ask the question 'how' then you become immoral. When you ask 'how', what is implied in the 'how'? Please, I am asking you. When you ask 'how', either you are asking for a technological skill, then there is an instructor, there is a professor, there is a mathematician who has gone into it for many years, and so on, you can ask him 'how'. But when you ask 'how' about psychological matters whom are you asking 'how'? That means you are asking somebody outside of you, a guru, a poor chap like K, or somebody like that. You are asking something from somebody else, and the somebody else is like you, full of opinions,

full of achievements, success, spiritually he has meditated for fifty years, and he has kept silent for ten years. But he writes.

So if we don't ask 'how' at all, which is really important, then you have to find out for yourself. Right? The man who knows more psychologically is still seeking the more. You understand? I wonder if you get this? Is it too early in the morning? Or is it too late in the evening? You see, you are all wanting 'the more', 'the better', which is, measurement. And can we be free of measurement, which means comparison, which means time and so on. The 'more' involves a great deal, not just achieving more, but the implications of 'the more'. So the brain is caught in measurement - psychologically. You must have measurement technologically otherwise you couldn't do anything.

Psychologically demanding the 'more' implies still 'more'. So there is always the 'more', the 'more'. That means, the whole process of time, evolution, measurement. To be free of all that. Because there is no 'more'. This is too complicated, I won't go into it.

So the questioner asks, he wants to understand K without any stress, strain or effort. A lovely question. What K is saying is not something different from what you are. He is saying, 'Look at yourself, not at the speaker', not what he says. What he is saying is only a description of what is happening in you; a description, an explanation, a verbal picture, a verbal outline. Right? But you don't look at yourself, you say 'How can I listen to you?' And I say 'Do not bother to listen to K. It's not worth it.' But listen to yourself very carefully. And to listen to yourself don't have any prejudices about what is going to come out, don't say this is bad, this is good, this is no good, this is a lovely thought, I must keep it. Just watch

yourself. And you say, 'I have no time. I have to go to the office. I come back, there is the wife, the children. I have no time to look at myself', which is nonsense. You have got plenty of time if you want to look at yourself. When you get into the bus, going from your house to the bus, you have got plenty, or sitting in the bus, or cycling along the road - one has plenty of time if you want to do something serious. But there are thousands of excuses for not being serious. So to listen or to observe yourself, and yourself is not different from the thousand, million other selves. I know we are educated to individuality. We are all separate, little bodies, separate entities, separate souls, separate atmans. Right?

I am questioning whether we are separate at all. You are brown, black, pink or blue or white. I speak one language, you speak another language. And that gives us not only a linguistic, separative feeling. "I'm a Telegu, you're a Tamilian" and all that nonsense that goes on. But are you different from anybody else? You may be tall, you may be short, you may be better employed, have better skill, those are all outward frills. You may put on a blue shirt, I may put on a white shirt. That white shirt and blue shirt make you think you are different. But are we actually different? Think it out, sirs. Are we actually different? We suffer. The American, the Russian, the Chinese, the French suffer. They are anxious as you are, as insecure as you are, seeking security, as they are. Psychologically, inwardly, we are all similar. Right? So, we are humanity. Not, 'I am K'. That is such nonsense. We are humanity. Do you know the implication of saying we are humanity? Either you say it verbally or turn it into an ideological concept, or it is an actual fact. I don't know which it is with you. Is

it a concept, is it an ideal to be achieved? But the fact is you are like the rest of humanity: you go through great travail, boredom, loneliness, despair, tremendous self-interest as each one of you has. So do the Russians, so do the Americans, so do the Chinese, French and Germans, and Dutch. Right? So you are the rest of humanity. If it is not verbal or an intellectual concept, if it is not a theory, then it's an actual fact, which it is. And when it's a fact, it has tremendous significance. Then you will not kill another, for your country, for your god, for your... Because then you are killing yourself. I don't know if you follow all the implications of realizing deeply that you are the rest of mankind, you are mankind. It's not an ultimate goal, it's a fact. And can one live with that fact? That means, there's great compassion. When there is compassion, there is intelligence. Then you wipe away all nationalities, all wars. I can't kill you because you're me. I don't know if you understand all this. It has tremendous importance. Not only importance, it's a fact, and one has to live with something that has tremendous, deep significance.

So, can we go on to the next question?

2nd Question: What is myself and what is its relationship to the cosmos?

K: First of all, let's look at what is the self. What are you? Don't be frightened. We are going to strip naked, understand what the self is. The self is the name, the form, the reactions, the responses; these are biological facts, and the professions, the vocation which you would like and can't have, marriage, sex, children, the responsibility of children, the responsibility of going to the office for fifty years and earning a footling little sum and being

ambitious, to have more - a better house, car, and all the rest of it. That's only the outward signs. Then inwardly, what are you? Actually what are you? Don't theorize. You can say, 'I am god', or you can say, 'There is a light in me, the atman light'. If you brush aside all that nonsense, then what are you? If you have no identification with your country, with roots in your family, roots in your knowledge (which is the most dangerous root) - if you have roots in a belief, a faith, a continuity, all that is the activity of thought. Right?

So, what are you? Memories? Be honest and deeply ruthless with yourself. Don't play tricks. What are you? You are memories. Be honest with yourself, really deeply ruthlessly honest with yourself, not with somebody else. And you're the past. Right? You are the past. That means you are the story, the history story of mankind. Which is memory. Alright, sir, can we go on? You are the past which is memory. You remember your grandmother, or grandfather, you remember your chemistry, you remember the various authors, musicians, the songs. Right? The brain is memory. So you are memory. I know it sounds terrible. You are the past and the past is all the time updating which is memory. You need memory to drive a car, for you to go from here to your house, or to your office, to recognize your poor unfortunate wife or husband - there you need memory. But why carry this immense memory which has accumulated for a thousand years or one day? As long as this memory is operating, which is the past, the self - and therefore self-interest which is the beginning of all corruption - not passing the money under the table. And in this country, especially, they are talking about eradicating corruption. Lovely, isn't it? All the

politicians are going to work at it. And it is there, self-interest, in each one of us.

So the self is put together by thought which is memory. Then the question arises, if there is no memory, which is no knowledge, then what else is there left? So we begin to invent: the self being reborn, higher self, lower self, higher consciousness, lower consciousness, how to join both of them together, how to... - all self-interest, prayers, rituals, going to temples. God, what a country!

Then the question is, 'What is the relationship of the self to the cosmos?' What is cosmos? Not the astro-physicist's cosmos, or the cosmos of some great philosopher or some petty little guru. But what is the meaning of that word? Cosmos means 'order', from the Greek and so on, it is order. Chaos is the opposite. Cosmos and chaos. There is a relationship only when there is complete order in you, because that is supreme order. Universe is in supreme order, which is cosmos: sun rises, sun sets, stars, clouds, the beauty of the sunset. All that is order. And I, who live in disorder with my self-interest, want to find out my relationship to order. We are so.... First, can I put my house in order? Not, 'What is my relationship to the cosmos?' I can never find out if my house is in disorder. But once there is complete order then.... I won't go into it. It will just be theory to you.

Then my question is, 'Can I put my house in order?' Then I have to discover what is order. Order according to politicians, according to law, according to the judge, a clever lawyer, or is order something definite? Please ask these questions. Don't go to sleep. Is order a discipline? Is order a habit? Or when there is no disorder,

there is order. I don't have to seek order, but I will try to understand, go into what is disorder. Are we moving together, or am I just talking? What then is disorder? Disorder basically means conflict. As long as there is conflict, psychologically, there must be disorder. Conflict exists apart from Vedantists and all the rest, put all those people aside, conflict exists when there is duality. I want this, and I don't want that. I must be this, I am this.

I am questioning, what is duality? Is there a duality at all? Except man, woman, dark, light, all that. Is there duality at all? Or is there only one thing? I am anger. Duality arises when I must not be angry. So there is only the fact and not its opposite. I wonder if you understand. The fact has no opposite. I can invent an opposite. I am angry - that is a fact. Then arises 'How to end it'. So I invent, 'I must not be'. Can I live with the fact? That is, I am angry. I'll find no excuses, no rationalizations. I am angry. I am not different from anger. I am anger. So, there is no duality. Do you understand this? If you really understand this, conflict ends and you are what you are - not what you should be. And what you are can never be changed by thought, by circumstances. You are that. You may have a different shirt tomorrow, but what is inside the shirt is always the you.

So, disorder exists when there is conflict, when there is the more, when there is the better. Violence and non-violence. Non-violence is not the fact. You can use it as a political stick, but the fact is that you are violent. To remain with the fact, let the fact answer - not you answer. I wonder if that is clear. I have explained that before. All right, you don't understand this. I'll explain it again.

When you begin to answer the fact as though you were separate

from the fact then the problem arises. 'I am violent'. That is a fact. Not only physical violence - violence of hate, anger, jealousy, obedience, imitation, conformity, all that is violence, and remain. You are that violence, you can't do anything about it, therefore hold it quietly. Do you understand what I am saying? Don't move away from it. It is so. That means that you are giving entire attention to that and then when there is that complete attention, that violence is gone. You can test this out for yourself. Put your heart into it. So can there be order, not in society, but in yourself first? Because you as a human being have made this society. There is no getting away from that. With your greed, your ambition, aggression, with your self-interest, seeking power, to be at the centre of things. Don't you want to be in the centre of things, next to the Prime Minister? We are all rather childish, aren't we?

So, disorder comes to an end and then there is order. When there is that complete order you will never ask, 'What is my relationship to the cosmos?'

3rd Question: Is not psychological time a fact? While there may be no gradation for the attainment of truth, how do you question the usefulness of self-preparation for establishing a right kind of body, mind, harmony. Surely this must be a gradual process.

K: Are you really asking this question seriously? Sir, this is a very complicated question and the question reveals in itself a much more complex state. First of all, the questioner says, 'Is not psychological time a fact?' Now, question it, doubt it. Why accept it? Is there psychological time as a fact? What do you mean by time? It is now half-past eight. There is tomorrow, sun rises, sun sets, twenty four hours, and tomorrow is another morning. That is

not psychological time, surely. That is ordinary chronological time. Twenty four hours a day. Right? Now what is psychological time? Of which you say 'Is it a fact'? What do you mean by psychological time? I will be there tomorrow. I hope to meet you tomorrow. Hope. I want to be beautiful. I'm not, but I want to be. The want implies time. I don't know if you understand this. Hope implies time. I must attain Nirvana, or truth. Time. I must discipline myself. Time. All those are factors involving time and more, and the questioner says, 'Is it not a fact?' An illusion can be a fact. I believe I am Napoleon. I'm convinced I'm Napoleon. And you all think I'm a crazy man. But I live in that illusion. As you do. Not Napoleons, but you have your own illusions, of grandeur, of belonging to a certain state, with a garland, a photo. You belong. So you live in illusion; god, rituals, nationality. They are all illusions. Do you question that? What is an Indian? What is India? A geographical description of a sub-continent. And you have given to that group of people living within the borders of that country tremendous importance: ancient culture 5,000 years old. Gone to smithereens now. And you take pride in all that. So does the Frenchman, the Englishman. And this is called 'factual, psychological time'. And I say there is no psychological time at all, except that thought has invented all this. I have invented, "I'm an Indian". Born in this community, in this particular part of the world. Brahmin, Non-Brahmin fighting each other, and all the rest of it.

So, I'm questioning, K is questioning this whole psychological time as evolution. I am this, I will be that next life. Or I am this, I will be different tomorrow. I've taken a resolution for a new year

and I'm going to stick to it. If I can. And so on and so on. So time is a movement, as thought is a movement. So time is thought. They are not two separate processes. Time is thought. And thought and time says, I will be, I must attain Nirvana, attain Moksha, or attain illumination, liberation. And somebody says 'I have attained'. And we are gullible enough to say 'My god, what a marvellous man he is', and then worship him, or kill him. Which is the same thing. When you worship somebody, you have killed him.

So, there is no psychological time at all as evolution. Psychologically, there is no you becoming something else, or better, more. We went into that. Because the self is put together by memory. Self is the process, the centre of all thought. Right? If I had no memory, I wouldn't call myself 'self'. But to go beyond memory, beyond knowledge, is something entirely different. I won't go into that, this is not the occasion for it. And for the attainment of truth the question says, time is necessary. Clever people have invented paths to truth. You have your path, I have my path, you've a devotional path, I've a ritualistic path, paths of various kinds, Christian path, Islamic path, Hindu path, Tibetan path. Which means path leading to a goal. The goal you call truth or the Buddha or some other. A path implies a goal which is fixed. Is truth fixed, stationary, non-dynamic, static, or something tremendously alive? That which is greatly alive has no path. How can you have a path for something which moves, lives, changes, vital, full of something else? Therefore there are no paths to truth. Be clear about it, then you won't be caught in a trap. The goal is the means. The goal is not separate from the means. The communists say, some of the communists, that the means doesn't matter, get to

the goal. We want a marvellous state, it doesn't matter if we kill thousands of people, or millions. We must have the goal. You understand all this?

But the goal is the means. They are not separate. And where is the goal? There? Somewhere in the distance, or is there no goal at all? I wish you would ask these questions. The moment you have a goal, a purpose, you are ambitious to achieve. Of course. But the achievement is the basis of self-interest - 'I have achieved'. Like a soldier in the army, he has achieved, he has become a general. And generals are tremendously important. So in the same way, our whole idea is to achieve - 'I have achieved Nirvana'. What a horrible statement to make. You understand? As though Nirvana, or heaven, or something immense, is to be achieved by a petty little mind - by a brain that is conditioned, frightened, anxious, limited, fearful, sorrowful - all the rest of it. How can such a brain achieve anything? It can only end all the fears, all its loneliness, it can only end all that. That's all it can do. It can't achieve something immense. Where there is self-interest, all achievement is disorder.

And the questioner says 'Is not self-preparation for the establishment of a right kind of body, mind, heart - surely this must be a gradual process.' I wonder if you can put away the whole concept of gradation which is really measurement. You can measure good cloth against bad cloth, a good car against a bad car. In this country, there are only bad cars. Sorry! May I tell a joke?

A car manufacturer of this country, a great man and fearfully rich, and all that, he goes to heaven. He goes to the gates of heaven, and the angel that is there says, 'Hey!' He says 'I'm so and so. I've built churches, temples, hospitals, schools.' The angel at the

gate says, 'We know all that. All rich people do that. That's their concession to their ego. We know all that'. And the great man says, 'What am I to do now?' Each time they get into my car which I've produced they say, 'Oh, my god!' Have you got the joke? Sorry!

So, body and brain - mind to the speaker is entirely different, I won't go into that now - between the brain and the body, not the mind. Is body different from the brain? It's one instrument, isn't it? An organic whole. But we have separated the body and the brain. Then we try to establish harmony, or conflict. Why do we divide, why do we separate, break up things? As Indians, as Arabs, as the Jews. Why do we do all this? Constant separation, constant division: my family opposed to your family; I'm nearer to the centre and you're not. Why do we do all this? Answer this question to yourself, sir. Why do we break up? Everything we touch, we break up. My wife against... Go right through life. God and good and evil and you follow. There is this process of division going on all the time. We and they.

Who is creating this division? Is it thought? Of course, there is division between woman and man, that is natural. But who is creating this psychological division? The brain and the body. How absurd to divide the two. And why do we divide? That is the fundamental question. Is it thought? Of course it is thought. Apart from man, woman, light and dark, better car and worse car and so on, better material, there there must be choice, there must be measurement, there must be consideration and all the rest of it. But otherwise, why is the brain dividing? Or is the brain itself divided in itself and therefore it divides everything? Are you asking this question?

So who is responsible for this division of mankind? Outwardly, Europeans, Americans, Russians, Super-powers, lesser powers. Who is dividing all this and therefore creating tremendous chaos in the world? War is an ultimate chaos. Chaos in the sense of total disorder. Who is doing all this? Is it thought? Because thought itself is limited, because thought is based on knowledge, memory and knowledge is never complete about anything now or in the future. Knowledge can never be complete about anything. All the scientists are adding more and more and more, their knowledge is more and more, accumulating. Where there is a process of accumulation there is limitation. Knowledge is a process of accumulation and knowledge is limited. And thought is limited. And so thought is breaking up everything because thought in itself is limited: the Hindu, the Brahmin, the non-Brahmin, this political party, that political party. Nobody considers humanity as a whole. There are economic divisions, social divisions, religious divisions: I believe in Jesus, you believe in Allah. I believe in nothing, you believe in everything. And this goes on. And therefore, my ideal opposed to your ideal. And we fight and kill each other.

So thought is responsible for all this division because it wants security. You all want security, physical as well as psychological. And you have invented god, the ultimate security, which is an invention. Thought has done it because you're frightened.

So can thought end? Thought is necessary in a technological world, but thought has no place in the psychological world. That is a tremendous discovery and depth to that. Then there is no division - then you're humanity, and when you're humanity, there is compassion.

MADRAS 2ND QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 3RD JANUARY 1985

I would like to ask, if I may, why you come here. I really would like to ask. What is your, if I may respectfully ask, what is it you are seeking? What is it deeply we want? If each one of us asked that question seriously, and sustained that question, what would be your answer? Not to speak it aloud, but to find out for oneself what is it most profoundly you desire, or crave for, or pursue; or do you want to be helped to find out, not only our own nature, psychological structure of oneself, or do we merely build a scaffold of theories, suppositions, and a verbal structure behind which there is no building at all. You understand my question?

Most of us have fears, one may be mistaken, we build a marvellous scaffolding - you know what a scaffolding is. And behind the scaffolding there is almost nothing, only a verbal structure, imaginative suppositions and all that. And there is no foundation, no strong lasting building behind that scaffold. Is it that we in our daily life imagine we have lost something and pursue that imagination? Or accept some tradition and live with that tradition? Or we are very good at talking, spilling out words, and that acts as a screen to the understanding of oneself, and living with oneself.

So one wonders what it is that human beings throughout the world deeply want, deeply are seeking. Is it money? Is it some kind of power? Is it that one has taken a stand and does not wish that stand to be shaken. You understand all this? If we deeply enquire into ourselves, can we ever say what it is we find, or what it is we

desire? Or one doesn't want anything at all in this world, or in the psychological world. One must have money to live by, a little money, clothes, shelter, but apart from that a professional skill, or vocation, apart from that, can we say, 'I really don't want a thing'? Can we actually say to ourselves, one must be terribly honest with oneself to say that, 'I really don't want a thing, neither heaven, nor hell, nor paradise, liberation, nirvana, or anything you like.' Can one actually say that? Or you are too timid, too anxious?

So to go back to our questions. When we were looking at the dark sky and the rain this morning, what was one's response to nature, to all the squalor, the dirt, the utter crude carelessness and indifference? It concerns all of us. What is our reaction to all that? Are we insensitive? Or if we are sensitive what can one do? And what is our relationship to society and so on? If we can put one serious question to ourselves, in comprehending that question you have answered all the questions in the world.

So let's go back to our questions, shall we.

1st Question: You have shown that thought is limited, but what other instrument of enquiry is available to man.

I haven't shown you a thing. That's a wrong supposition. We together enquired into the whole nature of thought, not the speaker has shown something to you and you accept. But rather that together, you and the speaker, went into the whole question of thought, not somebody else's thoughts but one's own thinking. And we live by thinking. Everything we do is thinking, through thought. All our emotions are recognized by thought, as bad, good, indifferent, romantic and so on. And we went into it fairly sufficiently. Perhaps we should go into it again. Because if one

understands this very deeply, what is thought? Not only the thought of the so-called great scientists, the great investigators into astrophysics, into archaeology, physics, chemistry and so on. They expend thought enormously, pursue one thought after another, come to a conclusion; and that conclusion is not correct, they throw it out and go on, thinking, thinking, thinking. And the villager round the corner, who doesn't know how to read or write because he has never looked at a book, he also thinks. So thought is common to all mankind. Right? And there is no good thought and bad thought, it is still thought.

We should now together, you and speaker, enquire into it. Not I show it to you and then you accept it, which is quite absurd. But if you and K enquire into it, go into it and if you discover it for yourself as a fact then nobody can dislodge your observation. Right? Nobody can deny the accuracy of your thinking. So can we go on, explore together. I mean together. That means you have to exercise your brain - I am saying this most respectfully - exercise your brain to find out together what is thought. Not thought about something. You understand the difference between thinking and thinking about something. We generally think about something, about my job, about my business, about my wife, about my sex, about so many things. The object of thinking may vary, may be different with each person, but thinking, thought is common to all mankind. That's a fact. Right? Common to all mankind. So we are not talking of the object of thinking, the object: I would like to be happy, I would like to have more money, or I would like to have a better car, I wish I could change my wife for somebody else and so on. Thinking about something. But we are not investigating about

something, but rather the whole activity of thought, how it arises, what is its origin, and so on. We are going to go into thinking, not the object of thought. Clear?

All right? What do you think - don't quote me, the speaker, then you are lost - what do you think is thought? Is thought a material process? Do you understand my question? Is thought something outside? In certain tribes thought is always considered something outside, according to the Eskimos thought is considered something apart from the physical, outside, and so on. I won't go into all that. I am not a scholar, I have just observed. I don't read books, I don't go into all that kind of stuff. So thinking can only exist when there is a whole background of memory. Right? If I have no memory at all I can't think. Right? Shall we go along with this?

So I have to enquire why memory, thought plays such an important part in one's life. Memory is based on knowledge. Right? I have had an experience of a car accident and that incident has been recorded, like the tape which is being now recorded, it is recorded by the brain, and that recording is memory of that incident. Right? Don't agree with me, just see for yourself. So the function of the brain is to record, and the recording is knowledge. I have had that injury through an accident of a car, and that is recorded as pain and that remains there recorded. That recording is knowledge. Right? Of course. Next time I drive a car I am going to be awfully careful - if you drive a car. So thought, memory, which is the recording as knowledge, that knowledge is based on that experience of an accident. Right? Experience in that car, which has had an accident, which caused pain, a broken leg - I won't say a broken head for then you are gone! So experience, then the brain

records that experience as knowledge, right, then that knowledge is memory and that memory is the movement of thought. Is this clear? Not clear, my description, your own discovery, your own investigation into the whole business of thinking. That thinking may be distorted, or that thinking may live in illusions, or that thinking may run away with some fanciful, imaginative pictures, but it is still thinking. And there is obviously no complete experience of anything. So experience is limited. And therefore knowledge is also limited because the scientists, as you observe, are adding more and more and more to their knowledge. Right? They never say knowledge is complete, now or in the future. So knowledge, if you observe in yourself, knowledge is always limited, whether in the past or in the present or in the future. So knowledge is always limited. Right? Do we see that? That is important because if you don't understand the nature of knowledge and what part it plays in our lives then knowledge becomes - one cannot grasp the quality of knowledge. Are we following each other a little bit, or is it all quickly done?

You understand? Knowledge is based on experience, may be thousands of years of experience, but those experiences of ten years, or a hundred years, or one day, are still limited, and therefore knowledge is limited, memory is limited, and therefore thought is limited. Right? Thought is always limited. Are we clear on this matter, or are is it all vague? And all our activity is limited too because it is based on thought.

And so the questioner asks, if thought is not the instrument of investigation, you understand, to deeper levels of one's own consciousness, of one's understanding the fullness, the wholeness

of life, then what is the instrument if thought is not? Do you understand the question? All right? Can I go on? Gosh, you all look so asleep. Thought is necessary, however limited it is. When you go home from here, or take a bus, car, walk, or these nasty little put-puts!, you have to use thought. You have to use thought in your business. You have to use thought when you fly, when you do anything externally, physically, you have to use thought. And if that thought is not employed - or if thought doesn't express itself clearly, then out of that lack of clarity there is confusion. So knowledge is always necessary for external activity. Clear? When one goes to the barber to have one's hair cut you must use thought. When you shave you must use thought.

So is there another instrument which is not limited, as thought is limited? Is there another instrument which can penetrate into the whole structure, nature of the psyche? The psyche being the self, the whole phenomenon of the self. Is there an instrument apart from thought? Right? What would be your answer? If you have pursued what we have said just now about thought, realizing that thought is limited, and therefore when you exercise thought as a means of investigating into yourself it will always be incomplete. Right? It will always be limited. It will not be holistic. If you see that clearly for yourself, for oneself, then what is the instrument? Or there is no instrument at all? Careful, please go carefully into this. Are we at least together in all this?

When you see a tree, that thing that is green outside there, how do you look at it? What's your relationship to that tree? Do you look at it without the word? Or the word is the tree? I wonder if you understand all this. You understand my question? When you

look at that extraordinary thing of nature called a tree, which man hasn't created, thank god, and what's your response to it? Is it a verbal response, how beautiful that tree is, and go by? Or can you look at that thing called a tree - the word 'tree' is not the tree. Right? The word which we use to indicate, to communicate with another, that thing which is over there, the word is not the tree. Right? The word 'door', behind here, is not the thing, is it? So could we say the word is not the thing. The word is merely to describe it, but that which is described is not the actual. Don't look so puzzled, please.

So this is important to understand because we are caught in words, we become prisoners to words, a slave to words: I am a Brahmin, or you are not, I am a communist, I am a congressman, and so on - words. So when you look at that green thing standing in the garden, do you look at it without a word? Do you look at it without any interference of thought which is limited? Or you are so occupied with your own thinking, with your own problems, you never really look at that tree? Now carry that same thing: do you look at your wife, or husband, or your girl friend, whatever you like, without the word, without the memory associated with that person? You understand this is very important to understand. I know you, you have been here, I see several people here I met a couple of years ago, or ten years ago, do I look at them - I am asking myself, please ask yourself - do I look at them with all the memory of five years ago? Of course, he is so and so. It would be rather silly if I have to be introduced every time I meet him! But do I carry that memory of meeting that person on the road - it was dirty, noisy, etc., etc., and I carry that memory and when I see him

next time that memory operates, therefore I am not looking at him afresh. I wonder if you understand all this.

Are you looking at my face? Enamoured with the face? Or are you really going into this carefully with the speaker? When you look at your wife or husband and so on, you have all the memory: sexual, memory of encouragement, depression, oh, she is a nagging person, and so on and so on, when you look at a person do you carry all this with you? Let's be quite simple and honest. Of course we do. Don't we? So you never look at that person at all because you have got this memory as a screen and through that screen you look at people. So there is an observation which is not controlled by words, shaped by words, twisted by thought, and that is the only - I don't like to use 'instrument' - that is the only observation, to look, to observe without any word. Don't shake your head, this demands extraordinary watchfulness. To look, to observe, without the word, without your opinions, prejudices, all the activity of thought, to look, to observe. Then that observation, when it is not shaped by thought, or driven by thought, then such observation is holistic, whole, not limited as thought is limited. Is this clear? No, no, please don't say, yes, don't agree, you can't agree unless you do it. Most of us like to be talked at, we like to attend meetings. It is one of our diseases. And you just listen, agree, disagree, and go off home. We are not in that area at all. What we are saying is extraordinarily important to understand for yourself. The limitation of thought, the memory as recorded of an incident which becomes knowledge based on experience and all that process is everlastingly limited. All the scientists are adding more and more and more; with the last two hundred years they have advanced immensely, adding.

And where there is an addition, that which is added to is always limited, obviously, it is not complete. And there is an observation, perception, not only seeing with the visual optical eye but also seeing, perceiving, observing without a single movement of thought. And such observation is complete.

Now from that arises another deep important question: what is action - the question is not here, I am putting the question - what is action when there is such complete perception? Do you understand my question? What is action to you? The doing, acting, present participle, sorry, the doing, what does it mean? The doing, acting according to a past reservoir of memory, knowledge, and you act according to that knowledge. Right? I am not saying anything mysterious, sirs. Don't look so glum. Or we act according to a symbol, or according to a preconceived concept, idea, an ideal. Right? Acting according to the past memories, and that action directed by the past, or the future. Right? I must do that, or I act according to my conviction, or I have an ideal, and I act according to that ideal. Right? Right, sirs. Isn't this so? You all look so frightfully serious. Either you are really serious, or you don't understand what I am talking about.

So action is based on the past memories, knowledge, or acting according to the future, what I must do tomorrow, therefore I will do this today. You understand? Is there an action which is not based either on the past, or on the future? Because the word 'act', I have just heard the other day the explanation of the word karma, to do - the doing is now, not tomorrow or yesterday. You understand what I am saying? The doing, the acting. We cannot live without acting. When you get up, that's an act, when you go to your home,

that's an act; not sublime act. So action, actual action is now. So I am asking myself, what is the relationship of action to perception, which is holistic? Am I right? Are you putting that question? I don't want to torture you, bully you, force you to anything at all. But these are the ordinary questions, this is the ordinary demand of every human being. So is there an action which is holistic, which is whole, not limited? Because our actions are based on thought. If thought is limited, as it is, action will be limited, therefore it is never, as it is limited, it creates all kinds of trouble.

Look sirs, there is a war going on in the Middle East, in Beirut, in Lebanon, the Jews and the Arabs. Right? They are both semitic people. You understand? But four thousand, or five thousand years of propaganda has made the Jews say, 'I am separate from the Arab'. All right, I won't go so far. Come nearer, much nearer home. Which is you are Hindus and there are the Muslims. The Muslims have been for the last sixteen hundred years, have been conditioned through repetition, through fear, through conformity, conversion and so on to believe they are Muslims, and you have been conditioned, programmed for three to five thousand years as Hindus. Thought has divided this, right, not culture. Culture belongs to all humanity, not just Indian culture. I won't go into all that. So you, as a Hindu, and the Muslim are at war - not actually killing each other but when there is a riot you burst out, you are violent.

2nd Question: Silence is the pivotal point in all your teachings for the transformation of man. To your closest circle you have advocated the need for 'sitting still', and 'staying in silence' for short periods during the day. To bring about this mutation in the

brain please teach us the practical steps to achieve this transformation.

God! Who put this question? I had better read that question without laughing at it. Silence is the pivotal point in all your teachings for the transformation of man. To your closest circle you have advocated the need for 'sitting still' and 'staying in silence' for short periods during the day. To bring about this mutation in the brain please teach us the practical steps to this transformation.

The speaker, K, has no closed circles. Right? That's the first thing to establish very clearly. Right? He has no closed circle round him, the disciples. Which is a horror to the speaker, to have disciples, because generally disciples destroy the teacher. (Laughter) You may laugh at it but it is a fact. So there is no closed circle. I would walk out of it tomorrow if there was such a thing. And I really mean it. Because independence is necessary. And it is only through independence there can be co-operation. You understand, co-operation is immensely important in life. We either co-operate for our own profit, for our own self-interest, or we co-operate round a person because we all worship him, then it becomes personal idolatry, which is an abomination. And co-operation, which is to work together, do things together, can never take place unless each one is completely independent. I know this goes contrary to everything. You co-operate with the government, you co-operate with the guru, you co-operate with the policeman, you co-operate with your governor, chief minister, and all the bosses and so on. And they all destroy your independence. It is only when you are really independent I can work with you and you can work with me. That means we must both be free to co-operate.

You are not my boss, I am not your boss. You understand all this?
Oh, lord! It's up to you.

I am afraid the questioner has got things totally wrong. Silence is the pivotal point of all your teachings for the transformation of man. Nonsense! And to your close circle you have advocated the need for sitting still, staying in silence for a short period during the day, so to bring about transformation, you know all the rest of it. You know that becomes transcendental meditation. You have heard about that? Morning twenty minutes, afternoon twenty minutes, in the evening twenty minutes keep silent, watchful. That helps bring about a good siesta! You can go to sleep during those twenty minutes, relax. I am not joking. This is what is going on in the world. The speaker is not advocating anything. He is not doing any kind of propaganda for you, to convince you of anything, and the speaker really means it. Please take it seriously. On the contrary he says doubt, doubt what the speaker is saying, not only other speakers, this speaker, question, be sceptical, be independent.

So he is not advocating silence. I won't go into all this. It is so trivial this question. The speaker has not even understood what the poor man has been saying for sixty years.

Sir, transformation of human psyche, the human selfishness, the human violence, is not through silence. Silence is something totally different from the word silence. Silence may include sound. I won't go into that now. We don't understand sound. The sound of a tree, the sound of a thunder, the sound of a jet racing across the sky at a thousand miles an hour, a minute - or an hour. There is tremendous sound in the world. Sound in ourselves. And we separate the sound from silence. Sound may be, and is, part of silence. I won't go into

this now.

To bring about the transformation of the psyche, which is ourselves, our self-interest, our confusion, our pains, sorrow, fear, pleasure and all the things that we go through life: the pain, the uncertainty, the lack of security, the demand for security both physically and psychologically, all this is me, you - your profession, your name, your bank account, if you have one. All that is you, imagining sitting very quiet, closed eyes, all that is you: your worries, your problems, your quarrels, your desires, your sexual demands, your name, genetically and so on, is you. And to bring about a total transformation, that is a total ending of this self which is creating such chaos in the world, that ending is not through silence. That ending has to take place now, not tomorrow. And that ending can only come through careful, attentive observation of yourself, of your desires, your thoughts, your attempts at meditation, concentration, going to a guru, all that is part of the self-interest. And to end that completely, this self-interest, you need a very good clear brain, not a muddled brain. And that means to have a brain that is free from all programmes, to be free from all conditioning, and therefore one has to observe the conditioning. The conditioning that you are a Hindu, Muslim, that you are this and that, all those trivialities which thought has created. That requires a great inward attention. You give a great deal of attention to earn money, to go to your office, to do this or that, tremendous attention. And you give very, very little attention to the other.

Have you ever noticed something very simple: suppose you and I have been going north, taking a certain path, always for the last

ten thousand, or a million years, we have been going north. It is a symbol, an example, don't say, we are going north. We are going north, suppose, and somebody comes along and says, 'You have been going along that path for the last hundred thousand years or more, I have been on that path too, but it leads nowhere'. That man says. He says, 'Go east, or south, or west'. And he says it in all seriousness, and you listen to it because you are weary of this path, going north, and you listen very carefully. And you say, 'Quite right, let me see'. When you turn from going north, east or west or south, the brain has broken the pattern of the north. You understand what I am saying? Are we together? It has broken the pattern, therefore the conditioning. The moment it turns going east it has changed radically the brain cells themselves, because you have broken the pattern. I have been a Muslim all my life, and I see how absurd it is, this division. The moment I perceive the absurdity of the truth of it, not the truth I must leave, the truth of this division, not about my thought and so on and so on, the moment I see that there is a mutation in the brain, in the brain cells themselves. We have discussed this matter with so-called brain specialists, they don't quite accept what I am saying because they haven't tried it on themselves. They have tried it on dogs, monkeys and all the rest of it. (Laughter) Don't laugh, sirs, please. All these professionals never try it on themselves. They are like you and me, ambitious, greedy, seeking position, power and all the rest.

So there is a mutation - mutation means total change, completely something different - when there is clear perception.

3rd Question: Can humanity survive without a universal code of morality, which is true for all times and in all climates? Can an

earnest man discover this way of life by his own reason and goodwill?

Are you tired? What is universal morality? This is again a supposition. Right? He says, can humanity survive without? Can you survive because you are humanity? You understand my question? You - must I go through all this. Aren't you like the rest of humanity? You may be short, dark, purple, white, pink, whatever pigment, colour of the pigment is, aren't you like the rest of the world? You may have a different profession. You may have dark hair, blonde, you can dye it any colour you like. Aren't you like the rest of mankind? Because you suffer, you go through agonies, worries, live a very, very superficial life, occasionally jolted out of that by sorrow, or fear. And your neighbour, whether it be very, very close, or thousands of miles away goes through the same thing in a different way. He quarrels with his wife, as you do, you run when something serious is being said. And also they do the same. So you are similar, or you are the rest of humanity. You won't believe all this, it doesn't matter. To you this is not a truth because you have been conditioned to individualism. All your religions, your physical condition says that you are separate souls, separate human beings, separate consciousness, that your brain is separate from any other brain. You have been conditioned to all that. And one cannot understand that you as a human being are like every other human being on earth psychologically. They all go through, every human being goes through death, or knows death, or somebody has died in the family, and there is sorrow. This sorrow is common to all mankind. You may suffer from disease and have sorrow, or another have sorrow through death of another's

death, or the sorrow of ignorance, or the sorrow of limited knowledge. We all go through this, there is not one single human being on earth who has not had this: pain, lack of fulfilment and its sorrow, the desire to fulfil, the desire to have roots in some place and not finding it, the man who can never go in a nice car, the villager, there is sorrow under every stone and every human being. So you are not different from another human being. So you are not individuals. Yes sirs, sorrow is. It is a hard pill to swallow. You won't like it. And so you are the rest of humanity, you are humanity. If you are immoral, if you are corrupt because you are of self-interest, you are adding to the misery of the rest of mankind. Don't agree with this, that is just theory. But if you set about to see how deeply you can wipe - if the brain can wipe away its self-interest.

Self-interest is one of the most deceiving things because it can hide under everything: in politics, in religion, in prayer, in puja, in rituals, it can hide in a family and so on. It is so cunning, so deceptive. And you can't trace all its hidden ways, nobody can because it is far too subtle. But when there is the importance and the urgency to see the nature of the self, and its interest, when there is perception, of which I was talking about, which is to see things as they are psychologically, inwardly, not run away, not suppress, not transmute it, rationalize it. When you observe the thing without any movement of thought then that glimpse of the truth will wipe away all the self-interest.

Questioner: If sorrow is common for all of us why don't we have love which is also common to all of us?

The gentleman asks if sorrow is common to all of us why don't

we have love, which is also common to all of us. We haven't got it. Do you love your wife? I am not asking you personally. Do you love that tree? In India and elsewhere they don't know what love is, sir, don't say it is common. You worship, you are devoted, you go to temples, you pay - there is a temple where they get every third day a million dollars. Think of the brutality of it! And you won't take away the village dirt. So we have no common love. We have no love in our heart. Face it! That's a good question to ask, but it has no meaning. You may be sympathetic, kind, and even, perhaps, generous, which I question too, charitable, give something to another if you have more of it. If you have more money, give it to somebody, a little bit of it; you won't do that either. And you talk about love. Don't use that word, sir, you don't know it. It is the most sacred thing on earth if you have it.

Oh, it's nearly ten to nine. Do we go on?

Q: Yes, go on.

K: Yes, sir, I know. You would like me to go on. It becomes some kind of hypnotic process. Sir, what we are talking about is a very serious matter, very, very serious, not just repeat, repeat, repeat. You can have a gramophone, tape recorders, play that if you want to go to sleep, but if you are really serious about these matters, with your heart, with your mind, with all your being because we are reaching a crisis in the world, of which you are not aware. Every religion has gone, finished, it has no meaning any more. Everything is gone, finished, intellectually, any deep thinking person rejects all that. There is no morality any more, there is corruption all over the world. In this country it is amazing, shocking. And we went into that. Where there is self interest,

whether it is in the politician, in the priest, in you or in the governor, anybody, corruption begins there, that's the root of corruption, not just passing bribes and all the rest of that. That's a symptom. And there is the threat of war, not just war between one or two countries, a global war, the whole world may be destroyed by these atoms. You are not aware of all that, the immense issue involved in all this. Some crazy politician can push a button and you are all gone, evaporated - you know what that word means, 'evaporated', nothing left of you, no bone, no skin, nothing. I won't go into all that.

So we are facing an extraordinary situation in the world, and there must be a few people like us, a few of us, I don't say all of you, a few of us who turn their face not towards the north but in some other direction.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 4TH JANUARY 1985

Shall we continue where we left off last time we met, that was last Sunday - last Saturday, sorry. Sunday it rained so much, we had to leave. I think we have to go back a little and go over what we said on Saturday. We're thinking together, not the speaker is thinking, and you not thinking, but together we are thinking, exercising our brain to its highest level, to its highest capacity. Also, we would like to point out as we did last Saturday, that we're not doing any kind of propaganda. We're not trying to convince you of anything, on the contrary. We're together going to observe all the activities of thought and the lives that one leads.

As one observes, we live a very superficial life, rather a sham life, because for various reasons, overpopulation, few occupations, it is a constant struggle, and struggle makes us rather superficial, makes us shallow. We build, as we pointed out, a marvellous scaffold of various theories, various traditions, including superstitions and all that, and behind this scaffold we have no building at all. We don't start to build at all, that's a fact. We're going to discuss together only facts; not a theory, not an ideal, not something that we imagine, but actually observe our own lives, if you are willing. And we've built a marvellous scaffold, not only in the universities, colleges, schools and kindergarten schools, but also we've built, gathered together, a great deal of knowledge, almost about everything, Mother Nature, of the earth, the air, all the diseases, transplants, new hearts, artificial hearts, liver and so on. We've acquired, during the last million years or 50,000 years, a

great deal of information not only of the world externally, but philosophers and those who have given a little thought to the psyche, like the psychologists and so on - but all those remain a verbal structure. To us, they mean very little in our daily life.

And we are concerned, not with acquiring any more knowledge, but rather together, think together and observe our life. Are we wasting our lives? This is a serious question which each one of us must answer. Are we living a shallow life, a superficial life, without much meaning to our lives. or have we put aside all the trivialities of religion - and they are trivialities - all the nationalistic, limited points of view? And do we think of the rest of the world, the rest of humanity as something separate from us? Do we think that way, do we look at the world that way? Then our lives, when we do look at it that way, narrowly, our lives become very individualistic, narrow, limited and rather shallow - because all of us are concerned with ourselves, with our own progress, with our own success, with our own religious conclusions and achievements. There's a tremendous lot of self-interest in all of us, whether we're highly placed politicians or the cheap gurus who only accumulate a lot of money and all of us pursuing, in the search of truth, or illumination, basically in all these movements there is self-interest. That self-interest may be covered up or that self-interest may be absorbed into something else. And this self-interest whether in the name of God, in the name of illusion, illumination - not illusion - there is a lot of difference. Right? Whether it be our own particular success or so on, there is deep, abiding self-interest in all of us. We may pretend that we are seeking truth, that we want to be illumined, or find how to live

properly - but basically, inwardly, there is this turmoil of self-interest.

Please don't agree to anything that the speaker says. What the speaker says has no value unless you yourself understand exactly yourself whether there is this deep self-interest. And this self-interest prevents total attention, which we went into the other day. Perhaps we may go into it later on.

And we have built an extraordinary world outwardly; thought has built the great churches and all the rituals, the ancient temples, and the beautiful mosques are all the result of thought. All the rituals therein are put together by thought. Right? Please don't accept what the speaker is saying. Question yourself, delve into these facts that thought has created not only nationalistic and religious divisions, but also, thought has created the most amazing technological world; they have invented artificial hearts to be implanted in human beings; quick communications and the computers - thought has done all this. But it is in cooperation with others and each one being independent to work together. I don't know if you have gone into the question of cooperation - unless one is totally independent, thinking for oneself, not accepting authority, especially in spiritual matters (if I may use that word 'spiritual') - thought has been responsible for all this. That's a fact.

So, thought has been capable of extraordinary work, great paintings, great statues, and great inventions. And also thought is always seeking security for itself and therefore it has created gods - I know you may not like this, but you have to see these facts. It has created gods of various kinds - Christian Gods, Muslim, Hindu Gods - thousands of them in this country. Together, we ought to

consider why thought has become so tremendously important; and why thought has worked, expended incalculably in the technological world, and that thought itself has said, I will understand myself. That is, thought has built, put together, 'myself'. Do you agree to that? Are we going together? Are we thinking together, or am I forcing you to think? Or can we have a dialogue about this? A dialogue means a conversation between two people, amicable, who are friends, who are not merely expressing merely at the verbal level - they're concerned with themselves, with their wives, husbands and the whole human nature - they're talking about it together. You and the speaker are in that position - we're having a dialogue together. This is not a clever statement. It should be like that - that is, we must together, I mean together, think of all these things, not according to your opinion or my opinion, according to your point of view, or according to your prejudice and so on.

To think together is very important. That means both of us are free to enquire, free to question each other, in a friendly way, not as a dialectical business, but together find out what place has thought, and where thought is not necessary. Right? We are going to enquire into that: where thought is necessary, and the more you think, the more energy, vitality there is in that direction - which is the world of technology. And observe the nature of thought which has built the self-interest. Right?

All of us need security, both biological and physical as well as inward security, all of us need it. It is the urgency, the demand of the brain that says, I can only function excellently if the brain is completely secure. Right? Are we together? Where does security

lie? Of course you must have security as a house, a flat or a hut, furniture, if you have furniture, a bed, a few clothes or many, many clothes. There we must have security otherwise you and I wouldn't be sitting here. And the brain also says, I must be secure not only outwardly, physically, but also inwardly. Right? That's what you want, don't you? In the search of security, there is also fear involved in not having security - they both go together. That is, I want security - my brain demands that you shall be secure. Either it accepts an illusion and that illusion gives it a sense of security, which most people have - security in tradition, security in old beliefs, security in carrying on day after day the same habits. Security in doing puja or ritual, to make you feel a little more holy.

So, we have to investigate together, have a dialogue, a conversation, to find out if there is security at all. You understand my question? The search for security may be an illusion, inwardly. That is, we find security within a family with a wife or a husband, having a house and so on, or living in a filthy hut along the beach. I won't talk about politics or governments. Is there security? We want security: I worked for so long with regard to something, I'm growing old, and I want in my own way to be sure, certain about death, about my life, about my family. Or I find security in becoming a monk, a sannyasi, or go away and live in the Himalayas and find security in my thinking, in my meditation. Right? Are you following all this?

So, is thought capable of giving human beings security? You understand what I am asking? Thought has put together a series of activities which is called National Security, and thought has divided this security as belonging to America, Russia, China and

India and so on. Are you following this? A little bit at least. And in the search for security it has created division and therefore conflict between various nations and so on, and it hasn't realized that in division, in separation, there must be conflict. Right? Am I talking to myself? You understand? Please this is important to understand as a dialogue, a conversation. Where there is division, separation as French, German and all that, there must inevitably be conflict, that's a law. As long you're a Hindu, attached to an idea called India and become patriotic and all that business, there must be the other, the Muslim. He has also got his conditioning, his propaganda, his beliefs. So where there is division, you're going to have a war: between Russia and America, England and all the rest of it. That has been the history of mankind from the beginning of time. Wars have been our heritage. Who creates this division? Is it thought? I am asking you, please. Is it thought that has divided the world into nationalities, into economic divisions, into various forms of culture and religions and so on? Is it thought?

Then we have to ask, what is the beginning of thought? What is the reality, what is the origin of thinking? Please, work together. Thought has done the most extraordinary things, there is no question of that. And also has done the most diabolical things. And thought which is so essential for all of us - because you couldn't, the speaker couldn't use words if he has no vocabulary and accumulated memories of English. So thought is limited. (Don't nod your head in constant agreement sir.) You have to look at this very carefully, understand it for yourself, the speaker can only describe, put it into words, draw a design, but you have to think, find out, doubt, question, ask - not agree at all. You know, this is

one of our peculiarities as human beings: we agree and disagree. What is the need to agree or disagree? When you see something to be actual, there is no agreement or disagreement, it is so. But you don't see anything clearly, you're all rather confused and out of this confusion arises agreement and disagreement.

But if you and I see something very clearly, there is no need for agreement. It is so. You understand? Please understand this. This is important. Go into it. You see on this basis agreement and disagreement, there is always division, and therefore conflict. I agree with you, and I don't agree with him. Or I follow this and you don't follow that, or I choose this, you don't choose that - this constant division, agreement and disagreement. You and I would never disagree that this is a microphone; we have been told, it would have been put together by electronic experts and they would call it a microphone - and we say it is a microphone. There is no disagreement. If you would like to call it a giraffe, you can, but nobody will understand, you say, this thing is a giraffe, but they have a picture of is a giraffe, they have seen it in a book and so there is no communication. But there is communication when you and the speaker see the same thing and say, this is a microphone. The perception of that, the seeing of that doesn't demand or ask agreement or disagreement. I wonder if you can go along in that direction. Because the speaker is not trying to convince you of anything, nor trying to make you feel you agree with the speaker. All that the speaker is doing is describing what is actually going on, not only externally, but inwardly. He is your mirror and the mirror has no authority, the mirror is not your guru. Right? I wonder if you see all this. It's a mirror. And when you begin to see

things very clearly, then you can throw away the mirror altogether, destroy it.

So, this is not a personal or personality cult. To the speaker, that is an abomination - to make a person into something extraordinary. But rather, thinking together, having a dialogue together, a conversation as deeply as possible, not superficial conversation about the weather, but conversation that touches our hearts and brains. So, we're asking, who has created all this division in the world? The good and the bad. This duality in us, who has brought this about? Is it not thought, and is not thought limited? Thought can imagine that it is limitless. It can project limitless, infinite horizons but thought itself being limited, whatever it projects, whatever it does, it is still limited and therefore breeding conflict. We must go into this carefully. Most of us live with conflict. Conflict between the wife and the husband, conflict with your neighbour, conflict with the Muslim and the Hindu - all our lives, from the beginning till we die, there is this perpetual struggle: to meditate, how to meditate, how to sit properly, you know - the whole business.

Is conflict necessary and can one live without a single conflict - which means having no problem at all. Why do we have problems? Religious problems, social problems, problems in our relationships with others, intimate and so on, we always have problems. Can one live a life without a single problem? Have you ever asked that question? And if you're asking it as you must, how will you find out if it is possible - not take it for granted as possible, or say, it is impossible - but to find out for yourself what a problem is, and whether you can live without a single shadow of it. Would you like

to go into that?

Our brain which is a most extraordinary instrument, which has got immense capacity, capable of the most astonishing subtleties, and that brain has become so crowded with problems - why? Please find out, ask ourselves why. The meaning of the word 'problem', etymologically is, something thrown at you. Problem mean a challenge. And the brain from the moment it is born till it dies has problems. It cannot write - and the teacher, the poor parents and others, teach him how to write, and to the child, that becomes a problem. So from childhood to university - if you're unlucky or lucky to go through that machinery - your brain is educated to have problems. Right? Do you agree to this - not agree, sorry! Do you see the fact of that: that every human being is educated to have problems, and having a brain that is educated to having problems, it can never solve any problem, because it is conditioned that way. You can observe it politically, religiously and so on. Can that conditioning, which is, having been trained to have problems, can that brain be free of all problems - religious, economic, social and so on, and problems of relationship Do you understand the question? If I have problems, my brain is conditioned to that, how can I solve any problem? I only attend partially to one and thereby create two or three others, politically, religiously - this is what is happening in the world.

So you are asking yourself whether it is possible to be absolutely free so that you can meet problems freely, not with a brain that is conditioned to problems. Right? Are we meeting each other somewhat? We'll go into it. We are asking why and who has created this division which creates problems. We say, thought,

because thought is limited. And we also said, memory is stored in the brain and that memory is thought. Memory is knowledge and that knowledge can never be complete; whether scientific knowledge or knowledge about anything including yourself, it can never be complete, there is always something more to discover, to understand, to find out. So knowledge is the past and knowledge also in the future will always be limited. Is this clear? And knowledge is the result of experience. Right? Experience, which is always limited, knowledge out of that experience is also limited; then memory, stored in the brain, and that memory responds, that memory is thought. It is not a question of agreement or disagreement, it is so. Our brains are full of memory, which is, our brains are recording, like a tape-recorder, it is recording. Right? Are you following all this? And so the brain is becoming gradually or rapidly mechanical. Not in the technological world - it has invented extraordinary things like the computer - I won't go into the computer business. The computer is programmed, programmed by the experts, mathematicians. A top mathematician can programme and it can teach others. Our brains are also programmed: you're a Hindu, I'm a Buddhist, I follow the Tibetan way of meditation and so on.

We are programmed as a computer is programmed: you're an American, you know, all the rest of it. It's not the moment to go into all that. Computers are developing so rapidly, they can do almost anything, and what is going to happen to the human brain when a computer can do a lot of things which the human brain has been doing, what happens to us as human beings? In exercising the brain, the brain becomes active, more and more and more. But if

the brain is not active, gradually the machine is going to take over, our brains are either going to within or enter into the world of entertainment. Right? You understand all this? Are you interested in all this?

Either the brain will be involved in great entertainment, because it cannot do much in the technological world. So the brain will gradually wither, either become involved, be amused, entertained, by sport, by religious ceremonies, which is now happily more and more; or there is only another possibility - enter into the psychological world, into the world that is beyond the psyche, beyond the limited self-interest, go into that most profoundly. Now, can thought do all this? You understand? Thought has created the computer, and it will build cars with robots, there will be a great deal of unemployment and so on and so on. So, as thought being always limited, and that's the only instrument apparently we have, and you may say, what about feelings, emotions, sentimentality? Is not that also part of thought? No? I'm very devoted to my guru, or to some idol in a temple: the idol in the temple is created by thought. My guru, if I have one, and fortunately I haven't got any - if I had one, thought has given him a great many attributes, he knows - I don't know, I'll be helped. That's one of the curses of gurus, wanting to help others. Do you listen to all this, without throwing something at me? Because we all want to be helped, and we have been helped not only by surgeons and doctors and so on, we've also been helped by philosophers, by ancient books, the Bible, Koran and the Upanishads, or whatever your particular religious book is, or your guru, or the local pundit, you all want to be helped. I have a

problem, I want to be helped, I come to you, you know much better than I do. I obey.

So what happens to me when I'm being helped actually? I become weaker and weaker mentally, morally, I just follow, obey, I become a machine, there is no independence at all. I never question, doubt, be sceptical. If you are sceptical, doubt, question, religions wouldn't exist.

So, we're enquiring now, talking over together, as thought is limited, and whatever it does in the world of technology or in the world of the psyche, I must understand myself, know myself, and then thought begins to investigate and then the very investigation becomes limited because thought is limited. Right? Are you following all this? So, we are asking, if that is the only instrument we have and if we see, actually observe the fact, not agree or disagree, but actually see the fact that whatever thought does must always be limited, and therefore conflict. There is conflict because we have duality: the good and the bad. Would you follow all that a little bit, if it interests you? From ancient days, this has been the conflict, between the good and the bad: the good trying to overcome the bad and the bad trying to overcome the good, the good is expressed in a thousand different ways and the bad in a thousand different ways, called evil and so on. Now is it possible - please listen to this - not to have duality at all? Do you understand my question? To find that out, urgently, not just theoretically, is there a duality at all? We are questioning.

Fear is a fact for all human beings, like violence is a fact, and the opposite of fear is courage, or escape or try to overcome it, so, there is duality. The fact and the non-fact. I wonder if you see that?

The fact is fear and the non-fact is, I should not be afraid, and therefore, suppression, conflict and all that arises; between violence and non-violence, non-violence is not a fact. It is just an invention of thought saying, I must reach non-violence - in the meantime, it is being violent. So, I'm asking myself, and you are asking yourself, is there an opposite at all - except man and woman, dark and light, tall and short, measurement, apart from that, psychologically is there duality at all? There have been all kinds of philosophers saying that you can only reach that level of no duality when you reach heaven, or something or other. There have been lots of books written about that. But we're pushing aside all authority in these matters and enquiring, is there duality at all, or only facts? The fact is, I am afraid. If the brain knows how to deal with that, how to be free of fear, then there is no opposite. Right? Right, sir? If I'm free - if there is no violence in me altogether, because I understand the nature of violence, I've looked at it, I have held it, I have observed it, gone into it, seen what it is; not only physical but also psychological violence - 'I must not be, I must be,' imitation, conformity, anger, jealousy, hate, that's all violence. If I can understand it, deal with it, there is no opposite, I don't need an opposite. All right sirs?

Now, can I deal with that instantly, not postpone it. When I postpone it, I've already gone into conflict. I wonder if you understand this. Anything I postpone, if I say, I'll get over my anger, give me time, let it be gradual, I've already created conflict. I wonder if you understand this? All right? Do we go together in this? So, can I, can my brain deal with the fact of what I am and not what I should be? There is fear. Can I deal with that

completely? Not say, I'll gradually get rid of it, tell me how to get rid of fear. Don't ever ask, as we said the other day, 'how' to do any psychologically thing. You can ask a doctor 'how' to do this and that? But psychologically never ask 'how'. There are a thousand people who will tell you what to do. Now can I be free of fear, completely? I'll go into it, but you are going to go into it, not just listen and say, well, an excellent description, I don't know how to do it, I'll think about it. Now we're looking at fear, not the objects of fear, not causes or results of fear. You may be afraid of darkness, one may be afraid of one's wife or husband, you may be afraid of losing your job, or afraid of public opinion, afraid of not being able to face yourself as you are, and say I can do this, and hold on, but you can never do it - various forms of fear. We are not dealing with the various forms, not the objects of fear, but to find out, for ourselves, what is the causation of fear, the cause? Where there is a cause, the effect can be put away. If I understand the cause, the effect has no meaning. If I can find out the cause of my illness, then I'll be healthy. So, if I can find out the cause of fear, not the multiple forms of fear, but the cause of fear. So, let us investigate it together, talk about it. Not agree or disagree.

Is it time, the cause? Is time a factor of fear? I might die tomorrow - tomorrow is time. I might lose my job. I might not love my wife, she'll get angry and so on. That is, time is involved as a cause of fear. Do we see that? Right sir? I am asking you, do you actually perceive for yourself the fact - the fact, not the idea, the idea is different from the fact. Idea is not the fact. You are sitting there, and the speaker is sitting here, that's a fact. But we can make an idea of it. But the idea is not the fact. Like the word door is not

the door. So we're only looking at the fact which brings about fear. Right? And we are saying, you and I in our conversation together, not persuading each other, seeing that time is a factor of fear. I have done wrong last year and I hope nobody discovers it because I've got a certain reputation, and if they find that out they will throw me out, so I've got to hide it. And therefore that is the cause of fear which is time. I've done something in the past which might cause trouble for me, therefore I'm afraid of that incident - that means time. Time is a movement, a series of movements.

Are you interested in all this, or have you heard the speaker talking about this endlessly, therefore you are bored with it? I'll go on with it, if you are bored it's up to you.

So, time is a factor and what is time? I know time by the watch; I know time by the sunrise, sunset, the evening star, the beautiful slip of a new moon, and the full moon. Time is the past, time is now, time is tomorrow. This whole movement of the past which is the accumulate of memory through time, through experience, knowledge and so on, all that accumulation is time, and that accumulation as memory, knowledge, goes through the present, modifies itself and goes on to the future. This whole movement of knowledge, experience, memory and thought is movement in time. So time is not only this movement from the beginning to the end, but also time is now, because tomorrow is what I am today. Tomorrow is what I am actually today. If I'm angry, violent today, if there is no radical and mental change, tomorrow I'll be still the same. Right sirs? You all look so puzzled. So that is time. I won't go into the question of change. That demands a great deal of investigation. I don't want to do that now for the moment.

So, fear is time and fear is also thought. I may lose my job, I may lose my wife who is looking at somebody else, I may not reach heaven and so on. Thought is the movement of the past, present and future. So, thought and time together - they're both movements - together are the cause of fear.

Then the question arises, is it possible to stop thought and time? That's the normal question. If fear is the result or the effect of the cause, time and thought, then is it possible to stop thought and time - otherwise, I'll go on with fear. Right, sir? Do we meet this? Are we together a little bit? Let's take the journey quickly. What shall I do? I see the cause, and I also see the effect. The effect is fear. The cause is time and thought. If there is a putting away of thought and time I've no fear. Then one needs no rod, no guru, when there is freedom from thought you are entirely different. So we ask ourselves: is it possible to stop time and thought? That's what meditation does. You hope through meditation to control thought and thereby push it behind, control it - never enquiring who is the controller, which is also thought. I won't go into all that now for the moment. Is it possible to end thought and time? Answer it, sir, work. Our brains are so sluggish, we've become so lazy, indolent, because we've been told so many things and we don't know where we are. So here what we are trying to do in our conversation is to see the facts and live with the facts, not escape from the fact. The fact is, I'm afraid, we're afraid, each one of us in different ways, there is fear and we know the cause. There is the absolute fact, that is, time and thought are the causation of fear. And also we see that by ending the cause, the effect is totally ended.

If I know what my illness is, I can take certain remedies and

that's the end of it. Similarly, we know the cause, the effect is fear, what shall we do? Don't wait for me to answer? This is a conversation between us. How do you observe the cause? How do you discover the cause? Not by being told or having it described, put into words, but to find out the fact, not the idea of the fact. Right? Please see this: not the idea, the conclusion about the fact, but the fact is time and thought. Is it possible to totally end all that - knowing the evolution of the brain has taken a million years. Your brain has evolved through time and through that long duration, long voyage of time, it has gathered certain conditionings: that thought will solve fear, thought will do something in order to escape from fear; do puja, escape, every form of escape. And all escapes have stopped because you know the cause, therefore you have to do something with the cause. If that cause is not eradicated, you'll always live with fear, psychologically. Psychologically is far more important than biologically, physically, because the psychological states always overcome the biological states. I won't go into that, there is no time left.

Now do you put the question seriously to yourself, or is it just a passing question? You put the question today and forget about it the next day, and pick it up the day after tomorrow. Or do you put the question seriously, with all your intensity, with your passion? And that means, are you willing to give your complete, passionate attention to the cause, or do we just listen and carry on with our fears? If you put that question, profoundly, seriously, put that question with all your heart and mind and passion to find out, that means giving all your energy, vitality, attention to that. When you

give all your energy, which you've wasted in trying to escape from it, or in trying to find a substitute, or rationalizing fear, if you drop all that completely, then there is no escape from fear. No god, no other human being can help you to be free of fear. If you really put it with all your energy, strength, vitality and especially the passion to comprehend something which mankind has lived with for millennia upon millennia, then you are giving that passionate, flaming attention to the cause. When you give such burning attention, the cause is burnt away. But very few people - we're not discouraging - very few people do this - they've so many things to do: family, husband, children, earning money and so on, and that takes a great deal of energy, all that. So you say, 'sorry I haven't got the energy, help me to have that energy', take a drug, instead of asking for help. I'm not advocating drugs. They are horrid.

So, passion is something entirely different from lust; lust is sensation, sexuality. We are not against that, we're pointing out that passion is something entirely different. That passion comes with all its tremendous energy and capacity when sorrow ends. When there is no sorrow in your heart or mind or brain, which is part of self-interest, when there is the ending of that, there is great, immense, inexhaustible passion, which can never be burnt away. And that passion, which is attention, burns away the cause of fear, which is time and thought.

We ought to talk about many other things. It is now quarter to seven. Should we go on? What would you like to talk about? What is your deep interest? What do you demand of yourself apart from earning money, apart from all that business, what is it that each human being wants? You want something, otherwise you wouldn't

be here listening to K. Somebody is yawning, tired, go to bed and rest, but we are asking something very serious. When you say, I want something, the 'wanting' is to fulfil the emptiness in oneself: I want to be happy; I want to reach nirvana or moksha or illumination. Wanting means, there is something missing. What are you missing? Is it that the emptiness, the loneliness can never be filled, but we are trying to fill it with puja, with books, with knowledge, with chatter, talking endlessly about politics, you know, the whole thing. Do we realize how extraordinarily shallow we are? And realizing that shallowness I want to have depth? So, we're always wanting, wanting, wanting to be loved, wanting to be encouraged, wanting to find somebody who will be a long lasting companion. This wanting is endless, if you've filled one want, you want another want - that goes on for the rest of one's life. I want to know or one wants to know what happens after death. That is one of the questions asked all the time. We'll go into that tomorrow and the day after tomorrow.

Can you ever stop wanting? You want to find roots for yourself in a country, in a person, in an image or an illusion, you want to establish your roots, and you want to fulfil, become somebody. This goes on all our life. Have you ever asked yourself, that I don't want a thing? I want food, clothes and shelter, that's understood, otherwise I don't want a thing. Have you ever asked yourself that? I think you should, if I may most respectfully suggest, you should ask that question. Because in discovering your wants, you must also discover why you want, and if there is an ending to all craving, to wanting. When you find that out, that you don't ask anything for yourself, then there is that state which is

indescribable. I know you are waiting for the description. That description is futile, it is merely words. But to come to that point, and that is not a long journey. It is the shortest journey, the next step - which is not to want psychologically anything.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 5TH JANUARY 1985

This is far better, to sit under the trees and talk about serious things with a group of people who are equally interested in things that we are talking about.

May we go on from where we left off the other day - yesterday. There is nearly a full moon. I wonder if one notices all these things: the full moon and the sunset, the richness of a cloud and the beauty of rain coming as a shower, and all the sound, the noise of the world. Probably we don't. We are too occupied with our own problems, or chattering, or too concerned with the things of the world, or too concerned with the other things of the world. And I think we should continue with what we were talking about yesterday evening, if we may. We were talking about conflict, problems and fear. One wonders if one realizes how important it is, how essential, how conflict damages the brain, when all our brains are damaged by conflict, by not understanding the facts of living, by all kinds of superstitions, ideologies and the conflict of duality. So, may we go into that subject.

Is it possible to have a brain - because we live by the brain, the brain is the centre of all our responses and reactions. The speaker is not a specialist with regard to the brain. But one can observe one's own brain and its activity. The brain is the centre of action, reaction, all the movement of thought, feelings, responses of nerves, it is the centre of our consciousness, our fears, our anxieties, our sorrow, our longing for something different from what actually is. This constant occupation, never a moment when

the brain is quiet. This conflict in any form does damage to the brain. And the brain is the centre of our consciousness. Right? That is so, it is not a theory, which the speaker is putting forward, it is the centre of all our action, of all our feelings, our imagination, our sentimentality, whether it is romantic and so on. This brain contains, or has within it, consciousness. Our consciousness is what we have made of it. Right?

May one again remind you, that we are talking things over together as two friends walking down a lane with many shadows and dappled light, sitting on a bench and talking about all this. They are friends, therefore they are not arguing, or trying to convince each other of something or other. Friends never do, there is no argument, or acceptance or denial, agreeing or disagreeing. And so we, the speaker and you are together thinking, not just listening. Listening is of great importance, how to listen. Listening not only with the hearing of the ear, but also listening to the meaning, to the significance, to the depth of a word. And when you listen so deeply you are not translating what is being said according to your own terminology, or translating it, or comparing what is being said, to what you already know; you are actually listening so that you capture the significance, the depth of what is being said. Which means you are listening not only to the speaker, but also much more to yourself: watching your own reactions, how you listen, whether you are really listening, or translating what you are listening to according to your own fancy, imagination, or according to your own particular experience and knowledge. All that prevents actually listening.

If you are listening to great music and if you are comparing it to

another great musician, you are not actually listening to that particular music. So, similarly if one is actually listening with one's heart - that doesn't mean sentimentality, it doesn't mean some kind of emotional chaos - but actually listening. And as two friends are listening to each other, in that quality of listening they are asking each other: is it possible for a brain which is the centre of our life, not to be wounded, not to have any scratch? And that demands that we enquire into the nature of conflict; why human beings from the beginning of time, a million years more or less, have lived with conflict, as we all live in conflict. There is no doubt about it, it is a fact. And we are asking why do human beings put up with conflict? Not only external conflict as war, as competition with another, as imitation, conformity and all the pressures, political pressure, newspaper pressures, the family pressure and so on, these pressures also damage the brain. That is a fact. Anything that is under pressure must inevitably either escape from the pressure, and that escape becomes a means of conflict; or, we are being programmed all the time: propaganda of newspapers, magazines and so on. All these activities obviously bring about conflict.

Now, can the brain be free of all conflict? This is a very serious question. Conflict breeds antagonism, conflict breeds self-centredness, it is the nature of selfishness. And we human beings are terribly selfish, self-interested and that breeds conflict. When each one of us is concerned with ourselves, our own fulfilment, our own ambitions and so on, that breeds, builds up slowly various forms of contradiction, conflict and ultimately war. All these are obvious facts. And we are asking whether it is possible for the brain to be completely healthy, rational, sane, logical? Because, it's

only then that you can function tremendously and fully. Is it possible to live a life in the modern world without conflict? You might say that is impossible; if you are not competitive, if you are not aggressive, if you are not becoming number one. If you are doing that you must inevitably live in conflict and you say to yourself, I can't do that; I have to compete in my business, I have to compete in my examinations and so on. We are nurtured, trained to compete which becomes aggressiveness. You must be aggressive in business, otherwise you don't get any business and so on and so on. Do we understand all this verbally, because we are both speaking English? Do we understand this verbally, which becomes then an idea, a concept, a theory, or do you see the fact of it? Do you understand me? There is a vast difference between fact and idea of the fact. The idea of the fact, and fact itself. Right? The idea is the gramophone, sorry the microphone - but the idea is not the actual instrument in front of the speaker. So there is a fact and the idea of the fact. Do you understand this?

Now, which is it we are caught in, the idea, the concept, the conclusion, the description or the fact itself? Which is, that we live in conflict. And this conflict is brought about basically, fundamentally, by self-interest. And then you will say, if there is no self-interest how can one live in this modern world? That is a very common question, and a rather silly question. Sorry, if I may use that word. Have you ever tried, or lived a life without self-interest? If you have, then you will have quite a different activity in life. Because we haven't done it, we say it is impossible. If you have to climb a mountain, and you have to climb that mountain, you don't begin by saying it is impossible. You go up it, with your

capacity, with your energy and drive. And if you want to find out whether it is possible to live in this world without conflict, you have to do it, find out. That is, can you live without self-interest?

And all the politicians in the world are concerned with themselves, and with their power, with their position, which is political self-interest. The world is that. Can we live without self-interest? That self-interest breeds continuously conflict, and so our brains get damaged, wounded. And, as we grow older the brain becomes more and more dull, more and more superstitious, repetitive and is willing to obey any tradition, any system of philosophy or religion and so on. So that is a very serious question. Because there is a possibility of having a brain that is never damaged, then that brain has immense capacity - not in the technological world, it may have also, but much more in the world of the psyche, in the world of non-self. You know, the technological journey is always limited, because there is more and more to be added. Therefore it is always limited. Whereas the journey that one takes psychologically, inwardly is infinite; it has no end, it is really a world totally different. This is not a theory. Don't go back to your books and say, yes, this is what they have said, and you are only putting it in modern words. But if my friend and I are sitting on that bench in the lane - and if that friend says, 'Really I want to find out, this is rather an interesting idea'. Idea first, he doesn't know anything else, but he listens to it, sees the significance of it, the beauty of it, the depth of it and he says, 'I capture what you mean. I don't know if I can ever do it because it demands a great deal of awareness, a great deal of attention, a great deal of watching, watching, watching. But, I am going to see if it is

possible.' And as you are that friend sitting on that bench with the speaker, you are saying to yourself - if you are at all serious, not flippant and just curious to attend these silly meetings - you are also, saying, I will see the significance of it, and I'll pursue it. So, if one sees the significance the reality and the beauty of it, then there is immensity beyond the self.

Talking of beauty - may I go into that a little bit? Are you interested in beauty? Are you? What do you mean by beauty? The beauty of a tree, beauty of a painting, a lovely statue, a great poem, the beauty of a sunset, the beauty of a person, a lovely face, with depth behind the face, not just the cinema stars. I don't know why they are called stars! The real stars are immense, they have an extraordinary sense of vastness, a light of their own, undiminished, perpetual. So what is beauty? Does beauty lie in a picture, in a painting, in a museum or if you are rich enough to be a multi millionaire to buy one of the old masters' paintings or one of the paintings of Van Gogh. I won't go into all that. Does beauty lie in a picture? Does beauty lie in that tree, in that moon just rising, with clarity, without a single cloud round it? What is beauty to you? Or you have never even thought about it? Or is it that we have become so insensitive we never look, we are willing to cut down every tree for profit and reduce the land to desert - which is happening. All the squalor in a street. What is beauty? Because if we don't understand or have that quality of beauty - because beauty is truth, without beauty there is no truth - and if there is no beauty in your heart you will never have truth, you will never come upon that marvellous word and the depth of that word. Not the beauty of a dress, or the colours of a marvellous sari or gown. But what is

beauty? If you ask it seriously, not what the poets say, not the books that have been written about beauty, or read one of the great poems and feel exalted, and emotionally responding to it, and say what a beautiful thing that is. Is that beauty? Is the word beauty merely a word? May we go into it a little bit?

I wonder. One wonders why in this country that word beauty is lost. Is it sensory responses of seeing a beautiful person and merely getting excited sexually, or because he is important in the world and earns a lot of money, a cinema person. I don't like to call them stars because politically they have become very important. Another country has made a President of an actor, and so you are also encouraging this, in actors who have just a face and a body, with very little behind it. So, to enquire into beauty, if you really want to go into it, one must understand or grasp, not intellectually, why human beings are absorbed by something? Absorbed by your puja. Right? Absorbed in your prayers. Please, pay attention, this is related to beauty. Please, don't throw it out, listen to it. Human beings are always absorbed in something or other: in a nation, in politics, or absorbed in their business. You know what it means to be absorbed: To give all your energy, absorbed by something external; or you have something inward, as an idea, as an ideal and you are absorbed by it. Have you ever asked, why human beings want to be absorbed? Have you ever noticed a child who has been naughty all day long, which they should be, fortunately, give him a toy and he gets completely absorbed in it. You have children, haven't you? No? Have you watched a child who has been naughty and given him an intricate toy and all his naughtiness stops, and the toy absorbs him. Right? So till he breaks it, he is completely

absorbed by it, quiet, concentrating, loving it. Right? You have children, haven't you? Haven't you noticed this? And also grown-up people similarly are absorbed by toys: the toy of meditation and the toy of god. And god becomes most extraordinarily intricate; different gods, you do puja, you are absorbed by it. What takes place when you are absorbed that way. Do you understand? When a child is absorbed by a toy, what happens to the child? He becomes quiet. Right? He becomes completely involved with that toy. He is absorbed by a story. And we human beings are also like that. And when you are absorbed what takes place? All your naughtiness stops. Right? When you are doing your puja, ringing a bell and going to the church and all the rest of it, what happens? For the moment, or for ten minutes, or twenty minutes, for an hour or whatever time it takes, the puja or the ritual has absorbed you, you are quiet.

Now when you look at a mountain - if you have looked at a mountain with its vastness, immense majesty, immovable, so enormous, snowcapped against the blue sky - for a second or two, that multi-spectacle drives the self away. Haven't you noticed this? Then what takes place? The grandeur, the immensity and the extraordinary beauty of a great mountain gives you a momentary shock and the self is not, at that moment. Right? Is this right? Haven't you noticed this. And you are so self-bound by that moment. And so you become silent for a moment. That is, the toy, of the mountain has absorbed you. So can you be free of the self without being absorbed by anything? Do you understand my question? Because when the self is not, beauty is. Do you understand all this? Do you know how important this is? Because

we have no beauty in our life, we are becoming more and more vulgar, noisy and we haven't even thought about this question. We are all too religious to think about beauty. And it is related to a woman or a man - it might absorb your senses, so therefore be careful. If you understand the nature of beauty then you can live in this world so completely, so holistically because beauty is not that which is ugly. Beauty has no relationship to the ugly. Have you wandered through Madras, as we did last night. Have you seen those buildings, how ugly they are? We live with all this, we live with ugliness, and we get used to ugliness. We have got used to the squalor of the streets, and we don't even bother, it is happening all the time. So we lose the quality of sensitivity; and sensitivity is essential, otherwise you can't feel, you can't look. If you are not sensitive to that moon, to look at it for some time without thought, just to look at it. See the beauty of that light on the river, or a sheet of water. That demands sensitivity.

That brings up the question - are you getting bored by all this? Why not? Have you beauty in your life? You are silent. Talking about sensitivity brings up another question. Do you want to go on like this, or would you like to talk about something else? Would you like to talk about pleasure? I am sure - one is sure that you are seeking pleasure. All human beings are seeking pleasure, not only sexual pleasure, with its repetitive, imaginative pictures and so on and so on, but also the pleasure of power, whether that power be over your wife or your husband or the power of a politician round the corner for whom you have voted. It is your pleasure to have that man - whether he is capable or incapable that doesn't matter - to put him in that place is your pleasure. And it is your pleasure to

possess something: possess money, a good house - a good house, you understand, a beautiful house, well proportioned - if you are rich - with a good garden and lovely flowers, that is a great pleasure. And the pleasure of achievement and the fear of failure. And pleasure is based on the principle of reward and punishment. Is that right? Shall we talk about that because that is what we all want? The ultimate pleasure is god. And therefore god is both punishment and reward; and this god is invented by our thought. And as we said yesterday where there is fear, there is god, there are many gods or one god - and if there is no fear at all, psychologically, inwardly, then there is no outside agency, but a door is open to eternity. Shall we talk about all that, some theory, or shall we talk about sorrow or talk about something much closer, though we do have sorrow, each one of us, or have had sorrow, but we will come to that presently, if there is time.

We ought to talk over together as two friends. This is not a lecture, not something to inform you, or to instruct you. But this is a dialogue between you and the speaker. And the speaker would like to raise a question: whether we are only functioning with one or two senses, or whether we are functioning with all our senses? Do you understand my question?

Probably being religious people, which I doubt - at least we think we are religious by going to the temple and all that business, and leading shoddy, conflicting, brutal lives. Religions have said, suppress your senses, because they are a distraction. Don't look at a woman or man and don't look at a beautiful sunset or the stream that is singing by the side of a road. Don't listen to all that. And so we are gradually killing our senses. When you hear noise day after

day, day after day, noise from the houses, you get used to it, you get dull to that noise. So gradually we are destroying our senses. Right? And we are asking, when you destroy your senses, the touch, the feel, the quality of a sense, the brain becomes dull too, and is it possible - I am just putting this question to my friend who is sitting on the bench in the shadow of a tree - can all your senses awaken and function together as a whole? Have you ever tried it? Then you will find when all your senses are active, not sexual senses only, but all your senses, the seeing the hearing, the touching, the emotions, the thought, all your senses - because thought is a material process. When all your senses are at their highest excellency, the self is not. It is only when there is partial, dull operation of one or two senses, then the self builds up. I say to my friend, listen to it, find out the truth of it and if you don't listen, don't bother.

We talked about pleasure and all the implications of pleasure, essentially based on reward and punishment. To avoid punishment, not physical punishment, but the sense of being, losing, the sense of not having. The having is a reward and the losing is the pain. So we live our daily life on this principle: reward and punishment. You reward a dog to obey you, and gradually train him to obey you, and he jolly well obeys you, comes to heel. So our life is based on reward and punishment. And in that is involved fear, pain and pleasure. We live that way: I will be good, that is the reward; and being not good is the pain, the punishment. So, if one understands the principle, reward and punishment, and whether one can be free of that principle, then life is entirely different.

Let's talk about something else, shall we? We have talked about

beauty, that is an immense thing, not in books, in poems. But if you have that beauty that is without absorption, that is without a sense of ugliness. We ought to talk over together a very complex problem of suffering. Is that all right? Can we go into that? Why have human beings from time immemorial suffered? And have never solved that problem, they have never ended suffering. After thousands and thousands of years we human beings in the modern world suffer; suffer not having a child, suffer of not being able to fulfil, suffer when one is not loved, suffer in our loneliness. Are you all lonely? Are you lonely ever? Are you really? Suffer when we are lonely, suffer when we don't get rich, recognized. Those are all very superficial sufferings: wanting to be a great man and not being capable of being a great man, wanting to manage something, not being able to manage. There are various forms, like fear, of sorrow: the sorrow of death of someone with whom you have lived intimately. This sorrow of death we all know, every human being on this earth, unfortunately, knows the sorrow of death. And in spite of all the comforts of reincarnation, in spite of all the religious activity and their superstitions, sorrow is never ending.

Sorrow is not only your sorrow, your personal sorrow, but there is the sorrow of the world. The sorrow of those people who have been killed in the war, maimed, blinded, no arms and no legs, just the body, torso, and their relatives; how many mothers have cried, sisters, wives, lovers and so on. Don't you know all this? Or are you only concerned with your own sorrow? If we are honest, we say, sorry, I am only concerned with my own sorrow. I recognize the sorrow of others: those people who are dying in Beirut, Nicaragua, and Vietnam. They are so far away, it doesn't touch us.

So there is personal sorrow and the sorrow of the world; it is still sorrow. Your sorrow is like the sorrow of another, your sorrow is mine. It is one's sorrow when one loses one's son, wife, husband. And what a lot of fuss we make about it, weeping, crying, wanting comfort. And there is all the sorrow of thousands, millions of human beings, who are suffering also, like you. And this sorrow, like fear, like pleasure, is common to mankind. It is the sorrow of humanity and that sorrow is never ending. Probably it will never end, because we have made the world so monstrous. This society which we have built, society doesn't exist by itself, we have built it through our fear, through our grief, through our selfishness and our monstrous activity. This society is corrupt beyond words, we have made it, because we are corrupt. And this corruption is self-interest primarily. And so society is not going to help us; religions have not helped mankind, they have not prevented wars. Though you talk endlessly of non-violence, peace in the world - I must have peace of mind, you know all this nonsense.

There is sorrow in the world and can that sorrow end? Perhaps you have never asked that question. We suffer and put up with suffering, take comfort in some religion, or some doctrine, or in some belief. It is a strange fact, isn't it: if one loses one's wife, or son or a relative, we carry that pain all our life. Don't you? I have the photo of my son on the desk, I weep quietly to myself. Or I weep publicly, which is with my friend. We never say, that is the end of it. I never carry the memory of pain. It is not brutal, put away the pain of loss in two or three days, not through years. Which doesn't mean that there is callousness, on the contrary. This everlasting talk about one's own son, or husband having died, you

keep that up. It is a form of entertainment, gossip. I am sorry, if I put it brutally.

So, we are asking, whether sorrow can end. Not this sorrow of the world, because there are going to be wars, because human beings are violent; they cry, their own son killed in a war. But your son is quite safe. So society which we have built, which each one of us has contributed to this society, to the political world, to the world of nationalities, with their divisions, that will go on because a vast number of human beings want all that, voting for someone. So you will say, if I end my sorrow, if it is possible, what effect has that on the rest of the world? It's like asking, if I free myself from all the trivialities of life, from all that pain, the anxiety and the loneliness, and sorrow of my life. I want to cry for you. All this is to you, meaningless. You will ask yourself, why? Free myself from sorrow, what will it affect the world? Will the world change, because I have changed? That is a wrong question because when you ask such a question you are finding an excuse not to change. That becomes an easy way out from your own change. And you say, well, it doesn't matter if I change or not because we are all like that. I must live in this world, so, I will listen to you. It sounds good but I will carry on in my own way. So asking a question, if I change will the world change, is a totally wrong question. Then you are looking for reward and punishment. If you radically change, you will find out whether it has an effect on the world or not. Hitler with his madness has changed the world. Napoleon and all the great heroes of war, heroes of murder, have changed the world. So has the Buddha and so on. They were individuals, they were separate. They said, this is what I want to do, and did it,

brutally or...

So if you really end sorrow, not verbally but actually be free of sorrow, then there is a passion which consumes you for the rest of your life. So it is important to understand whether it is possible to end sorrow: your sorrow, one's sorrow. Is sorrow of self-pity? Please examine what the speaker is saying. The speaker is telling his friend sitting on the bench and he is talking about sorrow, and the speaker asks him, K asks him, have you ever asked the question whether you can end sorrow, your sorrow? He says, I have never even thought of such a question, because all my life I have lived with sorrow. And when you put that question, whether you can end sorrow, I really don't know. I don't know what to do with it. I have tried ten different ways and I still go on suffering. And K is asking him, have you ever asked the question whether sorrow can ever end. He said, no, I have never asked it. And K says, now ask it. How you ask it is important: whether you are asking it casually, or asking it as an escape, or are you seeking comfort with the ending of sorrow, or are you putting the question free from reward and punishment? Ending sorrow, not saying to yourself, if I end this, I will get that. If I end sorrow, I will have peace, I will have happiness, I will have joy. That is mere exchange, it is not the ending of sorrow. So, K asks the friend, is it self-interest, self-pity? When you suffer, is it self-pity? He says, partly, yes. Is it the loss of someone who has given you comfort, who has given you pleasure sexually, or different forms of pleasure? He says, yes, partly. Is it that you find yourself lonely because you have leant on that person, been with that person for years, got used to her or him, or it - it may be furniture, which you have cherished, polished, an

old piece, 13th century furniture and then you get attached to it, and when that is taken away, you get upset. Is it that kind of suffering that you have - you have treated her or him like a piece of furniture, got used to him? You understand? Put all these questions. Don't just go to sleep.

The friend says, yes, all these are part of this. Primarily I am lonely. Aren't you lonely? What is loneliness? I am attached to you as an audience. And the speaker, if he is attached to an audience small or large, when the audience disappears he is going to be lonely, he is going to lose his fame, his notoriety; you are going to lose the image you have built about him. Right? So, similarly when you are attached to something, which is another form of self-interest, attached to a person, an idea, a concept, to a symbol, to a myth, then when that attachment is torn away from you, you become lonely, depressed, anxious, nervous, you break down. So, K is telling his friend, when you know all this which is part of suffering, which is the essence of suffering - suffering is not from you, as though you were suffering and suffering was something different. You are the entity that is suffering, you are suffering. Do you understand the difference? Not that I am suffering, the 'I' is suffering. Do you understand? Like anger, envy, is not different from you, you are envy, you are anger, you are violent, and you may say I am trying to be non-violent. That too is you, you are not different from the qualities, from the expression, but you are that. So suffering is not separate from you. So K says to his friend, the first thing when you suffer don't escape from it, don't seek comfort in any form. I am afraid that is much too difficult, not to seek comfort, some consolation, some way to relieve myself from the

ache and the pain. Then you are escaping from the fact, and we have cultivated a thousand escapes, it is part of our life.

So K says to his friend, who is you, he says, don't escape. That is the first thing to realize. If you escape to something, then that something you will also lose, and you will begin again. Do you understand? So don't ever escape. See the fact, the truth of it, the implications of escaping. Then if you don't escape, don't try to find out the cause of suffering - because that again is a process of analysis - right, which is the operation of thought, time: don't do any of that. But, K says to his friend, which is you, remain with sorrow. As you want to remain with pleasure, don't you, so remain with sorrow, don't ever move from sorrow. That is, don't let thought interfere with that thing you call sorrow. Sorrow is a great shock, not only to the physical organism, but also a great shock to the psyche. And to remain with that shock, never trying to transcend it, all that will be the activity of thought. Do you understand? It is like having a marvellous jewel in your hand, the more you look at it, the more the beauty of that jewel is revealed. Similarly if you look at your sorrow, if you hold sorrow, never move away from it, then you will see how immense it is, not just sorrow, the pain, and the anxiety, but in that observation of sorrow, passion comes. Not the passion of lust, and all that, but passion. Do you know what passion is? You don't. Because without passion you cannot create anything, you cannot love with passion. Don't translate it into sexual passion, lust. Passion is important, without passion life becomes shallow, and therefore that which is shallow has no beauty, no love, no passion.

I am sorry if I have kept you.

MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 6TH JANUARY 1985

I hope there are some friends here!

May we go on from where we left off yesterday? We were talking about conflict yesterday evening, and whether it is possible to live in this world, the modern world - I don't know if the word 'modern' is really applicable, but it doesn't matter we will use that word - to live in this modern world without conflict. We went into that very carefully. And also we talked about beauty. Beauty is not in the picture, or in the tree, or a description of a marvellous poem, or any of the great statues and so on. We said where there is beauty, which is truth, there is no self, there is no self-interest whatsoever. We talked about it considerably. And also we went into the question of what is fear, and whether it is possible to live our daily life without psychological fears at all. One doesn't know what you have thought about it, whether you have worked at it in order to find out for yourself whether it is possible to live without fear, which implies security. Is there security for human beings both externally and psychologically. We talked about that too.

Security may be something most definite, and it may not be found at all psychologically where there is this pursuit of self-interest, and therefore it breeds corruption. We went into that too. Where there is self-interest there must be corruption. Corruption is merely an expression of self-interest, the bribes, black market, you know all that, with which you are quite familiar, I am sure.

And also we talked about what you really want, what is your deep longing, craving. And can that craving, longing, wanting ever

be satisfied? So we went into that too a little bit.

So this evening we ought to talk over together - I mean together, this is not to instruct you of anything, or to inform you, but we are as two friends having a dialogue, a conversation, can we together go into certain problems this evening? Which is, death, what it means in life, and love, religion and meditation. We will talk over together these questions. I hope you are prepared for a very serious talk, discussion, not merely agreeing or disagreeing, as we went into that question yesterday. There is no disagreement when you see this microphone in front of you, unless we are blind or half blind and imagine it is something else, which it is not. Then that imagination, or that attitude, or that condition brings about agreement or disagreement. When we are looking together at a fact that which we call a tree is just that, there is no disagreement about it; you might like it, you might not like it, but it is still a tree. So it is important in our lives to face facts and not fiddle about with ideas, beliefs, faith and all that business. But actually deal with what we have, that is our fears, our anxieties, our jealousies, our antagonism, and great deal of pretensions, hypocrisy, worshipping peace and killing another. There is that word in Latin, which the Catholic hierarchy have been repeating for the last two thousand years - *pacem in terris*, which means, may there be peace on earth. And there has never been any peace on earth because the very church, the very temples, the mosques have created wars. Right? Whether you like it or not it is a fact.

So we are going to talk over together what is death, why human beings have been so frightened of it, why human beings have really never understood deeply what the deep significance of death is. We

can only understand it when there is no fear. Right? But most of us - I am sorry about my voice, it will get better as we go along - most of us are afraid of death. And we separate living from death - our daily life from death. One thing is absolutely certain, which is that we are all going to die. Right? Whether you like it or not that is an absolute, irrevocable fact. You and the speaker are going to die one day - I hope not in a few days but many, many years later.

So we ought to talk over together as two friends, not agreeing or disagreeing, but look at it all - the living and the dying. What is living? What is it that we call living? Please, this is a discussion, this is a dialogue between you and the speaker, so work it out. What do you call living? Is living this constant struggle, constant conflict, seeking power, status, position, and not being, perhaps, able to get it, and living a constant battle with oneself. And the living is what we call anxiety, attachment. Right? Living is going to the office, whether it is the highest ministers of this country, or the lowest clerk going to the office every day for sixty years, or fifty years of your life, from 9.0 to 5.0., being insulted, pushed around. Right? Unless you are the top executives. That's what we call also life. The responsibility of earning a livelihood with money to support your wife and children, and educate them - and the education is pretty rotten, as it is in this country, and elsewhere too, because they are merely emphasizing memorizing. Right? And making them into machines. You are programming them to be mathematicians, to be engineers, to be scientists, and so on. They offer a means of livelihood and so you spend eight hours of the day for the rest of your life, and then retire to die. This is a fact. Seeking god, seeking peace, seeking some kind of shelter, some

kind of way of living that is not so utterly shallow, empty. And this is what we call living.

Is it a waste of life? I am asking. We are asking each other this question. This way of living, with all the complications of that, always wanting more and more and more. And this is what we call living: trying to meditate, and prepare for meditation, sitting in the right posture, breathing rightly, hoping to control your mind, your thoughts, playing with all that stuff. Right?

And our bodies are being misused as our brains. Have you watched your own bodies? That is, our bodies are an extraordinary instrument, most intricate, anatomically, how through long centuries of millenia upon millenia our bodies have been prepared through evolution. And it is the most astonishing machine. And how we neglect it. And each one of us knows this and we neglect it, we disregard it, we never take proper exercise, yoga. I must be carefully of that word. You can get hooked up, hooked to the word yoga, and all the practices involved in it, and spend days and years being concerned with that, hoping to achieve some kind of... But exercise is necessary for the body. The speaker does it every morning for an hour, yoga and other forms of exercises. And we are accustomed to one kind of food and we stick to that. You understand all this, I don't have to go into it.

So our body, really if you have gone into it, is the most amazing instrument, like the brain. And through long usage it wears itself out. And the organism dies, when we are ninety, fifty, through accident, through misuse, through old age, the body, the organism may last a hundred or a hundred and ten years, but the organism comes to an end. That is what we call death.

Then we ask ourselves: what is it that lives, if I die? Right?
Aren't you all asking that question?

Q: No.

K: You are all asking that question: we know the body goes. And our life may have been wasted. Have you ever asked yourselves whether you are wasting your life? Please ask it now. And find out for yourself whether you are wasting it. Of course you have to earn a livelihood, have a vocation. That is granted. But otherwise are you wasting your life - spending energy on things that don't matter? As we said the other day, our brains contain all memory. Our brain holds our consciousness. Our consciousness makes up the content of our consciousness, makes consciousness. That is the content, which is our anxiety, our fears, our beliefs, our superstitions, our faith, our quarrels, jealousy, hate, fears, sorrow, and the search for truth. All that is part of our consciousness. Right? Is that clear? Your consciousness is what you are. Your consciousness is not separate from you, you are consciousness - your feelings, your emotions, your sentiments and so on. The whole of that consciousness is in permanent confusion, constantly changing but it is limited. That consciousness is what you are. Right? This is a fact. Look at it, you don't have to accept what the speaker is saying. [I am sorry about my voice.]

That consciousness is me. Right? That consciousness is the self-interest. That consciousness is the ego, the personality, the characteristics, the tendencies. That is the whole content of our consciousness. Right? Its reactions and actions, its appreciations, depressions, loneliness and all that. And we say, is that the end at death, my consciousness dies too, or will it continue? That's what

you are interested in. Right? No? Aren't you interested in the continuity of yourself? Or you want to end it quickly? Surely we all want to think and long for a continuity, otherwise you would never talk about reincarnation. Reincarnation implies that which you are now, not having all the opportunities, all the things, perhaps next life you will have it - a better house, more refrigerators, better cars, more power; or if you are religiously inclined, a little more saintly, more moral, not so corrupt. But it is the same desire for continuity. Right?

We all want to continue. We never question what it is to continue. You follow my question? We have never asked ourselves, what do I mean by continuity? Everything is changing - our cells, our blood, the cells in the brain are constantly dying, renovating. And what we mean by continuity is all the memories which we have collected, all the beliefs, all the experiences, the pain, the sorrow, the loneliness, the despair, all that we want to continue because we want to continue the 'me'. Right? Is the speaker saying something false or true? Don't become suddenly silent. Everybody longs for this continuity, which is continuity as security.

And if there is death, is that the end of everything? Now what do we mean by ending? Let's talk about it a little bit. Have we ever ended something voluntarily - your anger, your jealousy, your aggression - have you ever said, "I'll end it", not tomorrow, but now completely end it? But our brains are conditioned to the idea of gradation, gradualness, therefore we never end anything. Right? For example, one is attached, attached to an idea, to an experience, to some form of ideal - aren't you? To some form of a concept

which thought has created and we cling to that as security. So we are attached to a house, to the family, to a name. And where there is attachment there is anxiety, there is fear, there is jealousy, insurance, mortgage. All the implications of attachment. And death says, that is the end of it. Right? I may be attached to my wife, to my friend, to my family, and death comes along and says, it's over. Now we want to remain attached all the time through the next life. Right? I have lost my brother, or my son, and I hope to meet him the next life. Don't you feel all these things, or am I talking to myself about nothing?

And there is a continuity in our life through attachment. Right? And to voluntarily say, "I will end attachment", have you ever done it? So we are asking, and you are asking too, do we voluntarily ever give up anything, not for a reward, for itself? Oh, you don't see the beauty of ending something completely. So ending has great significance. Right?

Now the question is: why have we put death at the far end of one's life? Because we cling to what is known. Death is unknown. And we would rather live with all the turmoil we have, all the misery, the confusion, and the longings, we would rather have that which we call life, living, and avoid death as far as possible, at the end of everything. We are asking you as a friend, can you live with death while living? You understand my question? That is, when I die, not only the organism is cremated, or buried, or whatever his friends do to him when he dies, and that is the end of everything, though we may want a continuity next life, but that is the actuality, an end. Now death means that, to end. Right? Can you live with death, together, life and death together? Have you ever asked that

question? Will you ask it now, as a friend? That to end attachment now, not when you die. Can you end your fear now, not when you are gone?

So is it possible to live - this is a very serious question, please do pay attention to it, I am telling my friend - to live with that, not commit suicide, I am not talking of that, but living with death means ending everything every minute, all that you have accumulated as memory - of course you cannot leave your house because you have got to pay mortgage, insurance, and you have to have a shelter, you can't let that go, or your job, then you will be unemployed and all the misery of it, or you join a community, or become a sannyasi, a monk. They also have their misery.

So can you, can I, live everyday with death? That means ending my experience everyday, only the memories of those experiences, and knowledge, there physically they are necessary, psychologically can I end the memories? That is death. Death is going to tell us at the end of our life, "Boy, you can't carry your memories with you". So to live with death all the time, it's a marvellous thing if you do it. This is not a reward. Because our memories are entirely in the brain, in the very cells of the brain, and memories which are the past are gone, are dead, memories have no meaning really. But yet we are full of memories, which is our knowledge. You understand this, it is very important. Can you end knowledge today - not the knowledge of doing carpentry and technological things - but the memories, the knowledge that you have carried? Can you - I am asking my friend who is sitting beside me, I am asking him, you have to have memories to do certain things in the physical world, psychologically don't carry a

single memory. You understand? Not a single hurt, not a word of hate, or the feeling of hate, or seeking power, position. Power is evil, whether it is a political power, or the power you have over your wife, or husband. Any form of power, or near power, being near power is evil, ugly. And can you end all that psychologically? That means to live with death all the time.

Does it mean anything to you? Or we will always be afraid of death?

This brings about another question. Death and love go together. Death is not memory, love is not memory, nor pleasure. It is the ending of desire, the ending of thought, that's love. Therefore death and love go together. Do you understand all this? Have you ever enquired what love is? What is love, to most of us? Do you love a tree, do you love your wife, husband? Is love desire? Please, this is important, go into it, give your heart to find out because you have lost this quality in this country. When you talk about love you become vacant, you don't know what it means. If you loved your children there would be no war.

So we must enquire into what is love - enquire, not intellectually, not analytically - the word 'enquire' we use as watching, listening, observing. What is love? Is it put together by thought? You understand this? When you say, if you ever say, I love my wife, or I love you, what does it mean? Please ask yourself this question. Is it all the remembrance you have gathered about her or him, the sexual pleasures, the desires, the comfort?

So we have to ask ourselves what is desire, which is a very complex thing - I don't know if we will have time to go into it this evening. And also the images, all the pictures we have built about

each other, is all that love? Or love is something entirely different from desire, thought, memory? And without the beauty of love, which is truth, any amount of your meditation, reading, or searching and all the rest of it has no meaning.

So love is not jealousy, is it? Love is not hate. So can you put aside jealousy altogether, envy about anybody, anything? Will you do it? Now, not tomorrow. Never be envious, which is to compare yourself with another. Can you end that comparison and that envy? If you cannot there can be no love. If you are ambitious, seeking your own fulfilment, your own success, your own power, ambition, all that, that denies completely love. No? Will you end all that to find out what love is? You understand? Love is beauty - not the face and the painting and the pictures, and all the contents of museums, ancient or modern. Love is beauty, love cannot exist where there is self-interest, the ego, selfishness. You may love god, which I question because god is something born of your mind, brain.

So death is love. Ending is love.

We ought to talk over together, have a conversation, what is religion? I must finish this. Is your consciousness - I will pursue this - is your consciousness different from another's consciousness? Have you ever asked that question? If you have not, please ask it now. Is your consciousness, which is your beliefs, your turmoil, your pleasure, your faith, your anxiety, your uncertainty, that is your consciousness, add more to it - is that different from another, except along the borders, frills? You may have more capacity than another, more skill, and so on, those are all frills, tendencies, characteristics. But if you observe very carefully your own

consciousness, which is what you are, your consciousness is like other people's consciousness. They go through what you are going through, insecure, uncertain, confused, agreeing with certain politicians and disagreeing about others, corrupt. This is the consciousness of humanity. Right? You don't have to believe what I am saying, it is so whether you like it or not.

And that consciousness goes on even when our organism dies. You understand this? Because humanity for the last million years, less or more, has carried this burden of sorrow, pain, innumerable desires with their fears and so on. So when I die the common consciousness of mankind goes on, which is your consciousness. Right? Look at it carefully, look at it objectively, not personally. You may be born in India with certain traditions, superstitions, having a thousand gods, or more, and the other, only one god, and the other having a greater culture, greater sophistication, greater this and that, and your consciousness is similar to his. So when I die the consciousness of humanity with all the pain and sorrow goes on. You don't realize the seriousness of this.

And unless there are some who step out of this consciousness - you understand - unless there are some who are totally selfless, totally free of all conditioning, that consciousness will go on. And the few who can step out of it, or many, or all of you, you are contributing to something beyond this consciousness.

We ought to talk over another serious matter which is, what is religion? Why has mankind for over a million years sought something beyond himself? You understand? All new cultures are based on religion. This is an historical fact. And all our cultures in the modern day is nothing but money, noise, violence, brutality,

power, whether in the temples, mosques or churches with their hierarchy. Their rituals, that is not religion, is it? Ask that question, sirs. Is that religion, repeating day after day mantras, repeating day after day puja, going to temples, offering an incalculable amount of money. Look at all the churches, how they have been built, the great cathedrals - probably you have not seen some of the most beautiful cathedrals in the world, all in the name of god, in the name of somebody. In the western world it is the saviour, and in the eastern world you know better than I do. And that's what is called religion. The origin, the etymological root of that word has not been established. We looked it up in various dictionaries and it has not been established.

If we can put aside all the attempts made by man to find god, or something beyond god, and the priests who come in between us to interpret god, to show us the light, including the gurus, if we put all that aside, what is religion? You understand? Is religion put together by thought for one's comfort, for one's psychological safety, knowing that thought is limited, as knowledge is limited, thought is born out of memory, memory is knowledge, knowledge comes out of experience, the whole process of thought is always limited? It can imagine the immeasurable, but it is still limited because it can imagine it; it can project eternity, but the projector is limited.

So what is religion? What is it that man, you, and the speaker, say, what is it? Is there something more than mere knowledge? Right? You understand my question? Somebody answer. Do you understand my question? We have knowledge about so many things, how to go to the moon, how to kill a million people with

one blow, how to communicate with each other miles apart, thousands of miles apart so rapidly, all the great surgery. That is all born out of knowledge. And is knowledge religion, psychological knowledge? Or the ending of psychological knowledge? You understand? The ending of it, not the perpetuation of it. That means can the brain be free of knowledge, not worldly knowledge. Please, we must be very careful here to understand this. You need knowledge to drive a car, to write a letter, to telephone, to go to your business, you need knowledge; to recognize your wife and to beat her or to quarrel with her you need knowledge - or her quarrelling with you or beating you up, that generally very rarely happens that a woman beats a man up. I wish it would happen!

So I am asking, will the accumulation of knowledge, psychologically, you understand, will that bring about an understanding, or coming to that great state of sacredness? Right? Because man has sought something beyond all this. And the search is apparently through meditation. Right? Can we talk about meditation a little bit? The word 'meditation' means to ponder over, to think over. I will meditate about my problems. And also that word means to measure. Right? I believe in Sanskrit it means that too, ma is to measure. Correct me if I am wrong.

So meditation has now become a thing that you practise, you follow a system, a method, do part of yoga as a part of meditation. Is that meditation? Preparation and meditation. You understand? The preparing oneself through a system, through yoga, through repeating mantras, resting twenty minutes a day in the morning, twenty minutes in the afternoon, twenty minutes in the evening, having a nice siesta, or rest, or whatever it is, and practise that day

after day. Is that meditation? Most of us meditate deliberately, consciously. Right? Practise it consciously in order to meditate, or practise, follow, obey, a pattern, and then you will learn what it is to be aware. There are lots of people trying to follow somebody who will teach you how to be aware. It's all such rot.

So what is meditation? It is a very interesting question because conscious meditation, a deliberate process, to sit properly, breathe, you know all that business, consciously, deliberately meditate is no meditation. It is like consciously working to become an executive, consciously trying to become a millionaire, having plenty of money, it's the same. You want a result, you want peace of mind, silence. Right?

Now what is silence? Is it separate from sound? Have you enquired into sound? What is sound? There is sound inside your body all the time, the blood going through the veins. They have put a camera inside the body - you must have seen some of those television pictures, how there is pumping. That is noise, that is sound, when the heart is beating that is sound. You can hear another heart beating, that is sound. Right? And the sound of a tree, not when the breezes are dancing with the leaves, not when there is a great wind sweeping through it, but when the tree is very still without a single leaf moving, there is a sound in there. And we create sound all round us. Right? Next door for the last month, or another month, or whatever period they have, there is a noise going on, that's sound. Sound of a voice, the sound of music. You understand? There is sound. Why do we separate sound from silence? Because that is what you want, a silent peaceful mind, brain. And to achieve that you practise, hoping by controlling

thought gradually, or eventually or in a year or two you will have complete control of your thoughts, your feelings. And you never have asked, who is the controller? Right? Will you ask that question? I want to control my thought because thought is all the time chasing everything, restless, moving from one thing to another, and I want to concentrate, I want to fix my energy on that page, or on that ledger - how to make it crooked for the government, or the tax payer. I want to concentrate, and I try to focus my brain on that, then thought comes along and says, look, and it goes off, distraction.

So there is concentration and distraction. Right? Why do you call it distraction? Is there such a thing as distraction? Find out these things. I want to concentrate on that page but my thought goes off to something else, I pull it back and say, "For god's sake concentrate", because it will get you money, it will give you a position, and it will give you a sense of vitality, energy, and that urge is similar to earning money. There is not much difference between concentration, wanting to achieve an end, and the concentration you spend on earning a lot of money, or power, position. If you are a good talker, as you are in this country, you worship a talker. And anything that distracts your thought, you call that distraction. Is there such a thing as distraction at all? Please enquire into it. Distraction implies a moving away from what you should do, or you want to do. You want to concentrate and there is a distraction. Isn't your wanting another form of distraction? Right? Enquire into it. Isn't your whole life a form of distraction? No? Don't look at me as though you are puzzled. Everything becomes a distraction when there is no love, when there is no certainty. Right?

I will go into it if you will follow this a little bit.

To the speaker there is no distraction. To him everything is a distraction. See why. Endless talking about politics, endless reading newspapers and quoting, you follow, isn't that a distraction, chatting, gossiping, isn't that a wastage of energy, isn't that a distraction? So any form of wastage of energy is a distraction. Therefore we have to enquire: is there no wastage of energy at all? You people don't go into all this. Do we waste our energy? In many, many ways, don't we? And when you want to concentrate it is a form of resistance. Right? You build a wall around yourself and you say, "I must look at this carefully" - isn't that a wastage of energy, this battle, wanting to concentrate, wanting to control, wanting to have power. Isn't that a wastage of energy? Holding on to your position next to the most important person. I heard a lovely story the other day. Somebody shook hands with the queen, and the lady next to that person said to the lady who shook hands with the queen, "May I shake your hand?"! You follow, sir?

Listen to all this and find out for yourself why you call anything a distraction. All the conflicts are a distraction, aren't they? All your jealousies are distractions. That is a wastage of energy, being jealous. No? Hating somebody, being envious of somebody. So our life, the living, is a wastage of energy, the way we are living. And if we end that way of living there is no distraction whatever. Then you are living.

So we must go back to the question: what is meditation? It is very easy to mesmerize oneself. Right? To say to oneself, I am achieving, I am getting nearer to enlightenment. The question arises, can there be silence which is part of sound? What we call

silence is the ending of sound. Right? The sound being thought, sound being knowledge. Right? You have that silence without any disturbance. Right? And in that silence come upon something extraordinary, tremendous experience of enlightenment, or of great insight into the universe. Right? Isn't that silence related to sound? Or is sound different from silence? Or sound is silence?

Sir, have you listened to sound, not resist it? Not to say, it is ugly sound. An aeroplane passing overhead, thundering, it is a tremendous noise, sound. Lightning. Right? We are noisy, and therefore we are seeking silence. You understand? So we have separated sound, noise from silence, as we have separated death from living. Right? You understand what I am saying? So our brain, our thought rather, is separating all the time. You understand? It is the nature of thought to separate - nationally, religiously, you and I, the most learned, the ignorant - it is the activity of thought which is in itself limited, therefore whatever it does will be limited, will be separative - Jew, Arab, Muslim and Hindu, communist, socialist - you follow? All that implies a constant division. So we have separated silence from sound. Right, do you get it? If you don't separate, which is not seek silence as away from sound, then sound is part of silence. I wonder if you see this. Do you see this?

You see when you seek out silence you are creating disorder. And that disorder you call silence. Order is born out of... it comes into being when disorder ends. Right? To find out disorder first, not seek order, why our lives are in disorder, and to go into it, find out, and so on. When there is that comprehension completely of disorder there is naturally order. Now when you don't separate

sound from silence there is order, complete order - like the universe, it is everlastingly in order - sun rises, sun setting, the stars, the beauty of a new moon, the full moon, the whole universe is in order, it is only human beings who are in disorder because they have lost their relationship with nature, they have no beauty. You understand?

So the end of the matter is when there is no self, self-centredness, there is something which is totally orderly and that order is silence and sound, and then there is that thing that man has sought, which is timeless. Unless you do this, all this is verbal nonsense. Unless you put your mind and heart to understand your own life, why you live this way, why you have to go to the office day after day, why you have to quarrel with your wife and husband, the jealousy. All that destroys love, and without love there is no order. And where there is love there is compassion. And where there is compassion there is supreme intelligence. Not the artificial intelligence of a computer, nor the artificial intelligence or powerful intelligence of thought. But when there is that quality of the brain, which has understood the whole business of conditioning and is free, and silence is part of that enormous sound of the universe, and where there is the end of sorrow, there is passion. Compassion is that passion, and it is that intelligence, and then beyond that there is total nothingness.

IN CONVERSATION WITH J. UPADIAH, MADRAS 13TH JANUARY 1985

K: Sir, yesterday we talked about an ordinary man, fairly well educated, not too educated fortunately, no special profession. He starts looking at the world, outside world. It is like a great river flowing. As it enters the sea it is in a turmoil because it has got great volume of water for the last million years. And this turmoil, the conflict, the various deltas, the whole vast river entering into the sea, that is the world. He follows up that river. He is not any kind of religious or... just an ordinary man and follows up that river. And as he follows it up and up and up, up the mountain, he comes to a point where the river begins. He has observed various techniques, various disciplines, science, physics, judgement, the whole human existence is in this vast river. And he comes to the beginning of that river on a great hill, great mountain, it is very small there. And there he is after a million years, and he is alone, self-centred up there. It is like a funnel, wide at the beginning and very small at the end. And he realizes all that river was himself, not in any theological, or theoretical, hypothetical sense, because he has followed that river up and up and up, to the very small few drops of that river and there he discovers he is that river, he is the world. And the world is based - the movement of all that is self-centred, self-interest. And it is the end of that funnel, the narrow small funnel.

From there he begins to work and discovers slowly the enormity of that funnel on the other side. It is immensely wide, much wider than the river and he doesn't know quite how to move from there.

He has read and people have said that there is an enormity beyond this limited self-interest. He doesn't know anything about it, he is rather a sceptical man, very questioning, doubting, and doubting his own experiences, his own thinking, his own way of life, and he has never disciplined himself. This is important for him. He has never disciplined because he has just been following the river from the beginning, from that enormous delta up the river, he has followed it up. And the very following it up is not a discipline. I don't know if I am making myself clear? And he has reached that very small hole, which is self-interest. And he doesn't know how to go beyond that, he is stuck there. And that's where we left off yesterday - right?

And there have been teachers before him, authorities, great many scientists telling him what to do, what he is composed of, the atoms, the cells, how the origin of man began, and from the ape to the present state of brain, this long endlessness of time. He accepts all that, that is obviously natural, but he has come to a point where he discovers there is no authority, no spiritual authority whatsoever because he has left all that, he has climbed to the origin of the river. And there there is no guide, there is no helper. We were talking in somewhat detail the whole question of being helped spiritually, inwardly. And he discovers there is nobody to help him. As he climbed he hoped somebody would help him but he discovers that there is not a single person in heaven or in any book, or in any guru, or in any philosophy, and he is stranded up there, aware of his loneliness, all the rest of it. And he can't stay there. There is a pull wanting to climb more, but there is nothing to climb either. He has come to that point. I wonder if I have made myself

clear? Clear?

Q1: Yes. I think so. I think we went a little further yesterday, talking about how the self-interest can go. You said that it has to be a constant watching and doubting.

K: We will come to that. He has understood?

Q1: He says that you have explained the whole thing very clearly but he would like to ask whether each individual who is in this river, in this stream, has to remain utterly helpless. You correct me, utterly helpless, it is the river of hope, of desire, anxiety, and all that. Or whether there is a possibility for him to - not to be completely dragged in that stream, but to create something, a raft, something by which he can be out of it. He is not entirely out of it and yet he can stand apart from it.

Q2: This calls for some energy, some 'purushartha' - that means some special attribute of his own understanding. That means it does not come from outside, it comes from within him. And it is that which helps him to discover that rock and to hold firmly to that rock while people are being dragged against their will in that stream and he watches that, he is a witness to the people being dragged in the stream. But can he find some energy within him which will help him to cling to that rock?

Q1: Or which is that rock.

Q2: Which is that rock.

Q3: Krishnaji you also said one more thing. And that standing up in the stream, on the island in the stream, still is not separate from those who are being swept away.

Q2: But he is not being swept away. That is his point. He can stand on that rock and observe the whole process. He can stop

being dragged in that, at the same time he is not out of it. There is a mixed metaphor.

K: What?

Q2: There is a mixed metaphor. He says that this man is like the traffic policeman in a traffic island, and by his hand he is directing that traffic, but himself not part of the movement of the traffic.

K: Sir, I said, subject to correction, he is always moving up the river. There is no island because he is moving. And that very moving gives him the strength.

Q2: But he is not being dragged down. He is moving up.

K: You are missing the whole thing. He has been in all that noise, all the travail, he is moving away, moving, going up.

Q2: Again a mixed metaphor. He says it is not a rock or an island, but it is a small boat.

K: No, I would rather stick to this metaphor if you don't mind because it conveys an awful lot of meaning. And I may be mistaken. As I said yesterday, I doubt this whole movement of going up the river. I have gone up the river and watched all this movement round me, and I realize I am part of that movement, which we said yesterday very carefully. I am not different from that movement. I am that movement. I am that humanity. Not humanity and me, but I am that because I have wandered all over that and I discover that. And as I move up the river, because it is a movement, it is not a static state, as it is a movement up the river, that very movement creates its own discipline. The man who is static needs discipline. I don't know if you are following? But the man who is constantly moving up and up and up, he is following the river and therefore there is no island because he is moving. I

won't allow islands to be formed. I may invent islands. I may invent rocks to hold on but the river won't permit me to do that because he sees the implications of all that.

Q2: What I understand is: that as you have described the stream of life, everyone is being dragged down.

K: Because he is not moving.

Q1: He says that there is some seed within man himself. Man seeks some special kind of happiness and it is because of that he - there is the desire for sexual...

K: That is natural.

Q1: Yes. It is natural. But at some point he feels like transcending it, to be without it. There is something in him which takes him out of all that.

K: He may be tired of it. Don't make it something spiritual.

Q4: Krishnaji may I say something? The effort is to rise out of the stream. Every effort, he says, is man's natural effort is to rise outside the flow.

Q2: Within man, he says, there is the urge to rise above these sordid sorrows and worries and everything and every bit of... that happen. That is, he says, sex. Sex, he says, is that the totality of his tissues is making a great effort to move out of that vortex or sorrow, etcetera. Out of the flow, in the flow. But he is never out of it. And he wants to insist that this man by any act that he is doing is not trying to get out of this but he is part of this stream.

K: Sir, he has spent his youth in that, at the mouth of the river, sex, power, you know all the business. And he sees it is a habit, a condition, and he is bored with it. Don't give him some kind of spiritual... He is so exhausted and bored with the whole circus.

Right? This is what is happening Sir. From boredom, from laziness, he says, "By Jove, I must move somewhere." Not something inwardly pushing him. He starts from there.

Q1: You mean boredom takes him right up to the top?

K: No, I don't say that. He moves out of that.

Q4: Out of the stream.

K: Sir, he is not - Sir, have you ever watched the Nile, or the Ganga entering into the sea? The greater the volume of water the greater the delta, the little streams, they are tremendous, he is that. He begins there. You understand? We are all that. We want sex, we want power, we want etcetera, etcetera. And he says to himself, "My God, that is enough." Why impute something that in him that is going to reject all this? I said then he begins - please carefully - I said, he begins to move from there.

Q2: Sir one thing I have not understood - this is my question.

K: I am saying he wants to see where the river begins.

Q2: This is my question.

K: Wait a minute Sir. Wait, let me finish.

Q2: As you have put it, you have described the stream which is dragging the people, everybody along with it and then you say...

K: No. If he wants to remain there, he is there. But he is curious enough to find out the origin of the river. That's all. I followed Sir, the Rhine, up and there it was, I have forgotten five thousand or three thousand in Alps, a few drops, very slow, from the glacier, a few drops, and it became bigger and bigger and bigger, miles it flowed. So if he is following that. The moment he stays there, at the mouth of the river, he likes it there, the vast majority they like it there. They like drugs, they like sex, they like power, position,

knowledge, everything, they like it - don't they? What are you talking about?

Q1: I think nobody denies that. All that is said is that there is some energy which makes him follow the river to the...

K: Curiosity. He wants to find out. Why not be simple about it? He is curious, he wants to know. He has been through all that awful business and says, "My God, I am bored with this stuff" - aren't you bored with sex when you have had enough of it? Sorry!

Q5: Krishnaji, there seem to be two different metaphors which are so similar that they are clashing with each other. One is your metaphor of the person finding himself at the foaming mouth of the river, recognizing the river, feeling curious about it, he is not taken up with the...

K: He has been through it.

Q5: Yes. He, is there and having been there sufficiently long and experienced some of the things he becomes is curious and then he asks where from?

K: Move.

Q5: There is another metaphor that the Punditji has brought up, which is a different metaphor. It is the metaphor of the suffering humanity in which the river is not the river of the happening of one person's experience but of seeing the whole world and feeling compassionate about all the people being dragged down. The great misery which is called Buddhism, which talks about the world as a sad place.

K: I know all that.

Q5: One talks about saying that wouldn't it be nice if these poor people instead of being swept by there would be somebody to give

them the way, somebody to give them a help and so on.

K: Pat him on the back.

Q5: Or at least a traffic policeman.

K: I don't want all that.

Q5: No what I am saying is that there are two metaphors running at the same time. They both talk about the river but they are talking about two different rivers.

K: I am talking of one river. My river is the river of everybody. Don't introduce sorrow. I have been through sorrow, that is sorrow, that is pain, that is anxiety, that is loneliness, despair, hope, all that.

Q5: Sir, you would not describe your river as the river of sorrow?

K: And also the river of pain, the river of fear, the river of all that.

Q2: It is all part of sorrow.

K: Why reduce everything to sorrow?

Q5: Krishnaji, I am with you. I like the idea of not talking about sorrow but of talking about things as they are.

K: As they are. That is what...

Q5: Not the theory of sorrow.

K: Nothing. Punditji I am not trying to beat you down.

Q2: He wants to know Sir what is the place of the arising of sexual desire.

K: Biologically, procreation.

Q2: Biologically.

K: Biologically all the glands are prepared for that. For God's sake.

Q2: He doesn't agree.

K: Oh, he doesn't agree.

Q2: There is an ecstasy in which there is self forgetfulness.

There is an ecstasy in which there is self forgetfulness, this is joy.

K: That is sex.

Q2: That is what he says is sex, and this, he says, is not a biological but a psychological factor. He says that particular impulse pulls a man out of the common run of...

K: Which? The sex?

Q2: This urge for that ecstasy, self forgetfulness.

K: Wait Sir. For God's sake. I can take a drug and forget all about myself. I can go to a concert, Beethoven, and listen to the Ninth Symphony, or the Fifth Symphony and forget entirely myself. I go to a temple and do puja, I can forget myself. Why?

Q4: I am mankind. I have a lot of things in common with man, but I am an individual also.

K: I question that.

Q4: I have a lot of features in common with mankind. I am humanity and yet that humanity is given a particular form in me.

K: We said all that yesterday. We said yesterday I am humanity. We went in that, consciousness and all that. I am humanity. I am not different from the rest of you, I am the whole of mankind. Right? We discussed that - or didn't we? And I have been through all that, sorrow, pleasure, pain, sex, drugs, - please I haven't been, my thing will come a little later! I have been through all that and I am bored with it. Don't impute some strange inward impulse. I am bored with all that. To me that has no meaning. I have been in it. I have been involved in it, I have cursed, I have obeyed and I disobeyed. I have done all that. Then as I am bored - I am using the

word bored specially - I begin to question, is my life just damn boredom? A meaningless boredom. And I begin to move. No, I am beginning to move from the - up the stream. This is very important. I am moving. This is static. I don't know if I am making it clear.

Q2: This is static because it is just a repetition.

K: Repetition, mechanical, habitual and all the rest of it. The moment I move because I am bored with the whole thing, I realize movement has no discipline. This is where we are going to come into contact, conflict with all of you. While there is a movement there is no discipline. I am walking up the hill because...

Q3: You are propounding something. It may be only a semantic thing but you are using it a totally different opposite...

Q4: But it is not irrelevant. (A lot of people talking all at once)

K: Would you kindly let me finish?

Q3: But Sir, if I don't say it now it won't be said. This is the point to say it, the point at which you raise a thing. Afterwards it becomes lost.

K: All right, go on.

Q3: The point is you used to say the river of humanity flows, unless I step out of the stream - listen to me.

K: I know what you are going to say.

Q3: Unless you step out of the stream, unless the mind - I will use the word mind now, is a rock...

K: I know nothing about all this.

Q3: Please listen Sir.

K: You impute all this.

Q3: I don't. I am using your words.

Q4: But he may have used a different metaphor. It is a question

of metaphor and vocabulary.

Q3: What is the actual difference in terms of change of consciousness?

Q6: I think, Pupulji, I can solve this question because I have listened to Krishnaji's language and struggled with it for a long time and I now no longer pay any attention to the word meanings, because he means different things at different times. Previously when he talked about movement it was an ordered movement, it was an entire movement, it had a law, it was a slave thing and therefore there was time. Only a thing which is moving according to prescribed law can be used for time. This movement, he says, it comes by itself...

K: That's right.

Q6: ...it comes because it is bored, it has no law. And a movement without law is creativity, is freshness, it is ? , it has no time that can be associated with it.

K: That's right Sir, you have got it. He is my disciple!

[Laughter] Forgive me Sir! You are not my disciple.

Q6: What I am saying is that therefore because of this all those statements are really the same even though the words are different. People have accused me that I am now preoccupied with language but in language there is something called surface meaning and the deep meaning. The deep structure of language and the surface structure. If you said I throw a stone at... I mean a stone broke the window and I broke the window, they sound different, the subject is different, the object is different but in fact they are really the same. So these two are really the same.

Q2: I am concerned with our friend because he is trying to make

a distinction between the common run of humanity and this something special that he talks which is not special. I have not understood.

Q6: No, I have not understood but I understand one mistranslation. His samanya and vishesha are not general and particular. They are not. So we have to understand what is the technical context in which he does it, and the only way we will find out is not by listening to the word, this word but by asking him therefore to say something specific about human life.

Q2: What he is trying to say Sir is that you have been pointing out how the self comes into being as part of a process of activity of the brain cells, and this activity of the brain cells leads to thought, and then thought leads to these cells and the stabilizing of the cells. This process we have understood. And this is the process of all the people who are in that current.

He now wants to know that this is the course that we have seen, how come that out of this, without getting out it, some person arises who is able to end thought and he has love and he has insight, and all this, how does this man, he is not different from this, he is also in it, but he is watching therefore he is different and he is part of this, how does this come? This is what he wants.

K: I will come to that point.

Q2: He hasn't come to this yet. He says that when you talk about the differentiation, the special, the vishesha the second variety, it is not by giving up the previous awareness. You have that awareness and you also have something else. [Several people talking together]

K: I don't know what you are all talking about.

Q2: I have not understood Sir. I can't translate because I have not understood Sir.

K: Sir let me finish what I want to say and then you can jump on it. I have got this Sir. I am not at the top and all the rest of it. I have just began. I am bored with all that. I have been through all that. I am not a spiritual, holy, none of that. I began there. And I got bored and I have become very sceptical. This is important. Sceptical, doubtful, question. None of this has any meaning to him so he moves, naturally, it is not a seeking some high altitude. He moves. And in this movement he is becoming aware the difficulties of movement. You understand? I wonder. Difficulties of movement leaving this. So he begins to question why he is finding it difficult. Then he talks about renunciation and he says I don't want any of renunciation, I don't believe in renunciation. So he says I understand now why it has become a habit, sex, drugs, high position, language, and knowledge, it is all here. I am a little part of it because I have also collected a lot of memories. And also I am married, children - you know, all that turmoil. And he says somebody like Punditji or X comes along, you must do this, you must do that, in order to reach that. I say, for God's sake I won't want your advice. You understand? That is the position of an intelligent man now. Right? He questions everything, Buddha, Christ, and all the churches and he says for God's sake I don't want any of it. So he is moving. And he says, am I really moving? Or am I still there, pretending I am moving? Which means have I really understood all that? The biological part, the psychological part, the brain part, the physical reactions, biological, necessity, the glands? He says, am I really moving, or am I pretending I am moving? And

in asking that question he becomes terribly honest. I don't know if you follow what I mean? Right? Really deeply honest. No pretence, really no - then begins humility - right? And with that he is moving, learning, watching. He says I am not different from all mankind, I am all that, but I am watching. And he is climbing, moving. I will carry the metaphor if you don't mind. [Tape turns over] And he says there is no discipline for me. I won't accept any enforcement, any effort, any of that. I have had all that there - right? So he keeps on moving, moving, moving, and the movement is learning, not accumulating knowledge. I don't know if you see the difference.

And he comes to a point at the origin of the river and he says, I by Jove all this, this tremendous effort I have made, effort, climbing, physical climbing, not psychological climbing, he says I have been utterly useless because it was there and it is up here. I needn't have moved up here, because I am self-centred there, I am self-centred here. Right? That's all. I have come to that point. Explain that, very simply.

Q2: He says that after listening to this latter part of what you have said he has understood what you are saying, and he has also understood his own limit of comprehension, limit of understanding. He wants to describe that state where he has stopped. What he says is that yesterday we started with how this stream is there in the delta. He says that it does not concern him at all. How he happened to be in that stream or whether the stream is eternal or anything. He is concerned with the fact that the stream is there and he is there.

K: But he is part of that stream.

Q2: But now he says that being in the stream I have the urge to

get out of the stream, that is my limit. That is his limit, that is what he says.

K: No, is he bored with the stream?

Q2: He says there is no desire to get out of it but to get transformed.

K: I have no desire.

Q1: He says that I am not concerned with the origin of the stream, I don't feel like to going up to find out.

K: Then remain there.

Q1: But he wants to get out of the stream.

Q6: But Krishnaji it seems to me that there were irreconcilable differences in the starting point, in the cosmologies. The stream that you talked about is the totality of all the happenings that I am.

K: I am that.

Q6: Right. His stream is an external stream. He is immersed in that stream. He sees that stream...

K: I am that stream. I can't...

Q6: So these are two different streams so he is trying to somehow or rather to recognize that he is in the stream but the stream is not himself.

K: That's all.

Q6: Because of that difference...

Q5: I am afraid doctor I don't agree. Because when he started he started with a question which he wanted to ask. The question concerned...

Q6: ...existence.

Q5: If that question concerned existence then I think they are in the same stream.

Q4: The stream is the self.

Q5: The stream is the self, that is what he said. And I personally feel to be fair to him - that the stream that Krishnaji has described and the stream that he refers to as a distance is the same. Self-interest is the core of it, as I understood it. Have I misunderstood him?

K: Careful Sir, careful. Listen to it.

Q5: But I want to know if what I have said reflects what he is saying, or he has something different.

K: Listen to Dr. ? - he may be right. He says that K says you are that stream, you are not different from that stream - right? That's all first.

Q6: Well Punditji's stream is one in which he finds misery and therefore he wants to transform it. Krishnaji says I recognize I am the stream, I am in it, I have been it for sufficiently long, I am bored with it.

Q3: I want to transform, I want to step out. That is also part of this stream.

K: Part of this.

Q3: But you can't say it has no place, it is part of it.

Q5: We are back to that, Krishnaji has led us a step ahead of this. He said that this business of wanting to transform and wanting to change is also like the various other things of pleasure and other things that we have done. So ultimately you come to a point where you feel that there is movement without progress and with this situation you are bored.

Q3: But you see the whole point is this boredom he is talking about, he says, "I am bored" or whatever, "and I want no change."

K: No. Wait. Just a minute. Half a minute.

Q3: If you say I am bored and there is no movement to transform...

K: I don't want to transform. I don't know what it means.

Q3: That is what I said. We don't know these things.

Q1: Perhaps some confusion has arisen because of using the word origin in the metaphor, because you said this is everything, of course it is desire for transformation, it is everything. Then the question is: what is this everything? What is the very substance of this everything? It is a many branched thing, this delta, but is there a single root from which all these branches have come?

K: It is still water, whether it is up there or down here it is still water.

Q1: It is still water.

K: That's all.

Q3: What I am questioning is that this state of your saying that I am bored with all this and there is nothing beyond. I do nothing but stay with it.

K: Wait a minute, wait a minute.

Q3: That is what you said.

K: No wait. Would you let me finish.

Q2: He says... he wanted to say something, he didn't know that you were adding.

K: Sir, I am that. That thing is not different from me, both biologically, psychologically, in every way, atom, cells, all that is me. And I am that. So I am humanity. That has to me tremendous meaning. And I am there and I say is there any change at all possible? I thought change existed in climbing the hill and going to

the source but I find I am still there. I have never left it. I thought by going up to the source I would find the whole explanation but that explanation is there, which is my desire, all the rest of it. And there as well as up here it is self-interest - right? And I see self-interest has created terrible mess, obviously. This doesn't need a great deal of insight, you can see everybody is fighting each other, nations and so on. Then out of that observation I say is there any change at all possible? Not transformation. Transformation means changing from one form to another - right Sir? I am not going to use that word although I have used it. So I am concerned with change - right? What does change mean? From this to that. Or is change ending this? I don't know?

Q2: Yes.

K: Changing from this to that implies time and so I go into time and all the rest of it. So I may question: is there any change at all?

Q2: But you would say there is ending?

K: Wait. You are saying it.

Q1: Are you saying there is no such thing as change, or ending, or anything?

K: No, you are going ahead of me. I have reached a point when I say after all this movement and struggle, pain and listening to the master, changing the master, changing the gurus, getting more knowledge - all that has been done. And I come to the point, I see if there is no change man will be destroyed as he goes on. So I ask myself what is change? Right? Change implies time, and man has not changed through time - right? Right? So I question is there change at all? Or there is only ending, which means, ending means dying. Can I die to everything everyday and not pick up after dying

the same thing? You have understood Sir? I die today, to everything I have known, which is death. Or I die but carry on the same thing until I die the next day. You follow what I mean? So I question if there is a continuity at all, or simply dying. And then I will see what happens. The man who has been there has come to that point. That's all. I can go on further, explain that. Right?

What does he think?

Q2: What he says is that he goes with you the whole way. And he says that therefore there is no change but there is only ending.

K: You know what that means?

Q2: Yes Sir. He has taken the whole of it. But he says that in that stream itself is the seedling of a beginning because the stream is continuity.

Q5: When everything ends according to this one, everything ends with the stream business.

K: Quite right.

Q5: And the stream contains within it the seed and the sprouting of the seed.

K: No. The stream is my consciousness, the human consciousness. As I am the humanity I am that consciousness. Right? And if I die to that consciousness I am not in it. No, no, I am not in it. It is out. I don't know how to put it.

Q2: Sir, what he says is that there is a continuity to the stream of consciousness independent of my ending it.

K: Sir, that consciousness is sorrow, fear, greed, envy, etcetera, etcetera, which is the essence of self-interest - right? Now after travelling all that down there I come to that point. And I say is it possible for a human being, who is the entire humanity, to step out

of it?

Q2: Now you have again changed the metaphor.

K: Same thing. It is the same thing. I am that stream. Humanity I am. Humanity suffers, goes through hell and that stream goes on because as long as human beings have not moved out of it that stream will go on.

Q1: Then there is a stepping out?

K: Wait a minute. Have you understood what I said?

Q1: Yes.

K: As long as humanity, which is me, if I am in that stream that stream will go on. As I am humanity if that person who is humanity steps out of that stream, that stream will go on. But he is no longer he, that person, that something is out of it, therefore he can, not help, he has compassion, he has intelligence, therefore that acts.

Q5: You said, you started by telling us that here is the stream and this stream you watched that you are in the stream. And then somebody says how does it all go and start moving up the narrow funnel point. You said that.

K: No.

Q5: I understand. Now what I say is that if you do that then you also said that this process, there is no getting out or anything, you are just observing and you can get bored. That is the point you came to.

K: Sir.

Q5: Then you said boredom is ending if you understand it.

K: Sir, I belong to that. And I get bored, sceptical, all the rest of it. And I recognize this boredom is part of everybody. Therefore I

am everybody. Everybody is conscious and is my consciousness. And that consciousness from the beginning of human existence has been going on. And he questions whether he can ever get out of it. Not get out in the sense step out, or find nirvana. He says can I step out of it? Can one human being step out of it?

Q2: Step out? I can't...

K: Leave it. Leave it. Wait. Abandon it. Not keep on going with that stream. That is all. What is the difficulty in that?

Q3: Sir, at one moment you say there is no individual.

K: Because I am that.

Q3: I am humanity. What steps out?

K: Nothing. [Laughter] No, no, I mean this. I mean this.

Q1: When there is a stepping out...

K: I mean this. Let me explain. I have taken this as something perpetual, which it is, time.

Q5: The moment you use the word consciousness it becomes perpetual.

Q3: No but you see what he has said.

K: Can I use the word insight? A glimpse, seeing the whole thing as a unit, a unitary movement that is going on. And he is walking along the lane after seeing it is a whole unitary movement and suddenly realizes there is nothing. This goes on. Nothing beyond that. Nothing. Nothing in the sense not a thing. Thing is thought, which is a material process. So he says that is the end of thought.

Q1: And in that nothingness...

K: That is nothingness.

Q1: ...there is no duality between the self and...

K: No. He has been through conflict. He has been through hell, he has fought, he has struggled. Does it make any sense Sir?

Q3: Ending and stepping out are the same.

K: Stepping out. I am wrong in using those words - stepping out. That stream is self-interest. That is self-interest is perpetuating all the time, whether it is me or you or... humanity is perpetually caught in that. And that is thought etcetera, etcetera. He says, by Jove, no movement and therefore when there is no movement you are out of it. Not out of it - that is a word. There is no longer - there is something else.

Now K comes along, K and says he has never been in all this.

Q5: He has never been in all this.

K: Jealous, anxiety, pain, sex and all that. That is physical like going to the toilet. You understand Sirs? He never moved, say I am that - Sir, I don't know, that is what I want to get at.

Punditji I think - I am using the word think, forgive me if I use that word. Is it possible, except biologically, never to have the psyche as the centre? You understand my question? The moment you see that you are out, you are finished.

Q2: He wants you to repeat this. Explain it a little. Repeat.

K: Sir, we have the idea of a path, a goal, achievement. A path demands discipline, control, sacrifice. The horror of it. But he - somebody like K comes along and says don't go through all this stuff. Be aware of nature, be aware of all the senses, and the senses create the self, etcetera, etcetera. See it as a tremendous movement and a flash that you are out of it. It is not climbing, climbing, sacrificing, giving up, discipline, practice - oh, that is wrong. I am lazy, I don't want to practise.

Q5: Would I be understanding you if I said - you say that all that we have described is consciousness.

K: Yes, we said that.

Q5: You said that. Now... K: Which is part of self-interest.

Q5: Yes it is the self.

K: Keep to self-interest.

Q5: Then last you said, if I understand...

K: See the futility.

Q5: You were saying now from this you push out time, no time in this. There is no place for time in all the understanding of this. The moment that goes it ends.

K: And I doubt it! You understand? I question it, whether this is in myself. No. Therefore I began by questioning everything. I end up by questioning. No, you are missing something. I began questioning, doubting and asking. Not asking somebody, asking. I end up doubting, questioning, and asking.

Q4: Have I moved at all?

K: Ask. I don't know. I have said by Jove... now I leave that question alive. I don't say, is there an answer. That question itself destroys everything. I wonder.

Q5: No conclusion.

K: No Sir. I have got a quick bat!

Sir, Punditji, you and I have a dialogue. You put a question, I answer it. Then you answer that question. We keep this up. Asking, answering. We come to a point when the question itself is the answer. The question itself is so vital it bursts the...

Q5: I think it would be helpful if you will describe that particular state once again. You had mentioned earlier that K

questions this one, K has never experienced this one but he questions even that not question. That not experiencing. Then he said that question continues to remain and the question is the answer. Could you say a little more. Just say again the same thing. It would be helpful.

K: K comes along, some strange man from the dark Himalayas, and says why do you go through all this stuff? The Buddhas, the Christ, the disciplines, the sacrifice, the renunciation, control, don't do all that there is something else. Which is, just see this, the futility of it - right? And when you really see the depth of that futility and you ask why it has come - you understand - and live with that question, don't find an answer, then that question itself opens and withers. Like a flower. If you leave the flower alone, watch it carefully, nurture it, the flower blossoms and withers, at the end of it there is no flower at all. I don't know... Right? Which is nothing.

Q3: May I go into it? This you have talked about, we all know that, we have talked about it. But you said something else and that is, in seeing this whole stream and in questioning and in ending, the stream continues its flow. The question remains.

K: That's it, that's it.

Q3: And it is such a powerful, potent question...

K: I don't put the question casually. It is my blood.

Q3: ...it is such a powerful, potent question...

K: That's it.

Q3: ...that when it remains it has an explosive energy independent of me - it is like letting loose...

K: It is nothing to do with me, it is like a fire that is burning.

Q3: It has enormous...

K: Sir, I am sure you do that in science. You come to a point and you put the question and wait, don't you? Look at it, wait, and you have a sudden flash. Right Sir?

Q5: Yes there is a similar thing in connection with geometry. At one time people asked questions in Euclid's eighth postulate about parallel lines, could it be derived from the other postulates because it looked like a rather artificial technical assumption and many people tried for a very long time. And finally all these efforts came to an end when people discovered that there could be non-Euclidian geometries in which you say through a point which is not on a line you cannot draw any parallel line, or you can draw more than one parallel line. So the question arose: how many geometries are there? Only these three, or are there other geometries? And the question could not be well formulated because what is meant by how many geometries? When if you can construct one other geometry you can ask is it a good geometry or a bad geometry. The question was finally answered by studying something entirely different. In each geometry we will find out what are the transformations which leave the geometry invariant. For example in plain geometry if you contract, expanded a space, contracted a space, replaced, or moved a space, this way or that way, or rotated it, all the relations in geometry remain the same. So this is called the invariance group of geometry. Eventually it was discovered quite by accident that instead of asking what is the geometry, what are the geometries, you simply say geometry is that which is invariant under a group.

K: Which is?

Q5: Unchanged by a group. Initially the group was transforming the geometry because you thought you knew what the geometry was. After some time one said well geometry is that which is left invariant by the group. So the group then became... that of course was a technical question which could be handled. So the question of how many geometries, what are geometries, receded into another question. The question disappeared. Instead you said how many groups are there which will classify geometry? So it sounds somewhat like that. One talked about transformations, one talked about properties, about ending, beginning, and all kinds of things and suddenly the whole question ends. Saying there is nothing which is transformed except the question itself.

K: Shall we continue tomorrow Sir. You are not bored?

[Laughter]

OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 11TH MAY 1985

We're going to talk over many things which concerns mostly our life - our daily, monotonous, rather tiresome, conflicting life. And one hopes that you will be quite assured that we are not doing any kind of propaganda. To propagate any point of view, any particular ideology, any conclusion, or any persuasion. We are going to talk over together as two friends our various problems, not only the problems of the world externally, but also the very complex problem psychologically. We are going to talk over together, not accepting anything the speaker says, but rather questioning, doubting, enquiring together. So this is not a lecture or the speaker preaching.

But rather we should talk over, you and the speaker, not only what is actually happening in the world - it's becoming more and more disorderly; and also the world - that's much more complex; that demands a great deal of sanity, a great deal of search - looking, observing, searching, questioning - the world of the psyche, the so-called subjective world. And if one can be assured that this is not a sensational meeting, where you are going to receive sensations. It's becoming more and more clear that we are dependent on sensation - either intellectual, emotional, imaginary, or sentimental, romantic.

We must be very clear, all of us, if one may remind you, that we are together, you and the speaker, are going to look at the world first. That's the world that human beings have created: the economic, social, environmental, political, and religious. The society that we have made, put together; the disorder, which is

becoming quite dangerous, the world of tyranny, absolute tyranny, so-called totalitarian states, and the democratic, the free state. This country, and perhaps one or two other countries, are open societies. You can do what you want to do. Go where you will; change jobs, express your opinions, your judgments, criticize everything about you, if you want to. Or you accept what is, and go along.

So please bear in mind, if you will, that we are going to talk over as two friends - we may be strangers, perhaps - speaker doesn't know all of you, certainly not, but as we are here this morning and the next week, we are going to quietly, hesitantly, tentatively look what we are doing; enquire together, after all these millennia of evolution, thousands upon thousands of years of long duration of time, why we are what we are.

There are various kinds of disorder. War is the greatest disorder. And every little nation is arming itself, supplied by the great powers, and the little powers. And there has been holocaust, in the last war. And there are other kinds of holocaust going on now - Beirut, VietNam, and South America, Russia, and so on. There hasn't been only one holocaust. Those holocausts are taking place now. And we seem to have become totally indifferent to what is happening in the Far East, in the Near East, in the Middle East, in Europe and Russia and here. We are really insensitive, indifferent, silent in the sense, though one may have demonstrations, these demonstrations are taking place all over the world for various causes, not wanting a particular kind of war - neutron bombs and the atom bombs. But nobody, as far as one has been able to make out, nobody wants to end wars.

And, as we said, there is disorder, the ideological disorder: one

country, one part of the world having crystallized in a particular ideology. Leninism has become the religion of a certain part of the world, and anybody who is against it becomes a heretic, like the old Middle Ages, when the Catholics burnt people. They were heretics, heathens. That's what's happening in a certain part of the world. And we are indifferent to it. We know it is happening out there, newspapers are full of it, books have been written about it, and murder, one sect against another sect, of the same religion, being armed by the others, killing each other in the name of God, in the name of peace, in the name of their own particular ideology.

These are all facts. The speaker is not saying anything that's not actually taking place. And we are indifferent as long as it is far away. Apparently we become terribly alive, active when it touches us, when it touches each one of us, when it's very near at home, in your back yard. Again that's a fact. And, knowing all this in words, in books, and in newspapers and television, we seem to be unable to do anything whatever about all this. Again that's a fact.

And if we can this morning and the following weeks - next week, rather, we'll go and find out together what each one of us can do. What is our responsibility - not just the words, but the actual feeling of responsibility, as you feel responsible for your wife or children, for your husband or your girl friends, and so on. If you feel responsible. But when one asks oneself, what is one's place in this world, what is the relationship of oneself to the rest of mankind, what is one to do with this appalling, frightening chaos in the world? And most of us are aware, know, not only verbally but actually; we have been through wars, through concentration camps, whether in the recent war or in the past wars or the concentration

camps that are going on now, we know what is happening: how deeply we are responsible or how superficially; how indifferent. Or actually taking part in the whole human society, not a particular part of the world; whether America or England, France or India or Japan. We are human beings apart from economic and national frontiers, religious frontiers, we are all human beings: black, white, purple, pink, or whatever colour it be. It's our earth. To be lived on, to enjoy the marvellous beauty of the land, the lovely seas and the hills, and the great valleys and mountains, the groves, the orchards and the meadows.

But apparently we are incapable of living together without any barrier, without any separation as nationalities, which is really a glorified form of tribalism, without any organized religious attachments. We talk a great deal about freedom, the democratic world, though in the other parts of the world though they feel the demand for freedom, the human necessity for freedom, the absolute elite destroy their freedom.

So can we, recognizing all this, not merely verbally, not merely descriptively, not accepting mere explanations, whether it be historical or dialectical or personal, can we look at all this impersonally, if that's possible, without any bias, prejudice and find out together what we can do.

What is disorder? What would you consider to be disorder? And what is order? Is order brought about by ideologies? By one's opinions? Judgments? Various religious conclusions with their experiences? Are not the very ideologies the cause of disorder? Please, we are thinking together. Don't, if one may suggest most earnestly, don't merely listen to what the speaker is saying. If you

are merely listening as a long series of words, it's not worth listening. But if you listen not only with the hearing of the ear but listen with your heart, with your mind, with all your being to find out what we can do as human beings.

There's considerable mess in the world, which is called disorder, dangerous mess. And around this mess we organize, and reorganize what has been organized. Right, I hope you are following all this. And this reorganization round the disorder, mess, confusion, conflict, this reorganizing around that is called progress. Right? You are following all this? And we are satisfied with these new organizations. We feel we are vitally progressing. But the mess, the confusion, the conflict, the disorder, the terror that's going on, has been going on for millennia upon millennia; now we know it is happening all over the world, through quick communication and so on.

It is said that to train a Roman legion soldier in Italy, Rome, took 15 to 20 cents, now it takes probably thousands of dollars. You are following all this? And we have progressed tremendously. The man with a club killed another. Then somebody came along and invented archery, and they said, "At last all wars will end. This will kill so many people." Then came along various instruments, material of war, and we have the latest one, the absolute bomb, that can evaporate human beings by the million with one blow. And we have made again a vast progress.

In all this, the wars, the terrors, the appalling things that are going on, we have never tackled cruelty - not the cruelty of a Central Europe or the recent war with all their horror; and the horrors of war that are going on in the world. We have never as

human beings been able to be free of cruelty - not only to the animals, to nature, but to each other. The ultimate cruelty is war, naturally. Can we as human beings look at this word first - the word cruelty, then feel the meaning and the depth of that word. Cruelty to one's own self as discipline; we'll go into all that. Cruelty to others, exploiting others, using each other for our own personal ambition or sexual ambition. All these are various forms of cruelty, ideological cruelty, and so on. It's not the cruelty of a particular group of people, but the cruelty that is almost in every human being wanting to hurt somebody else.

Why is it, after all the religious admonitions, long before Christianity, many, many centuries before Christianity, they said, "Don't kill. The other is yourself." And we are still going on. Can this end? That's one of our great problems of life, whether this cruelty, which is inherent - please listen to all this - which is inherent in self-interest. As long as there is self-interest, there must be exploitation of another, cruelty to another, using others, and so on. This self-interest, which hides under every form of expression, it hides behind the name of God, it hides in every priest and every human being. Aren't you self-interested in yourself? Of course. But one never faces it. One doesn't want to look at it. And to pursue it, to find out, all its trickery, all its hypocritical hypocrisy, its pride, its arrogance, its vanity and its humility. It requires great awareness. And it demands great discipline. But we are all rather slack people. We are rather sloppy in our thinking. We are never certain about anything. We have a lot of beliefs, dogmas, faith.

I wonder if you have examined certain religion, as Christianity, and the world of Islam, based on books. If you begin to question

them, doubt, the whole thing would collapse, because we never doubt our own thinking, our own experience. We never question.

As we were saying, we never question our thinking, our prejudices, our conclusions, to find out whether they are accurate, or merely opinions. Or we never question our own demand for self-interest. So please, during these talks, and question and answer meetings, there must be doubt. Doubt is essential, a certain form of scepticism without cynicism, because that clears the brain so that one can see clearly. One can see clearly what one is. And so specially be sceptical with what the speaker is saying, specially, because he is not a guru. He doesn't want a thing from you, neither your applause, and so on. Please be assured of that. So you can relax. And be free. Because it's very important if you are really assured, convinced that the speaker is not expecting a thing from you, doesn't want your money - except what you give for the donations. (Laughter) But it's not for the speaker. It is to keep the place clean and the schools and so on. He doesn't want to create any sensation in you, because you want to be entertained. Your novels, your books, your television, everything entertains you. And you like that, the religious entertainment. But here we are trying to fathom, delve into this deep problem of our existence.

So is it possible, we are asking, to bring about order in our life? If there is complete order, both biologically and psychologically, complete order, then there is no conflict. There is conflict and disorder when we pursue an ideology - the ideal, which is projected from our confusion. So your ideals bring about confusion. I don't know if you are aware of all this. This is very clear if you observe what is happening in the so-called totalitarian states. There the

ideology is supreme. The ideology, Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and all those people, and their interpreters, they are creating and have done in the past and are doing it now, great disorder in the world. Any ideology, whether it is the Catholic ideology, or the Hindu ideology, or the socialist and so on. They are bound to create disorder because the ideology you believe in, I accept that ideology. Therefore you divide yourself against other ideologies. And hence there is conflict in ideologies. If you once actually deeply see that - not merely verbally, intellectually, but deeply inwardly, in your blood - the truth of that, then you are a free man to look at something else.

But ideologies give us the sense of security. And that's why we cling to beliefs and dogmas, faith, which are put together by priests and so on, I won't go into all that. And we cling to that. There are over 800 Catholics. I don't know how many divisions of Protestantism. And there is in the Islamic world several sects fighting each other, killing each other. But in the Buddhist and Hindu world it exists but not so violently.

So can one knowing the truth of this, the feeling, the depth of the truth, put away all ideologies which divides human beings. This is a very serious question, please don't push it aside, and say, "Well, why shouldn't I have my own particular little ideology, or my own particular ideal? The ideal based on my experience; my knowledge." Then that knowledge, that experience, that particular concept one clings to, must be questioned, doubted, torn apart to find the truth of it.

So then one must ask, what is disorder? Why we live in our private life and also in public life, why there is so much disorder.

The speaker is not asking the question. You are asking the question. Who has brought about this disorder? Don't casually say, "Yes, each one of us is responsible" and then put that aside too. We learn quick answers because we are all very learned people. Learned, quotes. But we never ask of ourselves why our house is in disorder. Which means where there is disorder there must be conflict. And we live with conflict - the ultimate being war with its total irresponsibility, and the disorder. You may have create order in your house, physical house, because most Americans do; but we are talking not only of the external disorder but also inward disorder. Why is there in all of us such conflict, which breeds disorder?

What is this conflict? Why have we human beings lived with disorder? Not only during this century, not only last week and now, but man has lived in disorder for thousands of years. We have inherited it, our brains are conditioned to conflict. Our very way of looking at life, thinking about, accepting, disobeying, belonging to this and not to that sect, particular silly guru - I hope you don't mind my using that word - particular person who says, I've got it, you haven't got it, let me lead you. The vanity of these people; and their followers. So what is this conflict due to, the reason, the root of it?

First let us look very closely and intimately, deeply, the human brain, which has evolved through centuries upon centuries, millennia, two million or three million years, or 15 million years, or 50,000 years, why this brain, the brain of human beings, not my particular brain - there is no 'my particular brain'. A nice idea, I think my brain is mine. But the brain has evolved like the human

organism. Your organism is like another organism. Highly evolved, sensitive, intelligent. Each organism has its own intelligence. But we are slowly destroying that intelligence, by drugs, alcohol, smoking, you know the whole business of modern absurd existence.

So what is the cause in our daily life, we are talking first. If there is order in each one of us, now as you are listening; if each one of us has this complete order in ourselves, do you think we would kill another? Do you think we would belong to any nation, any group, any guru? Any book that is sanctified through time? Then there would be no fear, no sorrow, no loneliness, and certainly no gods.

So we're going to find out together if it is possible to have this complete order in ourselves. Are you interested in it? Honestly? Would you spend your time, not your money, that's the last filthy thing you can ask, would you spend your energy to find out? As you spend your energy going to the office or the laboratory or a particular scientific discipline and so on, you give great deal of energy in all these directions - for power, money, and position, recognition, fame, all the notoriety of all that. You spend tremendous energy going to the office day after day, day after day, for 50, 60 years; and trying to cure others when you need curing yourself. Now will you give some of that energy? Sitting there quietly looking, thinking together, will you give that energy? Not all of it, because you have to go to office the day after tomorrow morning, or the factory or some job. Will you give that energy to find out if you can put your house in order, inward house, this whole complex structure of the psyche.

If you will give it - to yourself, not to me, not to the speaker, he won't accept it, then together find out. Together find out, not the speaker tells you, then it becomes absurd, childish, immature. But if you give that energy, that vitality, the drive behind it, to find out, if you can live without a single shadow of conflict, then we can ask, what's the cause of it? Because when you can find the cause the effect doesn't exist. I don't know if you have gone into the question of cause and effect. We'll go into it briefly.

Cause is not separate from the effect. The effect lies in the cause. If there is no cause there is no effect. But we separate the cause and the effect. The acorn of these oaks produce the oak. But the tree, the whole leaf, the beauty of the leaves, the sunlight on the leaves and the branches and the trunk, it lies in the seed. But to us the cause and effect are two different things. We say, if I can get rid of the cause, perhaps I'll be very healthy. But it's like saying the means to the goal matters - or the means doesn't matter for the goal, for the end. Whereas the means is the end. You understand all this? Look at it, what is happening in the world. They are talking about peace, all of them, and building up armaments. The cause is fear, trying to save something or other, you know all the rest of it. As long as there is that fear, that desire to be completely safe for oneself, you are going to have wars. We'll talk about it later.

So what is the cause of this disorder in which we live? As I said, give your brain, thought, your energy to find out. It's not very difficult. Don't call it difficult and then make it difficult. It's very simple. Look what is happening between Palestine, the Arabs, and the Israelis. They are of the same group. They live on this same earth. But one has been trained, educated, programmed to think he

is an Arab. Programmed like a computer for the last 1600 years. And the other side, call them the Israelis, for 4,000 years. They are old people, like the Hindus, like the Chinese. So they have divided themselves - the Arab and the Israelis, the Americans and the old Indians of this country, you have very carefully destroyed them. The holocaust.

So there must be conflict as long as there is division. Please, this is a law, it's not my law, it's a law - not the law of the judges and the court but this is the eternal law. As long as you are separate from your wife, and the wife separate from you, with their ambition, with their desire for fulfillment, with their pride, with their separate saying, I must fulfil, I must be this, I must be that. In that relationship there will be conflict, as there is conflict between the disciple and the guru, conflict between god and you - if there is a god. So wherever there is a division between me and you and they and we, we are going to have conflict.

How does this division come about? Is it self-interest on the part of all of us? Please examine, question, doubt, ask. Is it that each one of us is so self-centred, so concerned with himself, so that that very concern divides? You may get married, live with another and so on, but this division goes on. And we accept this division as being natural and therefore accept the conflict, everlasting struggle as part of existence, part of life, it's natural to struggle, to battle with each other. And the *raison d'etre* for that is, doesn't everything fight in nature? Each tree is fighting for light. The bigger animal eats the lesser animal, and so on. That's the reason we give. So our life then is accepted as being naturally, inevitably to be lived in conflict. But we never ask actually is it possible not to have this

separate individualistic self-interest at all.

Are you, if one may ask, are you asking this question of yourself? Are you frightened to ask it? Or do you just listen, spend useless hours sitting under these trees and go away, saying it is not possible; or, oh, yes, it is possible, and just leave it like that. Or, will you question it, seeing what the world is actually about you, first: nationalistic divisions, religious divisions, ideological differences; which we have created. The intellectuals, the terrorists, the imperialists. No empire has been built, whether the modern empire or the ancient empires, without blood. As they used to say, you first take the Bible and then the gun. This has been our way of life. And a man or a woman who is serious, really wants to find out whether conflict can end. If it ends, then only there is peace in the world. Peace demands a great deal of intelligence, not just demonstration of peace. It doesn't lie in any capital of any country. It demands to have real peace within one's heart and mind, about one to understand the nature of conflict and end it.

And to understand that, the structure and the nature of conflict, requires observation, not condemnation, not taking sides about it. But just to observe what one is doing. How we are constantly separating ourselves - the American way of life, and so on and on and on and on. Are you listening to all this. Or you're getting bored with all this. Would you kindly tell the speaker?

Audience: Yes.

K: You can all say, "Yes" and go home. (Laughter) Or be stimulated for the moment by the speaker. That doesn't bring about the end of conflict. One must exercise the immense capacity of the brain, immense, infinite capacity of the brain. But our education

limits that capacity. Our education also has helped us technologically; tremendous advancement. From the small computer to the complicated aeroplanes, submarines, warships, quick communication and so on, so on, so on. The more diseases are coming now, the more medicines are being invented. They are making tremendous progress. And the speaker is not saying this in cynicism. These are facts. He abhors cynicism.

So can one observe quietly, without any choice, without any saying - you know, observe what is going on in ourselves? The mirror in which we see our faces. How you comb your hair, how you brush your teeth, how you shave or do your face up, and so on. Can we observe as closely, as definitely, as precisely as possible, without any distortion?

That means, we have to understand the movement of choice. Why do we choose? Please ask yourself, why is there necessity of choice? Of course, there's choice between two cars, between two materials. If you have the money, you choose the better. Between two authors. The choice between the shadow and the light; shadow of the sun, sun which creates the shadow, and the light of the sun. Dark and the daylight. Tall, short. But is there psychological choice at all? You understand my question? Please ask yourself, why do we choose psychologically, inwardly, say I'll do this, I won't do that. This is right, that is wrong. I'm violent, but I must become non-violent. I have pride, but I'll become humble. You understand? This inward choice going on all the time. Is there choice at all when there is clarity? Or is there choice only where there is confusion?

Please listen, that is, not to the speaker but to yourself. You are

asking this question, I am not asking you to ask that question. You are asking that question yourself. Why is there this choice of not to be violent? That's a choice; I am violent, but I'll choose to be non-violent. Why is there that choice?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, would you kindly please, if you like to come here and sit here and talk, you're perfectly welcome. Sir, would you mind? You can ask questions on Tuesday and Thursday next week. I am not preventing you from asking questions. Please have the courtesy, the patience, and not get bored, to find out for yourself, not from what the speaker is saying, the speaker is not important, but what is being said together is important. The speaker is not seeking personal worship. There is no personality involved in this. I really mean it. He is not important at all. But what is being said is important.

So we are asking, why is there this choice in us - apart from the choice of things? Could we look at it for a minute? Human beings throughout the world inherited probably from the apes and so on, they are violent people, human beings are, throughout the world. And he says he realizes what is happening through violence, not only in himself collectively, he says, let us be non-violent, let's practice non-violence, let's talk about non-violence, let us use that instrument politically, and so on. This has been one of the things that India has produced, non-violence, not only India but others have talked about it long before. So, we, I, you are violent, if I am violent at all, we are violent. And then we say, I will become non-violent, which is a choice, isn't it?

Now, why do we do this? I am greedy, but I will not be greedy.

Right? I am full of vanity, but I will pretend not to be vain. You can't, where there is vanity, that cannot be changed into humility. Where there is vanity, the ending of it, complete ending of it, not trying, that becoming that, only then there is humility.

So let's look very carefully, if you will kindly have the patience and the energy, not be too bored and not too cold, why we are doing this all the time. Take violence. Because that's what is going on in the world and also in ourselves, the tremendous sense of violence. The bombs, the killing, the knifing, the stealing, murder, rape, every form of violence. What is violence? Physical violence? That's one side of it. Surely violence is much more complicated than that. Violence is, if you examine it closely, go into it in yourself, violence is conformity. I am this, but I will be that. You don't understand this, but you think you understand that. One doesn't understand 'what is' actually, and without understanding that you want to transform that into the other.

Suppose I am violent. Physically I don't like violence, physically, because I see it all about me; suppose, I say, I am not. I don't like what's going on, I won't be violent. I haven't understood the nature of violence, but I want to escape from that, therefore I create the ideal. So after creating something which is not, then there is conflict between 'what is' and what I think should be. This is what we are doing. So I say to myself, before I achieve the other, which is non-violence, I must first understand what is violence. This seems so logical, isn't it? We have become so illogical and we are frightened of being logical, because we are caught in illusions of trying not to be too logical. So I'm going to be very logical first, I can go beyond logic after I've used logic.

I'm violent. And I see everything round me has a different form of violence: from the animals, nature, and so on, the tremendous lightening, the beauty of it, it's a form of violence, the shock of it. And I'm violent. Violence is not only physical, but much more psychological. When I conform to a pattern, when I am being allowed to be programmed - you understand? When you tell me what I should do, for the good of my soul or my psyche or whatever it is, and you become the authority - so when I accept authority there is violence. Right? Psychological authority, of course. There is the authority of the computer. The authority of law. The authority of the policeman who says, keep to the left, or right. If you drive in Europe, you keep to the right, if you drive in England, or here, which is it, left? (Laughter) Yes, left. Left. No, right. (Laughter) Right. I haven't driven lately. (Laughter) Yes, I walk down to the left, walk up to the right. That's quite right.

So, violence must exist where - that is part of it - where out of my confusion, disorder, I create authority. You understand? I am confused. I am disturbed, I want certainty. And you come along, the guru, the priest, the psychologist, the others, and they become the authority. I have created them out of my confusion, my disorder. So I realize as long as there is an authority subjectively, either the experience which I have had, the memory of that experience which becomes the authority - follow all this - or the authority of somebody who says, I know, I'll tell you all about it. The nasty, ugly gurus do all this, coining money. They are some of the most rich people in the world - your evangelists, the churches, the tremendous organizations; they say, have faith, believe, accept. And I am so frightened, I say, yes. I am gullible, I accept it. So I

am creating out of my disorder authority. If there is order, there is no authority because I behave properly - not according to a pattern.

So, one of the causes of conflict, disorder, is psychological acceptance of authority. That means, can one live without a single ideal, single authority, so that one lives in great order now, not tomorrow? And psychologically there is disorder in our inward house, because we have separated ourselves from one another. It's one of the most difficult things to do; to say, there is no separation. I am the world. I am the rest of humanity. Because you suffer, the Russians suffer, the Hindus, Chinese, every human being on this earth suffers. I shed tears. And also laughter, of course. Every human being on this earth pursues every form of avoidance, every form of escape from fear, from sorrow. So I am the world. You understand, because I suffer, you suffer. This is not just ideological nonsense, it's the actuality. So as long as I separate from the rest of mankind, which is you, I must have conflict and disorder. We'll go into that a little later, whether we are a separate consciousness or consciousness of mankind.

What time is it, sir?

Q: It's five after one.

K: I'm sorry to have kept you so long. Somebody should tell us. So I'll finish with this. Where there is separation in my thinking, I can separate thought from action. I think one thing, and say another thing, think one thing and act another way. That is separation breeds conflict, hypocrisy.

So one can go into this question of conflict very, very deeply, and when you begin to understand the nature and structure and the way of its subtlety, as you watch it, the very watching without any

choice, in that watching you will see that conflict ends. And that requires great attention to every thought, every action, every way of inward feeling. And if one wants to end that conflict, you have to give tremendous attention to it. Not casual attention, not one day or one week later, but keeping that attention moving all the time.

OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 12TH MAY 1985

We must talk over together the question of time, thought, and the various forms of fear, and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure, satisfaction, gratification. And also we should talk over together sorrow, whether it is possible to end sorrow. And also love and compassion, death, and the religious mind, or the brain. And also we should go into the question of meditation, and ask ourselves if there is anything beyond all the travail of man; all this confusion, all this loneliness and despair and anxiety, if there is anything sacred, holy. And so we have a great deal of ground to cover, if you are willing.

As we said yesterday, we are not imposing anything on you, not trying to convince you of anything. And the speaker really means it. We're not trying to convert you, do propaganda, or programming, because we are apt to be rather gullible, easily satisfied with new forms of experiences and sensations. So we should together, not that the speaker is the only talker, but together you and the speaker are going to look into all these matters. Not only verbally or analytically, which is comparatively easy, but rather go much deeper than mere rationalization, explanation, and description. If that is clearly understood between us, that the speaker doesn't want anything from you, fortunately - neither your applause please, your applause at the end of the talks, or your encouragement or discouragement. Literally he doesn't want a thing from you. So you can all be quiet, relaxed, and listen.

It has been one of our problems, perhaps for many, many millennia, the question of guilt. It's important to understand this

question: why human beings, throughout the world, have this sense of guilt. Having been told from childhood to do something and not being able to do it like most children, happily, but unfortunately they cultivate this sense of guilt. And also in religions, especially in Christianity, the original sin, you must know if you are Christian all about it; and one who saves you from that sin. So you begin to have guilt there too: that we are all guilty, we are all the product of original sin, whatever that may mean. And also we are always falling short of our own ideals. And thereby also one feels guilty. You must know this. Probably most of us do. Either we are aware of it or it's deeply hidden in most people. We are indifferent to all that and if one awakens to it, knows the process of guilt, what is implied in it? And also there are those who love to keep other people feeling guilty. Then you have them under your thumb and you love that kind of power. So there is the guilt of not behaving rightly, according to some tradition or according to your own pattern of thought, and not being able to reach that level one begins to feel guilty; and so on.

And also there is the other question: we are living with something dreadful around us, something very, very ugly. Surely we all must be aware of it. Not only the ugliness, the naughtiness, the brutality of wars, but also this tremendous - if one can call it evil, the speaker doesn't like to use that word - but the constant pressure, influence of certain ideologies, like the totalitarian Communist ideologies, which is completely monstrous and deadly, if you know all about it, and we have to live with that next door. It's our brother across the wall. Not only the Berlin wall, but the wall that exists to push this away or to fight it or face it. And we

are living with that.

If you are at all aware of all this, not only monstrosities and the cruelty of war, but the ideology of wars. And how do we meet that, not only as individuals but collectively? And what is the response of each one of us? We are living with something in the world that is becoming more and more ugly, more and more destructive, tyrannical. This is happening the world over, it isn't just in certain spots of the world. It's gradually creeping. And what is our response to all that? Is it indifference? Is it we don't care what happens in the other field? Is it that we don't want to face all this? And if we do face it, what can we do? Not organizationally, because that always ends up in some kind of another kind of mess. What do we, as human beings living on this earth, which is also being gradually destroyed because of overpopulation, more and more big cities, and our indifference to nature, what is our responsibility to all this?

Do we feel at all responsible? Responsible in the sense not only to your wife or husband or to your family but to the rest of mankind, whether you be Protestant, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist, that's all just names, labels, without much depth.

Will you go into all this matter. Please don't wait, if I may most respectfully point out, for the speaker to tell you what to do. Which would be another form of cultivation of guilt. But rather, in talking things over together, observing, hearing each other very carefully, not merely to the words but behind the words, the deep significance of a word and what it signifies, then we don't have to tell each other what to do.

So there is guilt, and there is the thing with which we are living

daily, and what is the relationship of that, of these two, to fear. And in enquiring into this question of fear, that which is brutal, terrible, that is happening in the world, and also our own sense of inadequacy, which is another form of guilt; what is the relationship of all this to fear and what is fear - not the superficial or deep fears but the root of it? Not only the trunk of it but the many, many branches of it, what is the root of it?

So we are going to enquire not only into time; because time is related to fear, as we shall go into it. What is time, by which we live? Today, tomorrow, the past, the future. And also what is thinking? Because we live by thinking. Everything we do, act, is based on thought. So may we go into all that?

It's a nice, not too hot a morning. Pleasant under the trees, and a rather cool breeze, which one hopes you will not mind. And it is rather convenient to go to sleep here. If you are well-covered with blankets and all the rest of it, nice Sunday morning, free of all the office work, and labour and travail and skill. And under the trees in the dappled light it's rather pleasant. "You can go on talking, but it doesn't matter, I'll go to sleep and you go on." (Laughter) If that is what you want, go to sleep.

But if we are serious, earnest, which we must be because that's one of the crises we have come to, it's no longer mere entertainment, no longer mere intellectual game, or seeking sensation from one thing to another, or from another. We've got to face some extraordinary crises in life - life being our consciousness. The crisis is not in economics, political, religious, but the crisis is in our consciousness - why we are what we are after thousands and thousands of years. That's where the crisis is.

And merely to solve the economic crisis or the political crisis or the brutality of ideologies and wars, it's not only there but it's much deeper. So we are going to enquire first, because they're all related, all problems are related to each other, they are not separate. If one can solve one problem completely, then you have solved all other problems because there is no separate problem, whether it be sexual, whether it be the desire to fulfil, and so on. So in the resolution of one is solved the whole thing. If you know how to do it.

So what is time? Time not only be the sunrise and the sunset, the darkness of a night and the glory of a morning. Time as the past; not only the past of one's own life. But the vast historical past, the story of mankind; which is the history of mankind. That's the long centuries, millennia upon millennia past. And the present. And the past modifying itself through the present, becomes the future. Time is a cycle. It's a circle in which we are caught. So we should look at it closely, not merely understand it intellectually but actually go into it, if you will.

We are the past, whether that past be one day or many thousands of years. The past being the knowledge, the memories, the remembrances, concealed or open. And from that past is our action. That past is the tradition. That past is the religions of Christianity, with all its divisions during the last 2,000 years. That's the past. And in India and China the past is three to five thousand years old, with their tradition, with their beliefs, with their superstition, with their nonsense. So the past is what we are. Without the past you are not. So that past, that enormous past, weighty past, goes through and modifies itself through the present.

You can see it economically, the pressures change the present, which is past. And the future, tomorrow or the very end of one's life, and beyond. Not reincarnation, we will go into all that presently. The future.

That future is the modified form of the past. It's so obvious. And that future is in the now. Right? Because the past modifying itself is the future. And that future is now, because if I'm smoking, I'll smoke tomorrow, if I am greedy, tomorrow I'll be greedy still, and so on. So the past is in the present. Please understand this very simple fact. This whole movement from the past through the present modifying itself as the future, and that future is now, because unless I fundamentally change, the future would be what I am now. Right? See the truth of this simple fact. Not that I am persuading you; not that you are being told or pressurized or computerized. This is a simple fact. If I am vicious, cruel, brutal today, as I have been in the past, I'll be that tomorrow. You can't get away from it. If I am quarrelling with my wife or husband and so on, I'll do it tomorrow too. So tomorrow is now. And to break this chain in which we are caught there must be a mutation now. You follow this simple fact. This is the whole cycle of time. Isn't it?

And is it possible to bring about this mutation? What is it that is being not transformed, the word 'transformed' means moving from one form to another form, therefore it is not mutation. What is it that's being radically changed - even that word 'change' implies time, changing from this to that. So we have to stick to that word, to bring about a mutation. That is, radical ending of something, and the beginning of something totally new.

Isn't it that our consciousness, each one's consciousness, which is what we are - there are lots of books written about this stuff, but it's very simple. I don't know why people like things very complex. It's probably very exciting to get talking about things rather complex. But if it is rather simple, what is one's consciousness? Surely what one believes, what one has faith in, what one desires, what one is, one's nationality, one's fears, one's terrors, one's depression, anxiety, loneliness, despair, cruelty, guilt, fear, pleasure, sorrow, the multiplication of desires. All that is our consciousness, isn't it? Let's be simple about it.

You see if you approach a very complex problem, one must come simply to it first. Then it becomes complex; then you can understand it. But if you begin already with complexity, then the thing will become more and more complex, we'll never resolve anything. So our consciousness is all its content. You can put into that content everything you can think of: your knowledge, your superstitions, your fears, and so on. The multiplication of human experiences and trials and attempts, all the rest of it. And can the content, which is what we are, which is not only the past but the future - and that future is now, we went into all that just now, briefly. The whole of that is you; is the persona, is the ego. It's the tremendous self-interest. And we are asking, can that consciousness, which is the result of vast evolution, not only the survival but also the knowledge of surviving, can there be a total mutation in that consciousness? And if we rely on time, as we do, then we'll begin the same old pattern again. I wonder if we understand each other. The speaker recently talked, if I may most humbly point out, it's not out of vanity I'm informing you, he

talked to the United Nations. I don't know why he was invited, but he went there. And after the talk one of the high authorities there said, "I have come to the conclusion, conviction rather, that after 40 years working in this organization, I have come to the conclusion that I must not kill". Forty years it took him. (Laughter) No, just see, the significance of it. That it takes the human brain to come to some truth during 40 years. That is, not to kill another human being. And the whole organization is based on not to bring about wars, prevent wars. They haven't done - that's irrelevant. But the whole point is, how the human brain refuses to face fact and act. And we think that during time we'll resolve everything. Time will help you to forget; and so on.

So that's the nature of time: the past modifying itself through the present and continuing as the future. So the future, the past, and the present are one. Unless there is fundamental, radical ending of all that, otherwise you will be what you are tomorrow. We are unfortunately miserable people; unhappy people, which is a fact, and if we don't change now, we'll be tomorrow the same. It's simple reality, truth.

And also, what is the relationship of time - not the chronological time only, what is the relationship of time to thought? And what is the relationship of time, thought, to fear? You follow?

May we go on? You're not too bored with all this? I hope the sun is warming you. But please, keep awake for another 15 minutes or so, will you? Which is not an insult, please, asking this. So we are asking, what's the relationship of time, thought, and fear.

We've more or less gone into the question of time, so let us go

into the question of thought. What is thinking? The speaker is using words to communicate what he is supposed to be thinking, and you share the words and translate those words according to your pleasure or displeasure; or you're casually hearing, or probably you don't understand English quite well, or you do understand English very well and give certain significance to those words. Right? Thinking. This is the whole process of thinking. Thought has put man on the moon. Thought has created the instruments of war. Thought has created the destruction of man. Right? Put together the most amazing cathedrals in the world, temples and mosques. If you've seen some of them, they are marvellous beauties. And thought has also created the vast technological world. Thought has also established a relationship between man and woman, which we'll go into presently, afterwards. Thought produces all our actions, so thought is very important. Not to expand or give greater depth to thought, but we are enquiring into the very nature and structure of thought, of thinking. Right? Shall we go into it?

I do not know - one doesn't know - the speaker doesn't know if you have really gone into this question at all. Probably one has never asked; even the professionals don't ask, so why should you? You are not educated to enquire; you are educated to conform, educated to say, "Yes, I've memorized, I've acquired information, knowledge, and I'll get a good job, or no job", or whatever one does. But one has never gone into this question really very deeply, enquiring what is thinking? Why does the brain, which is after all our only instrument we have, neurologically, biologically, emotionally, it is the centre of all our existence. And that thing

inside the skull, which we call the brain, that brain has never asked itself, why am I constantly thinking, chattering away like blazes about everything: what I did yesterday, what I will do tomorrow, what I am doing, why this, why that? You know? Dreaming at night and all day long chattering. What extraordinary human beings we are. So we must enquire what is thought? What is thinking? What is the origin of it?

Do you want my explanation? (Laughter) You see, that's what I'm objecting to. (Laughter) Because you are not actually enquiring. You are waiting for somebody to tell you. Therefore he becomes the nasty guru and you become the follower. And the speaker says, don't, please don't do that. Really you'll destroy not only yourself but also the one who leads you. So let's put aside all that nonsense and enquire together. The word 'together' is important, but don't let's go into that for the moment.

So what is thinking? Does thinking rely on memory, the accumulated memories, remembrances? I want to be a great man, because I've seen great many people, great many men having good time, becoming famous, plenty of money, plenty of cars, all the rest of it. So there is this vast collection of memories. Not only personal, but also the remembrance of many things past: historically, collective memories; conscious memories and deep layers of memories; aren't we all memories? Aren't we a bundle of memories? Forgive me for using that word and putting it in a limited manner; aren't we all memories? What are memories based on? Please enquire with me, don't just listen to the poor man. Go into it with the speaker. What are memories based on? Aren't they based on knowledge? The tremendous accumulation of information

as knowledge, whether it be vast - not vast, limited knowledge of science adding to itself all the time; and that knowledge which is being added to must always be limited. Right? Because you're adding to it, therefore it's limited. One doesn't know about aerodynamics or the astrophysics, but I will gather, I will get it after experiment after experiment.

So knowledge is based on experience. Right? Right? And experience, or experience and all that, is essentially limited. Isn't it? All experience, it doesn't matter whatever experience it is, it must be limited because there is an experiencer who is experiencing. And the experiencer is the past: his memories, his accumulation, his hopes, his fears, his wanting to be enlightened, his wanting to be godly, his wanting to say, I want to be popular, therefore I'll learn a few phrases and translate in my own way and then become, blah, blah, blah.

So experience must be recognized, otherwise it's no experience at all. And the one who recognizes is the past, it's all so silly, isn't it? So the experiences are always limited. I experience the divine; that tremendous feeling of elation, temporarily, you can fall back. So experiences are always limited. Right? Therefore knowledge is always limited. Always. In the past, or now to which that knowledge is being added to, is limited. So memories are limited. So thought is limited. Right? I wonder if we understand this, actually the truth of it, not just intellectual concept of it, or the idea of it, the truth of it, that thought will always be limited. Thought can imagine the limitless, but it's still limited. Thought has invented gods all over the world, for the last millennia upon millennia, those gods are limited, naturally. So whatever the

activity of thought and its action must always be limited. Therefore thought is not holistic. You understand? If we can realize this simple fact that the thought and the thinker are one and therefore they are always limited.

Therefore all the religions of the world, though they say divine revelation direct from the horse's mouth - (Laughter) I'm not being irrelevant or cynical, but that is so, they're all claim direct... And putting on medieval dresses and robes and all the trickery of, that goes on in the name of religion, is invented by thought. And therefore the whole hierarchical and the religious structure is limited. And their belief, their faith, their ritual, all the rest of it, is limited, because it's based on thought.

So the question arises, if you will kindly listen, is there something beyond thought? Or everything is thought? Not nature, of course. The tiger wasn't put together by thought, thank god. Or the swift gazelle. So what is the relationship of time, thought to fear? We are talking about fear. Is there fear without time and thought? Please look at it carefully. Is there a sense of fear that is not rooted in thought and time? I have done something some time ago, and I am frightened of that, guilty. Something that I have done ugly, not straight, not excellent in its quality, and I'm ashamed of it, and I'm frightened of it, I feel guilty about it, I've lived with it. And fear of all that. Therefore the root of fear is time and thought. Fear of what might happen: I've got a good reputation, but tomorrow you mightn't turn up - not that I would care, but I'm just...

(Laughter) So there is always the shadow of fear with us, shadow of this fear between man and woman; what might happen. And the ultimate fear is death. And out of this fear all the gods are invented.

So one asks, is there an end to fear, a total ending. You are asking this question, not the speaker. Which means, is there an end to thought and time? You understand the relation? The logical sequence of all this. It's not only logical, but factual. Is there an ending to all this process, which causes fear? And one knows the results of fear, the consequences of fear, all the cruelty, you know, all the ugliness, the shrinking, the whole world of fear which is dark. And that breeds a great deal of neuroticism and all the rest of it. Is there an ending to all this?

Not only to ask a question of that kind - the very question sounds rather silly - you can't end time. You can't end thought. Because to go to your house from here, you need thinking. To turn on the ignition, you need thinking. On Monday morning, you're probably going to an office or something or other; you need to think. So to say, can thought end, or time end, is not the actual question. But rather to ask, do I really comprehend, understand the truth of time and thought? Because thought has its place, time has its place, time has its place. But why should fear arise from thinking? You understand the question? Why should time be a factor in fear?

So if I understand the whole picture, the whole design, the whole map of time, thought, guilt, or fear, then the very observation of it - you understand - the very eyes, seeing, not only the eyes but your whole being looking at it. That means giving your whole attention to this map of fear, not one spot in the map, not one village, or town or the road, but the whole map of it. Can one observe without any distortion this whole structure of it? Of course one can. That is to give attention to pure observation

without any distortion. Then that whole chain is broken.

Shall we go on little while longer? Aren't you tired?

Audience: No.

K: Why not? (Laughter) Are you all so actively thinking, working, applying, or just saying, well, it's a nice day, let's talk about it.

Also, in understanding fear, one should look at desire. We are driven by desire, not only for god, whatever that may mean, not only for success, for power, position, being at the centre of everything - like in Washington, or in Delhi or in London or in Paris or in Moscow, or Peking, shall we include Peking, better. We want so many things in life; not only physical things, good cars, good clothes, having a nice body, a nice face, nice cosmetic, you know, the whole game of it. Commercialism in this country is rampant: buy, buy, buy, buy. And desire to be good; desire not to hurt my closest friend, it doesn't matter if I hurt others, but somebody nearby, and so on. We've got so many desires: to be great, to be this, to be that.

And we have never asked, perhaps, what is desire? Why religions, the monks have suppressed desire. They burn with it, but they suppress it. I was once walking - the speaker was once walking behind a lot of monks in the Himalayas. Have you ever been to the Himalayas? Some marvellous hills, marvellous mountains. It was a place where you see over nearly 400 miles across the horizon, snowcapped, great valleys, great marvellous blue sky; unpolluted, sharp, clear. Four hundred or three hundred and fifty miles from range to range, the highest peaks. So I was walking behind a path - speaker was walking behind a path. And

there were monks in front of me. They were chanting, and never looking at any flower, any sky, any tree, and the rivers; they have little streams singing down the hill, dancing waters. And there they were, completely absorbed in what they were supposed to be thinking. Didn't dare to look up and see the beauty of the sky, the trees and the rivers and the flowers. Because that is a distraction. Like all the monks all over the world.

So there is this desire in every human being, and without suppressing or denying or transforming or transmuting into something higher - which becomes another form of desire, can we - sorry to laugh (Laughter) - can we look at desire and find out what is the nature, what is the movement, what is the structure of it? Quite objectively. What is desire? What is the beginning of it, not the ending of it? What is the origin, the source, the movement of it? Shall we go into it? Is that interesting?

We live by sensation. Biologically it's necessary. Otherwise we are paralysed. Sensation plays a tremendous part in our life, not only sexually, but wanting, having more and more and more sensations. Sensation is the result of seeing - will you kindly follow this for a little? Seeing, contact, sensation. Right? Seeing those hills, and saying, how beautiful, getting a sensation from it, and that's sensation. I read a beautiful poem, and sensation. Or see a marvellous painting; that's another sensation. And so on. That's a natural thing, sensation, isn't it? You look at the trees and the leaves and the sky, and say, how beautiful it is.

We're not talking about what is beauty. Perhaps we will at the next meeting if we have time. But we live by sensation, the whole nervous organism is sensation. What is the relationship of

sensation to to desire? You understand my question? Because we are enquiring into desire. What is the relationship between sensation and desire? Why they are always instantly related? I wish I could always live under these trees with a nice house. And then desire: I must have a nice house under the trees. So what is the actual fact, the relationship, the communication, between sensation and what is called desire? Right? Is there an interval - please listen - is there an interval between sensation and the movement of desire? A gap? Or they are instant? See something, grab it, if you want. So we are going to find out if there is a division, if there is a separation, if there is an interval. Right?

There is sensation in seeing a beautiful garden, well-kept, a lawn that has been mowed and rolled for the last 500 years. There are such lawns. And you see it and you say, my, how marvellous it is, what depth, what beauty in that grass! And you wish you could have it in your back yard.

So watch it, please just watch it closely. Sensation, no, seeing that grass, rich, heavy, deep-rooted grass; then the sensation; then wanting it in your garden. So that is, desire is born - please listen - the moment, the second thought takes control or gives shape to sensation. Right? And then at that second desire is born. You follow? That is, seeing that lawn protected behind a wall, behind walls; and seeing it, the sensation, and thought saying, "I wish I had that." At that second desire is there. You understand? Right?

Now we are asking, can there be a movement, an interval, between the sensation and thought giving it a shape, an image. You understand? That is, sensation, which is natural, seeing that beautiful grass: that field, that lawn. And then thought comes in

and says, "I wish I had it." At that second desire is. Right? That's the truth. So we are asking, can these two be separate for a while? See a shirt in the window, go and touch it and say, "What beautiful material it is," and leave it - we don't leave it there. We say, "I wish I had it." Then desire is born. So if the interval can be kept, you understand? The gap can be kept separate for a while, then you will see the movement of desire, how it comes into being. Then you can stretch that space indefinitely or keep it very narrow. You understand what I'm saying? When you understand this, then discipline is not necessary at all, control or suppress or fight it. You understand all this? Not verbally, in your heart. Then you will do it naturally; when you see something beautiful, it is beautiful, and there it is. You can't have those mountains, nor that beautiful lawn. One can look at it, admire it, and say, "How lovely," and feel it. That requires great alertness, awareness, a sense of deep attention to it. But we rarely give all that, except for money or for pleasure.

This is much more stringent, requires a great deal of austerity. The word 'austerity' comes from the Greek, which means 'dry mouth.' Not how we have translated it, austere, few clothes, and you know, one meal a day, and all that stuff. But austerity is something tremendous, not the trivial stuff. To be so attentive to this movement of sensation and desire, and all things we have talked about. To watch it very carefully; see every thought in you, not let it go by without understanding why it arose, what's its cause - you follow? That is real austerity. Not joining a monastery and all that kind of stuff. Austerity is in our daily life.

So we have talked about all this. On Tuesday and Thursday will be questions. Next Saturday and Sunday we'll talk about other

things: pleasure, sorrow, pain, and all the implications of loneliness, death, if we have time; and what is religion, what is a religious mind. Is there something which thought has not touched at all, the limitless, the immense, the nameless? Which is not an invitation for you to come. (Laughter) It's part of our life, not all the buying, buying, buying and selling, going to office every day of one's life, conflict and all that. One must also give one's energy to find this out. Not merely live on faith, symbols and all that. So perhaps we'll see each the other day after tomorrow or next Saturday and Sunday.

OJAI 1ST QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING

14TH MAY 1985

K: I've got my own watch! (Laughter)

Many questions have been put, written down. Out of those some have been chosen. I haven't seen them personally. And one cannot possibly answer all those questions, they're too many. It would take a very long time.

I think we ought to ask ourselves why we ask questions and naturally we must ask questions, but why do we ask questions? From whom does one expect an answer? From the speaker? Or from someone who can explain things away? Or can we have a dialogue about a question? That is, you ask a question and the speaker replies to that question. Then you reply to the speaker's response. And then the speaker responds to that question. So it's like playing tennis, back and forth, until the question itself is suspended between the two of us. That is, you ask a question, then I reply to that question, the speaker. Then you reply or respond to my response, and we keep this going until your response and my response have no further activity. So the question is suspended, as it were.

If you try it, if you have ever done it, probably not, then the question begins to have its own vitality. Right? Its own urgency, its own capacity to answer itself. But when we answer a question, it's always from the background of memory. It may be prejudice, it may be some kind of conclusion, or some faith and so on. So if we could suspend all that, and look at the question itself, let the question evolve, grow, expand, then if you want an answer, it is in

the question, not from your background. I wonder if I am making myself clear there. It's rather interesting if you go into it. It's very rarely that one has such a dialogue. Because we're so eager to find an answer we never look at the question, let the question evolve, expand, tell its story. And as you watch the question without any deviation, as it were, then the question itself has an extraordinary meaning. Is this clear?

So we are going to look at these questions that way. We're going to watch, listen to the question. As the speaker has not read these questions, you and the speaker can play this game, back and forth till the ball is suspended in the air. (Laughter) If we could do this, that's really the art of having a dialogue, a conversation, a communication in which the participants don't take part.

Will you do this for fun? Then you will see that the question begins to respond out of the very heart of the question? So let's try. That is, you and the speaker are going to have a dialogue in which you and the speaker are playing a part. They don't take the role of a questioner and a person who answers the question. But together we are going to put aside our backgrounds, if we have any, then the question itself begins to move; begins to have its own activity. Shall we do that?

You know, the speaker, fortunately or unfortunately, has talked all over the world, except behind the Iron Curtain or Bamboo Curtain. And questions are put to him of every kind. And if the speaker merely answers from memory, then it's no fun for him. It'll be like a gramophone repeating. But if one puts aside one's own inclinations and tendencies and one's own acquired knowledge, and looks at the question, and the person who is asking the question,

looks at his face, his gestures, why he is asking the question, what is the expression on his face, then you can see either it's a very, very superficial question, just put either to catch you, or to see what your quick response would be and so on. But if we could do this, what we just now said, that is, back and forth, and let the question itself respond, then the answering the question becomes extraordinarily significant. Right? Can we do that.

1st QUESTION: Would you please explore further into the mechanism of guilt and its relation to the ego?

Ego being the person, the psyche, the subjective entity, right? That's what generally one calls the ego, the 'me', and the 'you'. The question is, what relationship has guilt, the mechanism of it, to the whole structure of the self.

Now, I am putting that question to you. And you're going to reply to that to me, to the speaker. And then I'll answer you. And then you'll answer me. So we keep this going 'til we have worn ourselves out, and we have no strength in the arm any more. So the question remains. The question is a challenge. Right? Question is a problem that you have to face and resolve. We never resolve any problem because we're always answering from our background. Right? So let's go into this question. You're playing the game, don't just listen to me, to the speaker.

What is guilt? And what is its relationship to the ego, the whole consciousness of humankind, of man, of woman, and so on? What is guilt? Why does one have this enormous sense of guilt? It may be very, very superficial, or very, very deep, rooted from childhood, and allowed to grow as one gets older. And that feeling of guilt makes one either feel very empty - you know all this.

Empty, a sense of not being able to do anything. And then out of that guilt he builds a wall round himself. And that wall prevents any further communication. Or he is frightened of that guilt: you have told me to do something from childhood, and I can't do it, but I feel I must do it; and if I fail I feel guilty. And the parents play a terrible role in this. Sorry! They encourage this guilt, consciously or unconsciously. So that this guilt becomes part of the ego, part of me.

I think it would be wrong to put the question, what is the relationship between the two. You understand how the question is evolving? It is not two separate things. It is the outcome of feeling guilt, with other factors, that constitute the ego. They are not two separate activities or two separate reactions. So guilt is part of the psyche, part of the ego, part of the me.

Now why does one feel guilt? Apart from people who make you feel guilty, and hold you in that state. Because it's very convenient for them, they like to bully you people, and bring about a sense of guilt, the feeling that you must submit, you must accept, you must obey. Though you revolt against it, you keep it underground and hold on to your guilt. Right? And other factors make up the ego; the 'me'. And guilt makes one feel terribly lonely. Are we talking to each other? A sense of depression and if that guilt is very, very deep and strong, I can't resolve it. Therefore I come to you and say, "Please help me to overcome this guilt." And then you impose, if you are the boss, another reaction of guilt. So it goes on.

I am asking - we are asking, why does this feeling exist at all? It is encouraged, is it not, in religions, orthodox religions. In Christianity there is the original sin and the saviour, and therefore I

must feel guilty, and confession, and the whole circus begins. Forgive me if I use that word. It takes different forms. In the Christian world confession, absolution. And in the Asiatic world it has a different form: they go to temples - you know, all kinds of things they do.

But is it necessary to feel that? Can there be an education in which there is nothing of this? I wonder? Right? We are playing together, please. Is there a kind of bringing up a child in which there is not this encouragement or the feeling of guilt?

Guilt becomes a problem. Right? Then we have to understand what is a problem? You are following all this? Are you interested in all this?

Q: Can I say something?

K: Oui, madame.

Q: There is something I don't understand, and I want to ask you. How can I look at guilt if guilt is not happening in the moment, without looking in my background?

K: We're going to go into it in a minute. Let me finish. We are proceeding something, bring it in a little later. Where was I?

Q: Raising children without guilt.

Q: What is a problem?

K: Ah, yes. (Laughter)

Q: What is memory?

K: Guilt becomes a problem, how to resolve it; how to get over it, and all kinds of things begin with it. Then we make it into a problem. Now what is a problem? Human beings apparently have thousands of problems: political, religious, economic, sexual, relationship, you follow? Life, living becomes a problem, and

generally associated with guilt, part of it. What is a problem?

The meaning of that word etymologically, if I may use a rather long word, means 'something thrown at you'. Like a challenge is thrown at you. And a problem means something hurled at you, thrown at you, which you have to face. And what happens? There are political problems; and so on. And these political problems are never solved. In the very solution of one problem other problems increase, develop. So first let's go into the question, why human beings have problems at all. You understand what I am asking?

You have problems, haven't you? Why do you have problems? And is it possible - we'll go into the question, answer it a little later - is it possible not to have a single problem - sexual, religious, political, economic, relationship, and so on? So let's find out - you are playing the game with me - let's find out why human beings have problems.

From childhood, when a child goes to the school writing becomes a problem to him. Right? Reading, spelling, then mathematics, geography, history, biology, chemistry, science, archaeology, and so on. So from the very beginning he is trained, or conditioned, to have problems. Right? This is obvious. So his brain is conditioned to have problems. Are you playing the game with me? And all his life from the moment he is born practically 'til he dies, the brain continues to live in problems, because he has been educated, cultivated, and the whole system of comparison, examinations, rewards, punishments, and so on. All that has made the brain not only receive problems but have its own problems, it's conditioned that way, therefore it can never solve any problem.

So is it possible from the very beginning not to give the child or

ourselves problems? Which means, can the brain be free from its condition to live with problems? When the brain is free, then it can solve problems, it doesn't matter what they are. I wonder, are we together in this?

Q: Sir, how do you go about...

K: Don't go about. (Laughter)

Q: I'm talking about the organic causes like say, I have cancer, suppose, and I am dying.

K: Wait, sir, you are not dying, you are sitting there. (Laughter) Don't bring in the theories, just look, listen, sir, just listen. You see, we become theoretical immediately. That's not playing the game. You have the ball in front of you, you can't say, well, let's talk about the sun or the moon or death or this or that. Forgive me, sir.

So is it possible to have a brain that has no problems but can answer problems? Because there are problems. Now, is that possible, because as long as you have problems you must have the feeling that you must resolve them and if you can't resolve them, you feel guilty. And so we keep this going. Then others come and help us, and the whole thing beings again in a different form.

And another thing arises out of this question: why do we seek help? Are you trying to seek help from the speaker? Let's be a little honest about it. Are you trying to seek help from him? And he says, sorry, I am not helping you. That's a terrible thing to ask the help of another psychologically, for subjective states. We've asked help for thousands of years: god, the priest, and the cultivation of the priesthood; and then the psychologists, you know, we want leaders. Physically they'll tell you how to live, how to exercise, what to eat; how to comb your hair, and all the rest of that. So why

do we ask for help at all? You understand the question?

Listen to the question, which is: go into the mechanism of guilt, its relation to the ego, and we said don't separate the two, because guilt is part of the ego, part of the 'me'. It's not separate. Therefore it's not something related to. It is in, it is there. So we have understood that, back and forth. Then we said, why do we have problems. Problems exist from childhood, from the child who goes to the school. He is educated to have problems. So his whole life becomes a problem: depression, anxiety, and so on, so on, and I go and ask another. Which means I am asking help from another. And the other is myself. He has problems. He gets depressed, he feels lonely, and he wants to be a guru, but poor chap, he can't.

(Laughter) Right? He's burning with his own importance or with his own knowledge, with his own - all the rest of it. So the other is you. I wonder if you realize this. Therefore what's the good of asking him?

So we discover in the investigation or exploring into the question, and the question is beginning to answer all this. You follow? Not the speaker invented it; it's like a map, unfold it, you look at the whole of the map, not a particular part of the map. But when we look at the map, we want to go to a particular town or road, but we don't take the whole thing in. If you take the whole thing in and then come to the point, that's a different way of looking at it. Right? Are we together in this? Right.

Q: There's another kind of guilt that is due to an injury, an injustice to another person.

K: Ah, yes, of course, of course. Of course. Of course. You hit me, and I can't hit you back, but I feel - you know, all the rest of it,

include all that. Don't take various parts and put them together. The parts don't make the whole. If you see the whole, you can see the parts. Right? And that's the importance of a question. And if you look at the question, not back and forth, add, add, the question itself covers the whole field. Right? Is this clear so far? Can we go to the next question?

Q: Would the root of guilt then be the difference between division, between what actually is and what you would like to be, the proposed ideal?

K: Are you asking, sir, can we look at the fact and not create out of the fact an ideal, an idea?

Q: Yes.

K: Now, just listen to the question. That is, there is the fact, and the ideal, or the ideal separate from the fact. Right? That's what he's asking. There is war, and the ideal is not to have war, peace. Right? The fact is war. Why do you create the ideal out of it? The idea. So the idea is not the fact. So can we remain with the fact, and not have ideals and all theories about the war? You kill me, during the war; you kill me, that's a fact. You are encouraged, patriotism, all the rest of it, you kill me. But there are those people who say, we have ideas about war; which is, you must not kill, you must be sane, you must be rational, you must be kind, you must be generous, but those are all meaningless. Actually you are killing me. So let's remain with the fact and look at the fact, then you can do something about it. Right? Let's move to the next.

2nd QUESTION: Evolution has brought about certain physical differences in racial groups. Are there also parallel psychological differences born into an infant of a particular race, or are they only

acquired conditioning? And if the conditioning is inherited, can it really be changed or left behind?

Have you understood the question? Suppose I was born in China, with yellow skin, slanted eyes; I'm just observing, please, I'm not criticizing. I'm not saying the other is beautiful, the other is not. I'm born in China, with certain peculiar physiological, biological facts. Short, not so pinkish skin, which is fashionable, and slanted eyes and so on. That is a physical fact. The questioner asks: does that physical fact affect the psyche of the Chinese. Right? We are together in this? Are we together? Don't afterwards say, I'm not clear. That is, I'm born in China; I'm a Chinese. And I have certain physical and biological strains: face, limbs, hands, walk, and I can bear a great deal burden, and so on, physical burden. Does that outward biological, physiological fact affect the psyche, the structure of the psyche? Does the racial conditioning affect the psyche? Right? That's the question.

I don't know actually, theoretically, but suppose I am born in India which is, it comes to the same thing, I have a different colour, different - they are much more subtle, much more nervous, much more clever - sorry, excuse me! - much more theoretical, much more analytical. But they don't go beyond that. They are all up here; some of them. And they can argue back and forth, argue the hinds off a donkey. And go on and on and on and on. I have listened. All that capacity, all that intellectual training of three, five thousand years, does that affect the psyche? Does it affect the conditioning? I'm born black in this country, with all the peculiar physical phenomena, and does that outward structure of the organism affect the inner?

And do I inherit the physical, which will affect the psyche? Do you understand? Are we together in this? Is the psyche, the subjective state, is it different from the rest of mankind? You're white, you're tall, you can do certain things, and I born in India with a different biological and physiological conditioning, will that affect the psyche? Don't you suffer? I suffer? Right? Don't you go through various forms of fear? Which I do whether I live in China, here, or black, white, purple, whatever it is. And does the child inherit the biological conditioning? You are following all this?

I hope you listen to the question. Then you can answer the question if you really listen to the question. The questioner says, does the physical conditioning shape the psyche? Does it condition the childhood racially? If you treat me, born in this country as black, you would slightly push me aside, rather condemn me or look down upon me. And I feel inferior, guilty - follow all this - guilty, so you exploit me. This is happening the world over, this is not something only limited to this country. In India there is a great deal of colour prejudice. The more light you are the better you are. They would like to marry a girl or a boy who is light-skinned. You follow? It's the same the world over. It sounds funny, and rather silly, but it's a fact.

And the questioner says, does that racial biological condition affect the child, and that child as it grows up becomes biological exception. You understand? I should think not. This isn't a theory, I've watched this game being played all over the world. That is, those who consider themselves racially superior, because they are light-skinned or whatever it is, then they proceed to condition the other fellows who are not. And then they think it's a racial

inheritance, and feel guilty and all the rest of it. But as one observes these things very closely, without studying, going into books and all that, when one travels, even living in this country, one observes all this. And one sees fundamentally we are the same, psychologically. You suffer, I suffer, the black, the white, all that, we suffer, we have agonies, we feel guilty, we feel anxious, insecure, confused, depressed and all the rest of it. Like you. But we don't recognize that because we are so inhuman. We are alike psychologically.

That means - please listen - that means you are the entire humanity. Because you suffer, you go through agonies, suffer; I do, he does, right? The Chinese, the Russians, and so on. So you are the entire humanity. That's a tremendous realization. Not individual American with all the rest of it. This is not a theory. It's not an ideal, something utopian. It's an actual daily fact. Are we playing the game? It's an actual daily fact.

Q: You're saying the conditioning only goes so deep.

K: Yes, conditioning is only skin deep. If you like to put it that way. Biological conditioning. There are all kinds of other forms of conditioning, which is not related to race, which is the conditioning of the psyche. In its desire to be secure, I'm an American. I feel safe.

Q: That's still not....

K: Please, sir, I can't answer every question. Or British or French, you know the whole thing. And the other question is: can this psychological conditioning or inherited conditioning, in the sense, my parents telling me, look, don't look over - I have been told as a boy when I first came to England, "You're an Indian, don't

look over the hedge." You understand? Planted already guilt.

Fortunately I never played that kind of game.

So is it possible to leave behind or be free of this psychological conditioning? You understand? Obviously if one gives one's attention to it, not analytically but just observes. As you observe in a mirror your face you observe your reactions, without any distortion. And that can only be done in a relationship with another. Relationship then becomes the mirror in which you see yourself exactly as you are. And if you like to keep that image, keep it! If you don't like it, break it! It isn't something tremendously arduous or difficult. You'd like to make it because in our deeper sense we are feeling guilty, we must do this and we must do that, we all must be noble; you follow? Courageous.

So that question, if we don't come to it without any prejudice, approach it without any conclusion, then the question covers a tremendous lot. You understand? Right? Can we go on to the next question? Have I answered this question, my lady, whoever put it? Right. Not answered it; you have resolved it.

3rd QUESTION: It is said that the income from your books does not go to you personally. May one ask how you live, sir?

Are you really interested in this? I'll answer it. It's very simple. Are you really concerned about this question? As it is put then, let's answer it. Let's go into it. Personally, I've no money. I don't want it. I've been offered castles, estates. I've been asked go into the cinemas, they've offered me a great deal of money. I don't like it. I've no money. So what has happened is, to put it very, very, very simply, when I go to India the Foundation there looks after me. For my clothes, laundry, food, doctor, if I am ill, and the travels there. I

travel all over India. And I go to Europe, the European Foundation, that's English Foundation plus France and so on, they support K. And when I come here they do exactly the same thing. It's very simple. Is that answered? Right.

4th QUESTION: Why do you say there is no psychological evolution?

This is really a very serious question. Not as the previous one, but this is a very serious question.

What do we mean by evolution? I'm asking, you can't verbally answer it, because there are too many, but you must answer it.

What do you mean by evolution? The oak tree here, it drops its acorn; out of that grows the tree. Right? That's to evolve, to grow, to multiply. Right? And also we have evolved from the most ancient of times until what we are now. Biologically, organically. Right? This has taken us two or three million years, psychologically, to grow into what we are now. Right? It's obvious. Do we play the game, you are playing the game? It's in your court.

So we have evolved not only biologically but also psychologically, inwardly, subjectively. We can't grow a third arm or a fourth arm. We can't, we have probably biologically reached the limit. But psychologically, subjectively we think we can grow; we can become something: more noble, more courageous, less violent, less brutal, less cruelty, you follow? To us the idea of psychological growth is tremendously important. Otherwise the ego has no meaning.

I don't know if you follow this. I meditate in order to become. I breathe in order to keep the brain quiet. You know. I am becoming all the time. Either in the business world, in the world of

technology, in the world of skill, I am always becoming something better. I'm a better carpenter than I was two years ago, better electrician, better chemist, better this and better that. And I apply the same movement to the psyche. I don't know if you are following all this. That is, I am going to become something, psychologically. You're following this? Is that a fact? No, don't, please, this is very important, because if you really understand this, go into it, our whole life changes. You understand what I'm saying?

Is good the enemy of the better? Do you understand my question? Good; with all its meaning, we'll go into it presently. And I will be better, I'll be good or I am good, but I'll be better tomorrow. Better good. So the better is the enemy of the good. I don't if you are following this. I'll go into this.

So is there psychological evolution? Or what I am today I'll be tomorrow. You understand? We have evolved psychologically five to three thousand years, more, much more. Eight thousand years, ten thousand years. If you've gone into it - I won't go into all the ancient movement of mankind. People who have studied this have told me, therefore I'll only repeat something they have told me. Which you can find out. But I am questioning, we are questioning whether there is the psychic growth at all, becoming better. And if it is that we are through time, million years, 50,000 years, we have become better. We are much more evolved. Is that a fact? Answer it.

Q: I think we...

K: Attendez! If you all talk, madame, it's impossible. You'll ask, he'll ask; but just think, look at it, and then we'll communicate, not

only verbally but non-verbally. Have I as a human being who have lived on this earth, two or three million years ago or 50,000 years ago, or even 8,000 years ago, have I progressed? Evolved? Have you? Psychologically? Aren't you as you were at the beginning? More or less. Less than more, but more or less. Brutal, violent, aggressive, insecure, wanting to kill for your tribe, for your god, for your country, it has existed the same phenomena from the beginning of time. There you clubbed a man or a woman. Then there was the archery. Then there was the simple gun. Now we have evolved to have neutron bombs. Think, tremendous progress! No sir, don't laugh. Look at it carefully. But behind the archer, behind the gun, the man behind the gun and the man who is up at 50,000 feet dropping a neutron bomb, the man is the same. Right? This is a fact. You may put a flag on the moon and he says, it's my country that's represented up there.

No, look at it, sir, carefully consider all this. I am not asking you to believe what I am saying. Look at it. So one asks, is there psychological growth? Or psychological ending? - not growth, becoming something. You understand what I'm saying?

Q: Yes.

K: If I don't end violence today, that violence has existed a million years ago, in the human being, then if I don't leave that violence behind or drop it or radically bring about a mutation, I'll be violent tomorrow. This is a fact. So, is there a progress, development of the psyche as evolution? For me personally there isn't. For me. Don't accept it. I'm playing, I'm returning the ball to you.

So the question then remains, I am what I am at present. Right?

I have been what I have been. I am what I have been. I am all the memories, racial, religious, educational, travelling, all that is the past which is me. Right? My experience, my desire to be a great man, my desire to be important, my desire to be a guru, my desire to be somebody; I am not, but I'm just saying. All that is the past, which is me. If I don't drop all that, I'll be tomorrow exactly the same thing. From this statement arises the question, is that possible? You understand? Is it possible to let go all that? Not through effort, not through determination, desire, that becomes again another achievement. Can all that be dropped? Sir, it's in your court. Don't wait for me to answer it. It's in your court. You are asking that question. Realizing you are the background. You are all that accumulated racial, religious, economic, scientific, political; all that's your conditioning of the psyche. You've been programmed for two thousand years to be Christians. And the others are trained in their own way.

The other day somebody said they saw statue of the Buddha sitting in - you know, you've seen statues of Buddha. And somebody said, "What's the good of that man sitting like that all day long?" It was put by a Christian. Careful, careful, listen to it. There was somebody else beside me said, "What's the point of that man hanging on that cross all day?" No, no, don't laugh, please look at all this.

According to our prejudice, conditioning we act, think, feel. If I'm a Buddhist, if you said that to me, I would be terribly upset. I'll get angry, violent, because I worship that figure. But if I was a Christian and you said, what's the point of that man hanging on that wall - you follow? It shocks you, must shock you. So, can we look

at all this without a single shadow of prejudice. You understand? Single shadow of opinion, conditioning, so that we realize that each person creates the image which he worships.

There was a man we used to know many, many, many years ago. He was walking along the beach, and picked up a branch, a piece of stick that long, and it had the shape of a human form. He brought it home - this is a fact - and put it on the mantelpiece. And one day he put a flower to it. And after several days he began to put a garland round it, worship it, you follow? Human beings create their own images out of their own conditioning.

So, is there psychological evolution at all, or is there only an ending, not becoming? That is, the ending of violence. I'm taking that as an example. Ending violence completely, not tomorrow, now. Understanding the whole implication of violence: aggressiveness, ambition, part of the feeling of guilt and I'm not wanted to be - you follow? This whole concept of growth, psychological growth. Of course the baby grows into an adult and old age and pops off. That's so. That's one irremediable fact, that we're all going to end up in the grave or be incinerated. So one has to look at this question and ask the question of ourselves and find out the truth of it, not just say, yes, I think so or not think so, but carry on day after day.

5th QUESTION: To live peacefully needs great intelligence. Please enlarge on this.

The speaker said at the first talk or previously you need great intelligence to live peacefully. And the question is, go into it, discuss it, have a dialogue about it.

What is intelligence? I'm asking you the question, you must

answer it. Not all of you, but answer it to yourself. What is intelligence? The meaning of that word, Latin and so on, means - the dictionary meaning - to read between the lines. To gather information. To acquire knowledge. To accumulate the experience of others and yourself, from which knowledge. And to gather information that gives you more knowledge. That's generally the meaning of that word in the dictionary. That is the common usage.

You need a great deal of intelligence to go to the moon. Right? Extraordinary kind of intelligence. Thousands of people, literally thousands of people co-operating. Every detail had to be perfect. I was told 3,000 or 300,000, I've forgotten the number who had to co-operate step by step, each one doing the perfect thing. And then they built it, all the rest of it, go to the moon. That requires intelligence. And also to build a computer, that requires intelligence. To programme it requires intelligence. To invent communication, rapid communication between here and New York and Delhi and Moscow, that requires a tremendous kind of intelligence. That intelligence - please listen, we are playing the game - that intelligence is based on knowledge, based on experience, based on skill. Right? Which is the extraordinary intelligence of thought. Right Are we clear on this?

The surgeon who operates, of course he must have very skilful hands, must have a great deal of experience, and tremendous control of his body at that moment, giving complete attention. All that is based on experience, knowledge, memory, skill. And that's called intelligence. Right? We are together? Whether the intelligence of an idiot, or the intelligence of a very great mathematician or biologist and the archaeologist and so on,

scientists, painters. So that's limited intelligence. Isn't it? Are you sure? Don't agree, please, it's in your court, therefore you are in a game with yourself. If you see it, it's so. Because all that kind of intelligence is based on experience, knowledge, memory, thought. And thought is limited, as we went into it the other day. Because thought is based on memory; memory is the outcome of knowledge; knowledge is the outcome of experience. And experience is always limited. There is no complete experience, because there is always the experiencer saying I'm experiencing. I don't know if you are following all this. And therefore as long as there is the experiencer who is the background of memory, you follow, which makes him recognize the experience - I don't know if you are following all this - that experience is limited, therefore all thinking is limited. And out of that limitation there is a certain kind of intelligence. And that intelligence is applied to kill others, to control others, to deny freedom to others, to send them to the camp, concentration camp, which is happening now; not only the abnormal Germans, it's happening now. We don't make a lot of noise about that. We make a tremendous noise about something that happened 40 years ago.

So. We understand this intelligence with which we operate daily, you couldn't drive a car if you haven't intelligence. And that intelligence is based on learning how to drive a car. Which is, you have practice, your parents or a specialist taught you how to drive a car, it had to become automatic, you follow? Experience, knowledge, memory, thought. That is limited. So we are asking, is there an intelligence which is not limited? You understand? Not in opposition to the limited intelligence? I wonder if you understand.

Do you get this? I understand very clearly the limited intelligence; it's obvious. And we live within that narrow limited intelligence. We invent gods out of that intelligence; we invent all the rituals all the paraphernalia of rituals, the medieval dresses of the priests and the hierarchy of priests, all that is connived at, to impress the people, to hold them together in a particular belief, and so on, so on. All that is a form of limited intelligence. This is in your court. And you ask naturally, if you are alert, aware of all this, is there an intelligence which is not limited? You only ask that question when you see, actually observe in yourself and in others, the activity of limited intelligence. Otherwise you can't ask that question. The limited intelligence, which is to kill each other. It's so obvious, so impractical. So... you understand? I can think of nothing more horrible than to kill animals and all the rest of it and human beings, purposely, deliberately organized killing which is not called murder. It is called whatever you like to call it, give it a noble name. But it's still killing. And that's intelligence, part of intelligence, to invent modern machinery. You understand, sir? The material for wars, that requires a great deal of thought, great deal of experiment. Of centuries of killing each other, they have reached this point. Vaporize human beings by the million.

When one realizes this, not intellectually or verbally, in your heart, not romantically, but fact. Then you can ask the other question: Is there an intelligence which is not limited? Find out, sir. You can't have one foot in this and one foot there. You can have one foot there in that intelligence which is not limited and then you can come to the other. But you can't go from the limited to that. I don't know if you are understanding all this. You can meditate, you

can stand on your toes or on your head, do whatever you will, from the limited you can't go to the unlimited. So we are asking, not in opposition to the limited because then if you are asking from the limited to find out the other, you can never find out. So is there an unlimited intelligence?

And to find that out you have to give your life to it, not just one morning sitting here. You have to give your energy, your austerity, your heart, your brain, everything to find that out. And that can exist only when there is love and compassion, nothing else.

6th QUESTION: You have large audiences the world over. What is it that all of us desire?

Will you answer it? What is it, the question is put most respectfully, and humanly, which is humbly, what is it you all want? What is it you're longing for? What is it that makes people go to church, you follow? What is it you all desire?

Can you answer it seriously and honestly? Not one moment I want this, next moment I want that and third moment, third year something else, you know, as is happening in this country. One thing after the other. A new latest guru comes and you all... So what is it, when you sit down quietly as you are doing now, what is it we all want? Is there a common urge, common desire, common longing? Or is it all separate, each person wanting something totally different from another? Probably one has never even put that question to oneself seriously. If you put that question really seriously, what is it? Is it happiness? And is happiness the end of life? Is it security, to be safe? To be completely safe in that freedom which you want. Safe, safety and freedom. Security in a club, in a society, in a group, in a country, in a belief, and be free at

the same time.

Please look at it most seriously, for your own sake look at it. To have better relationship with somebody, to live with husband, wife, or whatever it is, completely without conflict? Is it that you want to be completely free of your conditioning? Or not to be afraid of death? When you look at all this, various forms of our desires, our longings, our escapes and our attachments, what is it out of all that we want? Somebody to lean on? I am getting old, I must have somebody I can lean on. And I live with that person happily, but I can't live with others. Please assure me that person and I will get on well together for the rest of our life. You follow? You are following all this? I have complexes or values, conditioning, I want to get rid of them all. If one looks at it all, learned, even if we are, great intellectuals if we are, and romantics if we are, and so on, scientists, politicians, what is it out of our heart we want? Would one answer cover the whole lot? You understand? If I can find the root of something, of all this, then I can let everything go. You understand? Is it freedom? Not to do what one likes, that's too childish, too immature, too limited. Freedom. That word itself contains love. Is that what you want? Or to have no responsibility at all? Like a soldier who is sent to war, he is perfectly happy because he has no responsibility. Is that what you want? No responsibility whatsoever? That's why, is it, that you take drugs? Or to have more excitement, you want more excitement, more sensation. Sir, put all this together and add more to it. There must be a root to all this. You understand? One question that will answer all questions. Is there such thing?

Is it that you want the increase of self-interest? To stabilize, to

strengthen, to have deep roots in self-interest? I can answer that, but it's in your court. You must return the ball, you can't just say, "Well, I'll hold the ball for a while." You're playing the game. What is it that will answer all these questions? Would not all these questions be answered when you have absolute unconditional psychological freedom? And freedom means love, not anything else. Love is not desire, pleasure, sensation, attachment. And where there is love, there's compassion and that unlimited intelligence. When it's there, you've answered everything. I don't know if you understand this. Then there'll be no war, no conflict. In relationship there'll be no conflict when there is love; not the image of each other, fighting each other. You understand my question? Is that the answer? Is that the root of all our desires, wants, longings, prayers, worship?

The question is answered, sir.

OJAI 2ND QUESTION & ANSWERS MEETING 16TH MAY 1985

K: I wonder what you would like to talk about.

Q: Jesus.

K: Just a minute, sir, just a minute. I've just begun, sir. I'd like to know, if I may, if one may, what you would like to talk about. There're lots of questions, many questions which can't possibly be answered. Only some can be answered and here they are typed out, which I have not seen. But before we begin to ask these questions I wonder what you would like to talk about? Not all of you at once, because that would be impossible. Yes, wait, sir, just a minute.

Q: What conditions are necessary in order to understand what you're talking about?

K: What conditions are necessary to understand what K is talking about. Is that it?

Q: In order to understand completely.

Q: In order to grasp what you're saying.

K: Oh, yes. In order to grasp what you are talking about, what is necessary? Is that what you want to talk about? You are one, sir, what is it you would all like to talk about?

Q: What shall we teach our children?

Q: Please talk more on what you said on Tuesday - freedom means love. You could talk a great deal about that.

K: What you talked about on Tuesday, about love, could you go into that. Right?

Q: Yes, freedom, you said, means love.

K: Now look, there are so many of us. The first question was:

what is necessary, what kind of brain one must have to understand what you are talking about, to grasp. It's not what the speaker is talking about, but to grasp your own understanding of yourself. Scrap or put aside what K is talking about and let us see what is necessary to understand, to go into oneself. Is that it? Would you like to talk about that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Apart from the questions.

What are the barriers that prevent us from understanding our own selves, not only at the conscious level, at the level of daily activities, but also go much deeper into oneself? Is that what you all want to talk about? If one asks that question of oneself, what prevents me or you from understanding, delving into oneself very, very deeply, what is the thing that's lacking? What do you think? Don't all say at once. What does each one of us say, answer or respond when we put that question to ourselves? I am occupied all day with business, travelling here and there; if I am an artist I am concerned with painting, writing poems, literature; and if I am a politician I am greatly concerned about politics, my place in it and my self-interest, my ambition and then the concern about people afterwards. So what is it that is lacking? Energy, intellectual capacity? We're just going to investigate it together. Intellectual capacity? Or we are too emotional? Or we have got so many romantic illusory concepts, images about others and about ourselves that prevents us from grasping the whole of one's being. Is it I'm too occupied - with my children, my wife, my job, my amusement, my place in society and so on? This perpetual occupation, constant chattering of one's own problems and one's

own against or for the environment; or fundamentalists. I don't know if you have noticed this fact, that fundamentalism is spreading extraordinarily in this country. And also it's spreading in Iran and Iraq, Lebanon, and also it's gradually seeping into India. All this is taking a great deal of our time. And therefore is it that we haven't the energy or the urge at the end of the day or the beginning of the day, that we are not sufficiently recollected, deeply concerned. We are concerned about money, sex, position, and so on, so on. That is, we occupy ourselves a great deal with superficial things. Does that deprive us of energy to dig deeply? I'm just asking these questions. Or, I'm really not interested in all this. I like to catch a little bit here and there; go to various gurus and various tricksters; theoreticians and theologians, and the experts in religion. And catch little bit of all this and they make a good table conversation. Is this what we are occupied with most of the day? Or do you set aside - we are not advocating anything, we are just talking about it - or you set aside some time in the morning or afternoon or in the evening and little bit attempt to be serious. Or we take each part of life as a separate part and deal with those parts. I can go on. Or can you look at this whole structure of ourselves as a whole, not as fragmented beings? Is that possible?

That is, you are not, if one may point out, you are not understanding K. You are understanding or using K as a mirror to understand yourself. And the mirror is not important. That's the first thing to realize. The mirror, the person is not important. What he is saying may reflect what you are. May. It may be contrary, but you are beginning to look at yourselves, doubting, questioning, asking.

So, how do you approach this question? Because the approach matters much more than the fact. Are we together in this? The approach, whether it be a scientific problem or an artistic problem or a humanitarian problem, or social, political and so on, or religious, how do you approach it, come near it? Because how you come to it is of great importance. Not what the question is, or the problem is. Because if I approach it with a preconceived ideological image, that image intervenes between the approach and the thing to be approached. Are we in this together? Little bit? So can one approach an issue, a challenge, a problem, however trivial, however deep, without all the connivance, without all the previous conclusions, prejudices, and come to it afresh? Can we do that or is it impossible? Because one has been trained or educated from childhood to be a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and all the rest of it. And one revolts against all that, if one is at all intelligent and active, say, what nonsense all that is. But that makes one's life very shallow, also. So then you try to fill that shallowness with all kinds of amusement, drugs, and entertainment, sex, and all the rest of it. So how does one approach the question?

Please ask this question of yourself. If you are a businessman, you approach it very cautiously, seeing what the reward is, what the punishment is, punishment and reward. If the reward is great you go on. If it is not great you slightly hesitate, you talk about it and gradually learn, avoiding something which is not profitable. In the same way we look at life from the point of reward and punishment. Right? If I do this I can reach heaven, or nirvana or whatever is, enlightenment and so on. So there is always this background of gaining and losing. Right? Can one put aside all that

and look at the problem, approach the problem freely?

There was a question asked just now: would you go into the question of what you talked about on Tuesday. It was about love and all the complexity of it. Right? Why to you want me to talk about it? Why is it we can't ourself go into it very cautiously, not assuming anything, be terribly honest and see what it all means? Is that impossible? You see, unfortunately, one of our difficulties is we read so much. We have been told so much: by philosophers, by experts, by specialists, by those who have travelled all over the world and gathered information, met with various saints and crooks and gurus and whole lot of them. And they say, yes, I met all these people, I know. And we are so gullible and so eager. We take on their coloring. Do we do this? All the newspapers, magazines, that's what they're doing to us. Every evening commercials. You follow? Look at all this. And we are being bombarded by all this so that gradually our brains narrow down, because this obvious bombardment. It's like constantly being shocked.

So would you consider whether it is possible to put aside all this and look at it all anew, afresh, as though you were seeing things for the first time. Could we do this? Or it's only given to the few - which is nonsense. Though people pretend, "Yes, I can do it but I'll tell you all about it." That's silly. I wouldn't accept such a thing. Why has our brain become so petty? You understand the word petty, narrow, limited, deeply rooted in self-interest.

Sir, these are questions that can be put. But the answer or the discovery or the root of all this one has to dig oneself or go into it. It's no good talking to each other all day long, or even for an hour. It's good to listen to each other. And how you listen also matters

tremendously. Whether you actually listen in the sense that you are listening without any determination, without any direction, bringing your own reaction, just to listen. As a child listens to an excellent, exciting story, he's full of eagerness, curiosity to find out. Could we do that? Not only listen to the words and so on but also listen to all our thoughts, all our feelings and watch the images that we are building constantly.

Can we go back to the questions? As we said, there are several questions here. Eight of them. Can we listen to the question first without any reaction, without saying, yes, I understand already? Just capture the question. It's like planting a seed in the ground in a healthy well enriched soil, planting a seed. If the seed has vitality, energy, the intrinsic value of its own, then you don't have to do anything, you water it occasionally, look after it and it will grow. So the question is the seed. I wonder if you understand? And let the question move. Let the question develop, enlarge, and see whether there is anything in the question at all or it's just a weed. Some weeds are nice looking, and worthwhile, but some weeds are utterly useless, destructive. So we're going to find out - sorry to make all these remarks - we're going to find out the worth of the question. The question may be put superficially or with great intent. And the question is not put by somebody else but the question is being put to each one of us.

(1st) Questioner: What is the difference between that shyness you have talked about and fear?

K: We talked about the other day fear. Fear is identified with the ego, with the 'me', with the whole structure of my psyche, it's part of my psyche, part of me. And fear also breeds guilt, various

types of greed. And all this makes one rather nervous, one has temerity, shyness, a sense of withdrawing, and yet wanting to express oneself. So there is a contradiction in oneself. And that contradiction breeds further guilt and we carry on this way.

Now, what is the root of this? You understand my question? The fear, guilt, and being rather timid, and not wanting to hurt others. But yet the very words you say may hurt others. If a Hindu says, it's all, what you're talking about, religious nonsense, you get hurt. And you hurt him. So this goes on. Is it possible to live daily life without fear, first? That is important, not all the branches of it: guilt, timidity, and the feeling of wanting to resist, wanting to hit back. All that is rooted in the sensation of fear.

Would you agree to that? Do we see that? Not because I am describing, not because the speaker is unfolding it. You see it if you watch it quietly, the activities of fear, how it creates barriers, not only in our relationship but also in our attitudes to the whole of humanity, and so on.

So we are asking first, is it possible to live without fear? Not say, I must be courageous. You can be courageous by taking some kind of drug. We know a friend who is producing rum. And he's supplying rum to the army. And he says, well, it's a very profitable business because soldiers going to the front are very, very nervous and this gives them a certain sense of courage, and various other reasons. So if we could really delve deeply into this question; together, not I explain and you accept, that's no meaning.

As we talked about it the other day, time and thought are the two major factors in manufacturing, if I can use that word, fear. We went into the question of time. Shall we go into it again? Yes?

You're rather silent. I'm not forcing you.

Audience: Yes.

K: This is rather a complex question and therefore must be approached very simply. All of us live within the radius or within the diameter, within the time process. All of us live in the time process. That is, I have done something, I will do that again today, change it, modify it, and I will do it again tomorrow, but modified. And if you watch yourself very carefully, all the memories are the result of experience, knowledge, contained within the brain - perhaps not the whole of the brain; the major part of the brain. Please, the speaker is not an expert in brain neurology and all the rest of it, he's just watched it. Watched. And by watching it tells you, you learn a lot. Not only from books, the speaker doesn't read books, fortunately. He reads other kinds, thrillers and so on. Don't bother about that.

So, time, which is evolution in one sense, time as survival, time as something to be gained, something to be achieved, an ideal to be pursued or a theology, a conclusion, an ideology to be held strongly, and see that ideology is carried out. And the same thing applies to the theologians. They have certain theories about god, and work that out. All this takes time. Right? And also time is necessary, to say, I am this today, I was this yesterday also, but I need time to change it. The word 'change' implies time. I don't know if you are following all this. Right? Are you interested in all this? All right. I'll talk for the talking's sake - not for talking's sake, I am interested in it myself tremendously.

In the cycle of time we are caught. Whether it's the greatest scientist or the greatest religious person, so-called religious; or the

ordinary laymen like us, we are caught in this. Right? There is not only time according to sunrise and sunset, and the time by the watch. You need time to go to your rendezvous. You need time to learn a language, a skill, and so on, to acquire more knowledge. All this requires time. And man has asked, is there an end to time? He has asked this. You will find it in various literature; Shakespeare - I've been told: "Time must have a stop." And also Eastern philosophers, Eastern saints and Eastern people have thought about it. They have enquired into it. And they have invented various forms of ending the time, various methods. That is - you are interested in all this?

That is, is there an ending to knowledge which is time? I wonder if you capture this? I need time to acquire knowledge. Right? I don't know how to fly, but I will learn. I don't know how to be a good master carpenter, but I'll learn about it, work at it. Which is acquiring knowledge about a skill, whether flying, science, whatever it is. And they asked, is there an end to knowledge? Or must it always go on and on and on and on? The boredom of it! You understand?

So you are asking that question. That is, is time by which we live, we do, act, think, feel - and when one watches it, one gets rather tired of it all, bored. And also in acquiring this skill one becomes lonely. And out of the loneliness you act, you do various kinds of activities. And you become neurotic and psychopathic and all the rest of it. So this goes on. So one asks very carefully, what is the past, which is time? Humanity has lived on this earth, according to the archaeologists, scientists, and so on, for over two to three million years, or recently, 50,000 years. Right? We have

evolved. And during that long period of time our brain has gathered infinite information and has battled with each other, killed each other. Right? Gone through various horrors: barbarism, cruelty, extraordinary brutality, holocausts. Not only in the recent holocaust, Germany, but there was Attila, Genghis Khan, Napoleon, Caesar, and that butchering of man is going on now.

So at the end of this long period what are we now? You understand my question? What are you? Are we still barbarians, savages? Highly cultured savages, sophisticated savages, fighting each other, aggressive, brutal, killing. Sir, that's what's going on. Have you ever noticed not one - I mustn't be too emphatic about this - not one priest, the hierarchy of the Catholic church, not any of them have said, stop wars, don't kill any more. Right? Not one of them. If they insisted on it, the church would collapse, because people love to kill each other. No? Yes, sir. They want to hurt each other, they are cruel to each other. So all this has come about, and it's still with us during the long period of evolution which is time. Right? I wonder if you are capturing all this.

And so one asks, is there an end to all this, which is ending of time? And time is also psychologically becoming something, which is far more important. Which means I have certain ideals, certain concepts, theories, visions, and it'll take time to achieve it. Which is, I'll become that. Which is again reward and punishment, the same thing in different words.

So all that which is involved in time, can it end? Sir, ask, put your guts into this, sorry to use that word. Put your whole heart to find out. That is, I have been for centuries this, in the past. And those centuries are now. Right? Centuries, all those experiences, all

that is now, is in me, in you. And tomorrow is modified by recent challenges: economic, social, war, and so on; the past is modified and goes on into the future. Right? This is a fact. So one says, the future is now. I wonder if you see this. Right, sirs? Do see this really; not verbally, see the truth of it. The future is now because if I have been that for centuries, millions of years, and if I don't fundamentally bring about a mutation now I'll be the same modified tomorrow. So tomorrow is now. I wonder if you see this.

So what then is the position of a brain, or the state of a brain that doesn't look to tomorrow - "I will change." "I will become that." - because all that is now if there is no total psychological revolution. The Communists are frightened of revolution because they are stuck in their ideology and they won't change. And they will go on that way 'til there is another physical revolution. So we are doing exactly the same thing in a milder form. So the past modifying itself through today continues as tomorrow. This is a fact. So tomorrow is now. And if there is no deep revolution in the psyche, tomorrow will be the same. So is it possible to radically end? I have been greedy, violent, acquisitive, possessive; that's enough. And can all that end now, instantly? Sir, ask this question. Either you treat the whole thing as an idea, or a fact. That is, you hear this and translate what you hear into idea, a concept, a Utopia, something to be achieved. Then you are back in the whole cycle. But can you look at the fact and remain with the fact? That is, sir, how do you observe a fact? Observe, not analyze. How do you observe a fact? There is the oak tree there. How do you look at it? Do, please, look at that oak tree and find out how you observe it. Not only visually, optically, and the nervous responses, all that, but

what is the process of observation? Are you interested in all this?
No, don't be eager, sir, don't say "Yes" too quickly.

Q: Yes.

K: It's easy to observe impartially without any prejudice the tree. Yes, you say, it's an oak tree. Or the mountains and the rivers and the valleys and the meadows and the groves. That's fairly simple. But can you observe your wife, your friend, your antagonist without any direction, without any bias? To be aware without choice, right? Can you do it? It becomes so extraordinarily interesting to find out if you can do it. Right? We are still talking about the first question. It's nearly quarter past twelve. Sir, to put it very briefly, we must go on.

Can you watch as you watch in a mirror your face, when you are doing your hair, combing, shaving and so on, can you watch yourself in a mirror so that psychologically you see everything in minute detail, what you are? You understand my question? Is there a psychological mirror as there is a physical mirror? A good mirror doesn't distort. It shows you exactly what you look like, if you are interested in what you look like. So is there a mirror which doesn't distort a thing, psychologically? You see the whole psyche as you move, as you look, you can observe the details of your face, the eyebrows, the eyes, the nose, the shape of the nose, the depth of the nose, the ear, and all that. You know most people do this, especially the ladies. So you keep looking. We are asking, is there such a mirror inwardly? So that you see exactly! Minute details, the latest wrinkles. Can you see that way? There is such a mirror. The mirror is your relationship. Right? The relationship between you and another, between you and your wife, or your husband,

your children, relationship. Either that relationship is very, very superficial, merely sensation or sexual - even there you begin to see very clearly, if you see the mirror. Or it's very intimate, very close, very observable in that relationship that relationship is the mirror. It will never distort. But when there is in that relationship sensation and possession, domination, merely sensation and so on, then the mirror distorts. Right? So to observe very carefully the minutest activity in that mirror, and as you observe it the mirror tells you the whole story. And then you can put aside the mirror; because the mirror is not important. Relationship then becomes extraordinarily important.

2nd QUESTION: The whole world of nature is a competition to survive. Is it not innate in humans to struggle for the same reason? And are we not struggling against our basic nature in seeking to change?

Don't change. It's very simple. If you want to remain as you are, carry on, nobody is going to prevent you. Religions have tried to civilize man. But they haven't succeeded. On the contrary. Some religions, like Christianity, have killed more people than anybody on earth. Right? I don't know if you have watched this. They have had two appalling wars, and they have killed millions. Not only Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung, these wars have destroyed. Right? And if we carry on this way, not wanting to change, it's all right. But the question is: nature struggles to achieve light, like in a forest, for example. And it is a struggle. Right? The big, the stronger kills the weaker in nature. The tiger kills the deer, the lion kills some other thing, this goes on, this is part of nature. And the questioner says, if it is part of nature, why should we change at all? Because it's

intrinsic. Why do we say it's intrinsic? Why do we say, there it's all right, and therefore it's all right with us too; and so why bother to change. It's part of us, part of nature, part of our existence, intrinsically this is what we are. And if that is so, that it is instinct, that it's innate in us, which one questions very deeply, then I can't change anything. But why should we accept that it's innate in us? Is it my indolence that says, "For God's sake, leave it all alone." Is it my sense of exhaustion? Or we are supposed to be as human beings a little more intelligent, little more reasonable, little more sane, and we are supposed to use our sanity, our intelligence, our experience to live differently? Right? To live differently. Perhaps that difference may be total; and not just remain as a mediocre person - which is now being encouraged for human beings to remain mediocre, through their education and all the rest of it. I won't go into it.

So is it mediocrity that is fighting us, that we hold on to, and say, "We are slowly moving, it's all right." Slowly moving towards the precipice. Or if you begin to question the whole process of our existence, using common sense, logic, reason, awareness - one questions intuition, that's rather doubtful because it may be one's wish fulfillment, calling it instinct or intuition, but one has to use logic in all this, not just say, "Well, it's innate." Let's go to the next question.

3rd QUESTION: Why is it that mankind universally has sought what is called God? Is it only out of fear and a need for security? Or is there some essential religious instinct in all human beings?

What do you think? What is your response to that question? Is it fear? Is it the desire for security. Is it the desire to be ultimately

rewarded? Is it desire for comfort? Is it we are so discontented with everything about us, that we want something to reach, to gain? And the religions have said god has made man; put it in different words. Obviously it must be an extraordinarily strange god. And has man made god? You understand? If god has made us, something has gone wrong. (Laughter) No, please, sir, this is very serious, it's laughable when you look at it and tragic. We have killed - no, I won't go - you know all that. So what is it that's making man, human beings create something called that word? If you haven't that word, you create something else.

So the question is not whether there's god or not, but why do human beings live with illusions? Illusions, images, symbols - why? If you look at yourself, you've got lots of images: image about yourself, first; then the image about your wife and your children, if you are a parent; or you have images about the politicians, religious people, you follow? We accumulate images which are illusions. If I create an image about my wife, which we do - am I coming too near, too near the bone? If I create an image about my wife, that image has been built through 50 years or 10 days or 1 day, what takes place in our relationship? The image becomes far more important than the fact. Right? So I impose this image on my wife or husband or whatever it is; on the politician. And this image then becomes a far greater potential than the wife, the actuality. Right, sirs? You people are married, you know all the game of it; the quarrels. You follow? Which means this image intervenes all the time. So this image or images separates us. She is fulfilling her ambition, her position in society: the tremendous women's activity, and the men's activity. So these images and the

fulfillment of those images are separating us, the man and the woman. This is all common sense!

And the brain then says, why should I create these images? What is the *raison d'etre* for this? None at all, if you go into it. The wife is what she is and I, the man, am what I am. And from there you start, you can do something. You can break the image and say, all right, let's face things as they are. You're possessive and I don't want to be possessive. Right? You like being possessed, man or woman, and I, sorry, don't cling to me, for god's sake. And so we begin to quarrel because I have an image about myself. You follow? He says I don't want to be clung to - not by her, but by somebody else! This all goes on. So can we live - that's the real question, not believe in god or not - the real question is this: can one live without a single illusion? That's real freedom, you understand? That means you are facing facts all the time. Not try to change the facts, that takes place when you just watch the fact.

4th QUESTION: What is the primary basic obstacle that prevents observation and insight?

We talked about observation just now. So we won't go into it again, because it becomes tiresome. What is insight? People have talked about it, to have an insight into things. That is, having a perception into not only images, illusions, but in facts. How do you have an insight into things? How do you have an insight - let's take for example, I'm taking that as an example - that all religious organization is merely the activity of convenience, fear. Right? All that, all religious organizations, whether it's Christianity or Hinduism, you understand? Insight, which means what? If I cling to Hinduism I shan't have an insight into Hinduism. Right? So I

must be free of my conditioning to have insight. Insight implies not having the continuity of memory, which is the past and all the rest of it, but the ending of it, seeing something new. If I have been programmed as a Catholic, Hindu, whatever it is, Democrat or Republican or Presbyterian, god knows what else, if I have been conditioned and that conditioning is always active, I cannot have an insight. I may have the capacity to invent. Naturally invention is based on knowledge, creation is not. Oh, I won't go into it, that's a totally different subject. Creation is continuous, it's not just creation and the end. We'll talk about it Saturday, Sunday, if we have time.

So to have an insight into things, there must be freedom from memory, that's the conditioning. The brain that is programmed, as we are, cannot have insight. It may have slight, partial insights, which the scientists have; it's partial. Because then the invention brings about other results, harmful, beneficial, and all the rest of it, you follow, all that takes place. But total insight is to be free of conditioning of the brain and that freedom, total freedom gives you a complete holistic insight.

5th QUESTION: What is the responsibility to ourselves and to others?

I don't quite understand the question. We have to look at the question. Responsibility, what do you mean, responsibility? The word responsibility, which means respond, it comes from that word respond. 'Respond' means it's retrospective. Right? Look at it carefully, I don't know, I'm just investigating the word. I have a responsibility towards my wife. That's what we say. We are looking at the word responsibility. I respond to her in a certain

way, and I don't respond to others in the same way. Right? I respond according to my background, of what I have learned about her, and she responds with what she has learned about me. In that response which is retrospective, that is looking back, because she's my wife, I've learned about her, that learning is memory. So the word 'responsibility' implies memory, recognition, the recognition is part of memory, you follow; all that. So responsibility towards her and the responsibility in our relation sexually and so on, sensation produces the baby and together we are responsibility for the baby. We are responsible for its education - superficial education, right? School, college, university if you have the money, or halfway. And so up to a certain age we are responsible for them. Afterwards they can go. And in old age they throw me out, send me to Florida or some place, or old age homes. You know what is happening in this country. The tragedy of it all, you don't see it. And in India there is no Social Security, I was told yesterday, it's the most populated country in the world, India is. It's the size, one-third the size of America, of this country, and population is growing every year at the rate of 15 million a year. There are over 800 million people there. There, as there is no Social Security, they must have children, especially men, boys, because when they grow old, as we all do, the son will look after them. That's the idea of having three or four children, not just one child. You understand? Please, understand the tragedy of all this. And as the boy grows older, gets a job, this has been one of their burdens, to look after their parents, educate their brother, sister. You understand, sir? When they can't, I have known several boys and girls who have committed suicide because they can't manage it

any more. They feel so responsible for their parents.

So the word 'responsibility' is very complex. You understand? And are we responsible to ourselves? That's the question. What is responsibility to ourselves and to others. Are we responsible to ourselves? What does that mean? Who is ourselves? You understand, sir? Who is ourselves, who is me? Who is I? Am I responsible to myself, which means - you understand the division? I wonder if you see that? There is a person who is responsible to myself. As I am responsible to my wife, there is somebody inside me or outside me who is responsible to me. It sounds rather silly, doesn't it? Or is there such a person who is responsible? God? Brezhnev? The glorified father in... you follow? You see how our brain works. When we say, am I responsible, responsibility to myself, which means I have divided myself into some entity who is responsible to me. Therefore I am responsible to that entity. Which I have separated carefully, which is myself. I don't know if you have gone into it. That is, the thinker is the thought. Without thought there is no thinker. Right? But we have divided the thinker and the thought: I must control that thought. That's a bad thought. And I must think rightly. Which means I am different from thought. So the thinker is the thought, there is no separation. The observer psychologically is the observed. There is no experience without the experiencer. Right? The experiencer is the experience.

So then what is the responsibility to others? Right? What is my responsibility to you? And what is your responsibility to me? Here is an audience, what is your responsibility to me? And what am I responsible to you? Sir, look at it. I'm just looking at it for the first time. And all this comes out because I really want to go into this

question of responsibility. I want to see, am I responsible to you? And you are responsible to me? And if I say I'm not responsible to you, then I'm isolating myself. Right? And if you say to me, we are not responsible to you, then you put me aside. I wonder if you see this.

Responsibility implies division, basically. Right? I am responsible to her, and she is responsible to me, I am responsible to you, and you are responsible to me. That means I have separated myself from my wife, and I've separated myself from you, and you have separated from me. And so I don't understand you, and we don't understand you. We said the same thing, which is, I am the Arab, you are the Israeli. Or if you don't like the Israelis, I am the Israeli, you are the Arabs. I am the Muslim and you are the Hindu. If you don't like it, I am the Muslim and you are the Hindu. So we battle with each other. It's my country, I'm going to protect it; it's your country, and we go to war for each other. It's your ideology and I'm going to be responsible to that ideology and you're going to be responsible to the other ideology. Right? This is what is happening in the world, calling it responsibility, specially the elite. You understand? The elite say, we are responsible for the people. Having reached that elitism, the high, and they say, we're responsible. It's all such rot to me, to me personally because we are one human being. You go through all kinds of travail, so does the other human being, psychologically. They have shed tears in India, and they have shed tears in Europe, and you've shed tears here. Right? Tears are common to all of us, like laughter. You have destroyed the whole Red Indian culture here, wiped them out. That's your holocaust. Yes, sir, face it. And this has been going on

from the beginning of time. And responsibility implies duty. Duty, I must do this. Duty to my country. Duty to my ideal. Sir, look at all this.

So, is it possible to live without division? Is it possible to live with my wife, if I have a wife, without any sense of division between her and me? Not common ambition. You understand? If it's common ambition, then it's again a division. If it is each one of us is fulfilling ourselves, again a division. I wonder if you see all this.

So is it possible to live without any nationality? The speaker has both a diplomatic and Indian passport. The Government of India gave me that, I don't know why but they gave it to me. And it's a bore having certain forms of paper, crossing the countries. And that doesn't make one an Indian, paper. You understand? So is it possible to live without a single nationality? Without being identified with any country? Because it's our earth, not your earth and my earth. Is it possible to live without any identification with any religion? Think it out, sirs, don't just agree or disagree. Or identified with any group, any organization, any institution - which doesn't mean you are withdrawing from the world, isolating yourself. On the contrary, because then you are the entire humanity. Not just the idea of it, but the feeling of it, the religious feeling of it, that you are the entire humanity. I am my brother's keeper. Not that it means I am going to interfere with the poor chap, tell him what to do.

So sirs, this is the last question and answer meeting. There are several questions left here, I can't go through them now. If one may ask, what have you received from all this? I am asking this most

respectfully and humbly, it's not aggressively put, this question.

What does one, after listening to some facts, not ideas and theories and opinions and judgments, what has one captured, received - not help - seen for oneself? Right, sirs, that's all.

OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 18TH MAY 1985

It's a beautiful morning, isn't it? And I hope you are enjoying yourself. We have this morning's conversation between you and the speaker and also tomorrow morning. We have to go into various subjects or various problems. We're going to talk over together the whole question of pleasure, sorrow, death, and what is it that human beings throughout the world have sought beyond the physical daily troublesome, boring, lonely life, what is there beyond, not only for the individual, but the whole of humanity? What is there that is not touched by thought, that has no name, that may be eternal, that is lasting, enduring?

So we are going to talk over all these matters, including meditation, perhaps yoga too. Everybody seems to be terribly interested in yoga. They want to keep young and beautiful. Shall we begin with that? I thought you would be interested in it. (Laughter) Yoga has now become a business affair like everything else. There are teachers of yoga all over the world, and they are coining money, as usual. And, yoga at one time, I've been told by those who know about this a great deal, it was only taught to the very, very, very few. Yoga doesn't mean merely to keep your body healthy, normal, active, intelligent. But also it meant, the meaning of that word in Sanskrit means 'join together.' Joining the higher and the lower. I don't know who joins it, but that's the tradition. And also there are various forms of yoga. But the highest form is called raja yoga, which is the king of yogas. There that system, or that way of living was concerned not merely with the physical well-being, but also much more strict psychologically. There was no

discipline, no system, nothing to be repeated day after day. But to have a brain that is in order, that is all the time active but not chattering, but active, that activity - the speaker is interpreting all this. Probably they wouldn't tell you all this. The speaker has talked to various scholars, pundits, real yoga teachers. There are very few of them now.

So to have a very deep, orderly moral ethical life, not just merely take various postures but to lead a very moral, ethical, disciplined life, that was the real meaning of the highest form of yoga. Thereby you kept the body healthy. Body was not first, of primary importance. What was of primary importance was to have a brain, a mind, a well-being, that is clear, active, not in the sense of movement, but in itself active, alive, full of vitality. But now it has become rather shallow, profitable and becoming mediocre. The speaker was taught - oh, many years ago - something that could not be taught to another. Let's leave it at that, shall we? Is that enough talk about yoga? Or you want me to tell you what I was taught? (Laughter) I'm sorry, I can't tell you. (Laughter) It's not to be taught to the casual. It is something that you do, perhaps every day, as the speaker does for an hour, to have perfect control of your body. So that you are watchful - I won't use the word 'control,' but to watch your body, not make any movement, any gesture, which is not observed. There is no unnecessary movement of the body. But it's not controlled. That's where the difference is. May we drop this subject and go on to something else? I know you are reluctant, because you think, perhaps you may consider yoga to be something to be practiced day after day, to develop your muscles, have a muscular body. It's not that at all. It is something you live all day

long. Something you watch, observe, be clear about.

We were talking about the other day, the other Saturday and Sunday, the question of guilt, being psychologically hurt, wounded, and the various forms of relationship. Not only with human beings, with each other, but also our relationship to nature, to all the beauty of the world, to the mountains, to the meadows, to the groves, and the hills and the shadows, the lakes and the rivers. To have a relationship. We talked a little bit about that relationship too. Where there is an image made by thought between you and the mountain, all the fields and the flowers, as one makes an image about one's wife or husband and so on, that image prevents one from having complete relationship with another.

And our relationship with each other now, between you and the speaker, that relationship is very important to understand. He is not persuading you to any point of view. He is not putting any kind of pressure, so that you listen, accept or deny. He has no authority. He is not a guru. He has an abomination of all this idea of leadership psychologically or spiritually, if I can use that word. It's an abhorrence to him. And he really means it. It's not something to be taken lightly, that the speaker pretends. That's why one has to be extremely honest in all this.

And we talked about the activity of time. We went into it fairly clearly. And also the movement of thought. What is thinking. We talked about that too. Do you want the speaker to repeat it again? Please tell me. If it's not clear the speaker has got a great deal of patience about it. Perhaps I won't even use the word 'patience.' So we talked about all that, had a conversation between you and the speaker. Therefore that conversation is carried on mutually. It isn't

one-sided conversation. And also we said the world is made up of bullies - the religious bullies, the newspapers, the politician, the guru, the priests, the bullies in the family. And those bullies make us feel guilty, they attack first and then you have to defend. That's the game that has been going on in our relationship with each other and so on. So that brings about this feeling of guilt. We talked a great deal about it.

And also we talked last Sunday about fear. Why human beings who have evolved through these many, many, many millennia, live with this terrible burden called fear. That fear is a sensation. And sensation takes many forms - the sensation of drugs, alcohol and so on, the sensation of sexuality, the sensation of achieving something - climbing the ladders, either mundane ladder or the so-called spiritual ladder.

We talked also what is the relationship between time and thought. Or are they one? And we went into that and also what is the root of fear? And we have many, many fears, which destroy not only the human capacity, distort the brain; distort or curtail or limit both biological and psychological activity. What's the root of it, root of fear? We went into it. We said the root of fear is time and thought.

One can listen to all this casually or seriously, listen to each other's conversation. But the words are not the thing. Fear is not the word. Or the word may create the fear. You understand? The word may create the fear or there is fear by itself. Right? Please understand. The word is the picture, the idea. But the fact of fear is quite different.

So one has to be clear that the word is not inducing, cultivating

fear, and then overcoming that fear, which means overcoming the word but not the fact. You are following all this? And we said one has to face this fact. And how one faces this fact is all-important, not the fact, but how you approach it, how you come to it. If one has conclusions, concepts, how to get over fear, how to suppress it, or how to transcend it, or go to somebody who will help you to overcome that fear, then that fear will continue in different forms. It may be one day you are frightened of something, the next day another. And out of this fear we have done terrible things to mankind. We have done terrible things to each other. Out of this fear of not wanting security, or having security, we have destroyed human beings by the million. The last war and the previous war showed it. Where there is fear there is god.

And all the comfort that one derives out of illusion. But when there is psychological security and therefore biologically, not the other way around - it's not physical security first and then the psychological security after. The socialists, the communists, the radicals, so-called radicals, have tried to establish order outside. As the communists are trying to do, the totalitarians. And they're not succeeding. They are only suppressing. But if one starts to understand this whole psychological structure of every human being, of oneself, then one begins to understand the nature of fear. And it can be ended if we understand the nature of time, thought, which we went into.

And we ought to talk over together this morning, as it's such a beautiful morning, what is beauty. Are you interested in this? What is beauty? The speaker is putting you that question, and you must reply. Not all of you, that's impossible, or even one. What would be

your reply, if one may ask respectfully, what is your response to that question? What is beauty? Is it in the mountains? In the shadows? In the dappled light under these trees? Is it a sheet of water still in the moonlight? Or the stars of a clear evening? Or the beautiful face - well-proportioned, having that weight and beauty inward? Or does it lie in the museums, the pictures, the statues? There is a marvellous statue in the Louvre in Paris. The statue of the Victory of Samothrace. It's a marvellous statue. And is that beauty? Someone should ask this question. Not the beauty in a magazine, is that beauty? A beautiful woman, carefully made up, etc., etc. Is that beauty?

So one should ask this question of ourselves. Because man, woman, are seeking this thing all the time. That's why museums become important because in ourselves we are so ugly. Not sinful, that's a wrong word to use. We are so broken up, fragmented, we can never see something whole, holistic way of living. And we think beauty is out there, in the pictures, in a lovely poem of Keats, or in marvellously written literature. So what is beauty? Are you waiting for the speaker to explain? Or, have you ever asked of yourself? Or, are you seeking for the experts to tell you? Can we go into it together? Not that the speaker wants to convince you, show you, tell you anything! That's very important to understand. He has not authority. He is not a public figure. He hates all that ugly reputation, success, becoming somebody. Then you can threaten that somebody. You understand? But it's not like that. We are two human beings, talking over together our whole complex problem of existence. So what is beauty? Is beauty love? Is beauty pleasure? Is beauty something that gives you an elan, a sensation?

Ah, you say, how marvellous, how beautiful that picture is. So what is beauty? May we go into it together? Together.

When you see those hills behind there and the blue sky and the line of those mountains against the sky, and see some of the shadows on the sunburned grass and the shady trees, when you look at it, not verbalize it immediately but when you look at it, or see a great mountain full of snow, high peaks, and a sky that has never been polluted - when you see this majesty of a mountain, what takes place? Does the majesty of that mountain, the enormous solidity of it, the greatness of it, what happens at that second you see that mountain or that hill and those shadows or these dappled light under these trees? For a second, the greatness of the mountain drives away all our pettiness, all our worries and problems and all the travail of life, for that second. Then you become silent and look. Right?

Take a boy, - small boy or a girl, they have been running about all day long, shouting and, you know, being a little bit naughty, which is nice. But parents don't like them to be that way. What happens to their naughtiness when you give them a lovely toy, complicated toy? Their whole energy is concentrated in that toy. They are not naughty. Until they break that toy. (Laughter) Then the whole begins again. That is, the toy - please listen to this, together we are talking - that toy absorbs the child. The toy becomes all-important. He loves it, he holds it, he kisses it, you follow? You have seen teddy bears worn out. And all that naughtiness has gone because the toy has absorbed the naughtiness, the toy becomes important. Right? You know this if you are mothers and fathers. And the toy is the television, unfortunately.

So the mountain absorbs us for the second. That's our toy. And we forget ourselves. Right? This is actuality. If you see a marvellous statue; not only Grecian statues, but the ancient Egyptian ones. Their extraordinary sense of earth, fullness, richness, stability, dignity. For a second, for a moment their dignity, their immensity drives our pettiness away.

So we are absorbed by the toys. The grownups too. It's maybe their business, their chicanery in politics. So all these things absorb us. And if there is nothing to absorb you, then you get depressed, try to escape from it, do all kinds of things to run away from what we are.

So is not beauty something that takes place when you are not? You understand? When you with all your problems, with your anxieties, insecurity, whether you are loved or not loved; when you with all these psychological complexities are not, then that state is beauty.

And this is one of the problems of meditation: to cultivate, practise, day after day, to see that you are not. And who is the entity that is practising? You understand? It's the same old toy. Only you call it meditation. So where you or K are not, there is beauty. As we said, beauty is not pleasure, it's not sensation.

So we ought to talk over together pleasure because for us pleasure is an extraordinarily important thing. The pleasure of a sunset; the pleasure of seeing somebody whom you like enjoying himself. So we ought to talk over together the whole concept of pleasure. Because that's what we want, if you are honest. And that's our difficulty, we are never seriously honest to ourselves. But we think to be so terribly honest to oneself may lead to further trouble,

not only for yourself but your husband, wife, and all the rest of it. So to understand the nature of fear, guilt, relationship, and all the movement of our daily life one has to look at it very closely, not control it, shape it, and say, this must go that way or that way. But to look at it first, without fear, without being depressed or feeling that you must do something about it.

So we are going together to enquire what is pleasure. To possess a beautiful car! Or have lovely 12th century furniture; to polish it, to look at it, to evaluate. There is a furniture in England, in a particular room, it's about 16th, 15th century. And one has paid a great deal of money for it. And it gives you, watching it, great pleasure. Then you identify yourself with that furniture. Then you become the furniture, because whatever you identify yourself with, you are that. It may be an image, it may be a piece of furniture, it may be a man, woman, or it may be some idea, some conclusion, some ideology. And all the identification with something greater or something which is convenient, satisfying, doesn't give you too much discomfort, that brings us a great deal of pleasure.

And pleasure goes with fear. I don't know if you have watched it. It's the other side of the coin. But we don't want to look at the other side. But we say to ourselves, pleasure is the most important thing, either through drugs, which is now becoming more and more in this country - opium, cocaine, alcohol. You know all that, what is happening in the world, especially in this country, which breeds certain irresponsibility, gives you for the moment certain elan, energy, quietens the brain probably and dulls the brain, and ultimately destroys human beings. You have seen all this on television. If you haven't seen all this, you know of somebody and

so on. We start with pleasure, and end up in ruination. And pleasure of possessing something, the woman or the man; pleasure of power - you understand - over somebody, maybe over your, if have domestic help, over that person, or your wife or husband or something or other, we want power. Right? Let's be quite honest about all this. We admire power, we extol power, we idolize power. Right? Whether it is spiritual power of the religious hierarchy, or the power of a politician, power of money. To the speaker power is evil. That's why followers are... who want power through knowledge, through enlightenment, you know all that rot they talk about. Not that there is not enlightenment, but rot, the stupidity, nonsense that they talk about. That gives them power.

Which is, if we may go on with it, our education, televisions, our environment, ambience, all that is making us mediocre. We have read too much of what other people say. The word 'mediocre' means 'going up the hill halfway and never reaching the top.' Not success, success is utter mediocrity. Sorry to talk emphatically about all these matters. If you don't want to listen, it's all right too. You are not entertaining the speaker, or he is entertaining you. These are all terribly serious matters. And we give power to others because we ourselves lack power, position, status, therefore we hand it over to somebody else. And then we worship that, adore it, or idolize it. And we have lived that way for millennia.

So power, identification, having security, money, and feeling that money will give you freedom, which is not freedom at all. You can choose, in freedom you can choose what you want or what you like; is that freedom? I do not know - one does not know if you have gone into this question of freedom, what does freedom mean?

Not in heaven. Do you remember that joke - may I repeat a joke? (Laughter) Two men are in heaven with wings and halo, all that. One says to the other, "If I am dead, why do I feel so awful?" (Laughter) Have you got it? So all forms of pleasure are part of our life. It has become more and more sensational - it is becoming noisy, vulgar, mediocre. And so we go on with our pleasures, and in its wake comes fear. So unless one understands this activity of sensation, fear and pleasure will go on.

What is sensation? If one may go into it now. The actual meaning of that word is, 'the activity of the senses.' Right? Either that activity of the senses is partial, which it always is, or all the senses are fully awakened. You understand? When it is partial, it's limited. Right? You want more and more and more and more. And 'the more' means that the past sensation has not been sufficient. You want some more of it, go to different schools of thought, go from one sect to another. You've seen all this in this country, and elsewhere. So is there a holistic activity for all the senses - you understand my question? You understand? I am asking you a question. Our sensations are limited. And you take drugs and all the rest of it to have higher sensation. It is still limited because you are asking for more. When you ask for 'the more' there is always 'the little', therefore it's partial. Right? Simple. So we are asking, is there a holistic awareness of all the senses, therefore there is never asking for 'the more'.

I wonder if you follow all this? Are we together in this, even partially? And where there is this total, fully aware of all the senses, awareness of it - not you are aware of it, the awareness of the senses in themselves - then there is no centre in which there is

an awareness of the wholeness. You understand? When you look at those hills, can you look at it not with only visual eyes, optic nerves operating, but with all the senses, with all your energy, with all your attention? Then there is no 'me' at all. Then when there is no 'me' there is no asking for more, or trying to become better.

Then we ought also to talk over together what is sorrow. You understand? All these are related to each other: guilt, the psychological wounds, which most people have. And what are the consequences of those psychological wounds, the vanity of one's own cultivated intelligence, which gets hurt, and the images that one has built about one's self, that gets hurt, nothing else. We went into all that. And we talked about relationship. We talked about fear, pleasure. They are all interrelated, they are not something to be taken bit by bit or separated and say, "This is my problem", and stick to that. If you say, "I can solve that, I don't mind the rest", but the rest remains there. So can one see this whole movement, not just one movement?

So we want to talk about sorrow. This is an immense subject. It brings tears to one's eyes. Not the words; the word 'sorrow' has been in the minds of men and women from the beginning of time. This feeling of sorrow, and sorrow has never ended. If one travels, especially in the Asiatic world or in Africa, this immense poverty, immense. And you shed tears or do some social reform, or give them food, or give them clothes and all the rest of it. But there is still sorrow there. And there is the sorrow of someone whom you have lost. You have their picture on the mantelpiece, or the piano or hung on the wall; and you remember it, look at it, shed tears, and all the memories connected with that picture. One sustains,

nourishes, continues loyally with that picture. That picture is not the person. That picture is not the memories. But we cling to those memories, and that brings us more and more sorrow. And the sorrow of those people who have very little in their life, not only money, few sticks of furniture, but also ignorance, not the ignorance of something great, but the ignorance of their daily life, of their having nothing inside them - not that the rich people have either, they have it in the bank account, but nothing inside. Look at all this.

And there is the immense sorrow of mankind which is war. Thousands, millions have been killed, and if you have seen it in Europe, thousands of crosses all in straight line. How many women, men, parents have cried, not only in this country, every community, every country, every state. Have we realized that historically there have been wars every year? Tribal wars, national wars, ideological wars, religious wars. In the Middle Ages they tortured people, burnt them, they were heretics. You know all this, if you have listened, if you have looked.

And from the beginning of man or woman the sorrow has continued, in different forms: poverty of sorrow, poverty of ignorance, poverty of not being able to fulfil your desires, poverty of achievement - there's more to be achieved.

And all this has brought immense sorrow, not only personal sorrow, but also the sorrow of humanity. In Cambodia, what is happening there. What's happening in Russia. In the totalitarian states. We read about it, we never shed a tear! We are indifferent to all this because we are so consumed by our own sorrow, our own loneliness, our own inadequacy. So we are going to ask ourselves,

is there an end to sorrow, ending, not what happens after sorrow?
After the ending. Is there an end to our personal sorrow, with all
the implications of it: ugly face - I won't call them ugly, it's a face
you don't like? You know the whole business of all this. And one
asks, if one is at all serious, involved, committed to find out, is
there an end to sorrow? And if there is an end, what is there?

Because we always want a reward. Something - if I end this, I must
have that. We never end anything by itself, for itself per se. So can
this sorrow end? Which means, can there be sorrow with love?

Let's go into it. I love my son. If I have a son or daughter, I love
them. And they become every kind of human being: drugs, you
know the whole process of it. And I cry. And I call that sorrow.
What is the relationship of sorrow to love? You understand my
question? I am asking you, please find out. We know what sorrow
is: great pain, grief, loneliness; sense of isolation. My sorrow is
entirely different from yours. In the very feeling of it I've become
isolated. We know, not only verbally but in the depth, the feeling,
inward feeling in our very being we know what the meaning of that
word is. And what is the relationship of sorrow to love? Then we
have to ask, what is love? You are asking this question, not the
speaker. What is love? When one asks that question, does one
come to it positively, in the sense, 'love is this', give it certain
definition, verbal definition, or inward definition, and stick to it?
Love of god, love of books, love of trees, love of a dozen things.
So what is love? Have you ever asked this question? If you have, is
it sensation - sexual, reading a lovely poem, looking at these
marvellous old trees. Is love pleasure?

Please, we must be terribly honest to ourselves, otherwise

there's no fun in this. Humour is necessary, to be able to laugh, to find a good joke, to be able to laugh together, not when you are by yourself, but together. And we are asking ourselves, what is love? Is love desire? Is love thought? Is love something that you hold, possess? Is love that which you worship? You understand, worship - the statue, the image, the symbol. Is that love? The symbol, the statue, the picture, is put together by thought. Your prayers you put together by thought. Is that love? Please, go into it for yourself. And when one realizes all that is not love - your pleasures, sensations, having a good cigar, good meal, well-clothed, with good taste. So is pleasure, desire - of course fear is not, obviously, love. Have you ever looked at hate? If you hate, you dispel fear. Yes, sir. If you really hate somebody there's no fear. Right? I hope you don't.

So can we through negation of what is not love, negate completely in oneself, totally put aside entirely all that which is not love? Then that perfume is there. And that perfume can never go once you have put aside completely those things which are not love. Then love, which goes with compassion, has its own intelligence. It's not the intelligence of thought, not the intelligence of the scientific mind, brain. When one has that love, that compassion, there is no grief, no pain, no sorrow. But to come to that - or not you, you can't come to it, sorry - it's there when you negate everything that is not. Not the beauty of an architect, which has put stones together. If you have seen those cathedrals, the temples and the mosques, they're all put together by thought and pleasure, or devotion, worship. Is all that love? If there is love, then you will never kill another. Never! You'll never kill another animal

for your food. Of course, please, go on eating meat if you want to, I'm not telling you.

So it's an immense thing to come upon it. Nobody can give it to another. Nothing can give it to you. But if you, in your being you put aside all that which is not, all that which has thought put together: the rituals, all that thing that goes on, the special dresses. When you with all your problems are totally empty, then the other thing is, which is the most positive thing, most practical thing. The most impractical thing in life is to build armaments, to kill people. Isn't it? That's what you are spending your tax money on. So I'm not a politician, so don't listen to all this. But see what we are all doing. And what we are doing is the society which we have created. That society is not different from us. We may reform the society, lots of us are doing it, the socialists, the capitalists, especially the Communists tried to organize outside.

So love has nothing to do with any organization, or with any person. Like the cool breeze from the ocean, this breeze, you can shut it out or live with it. When you live with it, it's totally a different dimension. There is no path to it. There is no path to truth, either yours or mine. No path whatsoever: Christian, Hindu, sectarian. So one has to live it. You can only come to it when you have understood the whole nature, psychological nature and structure of yourself.

We ought to talk over sometime, tomorrow perhaps - it's now twenty to one, yes, it's twenty to one - do you want to talk over together death, or wait 'til tomorrow. This is not an invitation for you to come to tomorrow. Whether you come, don't come, it's totally indifferent to the speaker. That's a very, very complex

problem, death. Death is not a sensation. Do you want the speaker, together, to go into all this now?

Audience: Yes.

K: Are you quite sure?

Please - we are asking this because this is a very, very serious matter. All that we have talked about is very, very serious. We have time to go into it. You understand? We went through all this very detailed, we can go into these things during six talks and all the rest of it, any number of talks, any number of conversations. But to talk about death, it's not a morbid subject. It's not something to be avoided. Something at the end of one's life. I think we'd better wait 'til tomorrow. Because, just a minute, sir, just a minute, listen to what the speaker has to say.

If you have lived the thing that we have been talking about - you follow? - you must come to all this delicately, gently, quietly, not out of curiosity. You must come to it hesitantly, delicately, in a sense with great dignity, with inward respect. And like birth it's a tremendous thing. And to talk about death also implies creation - not invention. Scientists are inventing, because invention is born from knowledge. Creation is continuous. It has no beginning and no end, it's not born out of knowledge. And death may be the meaning of creation. Not having next life a better opportunity, a better house, better refrigerator. It may be a sense of tremendous creation, endlessly, without beginning and end. And to talk about it - you understand - after an hour and twenty minutes, after an hour and ten minutes or five minutes, doesn't matter, it requires your attention, care, a sense of delicate approach to it.

So may we, most humbly I am asking you, respectfully, can we

go talk it about it tomorrow morning, when we'll have probably more energy?

J. KRISHANMURTI OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH MAY 1985

One hopes that you haven't come out of curiosity. In spite of the articles that have appeared in magazines and newspapers, they're just words. Don't be enticed by those words. If one may suggest. Don't please be impressed by the reputation, by the age, by all that has been written and talked about. Because we are talking over together, not that the speaker is important. The personality has no value at all in this world. But what we are going to talk over together has importance. And as the world is in such a state, we ought to be serious. We ought to be quite earnest about what we think; why we think; what our prejudices are; why we belong to a particular sect or group; why have we certain ideologies; why do we pursue what merely pleases us, what we like and dislike, what appeals to us, what is attractive to us.

If we could this morning at least, for an hour or so, if we could put aside all that, which is quite arduous, because we only function in the particular routine, according to our opinions, judgments, evaluations. Which may be right or wrong, but we never question them. We never question our beliefs, our ideals, our faith, why we have all this. One thinks it's important especially not to be persuaded by the speaker, not to be impressed. This is not a gathering which will stimulate you, excite you, intellectually, emotionally, or ideologically. For the speaker, it's very important to look at all this travail and sorrow of mankind. If we are here together, to be very honest to ourselves, there is no self-deception, no coming to any definite conclusion, but investigating, moving,

going further. Then we can talk over things together. Not merely listen to the speaker, collect a few ideas, or agree or disagree, but we could this morning put aside agreement and disagreement altogether from our life, at least even for this morning.

Then we can converse together like two friends, walking along a nice wooded path, talking over their problems, not persuading each other, because they are friends, they have known each other for some time. Either those friends are casual, or real friends. If they are real friends in the deepest sense of that word, then there is no barrier between them. They can talk about their intimate problems. Their crises - not only the economic, social, and religious or political, but the crisis in their consciousness, crisis in their lives. And to talk over these things, they must be free. And freedom is very important. Not the freedom to do what you like, which is what we're all doing. Because each one wants to express himself, fulfil himself, be somebody; you know all that self-interest that's going on in the world - whether in the name of god, in the name of church, in the name of politics, and so on.

So we should enquire this morning, amongst other things, because we're going to discuss, as we have during the last three talks and questions and answer meeting, we have discussed various aspects of our life - the conflict, our daily conflict with each other, and daily conflict in oneself, and the terrible things that are happening in the world. They are really terrible, appalling. If you have been in some of these countries, you come directly into contact with all this. Not read through newspapers and magazines and political speeches. The world is in a really grave crisis. We seem to be indifferent to it. And man has been appallingly cruel to

other men. Which is war, concentration camps, which are still going on, holocaust, not only during the last war, but this torturing human beings, confining them to concentration camps, killing them for ideologies by the million - not just six million of a particular group of people. China, Russia has killed millions. We are indifferent to all this.

And as human beings we have evolved millennia upon millennia, we are still what we are, what we have been - slightly sophisticated, slightly good-mannered, slightly better-fed, clothed, all the outside medieval dresses of the priests. But inwardly we are what we have been, rather brutal, cruel, self-interest. We are talking this over together. The speaker is not telling anything new. We'll go into what is new and what is creation a little later. But these are obvious facts. That millions are starving, poverty is on the increase, overpopulated earth. You ought to go and see some of all this. Then you will not merely be concerned with your own personal interests. And man, human beings, have always sought freedom. That's been one of their racial, religious, economic and social searches, that they should be free. And that freedom has been abused in the democratic world. Which is, that we are all separate individuals to do exactly what we want to do. Nobody must hinder, nobody must restrain us. That's what we all want to do. And that's what is happening the world over, except in the totalitarian world they are subjugated by the elite, told what to do, what to think, what to paint; what kind of literature, what kind of music, and so on. We are just pointing out all this, we're not taking sides. If one understands all this, not merely verbally, but understands within one's heart and depth of one's being, then we

will act. Observing and acting are the same. They are not two separate activities.

So we talked during the last three talks about conflict, psychological wounds with their consequences, guilt. Probably every human being goes through it, or holds in something that has to be held. We've talked about fear. And yesterday morning we talked about together sorrow and the ending of sorrow, and what is love, compassion - which has nothing whatsoever to do with kindness, with pity, with prayers, devotion. All that has nothing whatever to do with love or compassion which has its own intelligence. We were talking about it together yesterday morning.

And this morning we ought to talk over together, please bear that in mind all the time if you will, that we are talking over together. The speaker is not telling you what to think, but what is thinking, not what to think - the right thought, wrong thought, noble thought, ignoble thought, the ideological thought, dialectical thought: all that is still thinking. Put it any framework, in any cadre, it is still thinking. Whether it be the thinking of the right or the extreme left or the extreme right or the extreme centre it is still thinking.

Thinking has brought about enormous good to man. Thinking has produced great technology. Thinking has produced medicine, surgery. Thinking also has produced terrible wars, brutal, appalling cruelties. So what we are talking about is what is thinking, not how to think, or thinking together. When we understand the nature of thinking, not merely verbally or intellectually, but understand the quality of thinking, the source of thinking, really when we grasp it then we can go much further. But merely to remain in the realm of

thinking, clever lawyers, shady lawyers, they all think. Whether it is the hermit, whether it is the monk, whether you are related to your wife and the recognition, all that is the movement of thought. Either we think together and therefore form a clique, or belonging together to some ideological state, thinking together to become Catholic, Protestant, and all the divisions of Christianity. I don't know if you have noticed in this little village there must be dozen churches. Oh, I don't know the number, one has never counted them. But it's still thinking.

And as we went into that question, what is thinking? We won't go into it now. If you are interested in it, you can read or think about it, but it's fairly simple, not complicated. That is, all our thinking is based on memory. All our thinking is based on knowledge. Whatever that knowledge be, whether it is great knowledge, accumulated knowledge, or the knowledge of a human being who is totally ignorant, doesn't know how to read or write, living in a little hamlet, poverty-ridden shack, he's still thinking.

So thinking is based on experience, and experience is always limited, therefore knowledge is always limited, now or in the future or in the past. And our memories are also limited, because they're all based on knowledge and experience. So thinking is always, always in the future or in the present or in the past. It's limited. Where there is limitation there must be conflict. If I - if one is thinking about oneself all the time, as most people do - how they look, how they walk, how they behave, what kind of religion they belong to, what is their faith, what is their - and so on. You know, thinking endlessly about themselves or about their ideas and so on. So thinking has divided mankind - Americans, Russians, Asiatics,

Indians, Far East, Near East, Jew, Arab, and so on. So wherever there is limited thought - and thought is always limited - there must be conflict, either physical conflict or intellectual conflict or ideological conflict or conflict between man and woman - which is going on now.

So we must ask at the end of the day, observing all this, what is freedom? Can there be ever complete, unbroken freedom? The word 'freedom' means also not only to act freely, to think freely, but also that word contains originally love. Freedom also means compassion. And we have made that freedom, which is a most extraordinary thing, so absolutely necessary for human beings, into a very, very small affair. That is each one wants to do exactly what he wants, or what he thinks he should have. And that limits the immense freedom implied in that word. Freedom is not from something: from my complex or from my prejudice, all that's rather childish. Forgive me for using that word. Freedom implies the end of total, not only attachment, that's again an attribute of one's ego, the absence of the 'me', the absence totally of self-interest. Let's think, talk it over together.

And we are going to talk over together this morning, as we did the previous day, why do we live in disorder? Because we're going to talk over together death. As we said yesterday morning, we are going to talk about it. It's not a morbid subject. It's not something to be avoided. It's not something that concerns old people. It concerns you from the moment you're born 'til you die. It is the inevitable lot of all of us. That's one certainty. There may be no other certainty, no other finality. But death is facing each one of us. We are going to talk about it presently. But to understand that, the

immense significance of it, not the fear of it, or how to get over, how to meet death pleasantly - books are being written about it. Lovely idea, isn't it? How to be happy to die. So we are going to talk about it.

But before we do we ought to find out for ourselves, because it may be related, please quietly listen to it. We are talking over together amicably, not persuading you in any direction nor giving you comfort, nor saying, yes, there is something beyond death. Those games have been played by every religion, by every guru, by every crook. (Laughter) Please don't laugh, this is much too serious - not we shouldn't have humour, it's good to laugh, but laughter may be the means of avoiding facing facts. So one has to be aware of that. Not that we shouldn't have humour, laugh with all your being at a good joke. The speaker has collected a lot of jokes - not vulgar jokes, but good jokes.

So we must first consider, as we have in the past, we must go into it a little more, why is it human beings, whatever race, colour, group and so on, why do they live in disorder? What is the reason, what is the cause, the root of disorder? We are asking each other this question. Don't please wait for me, for the speaker to answer the question, because you are responsible for the question. And you are responsible to find out why we accept disorder. Throughout the world politically, religiously, economically and socially there is such vast disorder in the world. War is the ultimate disorder. So what is the root of disorder? Have we ever questioned it? Or are you merely out of disorder, living in disorder, trying to find order? You understand what I am asking? A disordered brain cannot find order. Right? It seems so normal, sane. If I am confused, uncertain,

caught in the boredom of life and boredom of doing things over and over again; whether it be sexual act, whether it be ideological - you see our brains have become so mechanical because we have been computerized by the specialists. Sorry there are some specialists here. We have been computerized, I mean programmed by the religions to believe this and not to believe that.

So - I am asking, we are asking each other - is the cause of disorder in ourselves, in our brain, is the cause, one of the causes - we're going to look at it, not say this is the one cause or there are many causes. We have to find out the real cause of it, not the multiple causes or causations. What is that? Why we live in disorder, which we have to face. If you don't want to face it, don't face it, it doesn't matter. But if we are honest, if you want to find out the causation of disorder, we have to enquire - not be prejudiced, not blame somebody for the disorder, or the society in which we live. The society in which we live, we have made it - grandfathers, great, great, great, great grandfathers. And we are making the society through our greed, through our ambition, through our aggression, through our self-interest and so on, so on. This is the society which we have created - the religious differences, national differences, and so on. Because our brains are fragmented, you understand, it's not whole, active completely. It's broken up inwardly, through desire, through pleasure, through aggression and violence and so on. It's never holistic. Is that one of the causes of disorder? Are you following this? Because our brains have been so conditioned, have been so programmed, which is the right word, like a computer. And so it thinks along a particular line, acts according to its faith, to its experience. You follow? Is that the

cause of our disorder? I mean, we are examining it. We are observing, questioning, not analyzing.

May we go into that a little bit? We said not self-analysis or analyzed by the experts. Analysis implies to analyze, break it up. And who is it that is analyzing? You understand my question? I am asking you, who is it that is analyzing not only the political, religious and so on, but self-analysis, self-delusion, and say I must not be deluded, I must be honest. So we are asking, saying, it is not analysis because the analyzer who says I will analyze is the analyzed. There is no difference. Please listen to this. There is no difference between the analyzed and the analyzer. They are the same. See the common sense, the rationality of it. But we have separated the analyzer and the analyzed, or rather the thing to be analyzed. Right? So there is conflict between the analyzer and the thing to be analyzed. But if they are one, as they are, then the whole problem becomes quite different. There is no thinker apart from thinking. Right? The thought makes the thinker. But the thinker says to himself, I am separate from thought, therefore I can control thought. You understand? If you once understand really, conflict has a different meaning altogether. So we are not analyzing. There is only observation, not the entity who observes. Right? There is only observing things as they are. But the moment we say I must look very carefully, am I looking rightly, is this right, is this wrong, you are analyzing, separating the observer from the observed. Of course you're not the tree. I hope not. But when you observe these oaks, observe them without using the word I like, dislike, it's nice, it's not nice, all the rest of it. Therefore there is only observation. And that very clear observation without

any bias, prejudices, that very observation is accurate. Go into it. So we are observing, observing our disorder in our daily life - the boredom of it, the tiredness, the mechanical part of it, and so on.

So is disorder caused by this division in oneself? You understand? I must be good, I am violent, but one day I'll be free from violence. I'm greedy but cruel, but one day I'll be... That is the entity who says I am different from the quality, then he has to come into conflict with the quality. But the quality is you. You understand this? If you really understand this in depth, then you eliminate conflict altogether, which is the cause of disorder. I wonder if you understand this? Look, I am not different from my quality, from my greed. But I have said, it has been my conditioning, greed is something outside or inside which I must control. Or I yield to greed. But the actual fact is greed is me. I am not different from greed. Vous avez compris, I mean, you have understood this?

So this division, psychological division in each one of us may be one of the major causes of disorder. Sir, you understand this? I wish you would. It's not an intellectual feat. It's not something that you say, well, I'll cultivate it. Just see it as a fact. That as long as there is division psychologically in me, I am different from my quality, I am different from my word, I am different from my image, I am different from violence, that difference brings about conflict and conflict may be the root of disorder. Right? And when there is no separation, as the actor and the thing acting, but they are the same and one, inseparable, then if that is real, true, honest, accurate, then conflict ceases and a totally different movement takes place.

So one of the causes of disorder is the separation between nationalities, religions, you follow? The Hindus, the Buddhists, the Christians, you know all that division that goes on in this world. And without this when there is the cessation of disorder then order is natural, it's not something cultivated, it's not something that you repeat day after day, day after day. It comes naturally, easily, freely. And bearing this in mind, that conflict is the essence of disorder: between man and woman, between God and man (if there is God), between the good and the bad. Be careful please; there is a division. The good is not rooted in the bad. The good has no roots in the bad. You understand this? Good is not the opposite of the bad. If the good has a relationship with the bad, the good is still limited by the bad. Right? You understand this? Go on sirs, move. The opposite, that is violence and its opposite is non-violence. If the good is born out of the understanding of non-violence then it's not the good. Good has no relationship with the bad. This is the actual fact.

So let's talk about death. Because there is still to talk about, after death, what is religion? What is it that man from time beyond time, what is it man sought apart from physical comfort, physical pain, psychological anxiety and so on, he said there must be something beyond all this ugly brutality and vulgarity. There must be something that is not put together by thought. There must be something that is immense, nameless. Right? We're going to find out. We're going to observe and learn about it, together. So there are many, many things to be covered this morning and one hopes that you will have the patience, the energy, the vitality to attend to all this.

Death is something that is common to all of us. So in talking over together about this subject, which is of extraordinary significance, death is not a sensation. You understand? It's not something to be cried over, something to be remembered, avoided, something that you put on the mantelpiece and worship. It is an immense act. So we are going to talk over together that. Man has always been frightened of death. That's a fact. Why? What does death mean? Not what lies beyond death - we'll go into that presently. It is something extraordinary to die. Not something to be avoided, you're going to, you can't avoid it. One may die when one is very young, through some disease, through some accident, through the parents' fault, over drinking, smoking, you know the whole business of this ugly society. And there is death for old age - through accident, disease, senility and so on. So together we are going to enquire into it. Together. Please bear this in mind all the time. We are going to give your energy to find out the significance, the depth of that extraordinary event.

There's two things implied in it, basically. A continuity, and the ending of a continuity. You understand? We have lived 40, 50, 90, 120, whatever the length of time it be. And during that long interval from birth to death we have acquired so many things. Not only physical things: cars, houses, if you're lucky, a field about half an acre. And you've acquired knowledge, experience. You have collected lots of memories. Right? Lots of experience. You have collected, gathered both outwardly and psychological. You don't want to be deprived of what you have collected. What you have remembered, what you have suffered. So we want and we have a long continuity, racial inheritance, collective limited experiences.

We are gathering like squirrels. Right? And to what we have gathered we are attached, tremendously. And that is a continuity. It may be a ten-day continuity or hundred years' continuity, the continuity of tradition, the continuity of identification with a race, with a group, with a family. You understand? This desire, this urge to continue, not only in myself but the inherited collection. If I die there is my son to continue. He inherits what I have collected physically. And also psychologically.

So there is this long, centuries and centuries upon centuries of collecting and continuity. Right? Death comes along, which is, the organism withers. Either we have used it sanely, rationally, healthily, or misused it through various drugs, you know all that's happening. So, the organism inevitably comes to an end. The ending is death. Right? So we must consider what does it mean to end. You understand? Continuity and the ending. We are together? We are talking over together? This is a conversation between you and the speaker.

So there is this continuity which you cling to, and there is the ending of that continuity. We have understood, I hope, what it means to continue. And so we said, I will die, but the next life there is something, I will live next life. Right? There'll be next life. That's the whole Asiatic, Pythagorean and some western people, ancient people, are saying there must be. And the whole of the East more or less believes in rebirth because they want to continue. They have never asked - some have asked - the ancient people, what is it that continues? Is there a continuity at all? Are you asking all this? No, you are not. I'm asking you. Is there continuity at all? And if there is no continuity what is it all about? Why

should I collect any more? So I won't collect. Then they become hermits, the Indian monks, and you know all that. I won't collect, only I'll collect one idea: which is my god, my saviour, my gurus, you follow? One thing I've collected, and so I cling to that.

So we know what it means to have a continuity. So we have to enquire into what does it mean to end? End, voluntarily, not through age old, disease and some kind of awful pain - you follow? All that. What does it mean to end anything? Right? Therefore one asks, is continuity creation or invention? Are you following all this? Can continuity ever be creative? Or where there is continuity as knowledge there is invention. Right? That is, invention is based on knowledge. Right? Scientific invention, mechanical inventions and so on. Because there is previous knowledge. Which is, following the same line of invention - gathering more knowledge, inventing more, that's what is happening technologically.

So is creation not just the baby, creation, is it related to ending? You understand? So we're going to find out. Please, I'm talking, you're not joining in this. Don't get too tired, please. So what is ending? Can I end - please listen - habit? Can I end habit tomorrow? Or today? Enquire into it, voluntarily, not through desire, through a direction because somebody says end it, then you'll get a reward and all that immature stuff. But find out for ourselves what it means to end something, easily, happily, without any effort. That means ending not only certain physical habits but the habits that the brain has cultivated to live safely. You understand? End it. That's what it means to die, doesn't it? Because we are a vast accumulation of memories. We are a bundle of memories. Right? I wonder if you see this. Not, I am spiritual and

God and all that stuff - that's still memory. The Indians have their own explanation. Separate atman - I won't go into all that.

So death means the ending. Right? You may not accept it, you may not like it, but that's a fact. You can't take everything with you. You might like to keep it until the last moment - if you've a bank account, and have everything comfortable, you might like to keep it until the last second. We used to know a man who had collected a lot of money, he was immensely rich. And he was dying. And he kept a lot of it in his cupboard. Literally, I happened to be there. He told his son to open the cupboard, to look at all the diamonds, gold and bank account, notes. And he was looking at it happily, and he was dying. (Laughter) And he never realized he was dying, because the money mattered enormously - not that which is contained in that cupboard. So is there an ending to one's deep memories? To one's attachment? Ah, let's take that up.

Is there an ending to your attachment? What is attachment? Why are we attached to something or other - to property, money, to wife, to husband, to some foolish conclusion, to some ideological concept? Why are we so attached? Enquire into it. Let's talk it over together. And the consequences of attachment.

If I'm attached to you, if the speaker is attached to you as an audience, think what his state of brain must be. He's frightened he may not have an audience. He becomes nervous and almost apoplectic. And he is attached to exploit people, to have a reputation. You understand? So the consequences of attachment, if you observe it very closely, whether it be a wife, husband, a boy or a girl or an idea, or a picture, or to a memory, to an experience, the consequences are that it breeds fear of losing. Right? And out of

that fear there is jealousy. You are following all this? How jealous we are. Of those in power - you follow? All the jealousy. From jealousy there is hatred. Of course, jealousy is hatred. And when you are attached there is always this suspicion, secrecy. Haven't you noticed all this? I don't have to tell you. It's so common in the world. And can you, if you are attached to something or some idea, some person, can you end it now? That is death. Which means, can you live with death all the day long? Ah, think of it sir, go into it. You will see the greatness of it, the immensity of it. That is, not commit suicide, we are not talking of that silly stuff, but to live with that, ending all sense of attachment, all sense of fear. Which means having a brain that is acting but never having direction, purpose, all the rest of it. Acting. That is to live with death every second, never collecting, never gathering, never giving anything a continuity. Sirs, you don't know, if you do it you will see what it means. That is real freedom. And from that freedom there is love. Love is not attachment. Love is not pleasure, desire, fulfilment.

And we ought to talk over together what is religion. Shall we go on? Are you tired? Would you like to take a breather? It's a very serious subject, is death and every other human endeavour, every human experience, sorrow, pain, grief. This is also a very important question. What is religion? Not the unbeliever or the believer, but from the days of ancient people, they have said, this isn't good enough, the way we are living is meaningless. We can give meaning to life, which is an intellectual process. But the real depth and the significance of life, what is it all about? And so in that enquiry they said there must be something beyond all this. Right? And the word 'religion,' the word itself - they haven't found

a meaning of that word, you understand, the etymological meaning of that word. So we must together find out what is true, actual religion. Not the religion invented by thought? Right? Not the religion organized like Christianity or Hinduism or Buddhism. That's not religion. That's just any other big business. Right? I'm not condemning it, I'm just observing. We are observing it. I really mean it, I'm not condemning it. Speaker has no sense of condemnation in him, he just sees these are facts, which we avoid. And we are now facing it. Christianity is one of the greatest, richest things in the world. There is a temple in South India where every third day it has a million dollars. Right? With those million dollars every third day they have universities, colleges, feed the poor, you follow? Do all the regular social things, but that's not religion. Going to church once a week - (laughs) sorry to laugh about all this. Going once a week, confession, accepting the wafer, the medieval dress and all the singing and dancing or whatever you do in all those places. That's what we consider religion, which has absolutely nothing to do with our life, with our daily unfortunate, miserable, happy, unhappy life. It is something traditional, we have been brought up in it, or we can deny it and say that's all nonsense, and become cynical about it all.

But if we are serious, and one hopes you are, even for this morning, what is it to have a religious brain? To the speaker the brain is different from the mind. Go slowly, I'll explain a little bit. The activity of the brain is not only neurological but also psychological. Right? It is the centre of all sensation. It's the centre of all stimulation - sensation, urges, desires. It's the centre of all thinking. And it's limited. It can invent God, it can invent immense

space, but it's still in the area of the brain. You understand?

Whereas the mind is outside the brain. Don't please accept this.

Though we have discussed this matter with certain scientists, some of them accept, some of them say, why this poor old chap is just wooly. (Laughter) It's all right.

So look at it carefully for yourself. The speaker is not an authority, so don't accept in these matters authority, for God's sake look at it for yourself. Your brain is conditioned, programmed, educated to be Oxford, Cambridge, here Harvard and so on, distilled knowledge. You acquire from the professor, from the teacher knowledge, and then you pass it on. And the whole activity is within the skull. And therefore however much it may imagine, it is still within the brain. Therefore it's limited. Love is not within the brain. For god's sake, realize it. Right? Love cannot be in the brain. You can't think about love - the love between you and your wife or husband, whatever it is. It is there as sensation. Therefore that sensation is not love. Death is not a sensation. Right? So to the speaker the brain is something separate from the mind. We'll go into it if we have time. You don't mind if I go on a little longer?

So we can see, if you are sane, rational, observing totally impersonally, without any bias, all the things that man has put together as religion, you understand, is not religion. The incense, the rituals, the worship, the prayer, all the hierarchy, the immense wealth of these people, immense, marvellous paintings, the Vatican, tremendous jewels in certain temples in India. Surely worshipping, kneeling, genuflecting, all that is not religion. Don't be angry. Please just listen, observe.

The fundamentalists, the evangelists, the fundamentalists not

only in this country, Iran in the Muslim world. And this fundamentalism is growing slowly like some terrible disease in India too. Because it gives them - you understand - a sense of power, position, unlimited. So all that, the preaching, the sermons; all the beauty of a marvellous Catholic ritual. You have seen the Cardinals officiating in Venice or in Rome it's a marvellous sight. It's like a military thing operating, but beautiful. But that's not beauty as we've talked about the other day. So all that is not religion. Right? Intellect, which is the power to discern, the power to distinguish, to see what is true, what is false; that's the power of the intellect. And the world over the intellectuals have denied all this. Not that the speaker is intellectual, I'm just saying. So all that's not religion. Can the brain, which has been conditioned to all this, be free of it? Not tomorrow, now. There is no tomorrow. We went into that. Time - oh, I won't go into all this, no, it is too long. Time is now. So that ends if all that has no meaning, then one can ask, what is religion? Right?

Then comes the whole question of what is meditation? Because meditation and to find out, find out, not experience. You understand? To see what is truth, not my truth or your truth, or the Christian truth or the Hindu truth. If it is mine and yours, then it's not truth. Right? It's mine. I keep it, and you keep it. How can it be? Like love is not mine, and yours. So, truth has no nationality, no religion, no path to it, no system. So we have to come to it, find out. Not I find out, you find out. It's to see it together. And there is this whole question of meditation, awareness, attention. Right?

Meditation is the Indian word which the gurus have brought over to this country. The meaning of that word is 'to ponder over',

the meaning, the dictionary meaning. To ponder over, to think over, to inform about something, to meditate. I meditate about the book I am going to write. Or meditate about the picture one is going to paint. But meditation is something apparently different. There is the meditation of the Zen Buddhists. If you are interested in word 'Zen,' it comes from the Sanskrit word 'Ch'an'. And one of the Buddhist priests went to China in the sixth century and preached Buddhism there. And they couldn't pronounce Ch'an, so it became 'zhia', then the Japanese took it over and it became 'Zen'. I've been told this, it may be wrong. You can take it as you please. So there is the whole movement and appreciation and the books about Zen. Then there is the Buddhist meditation, which is very complicated, I won't go into it. And there is the Hindu meditation. Then some people from Tibet have brought over their meditation. And the gurus invent their own meditation. Right? The word 'guru' in Sanskrit means weight, weight, heavy. And also that word has different meanings. Which is, one who helps to eradicate ignorance. You understand? Not the one who imposes his ignorance on others. (Laughter) I'm glad we can laugh. It means several other things, but that's enough.

So meditation, which is now being practiced the world over, is a deliberate act, a systematic practice, sitting cross-legged, breathing in a certain way, controlling your thought, silencing your reactions, holding, controlling, suppressing, or becoming aware bit by bit of your whole body - I won't go into that - awareness, keeping awake, not going to sleep. There are various systems and methods. Some are pleasant, some are unpleasant. Some when you meditate there is a guru who keeps you awake, either shouting at you or slightly

beating you. (Laughter) Oh, yes, this is going on. Or you meditate on a picture, on a symbol, or on a poem, just a phrase. Which all implies direction, control, limited energy, forcing. Right? To the speaker all that is not meditation. To the speaker. Please don't accept it. There is a different kind of meditation altogether. Because those are all the result of conniving, manoeuvring. Right? So gradually if you practice all those things your brain inevitably becomes dull. Right? And you can have X-rays and alpha rays and all that kind of thing, and it shows you can do certain things extraordinarily well, but it's still within a very, very limited area. Right? So the speaker is saying - please don't accept this at all. Because it's no value accepting and saying, ah, you are right, you are wrong, this is absurd. Just observe it - conscious meditation is no meditation. Deliberate meditation is like any other form of achievement, in business. Right? I set out, being poor, to be a rich man. What's the difference between that man who pursues money, power, position, and the other fellow who says, I'll meditate to achieve nirvana or heaven or silence? None at all. Both are achieving what they want. Only one calls it spiritual, other calls it business. And we swallow them both.

So is there a meditation which is not deliberate? If you ask that question, setting aside everything, you'll find out. Which means, a brain, if you are interested to go into this deeply, a brain that is free from all accumulated knowledge. Face it. Because all knowledge is conditioned. Right? Because knowledge is always limited. We went into it the other day, why. Because knowledge is based on experience. And experience is always limited - whether it is the experience God, or whatever it is, God is your invention out of

your fear, your anxiety, your desire to be secure, to have comfort, to rely, lean on somebody.

So the brain, which has its own rhythm - the speaker is not a specialist on the brain, but he has watched, not only his own petty little brain, but the brain of humanity - and that brain is everlastingly chattering, praying, asking, demanding help, you follow? Tremendously active. And can that activity calm down, become very quiet, still, without any movement, not induced, not cultivated silence? There is a great deal to be said about silence; not now, because it's nearly one o'clock. Silence between noise. Silence between two wars, peace. You understand? Silence between two notes. Between two words. Between two thoughts. All that is not silence. That's not the still, quiet, peaceful brain that is empty of everything that man has collected. And man has always sought from the beginning that which is nameless. He has given it different names, different aspects - here in Christianity it is one thing, in Hinduism it's another. In Hinduism you can believe or not believe, you are still a Hindu. You understand? You need never go to a temple, be utterly sceptical, doubt everything and yet be a Hindu. Marvellously cultivated brains they have. Now it is all becoming business.

So there is a meditation which is not conscious, deliberate. In that meditation there is utter stillness. It is not the stillness of thought. That stillness is not the product of thought. That's why it is very important to understand thought, thinking and all that. And when the brain is utterly quiet then that which is nameless is. That cannot be described, that cannot be given any quality, that is not the saviour, that is nothing, it is something entirely different.

So there is that something that is beyond time, because all time has stopped. That is the really true religious mind.

RISHI VALLEY 1ST TALK WITH TEACHERS DECEMBER 1985

Krishnamurti: There's a word in the English language called 'deliberate'; I'm sure you know that word. The root meaning of that word is libra - to weigh, you know the Zodiac, Libra, with the scales. It means really, the root meaning of that word is libra, to weight, to balance, to take counsel together. To think together, to find out also what is the right. That word contains a great deal of meaning. Deliberate, a deliberate action, a deliberate thought, a deliberate move which means a considered, careful weighing, taking counsel together, not just one person talking. So, if we are to go into all of this, I'm sure you are aware - I'm not patronising - that the world is in a deliberate going down the hill; degenerating. And also there is a great deal of pollution in the air, (except not here). And also there is great corruption all over the world and as educators, as people who are concerned with all this, this side of life, what is it we are going to do, facing all this? Degeneracy, pollution, and corruption. The word 'corruption' comes from the Latin rompere - to break apart. All right? Am I communicating? To break apart. That exists in the world more and more, through nationalities, trade, so-called culture, and the various linguistic and religious divisions. Right through the world, not only social, business, priestly class and all that, but also religions; everything is breaking apart. Slowly. That is corruption. Degeneracy, you know what is happening to all of us, and also there's pollution and so on.

So facing all this, what are we to do? As educators - listen, I'm not going to talk to myself, we're all going to share in this, in our

discussion - so what are we going to do? You spend a great amount of energy, enormous energy, in having to deal with student - little boys and little girls - and what is the end result? What are we all doing? I'm asking myself that, I'm not asking you alone. This is really a very, very, very serious question. Don't please be depressed by it. Or feel down and out. What are we doing, not only in Rishi Valley, that's a very small affair. As human beings, living in this world, with a great deal of fear, insecurity, uncertainty - I'm not exaggerating, please - and as human beings, fairly educated, fairly civilised, considerably knowledgeable, what is it we are going to do, facing all this? Facing your own children and the children of others? What is our action? Not merely as educators, but as fathers, mothers, and the rest of humanity. Am I conveying something, yes? I am asking you, sirs, a very serious question. We're going to discuss this; I'm not going to talk all the time. I've done that in Madras and Bombay and as I've just done in Benares, so this is a conversation together, a deliberation together, we're taking counsel with each other, weighing things, going into things deliberately. So don't - if I may most respectfully suggest - don't leave me to go on talking because I will stop after a little, it's no good sitting in silence. Either we sit in silence or we talk together. I can do both, so will you probably.

So, as human beings, not just teachers, not living in Rishi Valley with all its problems, like hot water and so on, and so on - as human beings we are confronted with this issue. It happens, unfortunately or fortunately, K has talked to a great many scientists; a great many so-called philosophers, psychiatrists, businessmen, politicians, and all the crooked world in which we

live - not all of them, I haven't talked to all of them, but some of them. And when you put them this question, a very serious and deliberate issue, they back out of it. You understand, they don't want to think about it, they say they will leave it to philosophers, to educators, we will have nothing to do with it. Are we in that position? That we have nothing to do with the future, what happens? We have nothing to do with 'what is'. If I had a son, what is he going to face? Not a good job - I'm not talking about good jobs and becoming a captain, soldier, minister and all that appalling business, but as human beings with all our problems; sex (am I allowed to use that word?), sex, pleasures, and our own conflict, ambition, you know, what we are. And if I have children, am I going to bring him up or help him to educate to meet the world? Or are we only concerned academically? Good first-class academics. Or we're not only concerned with top academics, first-class academic standards, but also something far greater than that. I don't know if you have ever considered - if I may bring this in - they have just discovered in Jerusalem, in Israel, in digging, a house eight thousand years old. Just see the stone walls. And India also is eight thousand years old, or older. So there is India - of course, China is, they say, forty thousand years old - we don't know; but we all like to exaggerate a little bit here and there. So, eight thousand years old, India, Israel eight thousand years old, and Athens comes much later. Seeing India - I am not anti Brahmin or pro-Brahmin. all right? Am I in safe company here? - one wonders, I've asked this question of the Prime Minister, the Education Minister - they're all peculiar, never mind, sorry - a culture, a Brahmanic culture, which has imprinted India very, very, very

strongly, what has happened to that culture, however wrong, however right, however true, however false, what has happened to it? You understand my question? Eight thousand year old culture, very strong, it wasn't just a feeble culture. Its footprint was very definite. The sannyasi, you know the whole business. What has happened to it? Is Western commercialism taking over? Please, do pay a little attention to all this; this is all a very serious question.

So I'm asking myself, and I'm sure you are asking yourself, I hope, what's the future for the students and us? What is the purpose of all this? You understand my question? If I have money, and good fortune to be chosen as one of the students here, seven out of one, what are you going to teach me? Mathematics, geography, physics, science, chemistry? You have to do that, for me to face the modern world which is stinking. You have no idea how serious all this is. You are going to teach me that, right? You are bound to. And my brain is conditioned from the very beginning, from the age of five or four or three, to have problems, right? I wonder if you understand this. Right, sir? My brain, as a small child, or a student - it's a problem to write, it's a problem to read, it's a problem to add two and two. So my brain becomes the centre of problems, right? The brain has been engendered, nourished, right from the beginning, to have problems. This is what you're doing, aren't we? And for the rest of my life, till I die, I have problems. I can never solve them because my brain is conditioned. Right? So, problems after problems. My god. Do you understand, sir, what it means to live this way, to the end of our lives. I won't go into all that. So, what are we, as grown up educators, what are we going to do - facing all this, not just A and B? Don't look at me. Let's talk it over

together. Start the ball rolling, sir.

I don't know if I may repeat all you've heard, I was invited to go to Los Alamos - do you know what that is? There's a national laboratory of America. Nine hundred top scientists in New Mexico. I was invited. I don't know why. I was invited. And the first question they asked for me to talk about was, if I remember correctly, 'what place has creation in science?' You understand the questions? What place has creation in science? I said, 'none'. They were rather taken aback. I said, creation is not invention. Invention is based on knowledge. And creation is nothing to do with knowledge. That took a whole hour to discuss. Mind you, they are the top scientists of America. And the next day they asked me to talk about 'what place has meditation in science?'. They're very damned learned people. And they handed me a series of questions - fifteen questions. First question was 'meditation and science' and similar questions - there were fifteen of them. And the last question was 'if you were the director of this place, what would you do, knowing you have to consider the safety of the country, the responsibility placed upon us, the National Laboratory, that we have to protect the people, invent new machinery, new submarines, new mathematics, computers, etc., etc. - they are doing all that - knowing all this, what would you do?'. I'm putting this question to you. What would you all do? Don't look at me, please. I said, K said, 'you can't ask me this question at the last moment, on the twenty-fourth hour. We must start right from the beginning. That is, you know, right from man; the origin of man. I won't go into all that. I just played with it for a while. What is life? You understand, sir? What is life? Not, 'what is the origin of life?'. The tree dies,

grows, we have babies, so on. What is life? Not the way of living, you understand my question? Life. Sorry, I won't go into that now. You don't mind? So what's your response to my statement?

Q: It seems that it's difficult to see things clearly.

K: Yes .

Q: To begin with.

K: Now, how do you see things clearly? I want to see very clearly what you see. I want to understand very clearly the words you use, the gestures, the face. How do I look at you? How do I hear you? Have I prejudices against you? "Oh, I've met you; he's so and so"? I've already made a background. And that background prevents me seeing things clearly, seeing you clearly. Can I be free from that background - however useful that background may be - to look at you, to listen to you, to see what you are? Not say, "I have talked to him and he's a nut". I'm not saying you are! Can I do that, sir? Can we do that? Or are we so filled with our background, with our experiences, knowledge, and so on, that we can never see anything clearly? Come on, sir, discuss. Ladies are supposed to be great talkers. Not you! Ladies, au generale.

Q: It seems to be too large an issue to face when one talks of the corruption in the world; the breaking up of everything. How does one face it at all, because ...

K: Are you breaking up everything?

Q: In a sense, if one is part of it, yes.

K: Yes. I'm not being personal, sir. Why? Bangalore, Rishi Valley, Madras, Rajghat, leave us alone. Sorry! Are we doing this? And why? You don't mind my talking like this? Sure? You can kick me afterwards! Why do we do this? I've just come from

Rajghat - Benares - public meetings and all the rest of it. And there is Rishi Valley, Bangalore, Madras. Why this - I'm not talking geographically or the distance, but why this constant breaking up? Leave me alone; I'm doing something - experimenting - I'm not criticising, I mean it, I'm not criticising. I'm just looking at all the world; you understand? Why does this happen? Is it security? I wish you would talk. Is it security that each one wants?

Q: A certain amount of fulfillment.

K: Fulfillment, which is part of security. Perhaps I'm using a word which includes a lot. So fulfillment, ambition, wanting to do something, please don't interfere. Is that what is happening in the world? Because Rishi Valley is part of the world; Bangalore is not some distant island. Right, sir? I'm asking that gentleman over there; why are we doing this? Why is the world, all around, why is this happening? Tremendous armaments are being built up; I don't know if you are aware of it. On television last year, I think it was on the fourth channel in England, the manufacturer of armaments was saying 'eighty per cent of our production goes abroad'. Getting up and saying that on television!

Q: Sir, are you implying that when I try to find fulfillment in something I am doing, it is directly related to the arms race?

K: Yes. I want to find out. All those ladies, they talk an awful lot all right, don't they?

Q: We're just shy. It's the first time.

K: You're shy. So am I! You may not think so, but I'm a shy, rather retiring person. So if you don't join me, I have ...

Q: I want to ask, taking up from that question, seeing that a certain amount of fulfillment need not - to my mind - need not lead

to separation, unless I feel that my fulfillment is threatened by the others' involvement.

Q: There is conflict.

Q: Yes, but I ...

Q: But she is implying something more radical. Whether it conflicts with someone else, or not? Just the seeking of fulfillment will inevitably lead to conflict. I think it is saying something more radical.

K: I don't understand what you are saying, sir.

Q: I said a bit earlier, why the separation of ...

K: If I'm married, why am I separate from my wife? I think differently, she thinks differently. Her ambition is to become Governor and my ambition is to be something else. Why this? You understand, sir? Why this constant breaking up, which is the beginning of corruption? I don't know if you follow what I mean. The word 'corruption', as I said, comes from the Latin, rompere, which means to break up, never a whole, but always breaking, breaking, breaking. And one of the things Radakaji said was fulfillment. Fulfillment in what? We use that word very easily. Fulfilling in what? Fulfilling my desire? My pleasure? My sense of righteousness? You understand, sir? What do you mean by that word, 'fulfillment'?

Q: Doing things, solving problems, creating situations, institutions that will be recognized by ...

K: That means what?

Q: That work, that are good in themselves, and that would be recognized.

K: Go to the root of it; what does it mean?

Q: Being in a situation there are problems, one sees things as ...

K: No, I want to know what you mean by the word, 'fulfillment'.
Fulfil, right. I want to fulfil what?

Q: Sir, I see myself as having certain talents and I see a problem and I see a solution.

K: No, you have a talent, no, you create a problem.

Q: Sir, no, sir.

K: Wait a moment. I'm a good chemist. PhD from ... where?
Some awful little place, right - or big place. And that gives me a sense of position, power.

Q: Eventually, that's the outcome of achieving.

K: No, wait a moment. My ambition says I must. right?

Q: It can be mixed.

K: Go step by step, step by step. I'm asking you, what does that word mean? Fulfilling what? Money? Power? Status? Those are the three things that count.

Q: Sir, it doesn't have to be so crass. It may be something a little more ...

K: Subtle.

Q: ... subtle.

K: But money's never subtle.

Q: Money may not be subtle, but ...

K: Power.

Q: Admiration, vanity.

K: All included when I have power, money, all that is given to me.

Q: I think the implication is that there is a fulfillment in good work.

K: Good work. All right. Fulfillment.

Q: You can justify your life.

K: No, I am asking you, what do you mean by 'fulfillment'? You don't answer that question.

Q: A feeling of having done something.

K: Yes, yes. Righteous, wrong, but I am asking you what you mean by the word, and you go around it. So please, ladies and ...

Q: A sense of satisfaction at having achieved an objective.

K: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. That's understood. Having, being gratified, because you have achieved that. But what? From that you have something else. And you keep the circle going 'till you die. You are not answering. Fulfillment implies a basic, deep desire to do something. What do you say to that? Deep desire. A longing.

Q: Yes, exactly.

Q: Would it also imply - the very word 'fulfillment' - a sense of lack of completeness in oneself?

K: Yes, sir. That's what I want to get at, you follow? Why do we feel the need for fulfillment? You understand my question? The need, not 'I must fulfil'. That sounds so cheap. The need for fulfillment, which implies an emptiness.

Q: Exactly.

K: That's it. A sense of nothingness inside, ah, I must fulfil. Right, sir? Now, why do I feel so empty inside? I've got all the money, a good wife, or ugly wife, or mischievous wife, or a very talkative wife - I won't look at them! And so on. Is there something beyond this emptiness? You understand? This emptiness in me says I must fulfill. I must do. But I'm asking you, is there something beyond this? That's much more - I won't go into it. Sir,

would you please discuss with me, what we have been talking about? You spend your energy, an enormous amount, you've no idea how much energy is spent, each day and that energy is consumed by your students and the students are consumed by society, right?

Q: And by us.

K: Of course, of course, that's understood. And also you, you expend tremendous energy, right sir? What for? What for in relation to the world, not just ... So I'm asking, is it possible - I'm just asking these questions - is it possible to bring about a totally different human being? You understand? Not educationally; more knowledge, more independence, more this and more that. I am not talking of that. Better human beings, not that. Something entirely holistic. You are all so silent.

Q: Why did you say, can you bring this about non-educationally?

K: No, you can't use non-educational; you become then a savage.

Q: Not as a result of a whole process.

K: No, I want to find out. It takes a little time, all right? If I'm going to spend thirty years of my life in the educational field at Rishi Valley, I ask myself is the material good enough - material, do you understand; the student, the parent, grandparent, is it good enough for me to expend that enormous energy on that boy or girl? Or am I demanding something which I am not myself living? You understand? That raises a totally different question - I won't enter into that for the moment. Somebody said to me, 'God, sir, what you say is so true, why are you wasting you life on this? Nobody listens

to you'. Look at them. They come here out of curiosity, another nut from the East or West, because K happened to have an Indian name, therefore they say he must be something odd. Here a crazy person becomes a saint. In America they put him into an asylum. That's all the difference. So, I'm asking you - please talk to me.

Q: We don't ask these questions.

K: Ask them now.

Q: The question of this transformation of the student.

K: No, don't. Transformation means - to transfer the same being, not transformation, but total revolution. Not Communist, not Socialist, not Democratic, not Republic, etc., but the human brain which has existed for two million years has evolved in the sense, it has evolved but it is still the savage. Right? Still cruel, brutal, self-centred, all that. We haven't evolved from that. We killed a man with a club, now we'll blow up millions, evaporate them, nothing remains of them, and that's called progress. But we haven't changed very much. That's all. So please, I'm asking you - not to depress you, not to elate you; we have got to face this problem in life. You expend lots of energy in a school, as an educator, immense, an incredible amount of energy and, again, there is this terrible society. He has to be married, or she has to be married, and so begins the whole problem of sex, children and the mother is a slave to the child for five years - you understand, sir. If you have money you have nurses, and all that. So what are you all doing? This is not a depressing question, please. On the contrary.

Q: Sir, I think it is not a wastage of energy when we spend so much time with students, even though the students may not receive anything - suppose - but in this process we are learning something

in our lives, so it is not a wastage of energy.

K: I see. What are you learning?

Q: Learning about ourselves.

K: Are you?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: How long will you take?

Q: No, it is learning ...

K: Ah, ah!

Q: It has nothing to do with time, sir.

K: Wait a minute, sir. Oh, yes, it has, forgive me. So, hasn't it to do with time? You say, it has nothing to do with time. Hasn't it to do with time? Learning; I learn one day this and I learn another day that. And keep on adding, right? Right, sir? Would you agree to that? Keep on adding.

Q: No, sir. I do not add.

K: Go ahead, tell me.

Q: Learning is always in the present.

K: What?

Q: Learning as things are happening. You be aware of it.

K: Yes, you are aware of it. This becomes an argument. We're not arguing, sir, we're just investigating. What do you mean by learning? This is a general question, sir. What do you mean by learning? I don't know anything but I'm adding - I'm learning. I don't know two and two make four but I'm learning. Right?

Q: That's what it usually means.

K: No, I'm coming to that. This is what happens - not 'usually'. This is what is happening in the world. I don't know chemistry but I'm learning. Which means, I'm memorising. Right? Would you

agree to all that? What's happened to all of you?

Q: There's another learning in human relations, when you see something and then you say, I learned something, probably meaning I won't repeat this mistake again.

K: Which means what? Careful, careful.

Q: You're sensitive.

K: No, sir. When you say, 'it won't happen again', it means what?

Q: Something new has taken place?

K: No, sir. Just look. When you say 'it won't happen again', what does it mean?

Q: That I have learned from it and I am carrying the knowledge to the future in order to apply it.

K: Yes, which means what? Learning, as far as we see now, is a continuation of memory, increasing more and more and more. Memorising. It won't happen again.

Q: You're not telling yourself that it won't happen again. It's a feeling.

K: It's a feeling you tell your wife, your father, your mother, or your child. But it's - when you say 'it won't' it's a determination. I won't go into all that. Words. Sir, please answer my question, would you? What is learning? There they are, 340 boys, girls - you are teaching them to learn. Right? No? Why are you all so silent? What's the matter with you? Aren't you teaching them to learn? What the heck is the matter with you? There's nothing wrong. So you're teaching them to memorise - what you call learning, is memorising.

Q: It can also be a sense of discovery, sir.

K: Yes, sir. It may be discovery. For the moment just look at it. It may also mean a dozen other things. But I don't know how to read and write. You send your daughter to the school and she copies; her hand is held and draws, a b c or whatever you do. Which is, you are guiding her hand, helping her to practise, helping her to memorise, to follow that line exactly, which is becoming a problem to me. As a child, I want to go and play! So, learning has now become a process of slow or rapid memorising. Be simple about it, sir. What are you all objecting to?

Q: Because part of us think that it's a little more sophisticated than just slow repetition.

K: Yes, but the greatest scientist is part of this. Memorising. Unless he's got a great log of memory ...

Q: Yes, and things fall into a new pattern.

K: Oh, God, why do you object to such a simple thing? Right, sir? What do you think?

Q: I was only wondering, sir; to come back to what you said earlier; 'what are we all doing here?'

K: But you don't answer me. If I send my child to you, I want him to be good at academics, otherwise present society will see that he's destroyed, right? So, please give me that first. Right? Then, I say to you, 'make him more ...' you follow? Something much more than becoming a BA, PhD, all that nonsense. He must have all that nonsense, but make him something much more. Can you? That's all my question. Help him to become a holistic human being. Right, sir? Not good ...

Q: I have a problem, sir.

K: No, answer my question first. I'm sorry; I know you have a

problem. Hold it a minute, sir. Will you, the people who live here who are responsible for educating my son, I say to you, 'Please, sir, I don't want him to be a glorified clerk', which is a Governor - glorified Governor, or a glorified Prime Minister, or whatever it is, 'I want him to be an extraordinary human being, holistic, be sensitive, be alive, look at the birds'. You follow? Take up something much more than bread and butter. And I say, 'Please, there it is'. Don't experiment on him. He's a human being, like you. Don't say 'you can't do this, you can't do that'. So, how will you bring that about? That's my question.

Q: I think the way you are beginning it, the way you have put the question, 'makes my child an extraordinary being', if you come to me I would say, 'look, I don't know what this extraordinary being is you are referring to'.

K: So what am I going to do?

Q: So let's find out.

K: How long? Don't fool around. How long will you take - another ten years, when the boy becomes cynical, already joined a gang and all the rest of it?

Q: What do you mean by extraordinary human being? I mean you can't put pressure on me 'how long?'.

K: Look, old boy: you must have noticed this. Boys and girls up to that certain age are very clever. Smart, alive, watching. Asking questions.

Q: And also in contradiction.

K: But a child.

Q: You must say that.

K: Yes, but he's a child. At a certain age the whole thing goes.

Why? Why?

Q: The idea of responsibility.

K: Why?

Q: I'm telling you why. I've watched it.

K: Oh, God. I'm asking you, sir.

Q: Is it partly because we have not shown him an alternative?

K: What?

Q: He has never known anything different.

K: No, I'm not asking anything different, darling, I'm saying, asking you - you must have noticed boys and girls reach a certain age, gone. Suddenly becomes dull, suddenly becomes totally unaware of things. He wants to become the Prime Minister, or the Chief Secretary or the Governor, or big business. You follow what I mean? The real thing is gone. Why? You never ask these questions?

Q: Because we have not drawn his attention to the real thing.

K: It's not there, at all.

Q: But when it was there, or if it was there, we have not ...

K: Yes, say if it was there. I've talked - wait a minute - I've talked to those children for the last twenty years, thirty years. A couple of boys get up and very smart, bright. I say come and sit beside me and they sit down, and we talk and all that. I come back next year, the same boys are totally different - or the girls. Why? Is it puberty? Is it glands? You don't seem to enquire into this.

Q: Because they have conformed to something.

K: Yes. Why do they want to conform to something? Last year they didn't.

Q: Because they are getting older and the pressure of the ...

K: Is there a way - just a minute. I have asked several biologists and all the others, professional, top people, is there a way of preventing all this? Or is it inevitable? Or is it the natural course of things? You understand? Find out.

Q: Sir, there are a lot of pressures on children to conform.

K: I know that, sir. At the age of twelve or thirteen they don't even know anything about that.

Q: But they pick it up.

K: What makes them pick it up? What makes them feel all this?

Q: Sir, because they have no alternate feeling of anything and we don't give them that alternative way of feeling.

K: I question all you say. Because you are finding excuses.

Q: No, sir. Otherwise why should it become an almost inevitable course, unless you have an alternative? If they saw an alternative which was as vital at the pressure ...

K: Then give an alternative.

Q: But we must give the alternative.

K: You. Give me an alternative.

Q: Sir, but that's the problem. Do I ...

K: Don't talk about it. Give me an alternative route.

Q: Exactly.

K: Instead of following the same old road.

Q: But how am I going to do it?

K: Don't ask how. That's the worst thing you can ask. Then you ... Can we enquire into this? You're all teachers, you're all dealing with children, you're all bored, strained, annoyed, all the rest of it. Is there another alternative? The present is this. Right? Same old bananas. I'm saying, is there another way of approaching

the whole thing?

Q: And sir, may I add to that, can I convey to the child sufficiently vividly that he's drawn naturally into that thing?

K: I'm sure you can. If you have the stuff in you. If your brain is that. You follow?

Are these meetings worth it? Don't smile. Are these meetings worth it?

Q: Yes.

K: What have you contributed to it?

Q: When we ask, 'isn't there an alternative?', we are also asking, 'isn't there an alternative to knowledge?'

K: Oh, yes, there is.

Q: Not in the sense that they shouldn't be skilled and so on.

K: First of all, sir, we have followed this road for two million years and we have so-called evolved along that road. You come along and say, 'don't be so damned stupid - there is another way of doing all this'. Will I listen to you? Will you listen to me?

Q: Not unless I can make it palpable.

K: No.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: There is no profit in this.

Q: But there is no profit, so ...

K: Please, this requires no motive, no profit, no position, no power, totally different from this. Not different, different means opposite. Is there something away from this? Will you listen to a man who says, 'look there is a totally different way'? Will you listen to him?

Q: First I will look at him.

K: Yes, look at me.

Q: I might listen to you, sir.

K: Because you like my face.

Q: I have a small confusion. From what you said earlier, it seems that just as you draw a line where man has gone for two million years and then you come and tell him, 'take this path'. From what you said it looks as if the child, up to a particular age, was alive, is on that path, and it is subsequently that you bring him back into this, it is we bring the child back into this.

K: Or, it's a glandular change. You must take everything, sir, don't just ...

Q: Biological.

K: Biological. And if it is biological, can we? Sir, I ask these questions of Radikaji and all the rest of you. They don't know. Probably they never even asked that question. Please, would you mind, I have to stop.

Do you like this kind of meeting? What? Nobody says anything.

Q: Yes.

K: Why? Why do you like this kind of meeting? I'm talking most of the time.

Q: It's starts an enquiry and introspection.

K: Perhaps this is a

Q: It really helps us - or me - look into matters that interest us. I need it as a catalyst.

K: That's why I'm asking you, sir. Is it worthwhile going on with these meetings?

Q: I would say so.

Q: There's no doubt about that, sir.

K: Ask them. All the men on one side, all the women on the other! God, you still are Indians, aren't you! Tomorrow, or when we next meet, you're all sit mixed up! Right? Not all the men on this side, like a zoo! When shall we meet again? You arrange and tell me. Is that enough for today? Bombardment! I've talked to a great many scientists, a great many blah, blah, blah, I've talked to ministers, Prime Ministers, all that rot, and they kind of say to me, 'Oh, I want to learn a great deal from you'. The next moment they're telling me about the Rig Veda!

RISHI VALLEY 1ST DIALOGUE WITH STUDENTS 5TH DECEMBER 1985

Krishnamurti: What would you like me to talk about?

Student: Why are you superior and we inferior? Why do we feel that way - many of us?

K: Feel superior? My god, I never thought about it. Why do we feel that you are superior to the rest of us? Is that it?

S: Many of us feel that.

K: Many of us feel that way. Why? Why do you think?

S: Maybe because everybody is talking about you.

K: Oh, everybody's talking about me. Too bad! But apart from that, why do you think that way at all?

S: I don't know.

K: You don't know.

S: It just comes into our minds.

K: Just comes into our brains. Why? I've been all over the world, which you haven't been. I have been, before the war, the second world war, all over Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, South America, all over America, Europe and so on, does that make any difference?

S: No.

K: No. Then what makes you different from somebody else?

S: Maybe, we build up opinions about the other person.

K: Why do you have opinions about other people? You tell me why you have different opinions from others. What is an opinion? You are clever boys, come on! Those two sitting up among the mighty! What is an opinion? Why do we have opinions; about me,

about each other, about other people? Why do you have opinions, what do you mean by opinions?

S: An image, an idea.

K: An image, or an idea about other people. Why do you have them? You don't know me. Right? You don't know me, do you? I come here once in a while and there is a lot of fuss about it. Right? But you don't really know me. Why do you have an opinion of me? I may be an awful crook, I may be a charlatan, a humbug, anything you like, but you don't know me. So why do you have an opinion about me? Opinion means, a suggestion first. Also it means that you have a preconceived idea about me. Also you have an image about him. According to that image you translate what he says, what he looks like, and all the rest of it. So, why do you have all this? I'm asking all of you, why do you have opinions?

S: Curiosity.

K: Why do you have curiosity about me? I'll tell you all you want to know about me, everything you want to know about me. Right? So why are you curious about me? How I comb my hair, how I brush my teeth, how long I sleep? Right? Do you want to know all that? No, you don't. Be honest, you don't. So what do you want to know about me? You don't know. So, why do you have an opinion about me? Why do you have an opinion about each other. That means, I have an opinion about you and that opinion prevents me from looking at you. Opinion interferes between me and you. Right? So why do you have that?

S: Then, how do you look at another person?

K: How do you look at another person? Look at me. I look at you, why do you need an opinion? I look at you. You have cut your

hair up to here. I have combed my hair. You have seen my photograph probably. So what? Why do you have an opinion? Go on, think it out. Are you really thinking or are you just being silent? Can you look at somebody, listen to somebody without a single opinion, so that you hear what he says? Right? You understand what he says; you begin to grasp the significance, the meaning of what another is saying. Right? But if you have an opinion you can't hear. Right? So will you listen to me when I talk? Actually listen? With your ear and listen to what he has to say without translating what he is going to say to you. That means actually listen to somebody. Actually listen. Will you listen to your teacher?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Don't lie, don't pretend. Do you listen to your teacher?

S: Not all the time.

K: Not all the time. Good! When do you listen to them? Don't look at them. When do you listen to them? You four are talking, let the others talk too. When do you listen to your teacher or to your educator?

S: When it suits you.

K: When it suits you. Perfectly right! When it is comfortable to you, when it is nice for you, when it suits you, you listen to him. Right? That's not listening, is it? You know what to listen means, don't you? That is: you hear a sound and that's conveyed to your brain which then translates into the language you are accustomed to and says this is what he is saying to me. Right? So do you listen to anybody? Carefully, not just casually. But do you actually listen to anybody? To your father, to your uncle, your aunt, your mother,

your teacher, your friend, do you actually listen to anybody?

S: We listen to you.

K: You are listening to me, why? Are you really listening to me or pretending, saying, "Yes, let's get on with it". Are you actually listening? Do you listen to the birds?

S: When we have no distractions we do listen.

K: You do it when? As a distraction.

S: No. If there is no distraction you do listen to what is said.

K: Why do you use the word 'distractions'? Tell me, you grown up people up there sitting quietly, why do you use the word 'distraction'? You know what that word means.

S: Something that comes in the way of something else.

K: Old boy, I am asking you, what do you mean by distraction? To be attracted, right? And to be distracted. What are you attracted by? Are you listening to me? Is it fun? Are you forced to listen to me? Nobody asked you to come and listen to me, have they? Are you quite sure? Don't look at them. You see the older ones don't talk at all because they are higher up. And you too when you grow up to be a little higher, you will also stop talking. But you don't stop talking amongst yourselves but you stop talking to me. Right? Why? Are you curious about what I want to say? Do you want me to tell you where I have been? Do you want me to tell you whom I met?

S: No, sir.

K: No. You are not interested, are you? These three birds are talking all the time! I'm glad you're talking. But the others keep quiet. Why? I met your Prime Minister, I met the Vice President. Then had lunch and dinner and we gabbled - you know what the

word 'gabbled' means? Talked. And we met several other people.

What is a politician?

S: Somebody who campaigns elections, to win elections and to look after the state or country in some high post. Who leads the country, sir.

K: Leads the country. Are they leading the country?

S: No, sir.

K: Then why do you use those words 'lead the country'?

S: Who helps the country?

K: What do you mean the country?

S: The place we live in.

K: What do you mean the country? Which country?

S: Any country.

K: Any country. So are the politicians leading the country?

S: They are trying to help.

K: Trying to help what? Poverty.

S: Trying to help solve problems.

K: What problems? Tell me what problems are?

S: Sir, to solve grievances of other people.

K: Grievances of other people. Right? Have you got grievances? Against whom? I wish some of them would talk. What are you interested in? Do you want to talk to me or shall I go on talking to myself?

S: Sir, I would like to talk about fear.

K: Fear. That is a tremendous subject, isn't it? Are you afraid of something? Be honest.

S: Sometimes I am.

K: Sometimes you are. What do you mean by fear? Carefully

think it out, carefully listen to the meaning of that word, 'fear'. Are you afraid of your mother and father? Sometimes.

S: Sometimes when they get angry.

K: Yes, sometimes. Now what is the feeling that you have when you are frightened? When you have fear. What is the feeling? Go on, sir. Think it out carefully. Don't just say anything. When you have fear what is the feeling of it? What is the taste of it? You have tasted bananas, you have tasted various types of food; what is the taste of fear? Especially for the older people, the older students. They are very frightened because they have got to pass exams and their fathers will tell them what to do. Right? You're also going to be told what to do; pass exams, get a job, you know all that. So what is the feeling of fear?

S: You feel like you want to withdraw into something away from what is frightening you.

K: Yes, you see a cobra. There are several of them here, I believe, I haven't seen them, long and rather poisonous. You are frightened, right? And you withdraw. What is the feeling of it?

S: The pain you are going to get.

K: The pain - yes, let's keep to that word. The pain that you might have if a cobra bites. Now, what is that feeling like? You haven't been bitten, but you imagine what might happen or think what might happen, and you have fear. I am asking you if I may most politely, what is the feeling of that? Perhaps the older generation will join us. What is the feeling of fear? Think it out sir, go on. Don't go to sleep, it's early morning!

S: Sir, maybe your mind is troubled.

K: The brain is troubled. What do you mean by that?

S: Sir, you don't understand what you are doing

K: You don't understand what you're doing. Right? You see a cobra on the road, or along the path and you know it is a poisonous thing, right? And you run away from it, or cry, shout. I'm asking you what is the feeling behind that?

S: Sir, you feel slightly restless.

K: You feel restless, you feel anxious. You get frightened. What is the feeling of that being frightened?

S: You feel insecure.

K: Insecure. What do you mean by that word 'insecure'? Go on. Examine it step by step.

S: Without protection.

K: Without protection. You've not been bitten by the cobra, right? You've already preconceived all this. Right? Do you understand what I am saying? You have imagined you might get hurt, you might go to bed, you might die. You get frightened. I'm asking you. You're not answering my question if you don't mind my saying so, what is the feeling of it? What is behind these words?

S: We feel just as if our muscles tighten up and there's a... I don't know how to describe it.

K: You tell me.

S: Just as if your heart has stopped beating and sometimes for people like me it starts beating faster.

K: I don't understand.

Narayan: He says that the heart beats faster.

K: That's what I want you to tell me. The heart beats faster.

N: He says, the muscles stiffen.

K: Muscles tighten. By Jove, come up here, old boy. You don't mind sitting next to me?

S: No, sir.

K: You do mind?

S: No, sir.

K: Then sit next to me. Two monkeys! Heart beats faster. Your muscles contract. And what else happens? Go on, just tell me. You wanted to discuss about fear. That's what I'm doing. Right?

S: You feel like getting rid of it.

K: You want to kill it. All right, your muscles contract.

S: You feel as though a bell is tingling inside you.

K: What do you mean by that? Have you ever been really frightened?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I doubt it.

S: At the moment you want to do something, you want to run but you can't do it.

K: Yes, old girl. But I am asking you something else, you're not telling me.

S: You start fretting.

K: He said to me, the muscles contract, you know, shrink and your brain becomes for a second numb, it doesn't think, it is frightened.

S: It thinks of the past images.

K: It thinks of past images. Does it, at the moment when you are frightened, when you see the cobra or a second later? By Jove, how dangerous it is, you run away from it, you throw stones at it from a distance and so on. But you're not telling me if you don't mind my

repeating it, what is the feeling behind it? You know that feeling when you get hurt, you know that feeling when you burn your finger.

You know that feeling when somebody hits you. I hope nobody does, but if somebody hits you. You know the feeling of it. So what is the feeling of fear? Don't tell me, carefully think it out. The feeling. The feeling when somebody insults you, you know what it means. The feeling when somebody flatters you. Right? So you know the feeling of all that. But I am asking you: what is the feeling, the sensation behind fear?

S: You feel frightened.

K: Yes, old boy, I said that you feel frightened. But what is the feeling behind it?

S: Sir, I think it's a feeling of complete confusion.

K: A feeling of confusion. What does that word 'confusion' mean? You see you don't think it out.

S: You don't know what to do.

K: You don't know what to do. Quite right. Go on.

S: You don't know if you do something, it will be right or wrong. You have not had the experience.

K: Yes. So your muscles contract, your brain is confused, there is a feeling of isolation, you know what that means?

S: Yes.

K: A feeling of being completely isolated from others. You're facing a cobra, facing something dangerous, and you shrink.

S: You feel stunned at that moment.

K: That's it. When you have fear, you feel stunned. Your nerves are all shrunk. Right? You feel you're isolated and so on and so on.

Now, just a minute. You feel all that, then what do you do? She asked that question, she said 'talk about fear', fear of passing examinations or not passing. Right? Fear of failure, fear of your parents, fear of your educators, fear of snakes; fear. Right?

You have dozens of fears. Right? Dozens of them. Agreed? Right? Now what causes fear? What is the cause? You understand when I am using the word 'cause'? Do you understand the word, when I use 'cause'?

S: Yes. What is the motivation.

K: What is the motivation? What is the beginning of fear. What starts fear? What is the cause, what is the root, what is the basis of fear? I have used some words, you understand, 'cause', 'motive', the 'root'. Right?

S: You suppose when you think that this may happen. If I don't pass my examination what will my parents think of me? So you think this might happen and so you feel fear.

K: Yes. That is, what will others think of you if you fail your exam. I hope you will all fail!

S: If you think of the future you then get scared.

K: Wait a minute. Stop there. What do you mean by the future?

S: What's going to happen tomorrow.

K: What might happen. Right? If I fail in my examination, and I hope you all will, and you think of the future, what your parents say, what your teachers say. Right? What do you mean by the future?

S: Sir, what might happen? Somebody might hit you.

K: I understand old boy. What do you mean by future?

S: What is going to happen in the past. (Laughter)

K: The past is over! I'm asking you what is the future. What do you mean by the word? Please do listen - this is important for you. What do you mean by the future?

S: What might happen?

K: What might happen. That is, you might - not you I hope - I might get ill, I might be killed, I might be wounded. That is all in the future, isn't it? You might be. Right?

S: When you get scared you think it will happen.

K: Yes. Now wait a minute, what is the future, I'm asking you. Tomorrow is the future. Isn't it? Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Next second is the future, next hour. So I'm asking you: what do you mean by the future? Careful. Think it out carefully. Don't just say something that comes to you. The future.

S: Future is when you don't know what is going to happen.

K: I said that. That means the future: What might happen, what might not happen; I hope it will happen; I hope it will not; all that is the future. Right? You might grow taller, I might grow shorter - might, might, might. So the word 'might' implies the future, a possibility. Right? It might happen. You might fall down. I might get ill. All that is implied in the future. Right? Agreed to that?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Now what is future? That is tomorrow. Today, it is now five minutes past ten, and in another five minutes it will be ten minutes past ten, future. Think it out. This is important for you. What do you mean by the future.

S: What is going to happen tomorrow.

K: Darling, we said that. We said future is what might, might

not happen. Future is tomorrow. Right? Future is the next second. Right? So what does that mean? Future. It is too complicated for you.

S: Future is something unknown to you.

K: Is it unknown to you?

S: At times it might be known to you. If you know what might be happening, if you know you are going to get into the college or something, then you will know what will happen to you.

K: If you pass the exam. Right?

S: When somebody tells you what's going to happen, then you know the future.

K: Yes, old boy. We have been through all that when we said it might happen, it's always in the future. Right? Or it may not happen. It's future. It is too difficult for you. So fear means either now, actual fear now or in the future. Right? Are you afraid now?

S: Not now.

K: Why?

S: Because there is nothing to fear.

K: There is nothing to fear. But when you enter the class, here nobody is telling you what to do, what not to do, what to think, what not to think. Nobody is telling you that. Therefore, you don't care. Or you are really listening to find out. Right? No. You're too young, too small. Fear is one of the most difficult things to understand and to be free of it. Right? People have gone to war, killed each other on account of fear. You understand? I might lose my country, I might lose my property, I might not belong to this group, you understand? So war, killing has been going on for two million years. You understand this? For two million years human

beings have killed each other.

S: Why?

K: Because he and I belong to one tribe. You and another belong to another tribe. Right? You want our land or we want your land or we want to steal your property - you follow, this kind of battle, killing, wounding, maiming each other has been going on for two million years.

S: Sir, there is division between us.

K: Division. There is India and Pakistan. That's a division, isn't it? So they are willing to kill each other.

S: Sir, but why?

K: Why? Very simple. I'm a Pakistani. He is a Hindu. I want him to become a Muslim. Right? Or I think my country is bigger, nobler, and so on than his country.

S: What do they gain by that, by making other people Muslim or whatever they are?

K: That's just it. What do we gain from it? You answer me. They are silly people. Right? No, listen carefully. This is happening in England, happening in Germany, in America, Russia. It's happening everywhere. This country is a poor country. Right? You go down the village and you see appalling poverty, and yet they are building tremendous armaments. Right? Why?

S: Sir, because...

K: No, listen carefully. As long as you're an Indian and you feel you're an Indian you're going to kill somebody. Right? So nationalism, racialism, tribalism, as long as that exists you're going to kill somebody or somebody will come and kill you.

S: Sir, if you have no nationality, then what do you identify

yourself with?

K: If you have no nationality, how can you identify yourself with something. Right? Why do you want to identify with India, with America, with Russia, why?

S: Sir, I feel secure as being a part of it.

K: No, wait a minute. You feel secure. Right? Do you?

S: But then you still have fears of your country being ruined. If you are a part of something, you are an Indian or something like that you always have a fear of people coming and attacking you or saying that you should be what you just said or a Muslim or something like that.

K: I don't understand.

S: She said that, you feel insecure, if you don't have a nationality or if you can't say you are an Indian or you are an American. When you say that, you still have the fear of being attacked.

K: Yes. So you are willing to kill me as a Muslim? You must be an idiot. Why do you want to kill me? Because I believe in some other god? But why do you want to kill me?

S: Sir, to get a good name.

K: To get a good name, by killing me?

S: It seems that you are more powerful after that.

K: You feel happier for killing me?

S: Because then you feel that you are more powerful.

K: You are all rather a crazy crowd. I was invited, if I may talk about it, I hope you don't mind, I was invited to speak at the United Nations. You know what that is?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Yes? Are you sure?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Are you sure you are sitting here?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I was invited to speak at the United Nations, and I spoke for forty five minutes. One of the chief organizers of that body, after I had spoken he gets up and says 'great privileges' etc - etc., 'to meet you sir' and so on, and he says, "I have worked here in the organization for forty years, very hard." You understand what I'm saying, forty years he has worked very hard to create, to sustain, to keep the United Nations going and he says, "After forty years I have learnt not to kill another human being." Do you understand what I'm saying? Are you as dumb as the United Nations? Do you understand what I'm saying? It took him forty years to learn not to kill another human being. Forty years! Do you understand what I'm saying? Are you going to do the same?

S: No, sir.

K: I'm not sure.

S: At least now I'm not going to do it. Now I don't think I'm going to kill another person. I don't know when I grow up.

K: That's right. You will be equally an idiot, will you?

S: I can't say.

K: You're quite right. It's too difficult for you to understand, what is the root of fear. Much too difficult. There is fear, you always control it or run away from it or suppress it or cry. Right? But perhaps there is another way of dealing with it altogether. Do you want to know? But that requires a great deal of thinking, a great deal of investigating. How long do you spend studying

mathematics or biology or science, how many years? Years, don't you? School, college, university. All of you spend about twenty or twenty five years going through all that. Right? And you won't even spend ten minutes or five minutes to find out if you can be free of fear. You spend twenty years on some beastly subject and you won't even spend five minutes to understand the nature of fear. That's correct. Right?

So you have to learn a great deal, you have to understand a great deal. What is the root of fear. I will tell you very briefly. Fear is involved in time; tomorrow, might happen. Right? So you have to investigate what time is. That's too difficult for you. Not only by the clock, but what time is. You plant a seed, it takes time to grow. You have a baby it takes time to become an adolescent. One is unhealthy, then to become healthy takes time. Right? You are learning mathematics or physics, or whatever you are learning and to be able to pass an exam in that subject takes time. It takes time for you to get from here to Madanapalle or to your home. You understand? Time is very important in one's life. Not only to go from here to there but also to grow, physically grow and then inwardly to grow. All that takes time. And it has taken time from the first man till now, two million years, called evolution. Right? So your whole life is bound by time. You understand? All your life is bound by time. You're living now, you might die, there is a long number of years. Right? So our whole life is entangled, is concerned with time. You will pass your exams or you might not. Time. Then we have to enquire what is time. It is too difficult.

S: Time is relative; is it not?

K: I know that, I said that, lady. I did not purposely use that

word because relative means something else also, "He is my relative". Now just a minute. Time is relative, but what do you mean by time? Sir, there you are, grown-up people who are going to pass exams, who are going to get your jobs, get married. All that takes time. Right? So is man bound forever to time? No, it is too difficult. What do you say, sir? Do you understand?

S: I did not quite understand.

K: You did not quite understand. Look, you are very small now. You will grow up, to be tall, to be..., so all that takes time. Doesn't it? If you are ill it takes time to get well. It takes time to get up in the morning, to get ready, all the rest of it, to bathe and all that - it takes time. It takes time to learn a subject, to learn a skill, to learn to plant a seed in the garden and see it grow. Everything in life takes time. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: And man is bound by time: to go from here to there. Where do you live?

S: I live in Bombay.

K: Bombay. It took time for you to come from Bombay to Rishi Valley.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Two nights or one night or whatever it was. And also to pass your exams, to get a job and all that takes time. So you are bound by time. Clear?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Clear? That means - I won't go into all that. It's too complex for you to understand. Whatever you do is bound by time, which is the past, which says you don't do that, the past says you don't do

that. If you do it you will be punished or you will gain. So the past is controlling you now. Get it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Understand it very simply first. The past is controlling what you do now. I must not do that, you have had the same experience and the past says: don't do it again or you will get ill. The past is shaping your thinking, which means the past means time. So time is shaping what you do now, and the future depends on what you do now.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Clear? Think it out, old boy. Think it out carefully. The past is teaching you, telling you what to do now and what you do now will shape the future. So the future is being put together now, manufactured.

S: At this moment.

K: At this moment. Get it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Are you sure? So the past controls the present, and the present is shaping the future. So careful, think it out. So the future is now being manufactured. Get it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So the future is now being formed, get it?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I wonder if you do.

S: Sir, I do.

K: So what you do now is most important. Not what you will do tomorrow. Get it? What you do now is all important because that is going to make your future. Get it?

S: Yes, sir.

S: Sir, is time limited?

K: Don't bother, old lady. Don't ask abstract questions because I can give you an abstract answer, but it has no meaning. Time is always limited. So is there a way - this is much too difficult - is there a way of being free of time?

S: No, sir.

K: Why do you say no?

S: Sir, when one is living there is no way, but maybe after death.

K: Do you know what death means?

S: No, sir.

K: Then don't use that word. Ask yourself a question. Don't try to answer it. Ask yourself. Which is, your brain inside the skull is put together through two million years, conditioned, shaped, moulded, experience, knowledge, all that is there: now can you now do what is right so that it will be right all the way along? You understand my question?

S: Yes, sir.

K: This is too difficult. Right?

S: Sir, what's the true meaning of concentration and attention?

K: Do you really want to know?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Why? Think it out. Did somebody else tell you to ask that question?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Ah, yes.

S: My father told me that you had once made a comment that

you need attention more than concentration.

K: Your father told you. Why? You know what concentration is? Listen: I'm your teacher, your educator, you are looking out of the window, much more interesting than the page. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: I'm the teacher and I say: please look at the page, and you don't want to look at the page but you want to look at the bird out there. Right? So he says, "If you want to learn look at the page". And he gets annoyed if you keep on looking out of the window. So he comes up and shakes you, or pulls your ear, or pulls your hair or beats you up. Nobody beats you up here, I hope. No.

So what happens? You want to look out of the window but somebody says, look at the page. So you're in conflict. Aren't you? You want to look out there and you want to look at the page. So you have a conflict. Right?

S: Yes, sir.

K: So conflict goes not necessarily with concentration. Right? I want to concentrate on the page. I force myself to pay a great deal of notice to the page, a great deal of concentration, that means I don't try to think of anything else but what is on the page. In that process there is a great deal of resistance, conflict, because I want to look out there, but I have to look at this page. You understand? So there is a great deal of conflict, a great deal of effort. I won't go into it. Whereas attention has no effort. Whoever has asked you to ask me that question, tell them that. In attention there is no effort at all. You attend.

We have been together this morning for an hour. Do you want to go on?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Ah, yes? Why? It's more fun! And there is a class waiting for you and you don't want to go to the class but you want to be entertained! Right? Have you ever looked at those flowers?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Have you looked at them? Look at them. Take time and trouble to look at those flowers for a minute. Look at them. Look at the mixture of colours, and the beauty of them, the setting of them, the light on them. Now, what does that mean to you? Don't say, beauty or - what does it mean to you? When you look at all that spread of colour and the variations in that colour, the green against the red, the further dark green and all that, what does it mean to you?

S: What does it mean to you, sir?

K: I will tell you in a minute. I asked you the question first.

S: Sir, I feel it means that; why do we want all these houses and mechanical things when there is so much of nature?

K: It is much easier to look at a mechanical thing. But to look at nature, the hills and the shadows, the rocks, the shape of the rocks, the fields, how they are sown, all in line, or mangoes growing, and the birds and the butterflies and the green earth, the shadow, the streams and so on. Look at it, look at the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the majesty of those rocks. But you are all concentrated on books. Right? On books, passing exams, getting a job, getting married and having a house. That's all you are interested in. Right, sir? But beyond the house there is the horizon. Right? And beyond the house are all those marvellous hills and beauty and greatness.

Sir, is that enough for this morning? Yes? Are you going to

have a nice day? Have a nice day.

S: Thank you, sir.

K: Enjoy yourself. Right? Tell the class to go to hell! You know I am inciting you? You know what that means?

S: No, sir.

K: Inciting you to blow up. You can't. Don't blow up with guns and dynamite. Have a good day. Right? Have a happy day. It's a beautiful morning. Enjoy it. All right, sir.

RISHI VALLEY 2ND TALK WITH TEACHERS 7TH DECEMBER 1985

K: May I raise a very complicated question? May I? How would you - if you had a son here or a daughter - want to educate them, or bring about an holistic life?

You've got so many students here - capable, intelligent, at least some of them, and would you bring about, through what means, through what kind of attitude, what kind of verbal explanation, would you go through to educate them in an holistic way of living? That is what I am proposing. I mean by holistic: whole, unbroken, not splintered up, not fragmented, as most of our lives are. So my question is, if I may put it to you: what would you do, in what manner would you educate, how do you bring about a holistic way of living, an outlook that's not fragmented in specializations? How would you help them, or educate them to bring this about? Is this too complicated a question? No answer?

HP: Sir, first we must be holistic ourselves.

K: That's understand, sir. But first of all, you are educators here, including myself, if you will permit me. I happen to be in Rishi Valley, I like the place, the beauty of the place, the hills, the rocks, the flowers, the shadows on the hills. I like the place. And I am one of the educators here; parents send me one of their children and I want to see that their whole life from the very beginning of their days, when they come here, I want to see that they live a life that is whole. Whole means good.

Good, not in the ordinary sense of that word, good. It has a special meaning, not the old traditional word good; a good boy, a

good husband - that's all very limited, in the verbal sense. But the word 'good' has much greater significance when you relate goodness to wholeness. I don't know if I am making any sense. Good has that quality of being extraordinarily generous; good has that sense of not wanting to hurt another, consciously - you may do it unconsciously, but the whole attitude towards life, not to hurt, not to do something unkind consciously, you may say something unconsciously. Good, in the sense that it is correct - not only for the moment; correct all the time. I am inventing! Correct in the sense that it does not depend on circumstances - if it is correct now, it will be correct a hundred years later or ten days later. Correctness which is connected with goodness is not related to environment, circumstance, pressures and so on. So from that comes right action. I don't know if you are following what I am talking about.

So, goodness and an holistic way of living go together. And I am one of the teachers here, educators here, this gentleman here sends his son to this school, in what manner am I going to see that the boy grows in goodness and holistic way of living? That's my question. Do we rely on each other? Is it an individual problem or is it a problem of the whole school, the whole body? So it must be a comprehensive - not that gentleman thinks one way and I think one way about goodness - it must be a cohesive action. Now, is that possible? And do you want that? Sir, in the word 'holistic' is implied: not the orthodox, organized and all that stupid nonsense, but that quality of religion which we will go into presently. How am I, living here as an educator, to bring this about? Don't leave me alone, sir.

K: The first thing we have to do is to help the child feel secure in his relationship. It seems to me that unless the child feels secure in his relationship, with me and the place, nothing further can happen.

RH: I have to find out whether that is really what I want to do. If I feel that is really what I want to do, then I must find out what do I mean by that, what is the content of my feelings.

KJ: Would it not be necessary, if you and I are working together in the school, not to say what I mean by that or what you mean, but to find out if there is something that is valid for all of us. Not because we stick to an idea or come together around an idea, but in the investigation we see clearly that this is it.

K: Sir, do we, you and I, for example, understand what it means to be whole, an holistic life? Verbally even, logically, rationally, sanely? Do we understand what it means to live an holistic life? Or is it merely a theory?

RH: Sir, perhaps we merely understand by contrast. We see fragmentation is ourselves.

K: If you see fragmentation or breaking up in yourself, then you have the problem of how to get rid of it, how to be whole. I don't want problems. I don't want a problem which in solving it will bring about an holistic way of life. I don't want a problem about it. Then I have already broken it up.

RH: Despite that, the fact remains that we are fragmented.

K: That's the point. Just a minute. I know I am fragmented; my whole thinking process is fragmented. And also I know I mustn't make a problem of it because that's another fragmentation.

RH: My feeling of fragmentation is itself a problem - I don't

make a problem, I see a problem.

K: I understand. I realize I am fragmented, but I don't want to make a problem of it.

RH: But, sir, doesn't it mean that when I see that I am fragmented, that itself is a problem?

K: That's what I want to get at That is, I see I am fragmented: I say one thing and I do another, think one think and contradict what I think, and so on, different types of fragmentation. And I also see very clearly that I mustn't make a problem of it.

RH: Perhaps I don't see that clearly.

K: That's what I want to discuss. If I make a problem of it, I have already further fragmented it.

RH: But there is an in-between stage.

K: Ah! I know all that. Just a minute. Follow what I am saying, if you don't mind. I am aware that I am fragmented, broken up in different ways - not wanting, wanting, ten different things. If I make a problem of it, saying to myself, I must not be fragmented - that very statement is born out of fragmentation. So something born of fragmentation is another form of fragmentation. Am I making myself clear, or am I being dumb? So I mustn't make a problem of it. But my brain is trained to problems. So I must be aware of the whole cycle of it. So what am I to do? Careful!

HP: When you say we should not make a problem of it, do we have a choice?

K: I did not say I should not make a problem of it.

HP: When you see the fragmentation within you, you say that I would not like to make a problem.

K: I see the truth, not, I will not make a problem of it. I see the

fact that if I make a problem of it, it is another fragmentation.

That's all. I see it. I don't say, I must get rid of it. I just see the fact that if I say, I must not, then that becomes another problem. That's all. So what am I to do? I wonder if you are catching at what I am trying to get at.

HP: Is there anything to be done in this case?

K: I am going to show you presently. Don't be so eager, if you don't mind my saying so.

HP: The way I see it, there is nothing to be done, just actually watching, observing.

K: Just a minute, sir. Don't come to that conclusion. What am I to do?

HP: Observe.

K: Don't tell me, sir. These are words. Seeing that I am fragmented, aware that whatever I do is another kind of fragmentation, what is left for me? You don't put yourself in that position, you have already come to a conclusion. So your conclusion is another fragmentation. I don't know if you follow all this. When you say, I can observe, that is already a conclusion.

HP: You have to say something.

K: Don't say anything. Whom are we talking to? Are we talking to each other? Or you are only listening to the speaker therefore waiting for him to tell you what to do. You understand? Suppose I have this problem, this question: is there a way of living holistically in which is involved the quality of a religious mind, deep goodness, without any mischief, without any duality? Am I making it complicated?

HP: No, sir.

K: Why not, sir? My whole brain thinks dualistically. It's always in opposition in the sense: I want to do this, and yet I mustn't do it. I should do it, but I don't like to do it, and so on. It always taking opposing positions. That is essentially fragmentation. Right? So what is left for me? I see all this at a glance, or through analysis. And I see it is like that. Then my question is, what am I to do? Don't tell me what you should do or shouldn't do - I don't accept anything from you, I am very sceptical by nature.

HP: You are asking the question; what am I to do? When one is observing there is no question of analyzing.

K: Are you doing it?

HP: Yes.

K: Are you doing it? If you are not doing it and you say; we must try, you are in contradiction, therefore duality, therefore fragmentation, and hence no goodness, and all the rest of it.

JR: As soon as you say or think about an holistic state, a state of goodness, you are already in duality, you are already in contradiction.

K: No, we are not in contradiction. I am only putting it into words. Holistic includes goodness. Right sir? A sense of religious action, a brain that is religious. What we mean by religion and all that we will go into presently. But I am asking you, what will you do, what's your action, what's your attitude when you want to educate your student in this goodness? The school has a certain reputation, a certain eclat - a feeling about it. And there is a certain atmosphere in this valley. And I send you my son, hoping that you will help him to grow in this holistic way of life. I am

communicating, it's not contradicting.

JR: It is in the way I posit the question that the contradiction arises.

K: I understand. We are trying to investigate the question, not trying to lay down laws about it. At least I'm not. I really want to find out what way I can help the student. I may not be holistic. You understand? Don't say: first I must be holistic, and then I can teach. Then we are dead. Then you will take an eternity, and the boy will have gone on to BA, MA, or whatever it is. If you say; I must first, then you have stumped yourself, stymied yourself. Sir, I am not going to saying anything. I don't know what to do. I really don't know what to do with the student who comes here, whose parents want him to join the army, or business, or something or other. And I've got the tremendous opposition of society, the father, the mother, the grandfather, wanting the boy to have a job and all that. How am I to bring this about? You don't answer me. I don't know.

KJ: Krishnaji, I am not answering the question: how am I to bring this about? I'm looking at fragmentation.

K: In the boy?

KJ: And in me, and in the world.

K: What does that mean? Follow it sir, don't change it, follow it, that mean? I am fragmented and the boy is fragmented. Right?

Right, sir?

KJ: Right.

K: Then what's the relationship between the boy and myself?

KJ: We are learning together.

K: Don't use phrases quickly. What's my relationship with the student who is fragmented like myself?

RH: I am not different from him.

K: Of course you are different from him - you teach mathematics, he doesn't know any. Don't say you are not different from him.

KJ: There is no relationship at all, if I am fragmented.

K: Please, sir, answer my question. You are fragmented, and your student, I am also fragmented. Right? Then what do you do? What's our relationship? Or, is there any relationship at all? Or, we are on the same level? Right? Ah, that's it, you won't admit that. I am fragmented, she is fragmented - not your sir. I am fragmented, he is fragmented - he is my student, or I am his student, better. I am his student. And what is the relationship between these two fragments? You understand sir, I am asking this question.

KJ: It can only be a fragmented relationship, if you can call it that.

K: Yes, so what is actually my relationship? What is my actual relationship with you who are fragmented, and like me, I am fragmented, what is our actual relationship?

KJ: There doesn't seem to be any.

K: That's all. How can fragments have a relationship?

A: Why not?

K: Are you really asking that question?

A: Yes.

K: You answer it. You ask me a question, and I am too eager to reply to it. So it goes on between you and me. I answer it, and then you counter it. Then I counter it, and so on. If your question is serious, has that question any vitality? Are you listening to what I am saying? He asks me a question, and he expects me to answer it,

and I say: I won't answer it, because in the question itself is the answer. So can we look at the question and wait for it to flower? You understand, sir? I ask the question, he won't answer it, because he says, I don't know, or I do know but it has no meaning. Because my question is very, very serious, you understand, sir? Let the question itself flower, not respond to it. I don't know if you follow what I am talking about. So the question itself contains the answer, if you let it flower, if you let it alone, don't kind of immediately respond to it. Because your response is already conditioned, already personal etc., etc. So leave the question. If the question has depth, significance, vitality, then that very the question unfolds. Am I talking nonsense? No, I have done this, so it is not nonsense.

Now, sir - just a minute. Is there truth? Does truth exist? You don't know, if you're honest. So we leave the question, I don't know, let's look at the question. And the question begins to unfold, is there truth, or only the sense of tremendous active, vital, illusion. I won't go into all that. What shall I do with student who has come here for four months, what shall I do, what shall I talk about? I wish you would look at it. Narayan, come on, sir.

N: What did you exactly mean when you said, is there truth, or only tremendous vital illusion. You are making a distinction between the two. Can you further go into that?

K: We are going off to something else. I am trying to say if the question has depth, if the question has a sense of great vitality - because you are asking the question after your own great inward searching, or outward searching, you are putting that question - so let the question itself answer. It will if you leave it alone.

Now I am coming back to my original question, we are going

off all the time.

G: As an educator, as a teacher, I have a child come to me. I am fragmented, the child is fragmented, so there is no relationship.

K: Are you sure there is no relationship, or are you just saying it?

G: I think, no, I am sure there is no relationship in the fragmented state, and I find that any response that I give to that child, or to the student, would itself be a fragmented response.

K: Yes. Stop there. Then, what will you do? You understand? Is that a statement - whatever relationship I have it is still fragmented. Is that a reality or a verbal statement?

G: It seems a reality to me.

K: Either, it is real, in the sense that the microphone is real there, that's not an illusion. The word 'microphone' is not that. The word is not that. Right? I don't know if you get the quality of it.

RH: Are you saying that conceptual understanding..

K:.. is not understanding. When I say 'the door', I mean the door, the fact.

RH: Then you are using your words in a very different way.

K: No.

RH: When you say: ask the question and leave it alone...

K: Let us see what happens to the question.

RH: What you are implying is: don't ask conceptual questions.

K: That's right.

RH: That flows from implication of certain statements.

K: Not only reflective questions, but also haven't you noticed how a question has a vitality?

So let's come back. We keep going off. What am I to do, sir?

You tell me.

G: I just want to add one more question. Am I fooling myself that I can give an holistic education?

K: We are going to find out. We are going to find out, you and I, whether it is possible to do it or not? The first statement is: we are both fragmented. et's stick to that, not move away. And I don't know what to do. Right sir? Are you clear? I don't know what to do. What does that mean to you; I don't know? Careful! I don't know. You understand, sir? You don't know what to do. Then, I must investigate. When I say, I don't know, do I really mean I don't know? Or, am I waiting for somebody else to tell me, so I will know? Which is it?

Gop: At the moment the latter.

K: Is there a state of the brain when it says: I really don't know? You understand my question? I really don't know. I am not waiting for him to answer; or memory operating, or expecting someone else to tell me. All these states are waiting for an answer. But no one can answer this, because they are all fragmented. Therefore I am waiting, watching, looking, observing, listening to the question. I don't know what to do. I wonder if you understand what I am talking about? Then I ask myself; what's the state of my brain which says: 'I don't know?'

GN: At that point in time, it's not functioning.

K: 'I don't know'. Or are you waiting for it to know?

N: Waiting for it to know.

K: Therefore, you are waiting to know, you will know.

Therefore your brain is not saying; 'I don't know'. It's all very logical sir.

AM: The brain doesn't say it doesn't know.

K: That's it, that's the first thing - the brain never acknowledges or remains in the state: 'I don't know'. I ask you: 'What is Iswara?' And you promptly answer, because you have read, or you don't believe or you believe; Iswara comes as a symbol to you. But if you ask: what is the element which created this? I won't go into this. It's a tremendously interesting question: What is life? (It's too complicated.) What is the beginning of life? What is the life in the seed that you plant? The life of man - what is the origin of that life, the very cell? It leads off somewhere else.

So I don't know how to deal with that boy or with myself. Any action I take, any movement of thought, is still born out of fragmentation. Right? So I really don't know. So may I proceed?

N: Please, sir.

K: What is love? Is it related to hate? If it is related - love then is still fragmentation. Right? Do you understand what I am saying, sir?

N: Love is not the opposite of hate.

K: What is love? It has nothing to do with pity, sympathy - all the rest of it. What is love? You don't know. Is it that state of not-knowing love? You're being mesmerized. It leads so far, so deep that I don't know if you want to go into all this.

I don't know what to do with that boy or girl; we are both fragmented. I can teach them mathematics, geography, history, biology, chemistry, psychiatry, or anything - but that's nothing. Sorry! This demands much deeper enquiry, very much deeper. So I said, what is it that is completely holistic? Certainly not thought - thought is experience and all the rest of it. It's certainly not

sympathy; not generosity; not empathy; not saying: 'you're a nice chap'. So love has - what?

N: Compassion.

K: Love, compassion - that is the only thing that's holistic. I'm just discovering something for myself. I say, love is not thought; love is not pleasure. Don't accept, for God's sake that is the last thing. Love is utterly unrelated to hate, jealousy, anger - all that. Love is really completely unbreakable. It's whole and it has its own intelligence. Compassion, love has its own intelligence. Of course. Am I talking nonsense?

N: I have heard you say this before in different ways.

K: In different ways. I am coming back to that. So not knowing, to know. What does that mean, to know?

N: It is love.

K: Oh, no sir. Just listen, you are not listening. To know: I know my wife. Can you ever say about a person - I know.

RH: To know is to shut off in some way.

K: Yes. If I say; 'I know Radhikaji' - what do I know about her? So, to say, I know, is fragmentation.

RD: Is it Krishnaji? - to say, 'I know'.

K: I'm talking about human beings. I know that is a palm tree. I know that is a tiger. But to say, I know him, is a violation.

RD: The brain is so dull.

K: Your brain, sir, is damned dull. (Laughter)

RD: Yes, sir. It is rooted. It remains rooted in all this knowledge.

K: Yes, sir. I asked a question, which is: can I help the student or talk to him? I know I am fragmented; he is fragmented. And I

also know, have a feeling, that love is whole, compassion.

Therefore compassion, love have their own intelligence. I am going to see if that intelligence can operate. I don't know if I am conveying anything.

JR: You say that love has its own intelligence; you say that love is holistic - it's not fragmented. Isn't that just an assumption?

K: No, I am talking about myself. Love is not an assumption - my god.

JR: Maybe it is, because I don't know.

K: Remain there. You don't know. Wait, find out; don't answer. I don't know what the inside of a modern car is. I don't know. I have, as a matter of fact, stripped a car, old cars. I know how it works, I know the gadgets of it, but a modern cars I wouldn't touch because it is too complicated. Right? So I want to learn about it. So I go to a garage man and he says; this, this, this, he teaches me; because I want to know how it works. I take the trouble; I take the pains; I pay him, if I have the money; or work with him till I know every part of that car. That means I want to learn, but I'm not sure you want to learn as I want to learn about a car. You understand, sir? I am not at all sure you want to learn.

RD: But Krishnaji, this very wanting to learn...

K: Don't translate into fragmentation.

RD: No, I'm not. I've done a lot with you on this. I wanted to learn, and wanting to learn itself, as we understand the word 'wanting to learn'. Today, I don't want to learn. Please listen to what I want to say. Today I don't want to learn in the sense of wanting-to-know-more-about it. I don't want to do it.

K: Just a minute, sir. I don't know how those cameras work, and

you say, learn about it. I ask him, and I become his apprentice: I watch how he does it, I learn about it. Then I say: I know how to work that camera. But human beings are not like cameras. They are much more complicated, silly asses! Much more psychological, they are like a messy machine, and I want to know how their brain works. Either I become a biologist, or a brain specialist, or I study myself, which is much more exciting than going to a brain specialist. Just a minute, just a minute. So I learn how my brain works - there is nobody to teach me.

RD: There may be.

K: I don't trust them.

RD: But I listen to them.

K: I don't trust anybody.

RD: True, I don't trust anybody.

K: All their knowledge is from books, or from their small little selves. So I say, I am going to investigate this whole way of living, not just parts of it, the whole way of living.

RD: Sir, I had a teacher, I had a teacher, please listen, who, I felt, had an extraordinary understanding about the nature of human beings. I wanted to learn. I began learning with that teacher. The teacher pointed out the nature of the brain, the nature of the self, the nature and I began learning in the same way as I learnt everything else.

K: Oh no. I understand, I understand.

RD: I did. And we began to gather knowledge, what learning really means - as we know it.

K: Learning, as we know it, is merely accumulating memory.

RD: Accumulating memory - but there is an observing in it.

K: Yes. Yes. Yes. Don't let's make it complicated.

RD: One observed; remembered; got what one called 'insight'.

K: Oh.

RD: Yes. I know. I said, what one called 'insight', something new, something one has not known earlier, something which seemed to make the picture better, larger and so on. You come to a point when you see that this process of making the picture is endless. It is nothing to do with the real thing.

K: So what? At the end of it, what?

RD: So, what is this learning?

K: I don't consider that learning.

RD: Yes, that's not learning.

K: So what is learning? Surely, memorizing is not learning.

RD: No. That's not learning.

K: But that's what you are doing. Rajesh, is there another way of learning? Is there something entirely different from the ordinary learning? You understand the question? Is there?

RD: I don't know.

K: Do you want to know? No. Do you want to find out if there is another way of learning - not memorizing, memorizing, memorizing and then remembering, acting skilfully and so on. We know that very well. Now he comes along and tells me: look, don't do that, that's mechanical, all that. He says there is another way of learning. Will I listen to him? Will I take the trouble to say, tell me about it. I am receptive; I am anxious; I am willing to find out. So he begins to tell me. Am I capable of listening to what he is saying? Or my whole brain revolts against this, because it's used to one pattern, and to break that pattern is the real difficulty?

RD: And trying to break that pattern is useless.

K: That makes another problem. I don't want to do that. So first, I ask myself - do I really want to learn? Go on, sir, don't ask me, I am asking you, do you want to learn? Or, is it another chapter to add to your memory, another book?

RD: I see what you are saying.

K: So let's come back. What am I to do or not do? Or the question is much deeper than merely the boy and the girl whom I'm educating. So it might be I have not really understood, verbally even, what it means to live a holistic life - understood intellectually. I don't know if you follow, what I am talking about.

Q: I would say yes.

K: No, are you sure. You've used two words. I am sure intellectually. So, you have separated the intellect from the whole. Therefore you're not - listen, listen ...

Q: Sorry.

K: What, what about?

Q: For not listening. You were saying something and ...

K: Sir, when you say I understand intellectually, it means just bananas.

Q: Sir, I don't say I understand just intellectually.

K: I say you are not listening old boy. When one says I understand it intellectually it means absolutely nothing. Right? When you say intellectual that's another fragment. So, don't use the word I understand intellectually. That's a crime.

Now, what am I, an educator at Rishi Valley, I understand partially what it means, verbally even, a holistic way of living. And knowing that he and I are both fragmented. Right? Are you

listening? You're getting bored.

Q: No, not bored.

K: You can't sustain attention?

Q: Sir, how do you say that? I am not bored, not at all.

K: You were not listening yesterday.

Q: I don't know what to say to you.

K: Yes sir. Five minutes we will stop. May I finish this? I am at Rishi Valley, lovely place, beautiful hills and all the beauty of the earth here. I wonder if you know what I mean by beauty. No, I won't go into that any more. I'm here, I am responsible for the parents for that boy or girl, right? They have send them because we have good reputation, we look after them, we do all that, That's not the point. He comes around and tells me: It's all right, but what matters is a holistic way of life. Not intellectual, but the whole psyche, the whole being, the whole entity, which is now fragmented, if that can be whole then you have done the most extraordinary education - he tells me that. And he goes away and I don't know what to do. I understand the verbal meaning of whole, non-fragmented, not broken up, not saying one thing and doing something else, thinking something and doing quite the opposite of that. All that is fragmentation of life. And I don't know what to do. I really mean deeply, profoundly, gravely, seriously, I don't know what to do. Right? Am I deceiving myself when I say I don't know what to do, or waiting for somebody to tell me or some book, something will accidentally come along and give me - unfortunately that word - insight. So I can't wait for that because the boy is growing up and kicking around. So, what shall I do? I know one thing, absolutely for certain - I don't know. Right? I don't

know. All my inventions all my thinking have collapsed. I don't know if you feel that way. I don't know. So the brain is open for reception. You understand what I am saying? The brain has been closed - by conclusions, by opinions, by judgements, by values, by my problems - it's a closed thing. When I say I really don't know I have broken something, I have broken the bottle which held the champagne. Out of that I begin to find out, when the bottle is broken. Right Sir? Then I find out what love is, what compassion and what that intelligence is that is born out of compassion. It has nothing to do with intellect.

Right Sir, it is now an hour and 37 minutes we have talked. Is that enough? Have I mesmerised you all?

Sir, we never come to the point when I say I don't know. Right? You ask me about God, I have immediate answers. Or you ask me about chemistry - out comes it, the tap is open. Sociology, any damn thing I am ready to answer. We meet day after tomorrow, don't weht? I hope you can bear it. You see I'm one of those idiots, sir, who hasn't read a damn thing except novels - you understand. It's a fortunate thing.

Q: And who doesn't think also, Sir.

K: No, it's like a drum, it's all tuned up, when you strike on it, it gives the right note. I hope you aren't tired.

RISHI VALLEY 3RD TALK WITH TEACHERS 9TH DECEMBER 1985

K: We were talking the other day about, why do we turn out mice instead of lions? May we talk about that a little? We seem to spend a great deal of energy and capacity on these students. Their parents, obviously, want them to be safe, well-educated, to have a good job, settle down in life, marry, children - the whole business. And we spend enormous energy in educating them to fit in that gap, or that slot, or that space - as an engineer, as a philosopher, as an academician, and scientist and so on. Is that all we can do? Come on, sirs, it's in your lap, in your court.

Like Kabir experimenting; he's organizing some kind of educational structure, or non-structure. He must spend a great deal of energy in thinking it out, with the others, talk to the parents, talk to the students. And yet they remain mice, tame, domestic mice. And we seem to be satisfied with that. There are nearly 350 students here 340 or 350, it doesn't matter; and the same number of students in Rajghat, and about 250 or so in Madras, Bangalore has 150. And out of this lot, about a thousand - I don't have to conclude the sentence.

So what shall we do? Apparently they go abroad, some of them, if they are unlucky enough, and they get swallowed up by the American technology, by the girls, by the marvellous beauty of the land. And they are lost there. Some of them are in the IBM, some invent something new. They seem to flower in the technological world in America, at least some of them do. And, of course, nobody goes to England anymore. Perhaps some of them go to

Germany. And they apparently do extraordinarily well in the technological, mechanical world. They have got fairly good memories, fairly good brains, and they slip into that rut.

And here we are, nearly a thousand students in our schools, and we don't seem to be able to produce one 'gazelle', or one 'lion', or even a 'big elephant'. Why is this? I am asking you. Please, you are the educators. Is there something wrong in our approach to all this?

Rajghat and this school, Rishi Valley, have existed for nearly 60 years and more, and when you consider the enormous energy that we've put into it - it's incalculable amount of energy, building, making the land fertile, digging wells - and yesterday, there was a collector here for lunch, and he said he's going to build more dams and all the rest of it. The environment seems to help us enormously - the trees, the land, those enormous rocks and the extraordinary beauty of this land. But somehow all that becomes insignificant, when we, as educators, are incapable of doing something marvellous. I believe both schools, especially Rishi Valley, has got a good reputation. It is fairly well known.

May I tell you a joke. The other day I was coming by air, going somewhere or other. 'From where are you?' somebody asked me. 'Oh', I said. 'somewhere'. And he said, 'Actually, where are you from? Are you a Turk? Are you Persian; are you one of the Muslim world?' I said 'No, no, no'. 'Where are you from'. I said, 'I am from the Valley of the Rishis'. It's rather a good name for this place. He said, 'Where is that.' I said 'You won't find it'.

So what shall we do together? To do, or not do, something extraordinarily alive, vital. Not let the students fall into the same old rut, business or army or this and that. Please, I would like your

advice and discussion.

RH: Sir, may I say something. Perhaps I am just paraphrasing you. But, I feel we fail because we deal with the problem you're posing, when we talk to our children, when we try to do something, we constantly make a problem of it.

K: Without making a problem of it, what is amiss? What is not correct? What is it that we should or should not do, to bring about a totally different human being? I don't know if you are interested in this.

RH: But perhaps sir, the question shouldn't be posed in the way you are posing it.

K: Then let us pose it differently. What is it I want my daughter or my son to be when I send them here, knowing that they will get a very good academic knowledge? And the parents are not really concerned about the other. Right?

RH: No, but in some vague way they will have a...

K: Yes some, but it's such a drop in a bucket. You see the fruit of it all. So what shall we do together? Please, I am putting all these questions to all of you. It's not just... What shall we do, come on sir, what shall we do sir? I don't want you to experiment on my children. Right?

KJ: Yes sir.

K: I say what the hell are you doing with my children, experimenting, like animals, pigs?

KJ: Sir, we are not. I think it's a very wrong notion that has gone around that we are experimenting.

K: I don't care. Are you experimenting with them? Are you trying something new on them? Or are you trying to bring a

different quality of a human being?

KJ: I would say, we're trying to do the latter, sir.

K: You can't. All right, sir. In what way? Sorry, I'm going to examine you, now that you're close. In what way are you trying to bring about a different quality of a human being? He's one of the - where is the other chap? No, they are all hiding there. There is, yes. These two are supposed to run Bangalore school. ir, you tell me. Your way may be the right way or the wrong way. I don't know. So you tell me. I've sent my daughter and son to you. I want them - please, I'm a fairly educated human being; I've seen different parts of the world, a little too much; I'm fairly knowledgeable and I send you these two children. I've a feeling, or rather a wish, a longing that you would do something different from the usual run of the schools. And I would like them to be academically excellent, because that is part of life, part of earning a beastly livelihood, with all the boredom of it. And also I would like them to be, if I may use the word most delicately, religious, not the usual temple and all that nonsense. So I send them to you. For nine months you have been in charge of them. Proceed. Tell me what you would do. What will you do? Not, we hope. Not, we will try. Not, we'll do our best. Because, that all sounds silly to me. So what will you do, sir? Sirs this is a question to all of you, not just to KG.

JR: Sir, may I respond. Why are we assuming that anything can be done. If these schools have been going for sixty years...

K: Sir, I will tell you.

JR: These schools have been going on for sixty years...

K: I know all that sir.

JR:... and there's nothing extraordinary that has happened yet.

K: Yes.

JR: So why do we assume, is there any evidence that anything can be done?

K: Sir, I'll tell you. We started this school - this and Rajghat. I used to sleep on the floor here. No water, no electricity, the toilet was all this open field. We thought we would educate them differently. We thought. I'm still thinking it can be done. You may say 'You're rather a bit old, in your head. Nothing can be done'. You might say that. I say, sorry, since you have educated man in that direction - right? Commercialism, technology, job, good life - you know all that. Since you have done it, man can do something else too. You understand?

JR: Why do we assume that?

K: Why not? If you have done that, if you have gone that way, why can't you go that way too?

JR: Maybe it can't be taught.

K: Why not? It may be. You assume it may not.

JR: I don't know.

K: Therefore, let's find out if it can be. You may take 50 years, 100 years. I hope not. There must be the other direction too. The Jesuits have done it. Right sir? The Jesuits.

JR: Have they produced extraordinary individuals that you're talking about? The Jesuits, have they produced extraordinary..

K: Oh yes! They have produced what they wanted to produce. The communist cells were based on Jesuit cells. They took a great deal from Loyola. So, you can't say human beings cannot go some other way too.

So what shall we do - you and I and the rest of us - to see if we

can bring something tremendous out of these places?

KJ: Krishnaji, obviously it cannot be experimented, in the sense of groping around. It cannot be 'I hope I'll do my best'.

K: Ah! I don't want you to do your best, which would be nothing. To me, to do something, your best, is nothing.

KJ: Right.

K: So, what will you, as a human being, create, build? You have built the pyramids, you have built the sphinx, you have built the Parthenon. You've built the most extraordinary things in life. And why can't we do this?

RH: Sir, one of the prerequisites, it seems to me, should be that one should be very critical - self critical - and not satisfied with what we have done, what we are doing.

K: You mean self-critical?

RH: Critical - what we have done so far.

K: That's what I'm saying. What have you done so far?

Q: Maybe our attention is in the wrong place. If we give attention to the children, yes, it's what we are, that we give to the children.

K: Just a minute, lady, just a minute. The parents want their children to be safe, secure. So, to be secure in this society you must have a degree, and examination, study, all that. Then they also want their children to be married and settle down. They have a job, and marry and settle down. For god's sake, get on with it. Breed like hell and carry on. Is it the parents, or is it ourselves or is it we are caught up in a system, in a whirlpool that cannot but carry us along in its own way? You understand my question? I cannot admit that. To me that is defeatism, to be defeated by a theory. So what

shall I do, what shall we do? Please, come on sirs.

RD: Sir the Jesuits and the communists, they rally their energy, all the people, they put all their energy in a common goal. It gives them a tremendous sense of energy. Now we are seeing that, that kind of energy, in the same thing. It is still isolation.

K: Yes.

RD: Our question is, when we see this, we're lost. We don't have...

K: No, Rajesh. Just a minute sir. What are you trying to tell me? If all of us have a certain goal, certain purpose, certain definite delineated shape, idea, or a principle or a pattern, then we can put all our energy into it? Can we? Can we all agree, all of us in this room agree that we need a different kind of brain, a different kind of outlook on life, a different way of living, of feeling and so on? Could we all agree on that?

RD: I think many of us are agreed on that.

K: Ah, No! I'm asking.

RH: Sir, we may agree, but what is the content of that agreement?

K: That's what I'm coming to. I agree we should build the sphinx, and we know we can't do it. So can we all agree profoundly on something together. Not superficially, not say, 'yes, yes and let's get on with it.' Can we have the same vision - I'm using the word vision, not from the world of psychiatry but in the world of the earth. Can we all together have one vision? Or is that impossible? Come on sirs.

RH: Sir it can be possible. But the same vision can be accompanied by fanaticism, zealousness.

K: No.

RH: You don't want all that.

K: No, no.

RD: What is the quality of that vision.

K: I'll tell you in a minute. That's not the point. The question is, can we all come together upon something? Not purpose, goal, god and all that, but the feeling that we are together, first.

RD: About something?

K: No.

RD: You said that.

K: No.

RD: Sir, you said it.

K: No, I didn't say that. Now I'm saying, can we all feel that we are together doing something. Not, 'what'?

RH: That's very different.

K: Ah, that's what I'm saying. Come on sirs. I mean, if you all want to build a house, that's fairly simple. Because we all have a common goal, we all want so many windows, so many bathrooms, so many rooms, so many sitting rooms and all the rest of it - that's fairly simple. Then we say 'good idea, let's all work together'. That is, you're working for a purpose, for a goal, for an end. But we are saying, first what is important is not the building, is not the shape of the house, the windows, bathrooms and so on, but the feeling that we are together. Don't go to sleep please. If we have that feeling we can do anything.

JR: What would bring about this feeling of togetherness, if it's not some kind of a conscious goal?

K: Sir, we can't do anything in the world by ourselves. Right?

Nothing! The Parthenon was not built by one man putting stones. It was a feeling, for Athena, (I don't want to go into that story) and putting it all together, with tremendous intelligence. Right? Can't we do the same thing here?

JR: But isn't there a goal there?

K: No, no, no. The feeling for the goddess. You understand? Goddess of wisdom, Athena. Right? The feeling of it, I'm talking of, not the goddess. That came later.

KJ: Are you talking about being together in the feeling for the religious quality?

K: I'm saying sir, do we have that feeling first?

KJ: Of being together.

K: Of being together. You cannot do anything by yourself in the world. You need my help, you need his help, you need your wife, you need someone. You can't live by yourself, unless you trot off to the Himalayas. And then there too, somebody comes and feeds you. The sense of isolation, which separates, that's all I'm objecting to.

RH: Isn't that inevitable if you rally around a goal?

K: No, no. I'm not talking about a goal, a purpose, an end, a goddess, or this. The feeling: I can't live by myself.

SP: Could we say that we get this feeling for a while, this feeling of togetherness. But when our own idiosyncrasies, our own tendencies come to the fore, and then somehow that feeling gets lost.

K: No sir, you can't lose it, if you have that feeling. I don't think we are talking about the same thing.

KJ: If it is an emotional...

K: Not emotional sir. Even intellectually you can't do anything.

KJ: I agree sir, intellectually one can say that you can't do anything alone.

K: You can't. To have a child, a woman and a man is necessary. It may be a tube or anything, but a man is necessary. So, this idea - 'leave us alone, we will do something by ourselves', is impossible. We are together in this. And I don't think you get that feeling. I don't think you have that feeling. To have that feeling implies that you sit down, if there is any misunderstanding wipe it out the next second. You follow?

RD: Sir can you explore a bit more into this?

K: What? Into what?

RD: Sir into this question of - you made a statement that 'You cannot do this alone'. No one person can do this. It is absolutely clear.

K: Except in parliament, , or a dictator.

RD: One person can only bully the rest.

K: Yes. So we're not talking of that kind.

RD: Or he can influence the rest. We're not talking of that.

K: The feeling that we are not separate, the feeling that you cannot - sir, you're utterly responsible for whatever you do. Right? I walk down that road. I see a branch fallen on it. I pick it up. I'm responsible, and not say, 'Well, the gardener will come and pick it up'. And if there is the feeling of responsibility, then you're together. I don't know if I'm conveying it. Please sir, let's discuss it, don't let me talk.

RD: Sir, there is this tendency to isolate.

K: Don't bring in all that. I know that. What will you do,

Rajesh? Don't talk about these things. What are you doing?

RD: When you watch it, sometimes you're not able to end that. It has its own force.

K: What? What?

RD: At times.

K: Not at times. Now.

RD: I see what you are saying.

K: What do you say: can we work together? Or you shirk responsibility and I do all the work? And you come along then and criticize. Suppose this happens. I say 'What the hell do you mean by it'? You and I are involved in this thing. It's not, you are superior, I'm inferior. You take the spade. I've taken the spade, dug a hole. You do the same. Don't tell me 'I'll improve the hole'.

RD: If you feel that, you will keep digging holes, and there's nothing in those holes, you don't want to do it.

K: I will plant a tree in those holes. What are you talking about? I dig a hole for an orange tree, or whatever tree, and I see it's the proper depth, soil, compost, all kinds of stuff in it - and I'll plant it.

RD: Plant it, then?

K: But it's my responsibility for the whole thing. I want Rishi Valley to be the most beautiful place, on earth, so I work. What are you people doing? You don't come and supervise me and tell me what to do.

RD: No sir.

K: I know sir. You dig. You plant, because you care for the whole place.

RD: Sir, you don't know what it means to care for the whole place. You want to find out what it means to care for the whole

place.

K: I'll tell you.

RD: You don't want to just fragmentarily plant a tree, and plant this. You can go on.

K: No I'll tell you. Really, you want me to tell you what it means? Sir, there is a particular hill, in Saanen, going up towards a certain other little town called Schonreid. We were driving up that steep slope, and a girl in front of us, on a bicycle, sees a piece of paper on the road. Get's down. Picks up that piece of paper and trundles up the hill. And there is a bin at the corner. She drops it in there. That little girl of fifteen or twelve or whatever she was - yes sir.

RD: You say that that is coming for the whole?

K: Please sir, see.

RD: No, I'm not going to let you make that statement and...

K: Sir, in the sense, she was responsible for that piece of paper, responsible to see the road was kept clean.

RD: Sir, each one of us here must be doing that - several times a day.

K: Eh, Rajesh. Sir, I'm talking about the feeling of responsibility, not for a particular thing, but the feeling of responsibility. If you feel that, you do everything.

RH: And sir, there is no feeling of 'my vision, and your vision'.

K: Ah. That's why I'm asking you all, gentlemen and ladies, what shall we do? Knowing that you cannot build anything by yourself. Impossible. So what will you do? Tell me, please. You know, I'd like you to discuss, talk. Tell me what to do - not verbal statement, not theoretical. Tell me, I've come here as one of you, as

a worker - worker, not a theoretician - and I say, Rajesh, please tell me, or Kabir or X, Y, Z - tell me what I am to do - please listen to what I'm saying - not to bring about a larger mouse, but something tremendously different. And if you want me to explain, I'll explain what is the difference. So, how will you manage this, how will you bring this about? And it's your responsibility because you are the educator here, you have lived here, you have worked here, you have shaken hands with the others, saluted, you have drunk the same water, eaten the same bread. Tell me sirs, please, what shall I do?

Look sir, K happened to dissolve the organization, tremendous organization; because he was the head of it, he closed it. And he did the same with other things. Recently, he said, no more talks at Saanen, because he was alone there and he decided. Here, we have to deal with five hundred people. Right? He can't say, 'Let's do this, don't do that'. We are all together here. Living in the same valley, eating the same food, etc., etc. So I can't say, 'Do this, do that'. I couldn't do it, personally. So I'm asking you gentlemen, what shall we do together. For god's sake, wake up Mr Kumaraswamy, what shall we do?

Sir this is a challenge to you. You have to answer it. You can't just neglect it. Look sir, come on sir. You are full of energy, aggressive action, tell me what to do. I'm one of your - hat do you call them? One of your colleagues, you are not my boss. You're not my educator. I'm one of your colleagues. And I say, sir what shall we do? That is, you and I talk it over. You don't lay down and say, do this, I won't. I have come to you on a different footing, on a different understanding: that we are colleagues, we're working

together. You start, and tell me what to do - not that I will accept what you tell me, but I will discuss it.

KJ: I don't know where to start answering this question, Krishnaji. One doesn't know where to start answering.

K: I will tell you.

KJ: There is the obvious need for a sense of togetherness. And there are a hundred things that come out of it.

K: You tell me one that's the key to it. That key may open vast vistas, vast rooms or something, but you tell me the key to it. Come on, please, don't go to sleep. Rajesh, tell me the key to it.

RD: What is the point if I can't end it? What is the point of saying it verbally - the key?

K: No, I want you to tell me. Not verbally. If you ask me - you're all waking up? - if you ask me, I would first ask you, before you ask me, why are you talking to me? What's your relationship with me?

KJ: Supposing I say we're working together.

K: Ah! Ah! That's all 'bananas'.

KJ: You're in the school, so...

K: No, I'm not talking that. I'm not talking about schools. I'm talking about, what's your relationship with another human being? You are a human being. You're not a principal, Akbar, no, Kabir - you might be Akbar's reincarnation.

I said first, what's your relationship to me? I have to answer that question. What's your relationship ladies and gentlemen, what's your relationship with me? That stumps you. Kabir, I mean Rajesh, tell me what's your relationship with me, K? You have to be very honest in this. You're going to marry me. Or I'm going to marry

you. What's your relationship?

RD: Shall I honestly answer it?

K: Oh! For god's sake.

RD: Sir, but don't pounce on me. Give me time. If you pounce, I can't answer it then.

K: Why I'm asking this question is we are going to establish a relationship first. Right? If we have no relationship we can't work together. Right? So I'm asking you, not personally, if you don't mind, what's your relationship with K? Have you any relationship with K? Don't say, what do you mean by the word 'relationship'.

RD: No, I won't ask.

K: I will tell you.

RD: Yes, but I won't ask you. Unless you wish to still...

K: No, tell me what your relationship is, or have you no relationship with anybody? I'm asking this of all of us.

RD: Sir, that, perhaps, is a very true statement, that one has no relationship.

K: I'm asking you. Don't budge. What's your relationship to K?

RD: K has stirred...

K: Careful, careful, careful!

RD: You're too quick sir. You won't allow me to...

K: So, what is your relationship with Radikaji, what's your relationship with her? Or with Mrs Thomas? Or with Kabir? Or with somebody else? What's your relationship, sir? Don't go on.

RD: My relationship is based on my experience of them. I know, please, you've asked me, I'll tell you.

K: I'm asking what's your relationship? Is it a friend ?

RD: Yes.

K: Is it your boss?

RD: No.

K: Wait!

RD: Go ahead, I'm just...

K: Is it your constant compassion, because you see her every day? You see her, talk to her everyday. Pour out your troubles, or whatever you talk to her about. Is she listening to you? Considering you? Trying to understand you? Or you are trying to understand her? Why she does this, that, that and the other thing? Or, you've kept to yourself? The same thing, what's your relation with him - or her? You see you don't answer these questions. Or you have no relationship at all. Because you have - I'm not saying you have, or haven't - because you have no relationship, you move along. So I'm asking you, sir, unless we establish a real relationship we can't work together - a genuine one, not a kind of ideological, romantic, sexual or otherwise. I am saying, do you, who have lived here for so many years, have any kind of relationship with any of these people?

RD: If you ask me very deeply, I would say no.

K: Good! Therefore you can't work with the others.

RD: Exactly. That is what is going on. Everybody...

K: Ah, don't say what's going on. I know what's going on. I'm not blind.

RD: You're right, sir. We've no relationship, in that sense.

K: So...

RD: In that sense!

K: Of course. Is that so with all of us?

RD: Yes.

K: Don't you answer.

RD: Sorry.

K: Is that so with all of us? I'm asking. Don't answer anything else, because from that stems everything. It's the fountain. If that fountain is not flowing, you can't work together, you can't build together.

RD: Sir, why is one frightened of 'breaking the bottle'? You used the analogy last time, 'to break the bottle'.

K: Yes, break the bottle.

RD: Why is one frightened to break the bottle?

K: Sir, do you want a good relationship with me?

RD: Good relationship?

K: Eh, eh, didn't you hear what I said? Good! Really good relationship with another with whom you can talk, expose, feel all, tell all your troubles, you know, a friend. For god's sake.

RD: That kind of relationship I have with many people.

K: Oh no!

RD: If you say a friend...

K: No, I'm asking you. Do you have a relationship with another, so that you don't have to talk, you can be quiet, but there is an interflow.

RD: There is.

K: A very...

RD: I have.

K: How many?

RD: A person opens up to me, I open up to the person, there is no fear, there is no...

K: Oh! No, no, no, no. m asking you, do you have the feeling of

being related? It doesn't matter with whom.

RD: No, no.

K: So how can you work with another who has that feeling - suppose?

RD: No sir. That is what has been happening.

K: So what will you do? Ah! No No! Don't throw up your shoulders.

RD: Cry?

K: Do. Cry.

RD: I've done it, sir.

K: All right, if you have cried, then what, after that, wipe your fears and get on with it. Then what? I'm not bullying you sir. I'm not being personal, I'm just asking, how can we work together, build together, think together, if we have no relationship with each other? Not sexual, not you lean on me, I lean on you, I scratch your back, you scratch mine. I don't mean that kind of relationship.

If you stand alone, you're related. I don't know if you understand. If you're dependent, you're not related. Sir, that's my job to go on like this.

So, you tell me, some of you, what shall we do together to bring about a different quality of a human being for whom we are responsible. The parents have put their children here, paying an awful lot of money. All the bother of it, train journey back and forth, and here you don't eat meat, there they eat meat, there they smoke - you know all that goes on. Here you have them for nine months, what will you do with them? Apart from academics. (How does it feel to be in India? It's a strange country. We'll talk it over later.)

Come on sirs. What's the good of being silent?

Would you work under authority? Don't say, no, sir. Be careful, careful! Don't say 'no'.

RD: I would fight it? I will not...

K: Don't say 'fight', don't answer yet, because you haven't yet gone into it. Would you, if I because the authority here - god forbid - ..

RD: I would leave this place.

K: You wouldn't.

RD: I bet sir, I would.

K: I'll tell you why...

RD: If you were an authority, I would not have lived in this place.

K: He won't even listen, that boy. Do you know what I would do? I would cajole, play with you, I would say, 'Come on old boy', you know.

Now would you work under authority? It's a very serious question, sir. Don't just say 'I won't'. It may be the authority of a committee. It may be the authority of half a dozen people. It may be the authority of some entity called KFI. Is it that there is no feeling that we are together in this? I can't build a house by myself. Impossible, I must have a carpenter. I must have a man who deals with glass work, you know, all that, electricity and so on. So, I want to co-operate, I want to say 'Please, let's do it all together'. Have you that feeling? I'm not asking you. Have you got that feeling?

RH: I'm sorry I interrupted. But sir, may I ask a different round about question? And that is, that we earlier said that there is no

such thing as my vision and your vision and that fragmenting. Would you allow that perhaps that there is a vision that is if we worked together and inevitable we should...

K: I don't follow.

RH: Not fragmented vision of different people but if we co-operate, when we co-operate is there a vision that is almost organic?

K: I think there is. I understand that.

RH: And that it is our business to discover it. And in the co-operation perhaps it can be discovered.

K: Radhikaji, you are not answering my question.

RH: What is it, sir?

K: What shall we do together? Not to bring about bigger minds but a line, something outrageous. Not outrageous, you understand?

RH: I don't know what to do if you pose the question that way.

K: Suppose you don't know, how will you then start? I don't know. How will you, not knowing, begin?

RH: It must begin that way because then it is...

K: You understood what I said?

RH: Yes.

K: Not knowing you begin.

RH: Yes.

K: Not experiment. You begin. I wonder if you understand what I am saying. Is it that we all know and therefore we do nothing.

RH: And bully each other.

K: Yes. I am not being clever. It is not being astute or cunning. Somehow I feel we are all striving after something that we inwardly feel is important. You understand? And therefore we

never start from saying, "I really don't know. Let us move together."

KJ: Isn't it that in not knowing you do move together, because in knowing...

K: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. So, start with yourself. You start with knowing. I am not being personal, and you botch up the whole thing. I come along, he comes along says, "Sir, I really don't know how to build this house. I don't know anything. Let us talk together." You are not instructing me. I am not instructing you. Let us see what it really means not knowing. What is the content of not knowing? Is there any content to not knowing? Is that a different quality of the brain. You understand? Because we say, "I know about this. I know about that. I am God, of course." We know every damn thing. So, you and I start with not knowing. That is an immense thing. You follow?

KJ: Yes.

K: It is not you are experimenting on me or I am experimenting on you. But I don't know. I am not weak. Are you understanding? I am not weak. On the contrary I am full of this extraordinary idea which is free from knowing. So, we talk it over, not knowing, what is the content of not knowing. And we have to eat food two hours later. You follow, sir. I don't know if you follow. Won't some of you say something? Is it time? It is time, I know. Aren't you tired of your long journey?

RH: Not yet.

K: This is the last...

RH: Teacher's talk here.

RD: It seems the mind is knowing. Knowing is the very nature

of things.

K: It is the brain. It is the nature of the brain. Knowing.

RD: So, when you say, " I don't know, let us find out". You will find out in talking over but it will still be knowing.

K: When you say, " I don't know" If you really say it to yourself, what takes place? Don't conjecture up things. What actually takes place when you say, " I really don't know." I really don't know what in the other side of the mountain. Right? I have never taken the trouble to climb. I won't imagine. I won't etcetera. So, I want to find out what it means to look over the mountain. I'll climb the mountain if I can or I can't. But there is something still on the outside of the mountain, beyond the mountain.

RD: How do you know? Why do ask that question?

K: What question am I asking?

RD: When you ask this question...

K: What question?

RD: Whether there is something else..

K: Maybe I said. You didn't listen. There may be something beyond the mountain. Right? To find that out, either I have to climb the mountain to find out or say, " Sorry, I don't know what is beyond it." Right? You understand?

RD: I am not sure I understand.

K: What is the difficulty, old boy? The mountain suddenly drops. Maybe. So to find out I have to climb the mountain. But I can't climb the mountain. Right? I am too old or too young or too inexperienced. I can't. And I don't imagine what is on the other side of the mountain. So, I say, " I don't know what is on the other side of the mountain." Right? It may a sheer precipice or it may be the

most beautiful of valleys. Right? I don't know. I won't pretend. I won't imagine. I won't get emotional about it. I don't know. If you go up there and see, don't tell me. Your description won't satisfy me.

Shall we stop? It is time.

RISHI VALLEY 2ND DIALOGUE WITH STUDENTS 12TH DECEMBER 1985

Krishnamurti: Did you have a good sleep?

Students: Yes.

K: Yes? Good. What are we going to do today?

S: Tell us something about yourself, sir.

K: No, I asked you what you are going to do today. School, class? Do we all sit quietly, silently, or do we talk? Tell me.

S: You talk.

K: What sir? You talk - then talk. What would you like to talk about?

S: Talk about yourself sir - tell us something about yourself.

K: About myself? Not very interesting.

S: It doesn't matter sir.

K: I know - it matters to me though. What would you like me to talk about myself? The past - about my past? Are you really interested in it.

S: Yes, sir.

K: Why? You tell me why, and then I'll talk.

S: I'm curious.

K: You're curious, and then what? If you're curious, and I fulfil your curiosity, all right, then what?

S: Then we'll be more curious.

K: More curious, quite right, so where shall we start?

S: From the beginning sir.

K: From the beginning. (Laughter) Look, most of my life I've forgotten, really. Really, I'm serious, and I tell you most of my life

is blank to me.

S: Sir, tell us what you remember.

K: Ah - that's good. You're rather persistent, aren't you? I'll tell you what I don't remember, what people have told me. Right? I really don't remember, but what people have told me - either they're exaggerated, you understand, or truthful, or imaginary. I think what they told me about myself, sounds so funny, doesn't it, is more or less accurate, because a lot of people have told me the same thing during the years. Right? Lord, I don't know where to begin. All right sirs.

You know somebody gave me personally 5,000 acres in Holland, you understand? 5,000 acres is an awful lot, and a castle; and we had gatherings there, 6,000 people at one time, lots of people; curiosity, like you, curious to find out what K was talking about, and so on. I was against - K was against, organizations, you understand? You don't understand, that's all right. You know what organizations are? To run a school, like Rishi Valley, you must have organization. You must turn up punctually at 1 o'clock or half-past twelve, when you have your lunch, right? You must go to classes, you must do this, play from 4 o'clock, and so on. The whole of that requires organization. But Lord, how did we get into this? Hey, come on help me, Radhikaji. And I was against so-called religious organizations, right. Do you understand what that means? No. Do you want to know all this?

S: Yes, sir.

K: Really? Yes sir - don't say yes sir because...

S: In many of your books it mentions Krishnamurti teachings, or religious teachings, and K himself says he is not a teacher, right?

How do you account for it? What do you say about it?

K: How does this come about that K's teachings are religious teachings, and K himself says he is not a teacher. Right? How do you account for it? How do you account for it? What do you say about it? I don't have to account to you sir. I was only joking, but I'm asking you how do you account for it? You asked that question, didn't you? Yes sir, what do you say about it? Is there a contradiction? Or, K is not personally as a body, you understand, as an organism, as a physical entity, he is not important. What he says is important. Right? That's all.

Where are we? You're interested in all this?

S: Not specially.

K: Not specially. I thought the older boys were going to sit here.

S: Sir, why is our mind always so cluttered with thought? And why are we all so concerned about ourselves.

K: Why are we so concerned about ourselves and why is our mind so cluttered up with thought? Right? I'm not a brain specialist, you understand? I've talked to a great many scientists, in America, in England, and so on, and I've also talked to a great many biologists and psychiatrists, and so on. Have you ever considered what our brain is? What's your brain - why is it so filled up with thought? Why is it that our brain is never quiet? Right? Why, I'm asking you. What's the other question?

S: Why are we so concerned about ourselves?

K: Why are we so concerned about ourselves? You answer me. Why are you concerned about yourself all the time, most of the time?

S: We want the best for ourself.

K: What do you call best?

S: We want all the privileges.

K: You want to have all the privileges. You want all the privileges - what do you mean by that?

S: We want to have all the comforts.

K: You want to have all the comfort, all the land.

S: The advantages.

K: All the advantages, all the best things of the world. Right? Are we answering your question? No? You understand what that girl asked? She wanted to know why we are concerned about ourselves so much. Have you answered that question?

S: We always think about ourselves.

K: Yes. I know that. Why are you always so concerned about yourself? Everybody is - it's not something unusual. There are very rare people who are not concerned about themselves, very rare. So, why are you concerned about yourself?

S: Everything you do is around you, concerns you.

K: Everything you do is around you, concerns you.

S: Sir, everything you do automatically concerns you.

K: Everything you do ultimately concerns you. Right? What is you, who are you?

S: I am the body.

K: Yes - what are you - the body, blond hair, purple eyes, dark skin, light skin, your name maybe what - Mr Rao or Mrs Rao, or Miss Rao, I don't know, whatever your name, that's what you are, aren't you? Your face, your body; and beyond that, what are you? Are you your BA's, and MA's? You're all going to pass exams, aren't you? Yes? I don't know why, but you are going to pass

exams - like a lot of monkeys. And that's what you are: BA, MA, PhD, or a good lawyer, good engineer, scientists, that's what you are, all that is you, isn't it? BA MA PhD, MAD! Right, all that is what you are, aren't you? No, what are you then? You marry somebody, and you're called Mrs, after that, right, or Miss, or whatever you like to call yourself. So what are you? Why are you so concerned about yourself? I know you want all the advantages, all the privileges, all the earth, but who is 'I' that wants all this?

S: Your mind.

K: Your mind, what do you really mean by the mind? Don't just throw out words - what do you mean by the mind?

S: Your soul.

K: Your soul?

S: May be the mind is something that tells you...

K: So what are you trying to say?

S: I want to know what the mind is.

K: You want to know what the mind is. Before you go in to enquire what the mind is, what is the brain, what's your brain like?

S: It helps you to think.

K: What?

S: Your brain helps you to think sir.

K: Your brain helps you to think, right. It's getting rather complex, isn't it? What do you mean by thinking? You are all thinking, aren't you? Naturally. What do you mean by thinking?

S: The way you feel, your ideas.

K: No, I said what do you mean by thinking.

S: To find out.

K: Thinking, not finding out! You understand the difference

between the two? I think this morning I'll go for a walk. I think, you understand? Now what do you mean by thinking?

S: It is the power to decide.

K: You're not answering my question, old boy. I'm asking you, if you'll kindly listen, what do you mean by thinking, not about something, not ask you to think about that, what do you mean by thinking? That is too complex. You go to a class, there the educator tells you, now let's study mathematics. Probably you don't like that subject - mind you, you have to study. Now, you are learning from that book, and what the professor, your educator tells you, so you memorize. Right? Am I saying something not right? You memorize, that is, you repeat over and over again till it becomes part of your brain. Right? So, you memorize, don't you? You don't know about physics, but you learn about it, that is, you memorize. You memorize your name. Right? Because you have repeated very, very, very often, my name is Smith, or Mr Rao, or Mr K. So our learning is memorizing. Right? Do you agree to this: our learning in a school, in a college, in a university, is all the time memorizing. I won't go into the whole subject of it, because it is very complex, I won't put you through that.

Now you memorize in order to act skilfully. Right. If you're a lawyer, you memorize all the previous incidents, judgements, and so on, and then you become a lawyer, and so on. A doctor, he must practise ten years, learn, then become an internee, and so on and so on. It may take fifteen years to be a really first-class doctor or surgeon, or a scientist, and so on.

So, what is happening to your brain - tell me, don't go to sleep - what is happening to your brain during those ten years or during

those five years?

S: Your brain is getting filled up.

K: Filled. Filled with what?

S: Information sir. With information about what you are doing?

K: Yes, your brain is being filled with a lot of information.

Right?

S: And knowledge.

K: And knowledge. What do you mean by that word knowledge?

S: Information about the topic.

K: Yes, information about a certain topic, a certain subject, and your brain is filled with that. Right? I am a PhD, I know how, etc., etc. Right? Right sir, are you bored? It's all right, be bored, go to sleep. I don't mind, it's a nice morning.

So, your brain contains all that you have learned. Right? Your name, your face, your father, your mother, it's a process not only of recognition, but also accumulation. Right? You understand my English? It is a process of gathering and spending what you have gathered. As you have gathered Sanskrit and you speak that, and so on.

So your brain is full of memories. Right? You know where you live, you know your father's name, your mother's name, you know your brother, so it's filled with information as knowledge. Right? And you use that knowledge skilfully, or not skilfully; you can be a first-class engineer, or a rather dull engineer, and so on, Indian administrative bodies.

S: And so on.

K: Yes, and so on and so on. Right? So you are always living

within a circle; circle of what you have learned, what you have acquired as information, which becomes knowledge. So your brain contains all that you have acquired, all that you have learned, all that you have experienced. So that is full of knowledge:

absurdities, imaginations, illusions, and this whole thing is me.

Right? I may think I'm a great man, that's me - I may sit very quietly, and that's me. So, whatever I think and do is out of experience, knowledge. Right? And I can imagine I'm God, or I can imagine I'm a great painter, when I'm not, and all that. Or, I can have fantasies, that I'm the emperor of India. Right? I can have various fantasies, imaginations, ideas, illusions, and so on. I'm all that: fear, pain, suffering, and so on, I am all that accumulation.

Right? Are you clear, don't agree with me, that's the last thing you should do. But find out if what we are saying is true or false,

I can imagine there is God in me. But that may not be true.

Right? So I am this whole bundle of two million years, gathered as me. Right? And I become very important, because I am two million years old - I've learnt so much. That poor chap wandering up there in the garden doesn't know much, but you know a great deal. You respect those people who have a great deal of knowledge, and you despise those people who are there. Right?

So when you ask, why am I thinking about myself all day long, it's because you have been trained that way, you have been conditioned that way; society helps you, to think about yourself, because if you didn't, you might not get a job. So all the people help each other think about themselves. Right? You are a Muslim, and you think about Allah. So you build up all kinds of imaginary, superstitious, illusory stuff, called Maya. Right? And there are

people who say, I must get away from all this, get away from myself. Right? I must forget myself, I must abandon myself, I must become something totally different from what I am. But is it the same circle repeated over and over again because I'm thinking about myself. I must meditate for two hours, which is, I'm thinking about myself, and so on and so on.

And your next question was, why is the mind always cluttered with thought. Why is the brain so occupied with thought? I explained just now. I see this thing in front of me, right, and I call it a microphone. Right? But the word microphone is not that. I don't know if you see that. That's very important to see in life - very important! - that the word is not the thing. You understand what I am saying? Or are you all nuts? It's very important to learn that the word is not the thing: the door, the word door, is not the actual thing.

S: Sir, why do you say that.

K: What?

S: That the door is not the door.

K: Now, you didn't listen. The word is different from the door. Is this too difficult? Look, my name is K. Right. But K is different from the actual. This becomes too difficult, does it? Now just a minute. Rishi Valley, the words Rishi Valley, is not the actual. Is this difficult? Why is the girl not bound to you? Why don't you understand it? The word is not the actual. You understand? You, your name is something. Right? That name is not you.

S: What importance does that have?

K: Tremendous importance. The word is never the thing. I can paint a picture of the Himalayas, but the picture is not the actual.

Right? I can describe New York, but New York is not what I describe. I can write about the Gita, or the Bible, or whatever it is, but what I write about is not the actual.

I wish you'd get this deep into your brain, because it'll help you then to deal with things actually. I have pain in my legs - suppose - that pain is not the word pain. Do you see it? I get hurt, a thorn, the pain, the word pain is different from the actual thorn and pain. Once grasp this fact, that the symbol is not the real. Right? Go to a temple, and there is some monstrous figure there, and that figure is the symbol of something else. But you worship that symbol. Go to a church, and there is the cross, that's the symbol of something else, but you worship that cross. Do you understand all this?

S: The symbol cannot describe the thing.

K: Yes, the symbol cannot describe. The symbol is not the actual and so on.

S: The symbol brings to your mind an idea of the real thing.

K: Does it? Is the idea a fact? The idea I'm going to climb the Himalayas, the idea is not the fact. I'm not climbing it.

S: No, but it is a picture of the Himalayas.

K: Ah, but that again is a symbol.

S: Yes, it makes you realize what the Himalayas look like.

K: But you haven't seen the Himalayas. So the seeing is different from the picture. Right? The actual seeing, the Himalaya mountains, their valleys, the blue lights of a morning on there, and the snow, is quite different from the picture, but we worship the picture. I don't know if you're following all this.

So your question is, why do we think about ourselves all the time? And the other question is, why are our brains filled with

thought? Now the older people, what do they think of it? There they are, sitting in chairs - I'll wait sir till you are.

S: Our brain is like a box, sir, when we're young the box is empty, so there are hardly any thoughts, when you grow up the box starts getting filled.

K: That's right. You are like an empty bottle, you are saying, and as you grow up that bottle gets filled. Filled with what? With dirty water, clean water?

S: Both.

K: Both, that's right. Filled with dirty water, and clean water. Right? You can't mix clean water with dirty water, because the clean water then becomes dirty. That's what you are doing.

So you asked me to talk about myself. I have. If you could learn, as you learn mathematics, whether your mind can ever be quiet, your brain, ABSOLUTELY QUIET!

S: Then how do you get pure water?

K: You don't. He asked, how do you get pure water? Life doesn't give you pure water, it gives you dirty water, because you have pain, you have sorrow, you have grief, you're ambitious, you want to be something or other. That's all dirty water.

S: But sometimes you get happiness, don't you?

K: Yes, sometimes you get happiness. Now what do you mean by that word happiness?

S: When my wish is fulfilled.

K: Yes, when your wishes are fulfilled. I want to live comfortably, in a big house, with lots of servants; and if you can wish, if those wishes can be fulfilled, you are happy. Is that it? Suppose they are not fulfilled, you are sad, right, you're unhappy,

you're depressed. So what is the difference between happiness and depression? It's too difficult for you, don't bother.

You understand sirs, ladies, to me, religious organizations are silly. You understand? Going to church, going to temples, mosques, repeat, repeat, repeat. What happens when you repeat?

S: You don't find anything new, sir.

K: Therefore will you stop repeating?

S: How do you stop that sir?

K: Don't ask me how I stop, will you stop? You stop scratching your head. I mean you start scratching, that becomes a habit. Right. And you can stop it, can't you, by saying, I won't do that. Right? Will you do that? Don't look at somebody else.

S: It's difficult sir.

K: That's right, it's difficult. So you'd rather keep on scratching. Right?

S: Sir, can we talk about the existence of God?

K: Jesus! How do you know if God exists?

S: That's what I want to ask.

K: You want to ask, is there God.

S: If there is, where is he, and why do we believe in him?

K: Where is he, and why do we bother about it?

S: We want to be secure.

K: Yes, sir. First let me answer her question, will you - do you mind. Is there God? Right? What do you think?

S: I think there might be, but I don't believe in God.

K: Why, why don't you believe?

S: Because I have never seen, I have just heard about God.

K: Go on, tell me.

S: It seems to me that God is something like a pillar of support.

K: What, financial support?

S: No, a pillar of support.

K: You are quite right. Yes sir, yes sir, but he said financial support, it was pretty good. That is, you rely, or you seek god when you are depressed, when you are unhappy, when you want something, when you pray. Right? Now, how do you find out if there is god, or not.

S: You don't actually see him.

K: Will you actually see him?

S: No, you find more about, when you see him you know more about him.

K: Do you know the story about two Americans going to heaven? And they wander about in heaven, all over the place, for weeks and months, and there is a sign saying, god. And they go up that path, and one of them says, that is too much of a climb, you go up and tell me all about it. So he goes up there and comes rushing back, my god it is a woman. Right? Now how do you know there is god? Because a hundred people say so?

S: Just because a hundred people say that there is God, doesn't mean anything. For all you know they might have heard from somebody else.

K: Quite right. So how do you know there is God?

S: When you see him.

K: Where do you see him?

S: Then who created the world?

K: He asks, if God didn't create the world - what do you mean by the world? You, the trees, the fishes, the water, the frogs, the

elephants, the lions.

S: All matter.

K: All matter. That is, all the rocks, the trees, human beings, the valley, the rivers, everything you think is created by God.

S: If it's not God, who else can it be?

K: If it's not God, he asks, who else could it be.

S: It could be a form of energy or something.

K: What?

S: It could be some form of energy.

K: How do you know?

S: I'm just guessing.

K: Guessing. That's what they're all doing. And so somebody guesses much more, seriously, and said there is, and then you accept it. Suppose you don't accept your tradition, that there is God, then what will you do, how will you find out? That's much more important than believing. Right? Do you agree to that, it's much more important to find out, rather than believing. Right? Now, will you stop believing? Stop it - therefore, you are free from certain conclusions that there is God. Right? Will you do that, or you're frightened?

S: No.

K: No, don't say no, we're all frightened people.

S: Sir, we are frightened that if we don't believe in God, all our mothers and fathers believe in God, then they might say something about it.

K: That's right.

S: Sir, since we are children we are brought up to believe in God. We start believing that if we don't believe in God, God will

do something bad to us.

K: I know. But first find out why you want to believe in something. Don't go to sleep! Why do you want to believe in something? Does it give you comfort, does it help you, does it cover up your sorrow, pain, and all that? Why do you believe in all this? What's wrong with you?

S: I think many people, including me, believe because they feel after so many stories which so many people have told them about God, I think this person is God, I think that person is God, they feel that if they believe in God, they might also be helped.

K: But find out if they have really been helped first.

S: I haven't been helped.

K: You're too young, you're too small. Don't bother about God and belief. You see that's one of our peculiarities, that we believe, right away, right? We believe. We never find out! Your belief will prevent you from finding out. You understand what I am saying?

S: Sir, you believe when someone close to you believes it, like your mother.

K: Yes, yes, if your mother believes, she wants you to believe the same thing. Right? And you listen to her but you don't have to believe.

S: Sir, some people are frightened that they might be excommunicated from the religion, and they don't want to do that. To be excommunicated from religion, if they don't believe in God.

K: I know, of course. That's playing games.

S: Sir, does God help anybody?

K: Me? Are you asking me? Has God helped me?

S: No, helped anyone.

K: You'd better ask them. But ask somebody who says God has helped them. Be careful. If he says he has, what will you do?

S: Believe in God.

K: Yes, that's all. Some nut comes along in peculiar clothes, like me, and he says there is God, I know there is God. Right? Will you believe him?

S: No, sir.

K: Why?

S: We don't believe unless we see it. He's got to prove it.

K: There is no proof.

S: You've got to be very convincing, only then can we believe.

K: You know, have you been to some of the magicians, some of the conjurers, have you seen them?

S: Yes sir.

K: They will do something before you know what has happened. No, don't go into all that, you're all too small.

What time is it?

S: Ten fifteen.

K: Ten fifteen. I've got fifteen minutes more? Too bad! What shall we talk about?

S: Is there a way of thinking without the past?

K: Is there a way of thinking without all the memories involved in the past? Right? To answer that question correctly, accurately, impersonally, you have to go into the whole structure, the nature of thought. Right? Have you done it? No. Would you like to do it? Would you like to listen to it? And would you like to follow it up after you have listened to it?

S: If it is true.

K: If it is true. Right? What is the origin, the beginning of thought? How does thought arise? So are you saying that thought has its roots in the past experience? In past experiences, plural. So you are saying are you, that thought has its roots in experience? Right? Are you saying yes?

S: Yes.

K: Be quite sure, don't hesitate. If you had no experience, would you think?

S: Sir, like I told you, our thought in the beginning is like an empty box, and that has been filled up sir, and that is all the past. If there is no past sir, the bottle be forever empty.

K: Quite right sir. You come out here. You don't mind, no. Do you mind coming up and sitting here?

S: No sir.

K: Good. He's saying, the bottle - we've gone back to the bottle, you know what going back to the bottle means? Drinking. Where do you come from?

S: Mandu.

K: Mandu, good. Do you like it here?

S: Yes.

K: Have you told the teachers you like it here?

S: My teacher asked that.

K: It's like an empty bottle that has been filled with a lot of experience. Right? This is what he says. And, from that experience, from that past, all the things that have been filled in the bottle, are memories, are remembrances, and so the bottle is always moving within itself. All right sir, and then what? Tell me, go on! Your brain is like an empty box, empty bottle, and filled from childhood

with problems. Right. How to pass, how to read, how to write, and all that stuff, all through life. And so your brain, like a bottle, he says, is filled with all that. And when the bottle begins to move around, talk, the bottle, the contents of the bottle are remembrances, knowledge, which are then put into words - first thought, then words. Right? I wonder, don't agree, you don't learn anything if you merely agree.

S: Sir, pretend the box was empty, how did you get your first thought?

K: How did the first man, two million years ago, how did he begin to think? Have you seen that cartoon by a scientist, probably a biologist? You see the man's picture, a cartoon, a man who hunts game, hunts, eats, and sleeps. Right? Are you listening? Then the next cartoon is a little more advanced, he doesn't hunt, but he gets somebody else to hunt.

S: Because he knows it is dangerous.

K: Yes, yes. And the third picture is he doesn't hunt, but he's learning how to use instruments, and so on. So ultimately, he's become very intellectual, right, like you, very intellectual, very like us, you understand? First he begins by hunting and eating, then by making others hunt and eat, and third he's the picture of us. I don't know if you understand all this, it doesn't matter. So what makes us behave as we do? This is too difficult for you.

Have you ever sat quietly, not moving a muscle, not moving your eyes, have you done it? Would you like to do it? Sit absolutely quiet. Will you do it?

S: Sir, but what's the use of that?

K: What? What's the use of that? Just to control your body, see

if you can control your body. There is no use in anything; if you say, why should I eat, what's the use of it, you die. Right? Yes sir. So, will you try and sit very, very quietly, not blink, not move your eyes. Try it old boy, try it for fun, you know, sit quietly, go on.

S: Life is fun sir?

K: Move your leg over - put the other leg over there old boy.

S: Sir, is life fun?

K: It all depends.

S: If it's dirty water it's no fun. If it's clean water, it's fun.

K: Clean water is, if you like to call it fun, but it is all mixed with dirty water. Right? So let's see if you can sit quietly for a minute.

SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 7TH JULY 1985

I see some old faces I can recognize. What shall we talk about? If one may, one would like to point out that we are a gathering of serious people who are concerned with a daily life. We are not concerned whatsoever with beliefs, ideologies, suppositions, theoretical conclusions or theological concepts, nor are we trying to find a sect, a group of people who follow somebody. We are not, let's hope, frivolous but rather that we are all together concerned with what is happening in the world and our responsibility to it - all the tragedies, the utter misery, poverty - not in this country, there are no slums, we were told the other day you couldn't have slums in this marvellous climate, though it has been raining day after day, but let's hope during these meetings that we have fairly good weather.

And also one would like to point out, if one may, that you and I, the speaker, are walking, taking a journey together, not in an aeroplane high up at 31,000 feet or 40,000 feet, but walking along a quiet road, a long endless road all over the world where one sees appalling terrorism, killing people for no purpose, just to threaten them, terrorize people, kidnapping people, hijacking, murdering, preparing to murder other people, wars, not only in Afghanistan, Beirut, and South America and all over the world. Perhaps most of you know all this. We don't seem to very much care, we are rather indifferent, it is only when it happens very close to us that we become concerned, worried, fearful. Where it is far away from us, each one of us, we are not so indifferent - or rather more indifferent. This is what is happening in the world - economic

division, religious division, political division and all the religious sectarian divisions, and so on. There is a great deal of danger, hazards. One doesn't know what is going to happen in the future, not only in our own life time but also for our grandchildren, children and so on. The whole world is in a great crisis and the crisis is not only out there but also in each one of us. If you are at all aware of all this. And what is our responsibility to all that, on the part of each one of us? One must have asked this question of oneself very often: what is one to do? Where should one begin? Join a political party? Republican, Conservative, Democratic, Communist, following Marx and Stalin and all that group. Where would you all begin? What would each one of us do, facing this terrible society in which we live, each concerned with himself, with his own fulfilment, with his own sorrow, with his own misery, economic struggle, and so on and so on? Each one of us is concerned with himself. And what shall we do? Shall we pray to God? Repeat prayers over and over and over again? Or belonging to some sect, some guru and follow him, escaping from the world? Put on some medieval dress or modern robes of peculiar colour and all the rest of it? Can we withdraw from the world at all, like monks both in India and here?

Seeing all this, observing intimately, not as something in the newspapers, or something you have read about, or told about it, or been informed through journalists, novels, television and all the information industry, what is the role of each one of us, the responsibility?

As we said, this is not an entertainment, we are not trying to entertain you, or trying to tell what you should do, each one of us.

We have had leaders galore, hundreds, political, religious, those who say, "We are illumined, we have attained" - whatever they have attained. We have had thousands of leaders, political, economic, religious, sectarian, and they have been utterly helpless, they have their own theories, their own way and there are thousands of people who are following them, all over the world, quantities of money, really enormous wealth, not only the wealth of the Roman Catholic church but also the wealth of the gurus. It all ends up in money.

So if one may ask: what shall we do together? Or what shall we do, a single human being? Are we at all concerned, or are we seeking some peculiar satisfaction, gratification for ourselves? Or we are committed to a certain symbol, religious or otherwise, and we cling to that, hoping that symbol, that - what lies behind that symbol helps us. This is a very serious question. It is becoming much more serious now, for there is the threat of war, then total uncertainty.

May I, may the speaker inform you of a conversation he had with a Mr.X, may I? A conversation between this Mr.X and the speaker for several days continuously. Mr.X has travelled all over the world, more or less, he told the speaker. He is fairly well read, gone to various Institutions, sometimes he joined them, and with a rush he got out of them. He followed one guru or another and gave them up. And for a few weeks he tried to become a monk, and that too he gave up. And he looked at the various political parties, extreme Left, extreme Right, Centre and the spectrum of political activities. And at last he said, I have come to talk with you. I would like to have a conversation with you, at the same level as I am, not

you are pretentious, or your real position. I don't know what you are, I have read something about you. May I go on with this conversation? May I repeat? Does it interest you?

And he said let's talk over things together like two friends, you and I. Like two friends who have lived together in the sense in the world, been through every kind of travail, and he said to the speaker, what is it all about? Why is man born like this? Why has he become after many, many, many millenia what he is now? Through that long period of evolution, long period of time, suffering, anxious, lonely, despairing, disease, death and always the gods somewhere about, among the Olympian mountains, or on the River Nile, or in the ancient city of Benares in India. Let's forget all about those gods and let us talk together as two human beings, living in this world, in this marvellous country, the earth which is so beautiful, which is the mother of all things - right? You are following all this? Mother was worshipped because the earth is the mother. The Greeks had the Athene with several breasts, I think four on each side, representing that she was the mother of the earth - mother as the earth.

And so he gave, this Mr.X, gave something of his inward thoughts, his outward activities. And he said what is all this about? Why are human beings, who have educated themselves, sophisticated, experts in technology, and can argue the hind legs off a donkey - do you understand all these expressions? - who can invent gods and goddesses and everything, why have human beings all over the world, why are they in perpetual conflict? Not only with the environment, not only with their governments whom they have elected, or dominated by a Politburo, or dominated by some

dogma invented by ancient priests, but in spite of all this why is each human being everlastingly, from the moment he is born till he dies, why does he live in this conflict? That was the first question he asked, this Mr.X. Why? What is the *raison d'etre*, or the cause of this conflict, not only outwardly but also most deeply, inwardly, subjectively, inside the skin as it were, why is he in conflict? They have talked endlessly about peace, all the religions have preached, long before Christianity, centuries before Christianity, live at peace, be peaceful, be quiet, be gentle, generous, affectionate, loving. In spite of their propaganda, in spite of human beings programmed from their childhood, encouraged to be aggressive, or to be gentle, or to go, face the world for themselves, alone, fighting - you know all that. Is there an answer to this question, a final, irrefutable answer? That is, can human beings in this world, living their daily life, going to the office, keeping a house, sex, children and all that, and also this search, this longing for something much more than the mere material things of life. Can this question be ever solved? And apparently man has not solved it, though he has lived on this earth for two or three million years and for forty thousand years, or fifty thousand years as a human being. We have gathered tremendous experience. We have gathered a great deal of knowledge. Mr.X was telling the speaker, we have gathered immense information technologically, but inwardly we remain Barbarians trying to kill each other, trying to compete with each other, destroy each other.

So he came all that way, which is a long distance, bus, train, aeroplane, and he said answer this question: is there a cause for this conflict? And if there is a cause then let's discover what the cause

is. Not that you are going to lead me, or tell me, but together you, Mr.X and the speaker, together, not that you will tell me and I will accept, or I will go and think about it and come to some kind of my own conclusion, but rather, he said, Mr.X, that together as two human beings, not one is sitting on a platform and the other sitting down below - sorry! - but together as two human beings who have gone through a great deal of life, the loneliness, the desperation, the anxiety, the uncertainty, wanting love and not finding it, or loving and not be satisfied with that, always pushing, pushing, pushing, always wanting to achieve something, whether it is heaven, or illumination, or enlightenment, or become a multimillionaire, which is more or less the same thing. All want to achieve something. They are never content, they never know what peace is, they never sit quietly under a tree looking at the mountains, the rivers, the blade of grass and the beauty of the earth and sunlight, and the glory of an early morning.

So Mr.X said to the speaker let's talk, let us question each other, never accepting what he says, or what you say. I won't accept a thing from you, nor will you accept a thing from me. We are on the same level, you may be very clever, you may have a reputation which is nonsense, you may go around the earth, or a certain part of the earth, all that doesn't count. It has no value. With which the speaker agreed wholeheartedly.

So let us explore this curse which man has borne from the beginning of time: why man, which includes woman please, why man lives this way, why man is in conflict in his own intimate relationship, sexually, in a family, the whole network of conflict - right?

So he came the next day, Mr.X, and we continued. We sat on the veranda on a beautiful day overlooking the valley with the great mountains round us, snow-capped, marvellous valleys, blue and lovely azure skies, and the sun glittering on the leaves, dappled earth, everything seemed so marvellously alive, pulsating, full of energy. There we were, he and the speaker, watching this great beauty and never being with the beauty, always watching it, never feeling the beauty with one's heart and mind, be utterly sensitive to all the glory of the earth. He said we won't talk about beauty, that is your business, you tell me about it. He said we would a little later. First let us take a journey or explore together into this question of conflict. We are asking: must human beings bear with it, get accustomed to it, hold it, never, never be able to put it completely aside, so that his brain then can function as it should, completely untethered, completely free, not programmed, not conditioned.

So now the speaker is putting this question to you. And also we discussed, talked over, debated this point: what is the cause of it? We are taking a journey together, not asking you to tell me, or I to tell you. What is the cause of it? Everywhere there is struggle. You might say there is struggle in nature, the big animal lives on the smaller animal and so on. In a forest the little tree is struggling against the gigantic trees for light. You might say everywhere on earth, in nature, there is conflict, some kind of struggle going on. So why shouldn't we also go on that way because we are part of nature? There out there, there is conflict, what human beings call conflict, it may not be, it may be the most natural way of nature acting: the hawk, the eagle kills the rabbit, bears kill salmon, the tiger kills something swiftly, or the cheetahs, it goes on killing,

killing, killing, in nature. And one might say we are also part of this whole nature so it is inevitable that we should be in constant struggle. If one accepts that, that it is natural, inevitable, there is nothing more to be said about it, because you say it is natural, we will go on that way because we are part of the whole earth. But if one begins to question it, Mr.X was telling the speaker, if you begin to question it then where are you? That means, are you willing together to find out because we are supposed to be a little more active, intelligent than the trees, the tigers, the elephants, not the elephants fortunately they don't kill too many things, but they destroy trees, and the cheetah and all the rest of it. We may have come from the ape, probably we have, we must be stray monkeys. And if we do not accept that conflict is the way of life then what is one to do? Where does one start to understand the whole movement of conflict? Where does one - how does one feel one's way into all this? Either, the speaker said to Mr.X, either you analyse very carefully all the factors of conflict, one after the other. Through analysis, self analysis or being analysed by another, or accepting the professional advice of professors, philosophers, psychologists, if one begins to analyse, will that bring about the discovery of the cause? Either the discovery will be intellectual - right? - through analysis, or that analysis may bring you certain intellectual conclusions, or you put all the analytical factors together and see the whole. You understand what.? Is that possible? Or is there a different approach to the question? You understand? I wonder if Mr.X understands what the speaker is saying?

So he asks Mr.X do we - we are still on the same level, same

comprehension? That is, the speaker is telling Mr.X analysis implies one who is analyser - right? Therefore there is an analyser and the analysed, the subject and the object - right? Is there such a difference in oneself as the subject and the object? Are we getting together? That is the first question the speaker asks Mr.X. You are the Mr.X. The analyser has been encouraged through education, through conditioning, through being programmed, that he, the analyser is different completely from that which he analyses - right? And a microscope, when you look at something very attentively, that very attention gives greater light to that which is being observed - right? I won't go into this. The speaker says I am going to question the whole attitude towards analysis. I am not accepting - the speaker says I am not accepting what the professionals say about analysis, including those people who come from Vienna, or the latest American psychologists. I am not accepting any of those. The speaker tells Mr.X, but I question it, I question the - not only the activity of analysis but who is the analyser? If you can understand the analyser first then what need there be for analysis? You understand Sir? Am I going too fast? May we go together in this?

I analyse myself. I have been angry, or greedy, or sexual, whatever it is, and in analysing, that is breaking up and looking at it very carefully step by step, who is the observer? Is not the observer, the speaker is telling Mr.X don't accept what he says but together question, doubt, is not the analyser all the accumulated past remembrances? He is conditioned through experience, his knowledge, his way of looking at life, his peculiar tendencies, his prejudices [noise of train - then tape turns over.] - his prejudices,

his religious programmed - being programmed religiously, all this is the past, all this is the background of his life, from childhood. He is the observer, he is the analyser. Whether that background includes communal remembrance, racial remembrance racial consciousness and so on and so on, he is the observer. And then the observer breaks it up into the observed and the observer - right? Are you following? So that very division in analysis creates conflict. Right? Are we together? You are the Mr.X, I am the speaker. Are we taking the same journey together? That is, the moment there is a division between the analyser and the analysed there must be inevitably be conflict of some kind, subtle, fatuous, no meaning, but it is a conflict, overcome, conquer, suppress, transcend, all these are efforts in minor or major form - right?

So one discovers that where there is division between the Swiss and the Germans, and the French and the English, wherever there is a division there must be conflict. I and you. We and they. Not that there is not division, the rich are very powerful. But if we created subjectively a division, I belong to this and you belong to that, I am a Catholic, you are a Protestant, I am a Jew and you are an Arab - right?

So wherever between two people [noise of train] - so whenever there is this division between man and woman, between God and earth, between 'what should be' and 'what is' - I wonder if you - I am asking Mr.X if he is following all this, not only verbally, intellectually, which is meaningless, but with his heart, with his being, with his vitality, energy and passion, that wherever there is a division, me and you, I am a woman and you are a man.

So one begins to discover the root of conflict. Is it possible for a

human being living in a modern world, going to a job, earning a livelihood, business there, family here, I am aggressive there and with my wife submitting, and all that. So that one's life becomes a contradiction. Can that contradiction end, otherwise we will live in conflict, otherwise one becomes a hypocrite? If one likes to be a hypocrite, that is all right too. But if one wants to live very honestly, which is absolutely necessary, to live with great austere honesty, not to someone, to one's country, to one's ideal, but to say exactly what you mean and what you mean you say. Not what others have said and you repeat, that is not honesty. Or believe in something and do quite the opposite - right? All talk about peace. Every government, every religion, and every preacher, including the speaker, talks about peace. And to live peacefully demands tremendous honesty and intelligence. So is it possible, living in the twentieth century, or now, to live inwardly first, psychologically first, subjectively, not to have in oneself any kind of division? Please do enquire, search, ask with passion. Passion doesn't include fanaticism, passion doesn't demand martyrdom - right? It is not something you are so attached and that very attachment gives you passion - you understand? That is not passion, it is tied to something which gives you the feeling of passion, energy, like a donkey tied to a post, it can wander round and round and round but it is still held there.

So could we, Mr.X and the speaker, not telling each other what they should do, discover for themselves in all honesty, without any sense of deception, without any sense of illusion, whether it is possible, possible, not saying it is possible, whether it is possible to live in this world, wars, you know all the horrors that are going on,

without conflict, without division? Don't go to sleep please, it is too early in the morning. If you are asked, you are the Mr.X, if you are asked what would your answer be inwardly? You are a Swiss, a Hindu, an Indian, a Muslim, or follow some clique, or some group, some guru's followers, wouldn't one have to abandon all that completely? You may have a Swiss passport, the speaker has an Indian passport but he is not an Indian - they don't like that in India but we have told them several times not to belong to any cult, to any guru, to anything. You are going to find this terribly difficult. Not at the end of it you stand alone, but there is the comprehension, the inward awareness, insight, into all that thing which is really nonsensical. It may give one momentary satisfaction, belonging to something, belonging to a group, belonging to some sect, but that is all becoming rather weary, wretched and ugly.

So can one not be attached to any of this? - including what the speaker is saying specially? So that one's own brain, and strangely your brain is not the brain of another is also the other, you understand? Your brain is like the brain of every other human being. It has immense capacity, immense, incredible energy. Look what they have done in the technological world. All the scientists in America are now concerned with Star Wars. We won't go into all that. The energy, you understand? The brain has this extraordinary energy, if you concentrate on something, give your attention to something. They have given attention to kill other human beings, so the atom bomb came into being. So our brains are not ours, they have evolved through a long period of time. And in that evolution we have gathered tremendous knowledge,

experience, and in all that state there is very little what is called love. You understand? I may love my wife, or my children, or my country. My country has been divided by thought, geographically, it is the world - my world, the world in which one lives is the entire world. So my brain which has evolved through a long period of time, that brain with its consciousness is not mine because my consciousness, Mr.X is saying, I have read something about what you have said, I am not repeating what you have said, but this is what I also feel, see its actuality, that wherever I have been, in every corner of the earth, there are human beings who suffer, pain, anxiety, desperate loneliness [noise of train] - and so our consciousness is shared by all other human beings. Do you realize this? Not up here, not intellectually but actually. If one really feels that then there will be no division. Do you understand? I do not know whether Mr.X - I ask him, do you see this reality, not a concept of it, not an idea of it, not the beautiful conclusion but the actuality of it? The actuality is different from the idea of actuality - right? You are sitting there, that is actual, but I can imagine that you are sitting there which is totally different.

So our brain, which is the centre of our consciousness, with all the nervous responses, sensory responses, centre of all our knowledge, all experience, knowledge, memory, your memory may vary from another, but it is still memory. You may be highly educated, the other may have no education at all, doesn't even know how to read and write, but it is still part of that - right? So your consciousness is shared by every human being on this earth. Therefore you are entire humanity. Do you understand Sirs? You are in actuality, not theoretically or theologically, or in the eyes of

God we are all one - probably gods have no eyes! But in actuality wherever you go there is this strange irrevocable fact that we all go through the same mould, same anxiety, hope, fear, death, loneliness that brings such desperation. So we are mankind. And when one realizes that deeply conflict with another ceases because you are like me.

So that is what we talked about, Mr.X and Mr.K. And also we continued about other things for he was there for several days. But we first established a real relationship which is so necessary when there is any kind of debate, any kind of communication. Not only verbal but un - words don't convey profoundly what one wants, what one desires to convey. So at the end of the second day, or the first day, we said, where are we? You, Mr.X and Mr.K, where are we in this? Have we brought about, not change, change implies time - I don't know, we will go into that another time - have we merely gathered - you understand, as we gather harvest. We sow, which is you have come here, which is part of sowing. And you have listened to K and Mr.X what have you gathered? Which means gathering means accumulation - right? You have gathered so much information - please follow this, we will stop presently, don't get sleepy or nervous. You have gathered so much from professionals, from psychologists, from psychiatrists, you understand, gathered, gathered, gathered. And Mr.X, K asks him, have you gathered also? If you have gathered then it becomes any other gathering. I know, I have gathered, or rather learnt how to climb a mountain, now I am an expert at climbing the mountain. I am not but... So the brain is like a magnet, gathering. So K asks Mr. X what have you gathered? Or are you free from gathering? Please

this is very... you understand? Please, if you have the patience, listen to this.

So do we ever stop gathering? Gathering bedsheets, pillowcases, that of course, water, gathering a degree in order to have a good job? For practical things in life one has to gather. But to see where gathering is not necessary, that is where the art of living comes. Because then if you are gathering our brain is never free, is never empty to - we won't go into the question of emptiness but that is a different matter - but are we aware that we are gathering, gathering, gathering? As we gather habits, and when you have gathered so much it is very difficult to get rid of it. This gathering conditions the brain. Born in India, belonging to a certain type of people, tradition, religious, or very, very orthodox, and you have gathered all that. And then to be free of all that takes immense enquiry, searching, looking, watching, aware. So is it possible not to gather at all? Please consider this, don't reject it. Find out. You have to gather knowledge to go to your house, how to drive a car, to speak a foreign language, you have to gather words, verbal irregularities and all the rest of it, but inwardly is it necessary to gather at all? Enlightenment is not gathering. On the contrary it is total freedom from all that. Which is after all love, isn't it? I don't love you because I have gathered you. Right? I have sexually been satisfied with you, or you are companionable, or I am lonely and therefore I depend on you. Then that becomes a marketable thing. Then we exploit each other, use each other, sell each other down the river. Surely that is not love, is it? It is the quality of a brain that doesn't gather anything at all. And then what it says will be what it has discovered, not what other people have said. And in

that there is tremendous passion, not lust, passion. But it has not fanaticism. I don't suddenly become a strict vegetarian, won't touch salt. Or I am a Muslim, fanatical Shi'ites - you understand. They have all passion of a certain type but they have become fanatical, inclined to martyrdom, and all the rest of that business.

So I am asking, the speaker, K is asking Mr.X. find out if you can live without gathering. You can't be told about it. We can enquire into it together, but the actuality of never gathering, never the accumulated memory operating. This is really very subtle, it requires a great deal of enquiry.

May we stop now? It is an hour and a quarter we have talked. You haven't talked but K has talked. But we have had a communication with each other, because we have established the basis of a communication in which there is no superior and the inferior, one who knows and one who does not know. May we get up? *Après vous!* After you!

SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1985

May we continue with what we were talking about the other day? I think it is important to realize that this is not a personality cult. The person called K is not important at all. But what is important is what he is saying, not what he looks like, his personality, and all the rest of that nonsense. So please, if one may point out carefully and definitely, that the person who is speaking on the platform is in no way important. So this is not a personal cult with all the nonsense that goes with it.

We talked about the other day various forms of conflict, what is the cause of it, why does one throughout the beginning of mankind, two and a half million years ago or so, why man, including of course the woman, why have they lived in conflict and have never solved that problem at all? And throughout the ages, during this long period of evolution, of many, many millenia we are still in conflict with each other, between man and woman, between human beings, between a group of people, between nations, sexes, religions, this has been going on for thousands of years. I am sure one is aware of all this.

Either we are utterly indifferent to what is going on, the terrorism, the brutality, the appalling cruelty, all that hideous things that are taking place in the world - who is responsible for all this? As we said the other day, this is a serious gathering, not just spend a good morning under a tent, or listen to somebody, but this is a serious, active, co-operative, definite gathering.

We were asking too this morning, who is responsible for all this? The responsibility, which implies care, attention, to what is

not only - what is taking place outwardly in the world, but also inwardly in all of us, who is responsible for this? Are the politicians responsible? That is, let them do what they want to do, because we have elected them in the so-called Democratic society. In the Totalitarian states they are not elected, they just come to power and dominate the whole. All that is going on in the Communist world. So again who is responsible? The religions? The Islamic world? The Christian world? The Hindu world? Buddhist and so on? Or are we responsible, each one of us? Please do consider this. Is each one of us, living in this world, in this environment, not only in lovely Switzerland but also all over the world, is each one of us, you, sitting there and the speaker here, are we responsible for all this? When you put that question to yourself - I hope we are doing that - are you responsible for creating this appalling world, dangerous world, the brutal world and the terrifying? If you have gone to various countries you see all this, enormous poverty, and those who are terribly rich, high position, born to it and for the rest of their life they have got their riches, castles, mansions and so on. There are millions upon millions of poor people, starving. Who is responsible? If you are responsible because you are, as we are, responsible for creating this society, we have created this society around us, the culture, the religion, the gods, all the rest of that ritualistic repetition and sensation. Because we are angry, greedy, violent, disorderly, hating and only limiting our affection to a very, very, very small few, and we, each one of us, have created this society in which we live. Is that so? Is each one of us responsible? Or you say, "I am sorry I am not." Or you are indifferent to the whole thing as long as we are safe in a

particular country, protected by frontiers.

So we come to a very serious question. What is order? And what is disorder? Please we are discussing, or going together over this question. We are deliberating over this question. Not that you will accept, or in any way acquiesce to what the speaker is saying, then that would be utterly futile. But if we could together take a very long journey, not only intellectually, verbally, but much more profoundly. Why the society, which we have created, each one of us, which is creating such terrible disorder, cruelty and all that, are we responsible for all that? And are we different from society, the thing that we have created? Or must there be order first at the house, at our house? Not only in the outer walls of a house, and garden, or the valley, but also the inward world in which we all live, the subjective world, the psychological world. Is there disorder there? You understand my question? I hope the speaker is making it quite clear. As long as we live, each one of us, in disorder - we will go into the question of what is disorder in detail - as long as we live in disorder psychologically, subjectively, inwardly, whatever we do will create disorder. The Totalitarian states have said by changing the society, the environment, forcing them, compelling them, will change humanity, the human brain. They have not succeeded. There is constant dissent, revolt and all the rest of it.

So if you see this, that we have created this disorder and this disorder is the society in which we live then what shall we do? Where do you start? Do you want to change society? The social reform, the do-gooders, the men who want to alter laws, through terrorism, through compulsion, through, all the rest of it? Or do

you put your own house inwardly in order? Is the question clear? If it is not clear we will go over it again. That would be rather an empty waste of time.

So how shall I, or you, put our house in order? Because that is the only place I can start, not outward reforms, outward change of laws, form United Nations. There if I may digress a little bit, we were invited to speak there last year and this year. One of their big shots got up after K had spoken and said, "At last after forty years of working in this Institution, very hard, I have come to the conclusion that we must not kill each other." (Laughter) Forty years! And we do the same, hoping something will happen out there, something that will compel us, force us, persuade us, drive us. And we have depended on the outer, outer challenges, outer wars and so on.

So what shall we do? It is no good joining little communities, following some guru. That is total irresponsibility. Giving, surrendering oneself to somebody, who calls himself enlightened, lead you to... whatever he will lead you to, generally money and so on. So how shall we start inwardly and bring about order? Order implies no conflict, doesn't it? No conflict in oneself, completely no conflict. We went into the question the other day, what is the cause of conflict? Volumes have been written about it.

Psychologists, psychiatrists, therapists and so on have explained verbally, millions of words have been spilled over, and yet we remain, all of us, in conflict. Where the mind, the brain is in disorder, which is the essence of conflict, that brain can never be orderly, simple, clear. If that is taken for granted as a law. Law of gravity, the law the sun rises in the East and sets in the West. That

where there is subjective or inward conflict there must be disorder. Look into it please carefully. [Noise of train.]

And what is the nature of disorder? Not what is order, because a confused mind can invent order and say, "That is order." A brain that is caught in illusions, as most people are, then it will create its own order out of confusion - right? So what is the nature of disorder? Why do we say there must be order and then be in disorder? You understand? Why do we separate the two? You understand? We say we realize we are in disorder, which is fairly simple, and then we are seeking order out of it - right? That is, the politicians know there is disorder - right? And they are seeking order - right? Is this clear? Of course. Not only the politicians, each one of us, we know our life is in disorder. Go to the office in the morning from nine until five - what a life you lead! Nine to five, or twelve to midnight, or whatever it is, and struggle, fight, ambitious, greedy, aggressive, climbing the ladder, and come home and be very docile - right? Or submit to your wife, or husband, or whatever it is. So there is disorder in this. Then there is disorder and all the time the brain is seeking order, all the time because it cannot live in disorder. It cannot function clearly, beautifully, exquisitely, its highest capacity when there is disorder. Therefore there is a slight search for order - right? In all of us. So we are asking: why is there this division? You understand? Order and then living in disorder. I don't know if you are following all this - right? Don't be puzzled, there is nothing - it is very simple. We live in disorder, that is certain. Why bother about order? Right? Let us see if we can clear up disorder. Then if you clear it up then there is order. There is not this conflict between disorder and order. You

understand?

Look: it is fairly simple this. We are violent people, aggressive, not only physically but also psychologically, inwardly. We want to hurt people. We say things brutally about others. Violence is not merely physical action, activity, but also violence is psychological, aggressive, imitative, comparing oneself against another and so on, all that is a form of violence. Right? We are, by nature from the animal and so on, violent. And we don't stay with that, recognizing I am violent, but we invent non-violence - right? We say, "I mustn't be violent" - you understand? Why bother with not being violent? You are violent. Let's see, stay with that, hold with that, not move away from that, then we can examine it together and then see how far we can go to dissipate it. But if you are constantly struggling to become non-violent then you can't solve the problem. Because when you are trying to become non-violent you are all the time sowing the seeds of violence. You understand? Right? I am violent, I hope one day to be without violence, that one day is pretty far away and during that interval I sow, I am still violent, perhaps not so much but still violent. So I say don't let me bother with not being violent, let's understand violence, what is its nature, why it exists, is it possible to be free of it completely? Right? That's much more interesting and vital than pursuing non-violence - right?

So similarly it is important to understand disorder, and forget about order. Because if we understand and move out of that intellectual, verbal understanding, then we can find out to live a life which is completely non-violent. Right? I hope we are clear on this matter.

So what is disorder? Because the brain is not seeking order, it is

not concentrated, attentive to discover what is disorder. This is a dialogue between you and the speaker. Don't wait for him to answer that question, then you will just repeat. But if you can discover, find the truth of it, it is yours, then you can act. But if you merely listen to what the speaker is saying then you repeat, you don't know, "I don't understand, it is so difficult" and all the rest of that nonsense. Right? So what is disorder? To say one thing and think another - right? To act in one way and hiding your own thoughts, feelings, in another way. That is only a very simple matter. That requires great honesty, to say things what you mean. Not what others have told you what you mean. Right? Probably all of you have read a great deal so your brains are full of all the other people's knowledge, other people's concepts, prejudices, added to your own. So you repeat. But you never sit down, or walk in the woods, and find out what is disorder. And to find out one has to have tremendous honesty. Face things as they are. If I am afraid, I am afraid, I don't pretend I am not afraid. If I have told a lie, I say I have told a lie, not defend it, cause, you know all the game around it. So if each one can face exactly what one is, not what one should be. Are we together in this? We are walking the same road together, for the time being? So gradually, or instantly, you find out for yourself the causation of disorder. That is, there must be disorder where there is conflict of any kind - right? Either physical, or subjective, or psychological. And conflict exists when there are two opposing factors in life, the good and the bad - right? Is the good something totally separate from the bad? Or is the good partly bad? You understand? Am I making myself clear? No.

What is bad? And what is good? Obviously to kill another is

bad, in the name of God, in the name of etc. etc., another human being. And what is good? To be good. Are you waiting for my description? Probably you have never gone into all this. Is - we will go into this rather interesting subject. Is the good separate from the bad? Or does the good have its roots, its beginning of the bad - you understand? I won't ask if you understand. It is silly on my part. There are two elements in human beings, the good and the bad. The bad I say to be angry. The good is not to be angry. But I have known anger - right? And when I say I mustn't be angry, I will be good, the good is born out of my anger. No? When I say, "I must be good" because I have known the bad. Right? If I don't know the bad I am the good. Not the goods! I am the good. You understand this? I wonder if you understand. That is as long as I am violent I don't know what is the other. If I am not violent then the other is. So is the good born out of the bad? And if it is born out of the bad, the good, then it is not good. Right? Are we together in this? It seems rather mystifying, but please it is not. It is very simple. That is why I said please let us think simply, clearly, without prejudice, without taking a bias.

So love is not hate - right? If love is born out of hate then it is not love. Is that clear? If I - I don't, the speaker does not hate anybody, but suppose he does, then he says, "I mustn't hate, I must love", that is not love. It is still part of hate. It is a decision, it is an act of thought. And thought is not love. I won't go into that now, for the moment, we will go into it.

So can we, each one of us, feeling the responsibility that we have created this society in which we live, which is monstrous, immoral, beyond imagination, what we have done, can each one of

us living in this world, in this society, be utterly free of disorder? That means to be free of complete end of conflict, end of this feeling of duality in us. Duality, the opposing elements in us. So is it not a matter of being tremendously aware - you understand? Aware of every thought - right? Can we?

So that leads up to a certain point: what is thought? What is thinking? If you are asked: what is thinking, what would be your answer? Thinking. You are thinking now. But I am asking you, the speaker is asking you: what is thinking? And you begin to think. And all our life is thinking and sensation - right? Sensation, it is my clock, the child says, "My book", "That's my swing" - so what is thinking? By thinking mankind has sent a rocket to the moon. But that thinking also put a flag up there, which is so... you follow? Go all the way up to the moon and put a flag. [Laughter] No don't. See what thought is doing. Tremendous invention, concentration, co-operation of thousands of people, training and they go up there and do the most... [Tape turns over] And so thought has created the whole world of technology - right? Astonishing things they are doing, of which we have very little imagination, or we know very little about it. The computer, the extraordinary submarines and so on and so on. All that has been done by thinking - right? And it has built the most extraordinary buildings - right? So when you write a letter you have to think, when you drive a car it is almost automatic but you have to think what... and so on. So thinking has become extraordinarily important for all of us - right? Thinking is part of our programme. We have been programmed. I am a Catholic, you are a Protestant, I am a Muslim, you are a Hindu, you are a Communist, I am a Democrat - you follow? It is part of our

conditioning - right? Which is, we are being programmed, newspapers, magazines, the politicians, the priests, the archbishop, the pope, you know the whole thing, we are being programmed. So thinking is what? Why do you think? Why do you think at all? Why don't you just act? You can't. First you design very carefully what you are going to do, is it right, and wrong, is it should be, should not be, and then your own emotions, sensations say it is all right, all wrong, and you go and do it. All this is a process of thinking. Right? Should I marry, should I not? That girl is right, that girl is... [Laughter]... or the other way round. So thinking has done an extraordinary amount of harm, war - right? Hate, jealousy, wanting to hurt others. So what is thinking? The good, so-called good and so-called bad thinking - right? Right thinking and wrong thinking, but it is still thinking. Right? Oriental thinking and Western thinking, but it is still thinking. What is thinking? Don't wait for me. Put yourself that question. What is thinking? Can you think without memory? (Coughs) - sorry. You cannot think without memory. Then what is memory? Go on. Put your brains into it. Remembrance? Long association of ideas, long bundle of memories. Then you ask: what is memory? I remember the house I lived in. I remember my childhood. That is what? The past. Right? The past is memory. You don't know what will happen tomorrow but you can project what might - it might what, what it might do. That is still the action of memory in time. Right?

So what is memory? How does memory come? This is all so simple. [Noise of train] Memory cannot exist without knowledge. Right? If I have no knowledge of my accident in a car which happened yesterday - it didn't - that accident is remembered. But

previous to that remembrance there was the accident, which was the knowledge - right? The accident becomes a knowledge, then from that knowledge is memory, yes, memory. If I had no accident there would be no memory of an accident. You can imagine other people's accidents. So knowledge is based on experience - right? So experience is always limited. I can have more experience, more varieties of experience, not only physical, sexual, but also so-called inward, experience of some illusory god and so on and so on. Right? So experience, knowledge, memory, thought. Right? So knowledge - experience being always limited, always, I can't experience, experience the immensity of order of the universe - right? I can't experience it. But I can imagine it. It is marvellous! So experience is limited and therefore knowledge is limited, whether in the future or now because all knowledge is being added, more and more - right? Scientific knowledge is based on that. From before Galileo and so on and so on and so on, there has been added, added, added. So knowledge is always limited whether now or in the future - right? So memory is limited. So thought is limited. Right? This is where the difficulty is. Thought is limited. Thought has invented gods, saviours, rituals, Lenin and Marx and Stalin Limited, their knowledge. So thought, whatever it does, noble or ignoble, religious or non-religious, virtuous or not virtuous, moral or immoral, it is still limited. Whatever thought does. Right? Are we together in this?

So can thought bring about order? Because thought itself being limited maybe the source of disorder. I wonder if you capture this? You understand my question? Very interesting. Go into it. Anything that is limited must create disorder. If I am a Muslim,

which is very limited, I must create disorder. If I am an Israeli, it is limited, I must create disorder. Or a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, and all the rest of it. Right? So is thought the very root of disorder? Go into it. Please be sceptical, don't accept a thing that the speaker says. Find out, investigate, not tomorrow, now sitting there, go into it, find out. Put your passion into it, not your fanaticism. Then you will begin to discover.

So we have lived so far after two and a half million years, or less, or more, as human beings, in a state of violence, disorder, conflict, and all that is brought about by thought - right? All of it. So I begin to enquire, one begins to enquire: is there something else which is as active, as clear, as precise and energetic as thought? You understand? One discovers, say, K discovers that thought is very limited, long ago. Nobody told him but he discovered it, or came upon it. And then he begins to ask is there another instrument like that? Right? Thought is within this brain, within this skull - right? The brain is the holder of all thought, all memories, all experience. It is also all emotion, sensation, nervous responses. It is the vast memory that is held there, racial, non-racial, personal, you follow, all that is there. And the centre of all that is thought. It may say, "No, it is something else", it is still thought. When it says it is seeking super consciousness, it is still thought.

So one asks, K asks is there another instrument, not this, another instrument, or not an instrument, a way, a movement which is not of this kind? Right? Are you asking that question? Right? If you are asking it who is going to tell you? Is thought going to tell you? Be careful please. This demands great subtlety,

skill because thought can be very deceptive. It says, "All right I have understood thought is limited" but it is still active. And then it begins to invent. "I know thought is limited but God is limitless, and I am seeking God." Thought is limited but it invents the rituals, the Middle Ages' robes, of the monks and the priests and all the rest of it.

So to find that out, can the brain - this is a very - can the brain use thought, act thoughtfully when it is necessary - right? - and otherwise no thought? You understand? Can the brain when necessary use thought? Or live with thought both when you drive a cars, when you eat, when you write a letter, when you do this and that, it is all the movement of limited thought. That is when necessary thought can act. But otherwise why should it chatter all day long? You understand?

So is there another instrument which is not at all thought? Which is not put together by thought, or conceived by thought, or manufactured subtly by thought? You understand? Find out. That requires the understanding of time. May I go into it? You aren't tired? Well you have paid for it so it is up to you!

You have to understand what is time. Not the time of the rising of the sun and the setting, which is also time. The time of the new moon and the full moon. The time of day from morning until evening, twenty four hours. Time is also all that happened in one's life which are a thousand yesterdays - right? And all that might happen tomorrow. Time is horizontal and vertical - right? The going up and linear. And time which is the past, time now, sitting here, and time also is tomorrow. So this is the cycle in which we are caught. A thousand yesterdays, many days in our life, and

before I die there will be some more days. So this whole movement, the cyclical movement is time - right? Are we? Right? Time is necessary to evolve from the little seed to the big tree - right? From the little baby to the grown up man. There is the physical time and also there is psychological time. I am this, but I will be that. To become that I need time - right? You are following all this? So the brain lives in time. The brain has been cultivated, grown, evolved through time, from the most primitive now to the most sophisticated, it took time. So this whole movement of life as we know it is time - right? Right? Is that all?

Then we know what was yesterday. You may remember your childhood, you may remember your life twenty years ago and ten days ago, which is the past - right? Following? Which is the past. That past is the present, slightly changed, slightly modified by present circumstances. Are you following? Or am I talking to myself. Don't go to sleep. Another ten minutes please. Don't go to sleep or get bored. It is your life we are talking about, not my life. It is your life, your daily life. What it actually is, not what it should be. Your daily, monotonous, lonely, desperate, anxious, uncertain life. And that life is part of the movement of time. Time is also that time coming to an end when I die. So we are concerned with time. I will have a better job if I keep at it. If I get more skilful I will have more money. Right? All that is time. And yesterday, many yesterdays, being slightly modified by circumstances, by pressures, is now - right? Do you see that? All that has happened from a thousand yesterdays becomes slightly polished, slightly modified and goes to the future - right? The past modifying it self through the present becomes the future - right? So the future is now. I

wonder if you see this. Right? This requires - please just give it a little time. That is I lived in India, with all the cultural superstitious beliefs, dogmas, traditions, immense traditions of three to five thousand years old, immense traditions, you were brought up on that and you lived there in that little small circle of Brahminism - right? And if one wasn't awake you remained there all the rest of your life until you die. But circumstances, economic circumstances, travel, this and that, makes you drop this - right? So the past tradition of three to five thousand years is now changed through modification, which is through economy - right? I have to earn more money. My wife, my children, must have more clothes. But the past is still moving which becomes changed through circumstances - right? And the change goes on into the future. That is clear. So you ask: what is the future? Ask yourself: what is the future? What is your future? Is what you are now is your future, modified, but it is still the future. Right? So there is a continuity from the past, slightly changing, to the future. Right? We have lived on this earth as human beings, homo sapiens, for two and a half million years - right? And we were savage then and we still are savages, but with clean clothes, shaved, clean, polished, but inwardly we hate each other, we kill each other, we are tribalists, and all the rest of it. We haven't changed very much. Right? You understand this? So the future is now. I wonder if... Because what I have been I am still modified, and I will go on like that. So the future is now. Unless I break the cycle the future will be always the now. I wonder if you understand this? It is not very difficult. Please don't make it difficult. It is very simple. I have been greedy for the last thirty years and that greed becomes modified because I can't

earn so much, satisfy myself so I am still greedy but it goes on - right? So unless I stop greed now tomorrow will be greedy. I wonder. It is very simple.

So our question then is: can 'what is', the past, change completely end, then you break the cycle. When you break the cycle the cells in the brain themselves change. We have discussed this matter with brain specialists - don't bother with all that. You see Sir, I have lived 80 years - I am 90, the speaker is 90, don't sympathize with me for God's sake, just 90 [laughter] - all that has happened during these 90 years, or 50 years, or 10 years, or even 10 days, is the past - memory, experiences, talking here, there, small audience, big audience, reputation and all that nonsense, all that is in the past. And he feels important sitting on a platform, his reputation, and he must keep up that reputation, otherwise... So he wants this reputation, sitting on the platform, all that business, to continue - right? But he may get old - not may, he is old - and he may lose the audience because his brain might go gaga [laughter] - no listen to it carefully please listen, it is not a matter of laughter, it is funny but just look at it. His brain may go senile and he will be stuck. So what happens? Unless he is free of the audience now, his reputation now - you understand? - end it. And he may go gaga next year, all right, but he has ended it. You understand? The brain has broken the cycle of time. Which means the brain is composed of millions and millions of cells, those very cells mutate. There is a different species of cells because you have moved away from a certain direction to another direction. You follow? That is, you have been going North all your life. Somebody comes along and says, "Look there is nothing in the North, for God's sake don't

waste your energy on going North, go South or East." The moment he turns East he has broken the pattern. You understand? The pattern which the brain cells have set, he has broken it and gone East. It is as simple as that, if one does it. But you can play with words endlessly, write books endlessly. But once you see the nature of time, that we have changed through these millions of years very little. We are still killing each other in a more diabolical way - right? The atom can wipe us out in a second, vapourised. We don't exist, nothing exists. But it is the same when a man killed another man two million years ago. We are still doing that. Unless we break the pattern we will do that same thing tomorrow. You follow? This is very simple. They killed with a club two thousand years ago, later on they invented the arrow. The arrow, they thought would stop all wars. Then there came the Roman Legion and all that. Then we have the present day. Terrible means of destruction - right? The same thing as two million years ago, we are still doing, killing. That is the pattern the brain has accepted, has lived with, the brain has created the pattern. And if the brain doesn't realize for itself, not through pressure, compulsion, doesn't realize that time has no value in the movement of change. I wonder if you see - right? Then you have broken the pattern. Then there is a totally different way of living.

May we get up? You can't sit here for ever, it is time for lunch!

SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 14TH JULY 1985

May we continue with our conversation?

We were talking about conflict and the causation of conflict. Conflict is growing more and more in the world, in every form, in every social section and so on. We said the cause of conflict is this constant opposition, not only within ourselves but also within the society in which we live. Society is what we have made of it. I think that is fairly clear and obvious, because in ourselves we are, from the moment we are born until we die, we are in constant struggle, competition, conflict, every form of destructive or positive attitudes, prejudices and opinions. This has been the way of our life. Not only at the present period but also for the last probably two and half million years. And we are still going on with this in the same pattern, the same mould - wars, more destructive than ever, division among nationalities, which is tribalism, religious divisions, family divisions, sectarian fragmentation and so on.

If we may point out this morning again, that we are not here as an intellectual group, or rather romantic. imaginative, sentimental assembly. We are together, you and the speaker, are going to take a journey, not he is leading you, or you are following him, but together, side by side, perhaps holding hands if necessary. We are taking a journey, rather complex, twisting, subtle and perhaps endless, a journey that has no beginning and no end. Or the term has an beginning and an ending, as we understand it, something starts, goes on and then comes to an end. Perhaps it may not be at all like that. It may be a constant movement, not within the cycle of

time but rather outside the field of momentum as we know it. We can go into all that presently.

So we are together. Please the speaker must insist on this point. You are not merely the listeners and you accept or reject what he says but rather in co-operation, in responsibility, together in step, not one behind the other, walking along the same path, same sandier, or same lane. So it is your responsibility as well as the speaker not to accept or to deny, or to agree or disagree. We have been brought up, educated in this system of agreeing and disagreeing. We agree with some things, we disagree entirely with other things. So there is always this division, those who agree, do something together, and those who are opposed to what they are doing.

Could we this morning banish from our brains altogether, entirely, out of our blood, out of our brains, the idea of agreeing or disagreeing? Because if you agree with the speaker, and there are some who don't agree, then there is a conflict between the two inevitably. One may tolerate it, one may put up with it, accept it, but there is always this division - clear? So could we, seeing the consequences of agreeing and disagreeing, approving and disapproving, but together observe, together see exactly not only as far as we can what is happening externally, that is fairly simple because we are not told very much what is actually going on, in the political world, in the world of armaments, in the scientific world and all the technological world but inwardly, subjectively, to see exactly what is going on, not saying, "Well, this is bad, this is good. I accept this, I don't accept that.", but just to observe. Not in that observation any prejudice - right? Can we do this? Can we

observe ourselves, our conduct, our behaviour, the way we think, our reactions, our faiths, beliefs, conclusions and so on? Could we observe all that as it is, not as it should be, or as it must be, just to look at it? Could we do that? That requires a great deal of attention, the brain must be extraordinarily active to reject any kind of reaction in watching oneself. Because after all what other people have said about us, the professors, the psychologists, the psychiatrists and the gurus and all those people, it is what they say, it is not what you see of yourself. I hope we are following each other. We are speaking English and the words the speaker is using are very simple, simple words which we use daily in our conversation with each other. There is no jargon, no specialized linguistic, semantic jargon. We are talking over together, as two friends using ordinary, daily language. So we are asking: can we see exactly what we are without taking sides about it? Because we are going to go into all that this morning. Not only agreeing and disagreeing, seeing the consequences of each attitude, put away that completely, assessing, disagreeing, evaluating, judging, but just to observe as you observe the sky of an evening full of stars, and those mountains, majestic against the blue sky. You just observe. Can we do the same thing outwardly because there is the criteria, and from there observe ourselves and our relationship to the world, and the world relationship to us? It is a rather complex process - right? Are we together? Or am I marching ahead, and leaving you behind? Could we go together? Keeping in step, if we don't understand each other we say, "I don't understand what you are talking about." Right? Could we start with that?

What are we? Why have we such deep rooted self interest? Not

only self interest outwardly, there is a certain necessity of self interest otherwise one has to give up. But inwardly, psychologically, subjectively, why is there such deep, impenetrable self interest, in all of us? That self interest - you know what that word means? To be interested in oneself, one's own profits, one's own failures, one's own fragmentation, one's own prejudices, opinions, the whole existence of one's life. Self interest - why is it we are so committed to that? Is it possible to live in this world without that self interest? First psychologically and then we can see if it is possible externally. Right? Are we together? Or am I talking over beyond that tent, over the fence?

Have you ever noticed that we build a fence round ourselves? A fence of self protection, a fence to ward off any hurts, a barrier between you and the other, between you and your family, between you and so on, there is a barrier between you and the speaker - right? Naturally. You don't know the speaker, the speaker doesn't know you, therefore you are rather politely listening, curious what the devil he is talking about and hoping that you will get something out of it after sitting an hour or so in this hot tent, marquee and expecting something - right? Naturally. Curious, choosing what suits you, what doesn't suit you, listening partially, not entirely because one doesn't want to expose oneself to oneself so naturally one creates either a very, very thin barrier, hardly any, or a definite wall. Why do we do that? Is that not also self interest? And this self interest must inevitably bring about fragmentation, to break up - nationally, you can see the barrier, on one side England and the other side all Europe and beyond it. There is this constant division. And where there is division there must be conflict, that is

inevitable. Whether you have very deep intimate relationship with your wife or husband, girl or boy, and so on, where there is division there must be fragmentation, there must be conflict. That is a law - right? Whether you like it or not that is the law. But when one sees that then you break down, the very seeing is the way of breaking down the barrier.

So we must enquire: what does it mean to see - right? What does it mean to observe? I am observing myself - right? I am watching what I am, my reactions, my prejudices, my convictions, my idiosyncrasies, the traditions in which I have been brought up, the reputation, all that rubbish. I am watching. If I do not watch very, very carefully, listen to every sound that is going on in watching, then I set a direction in which I must go. You are following all this? Am I talking to myself?

We were talking in Washington, America, and what I said they clapped, approving, encouraging. Here, you sit all very quietly. One really doesn't know if you are really walking together or actually listening, or casually come in, a Sunday morning sermon. Instead of going to church you turn up here, either for amusement, or just hear what that chap is saying, or, "Well I agree with him but he is not quite right about other things." We never look at the whole thing, the whole problem of life, the whole existence from childhood to death. We never take the whole thing in and observe, learn, not accumulate knowledge, that is fairly simple, but to learn what is happening in ourselves, the demands that we make upon each other, the hurts, the deep loneliness, the depression, the anxiety, the uncertainty, the fears, and all the pleasant things that we have, and also suffering, and ultimately there is the pain of

death. We never look at this whole movement as one, but rather we consider it fragmentarily.

Now we are going to look, if we may, together, not only at what is the cause of this fragmentation but also whether the brain, which has been conditioned for millions of years, to war, to conflict, to work, to work, to work all the time, endlessly chattering, divided as tribals, as nationalities and so on, your god and my god, Eastern philosophy opposed to the Western philosophy. You know all that is going on. So if we could this morning put aside altogether, if we can, the whole movement of agreeing and disagreeing, in which there is choice - right? I chose to go that way and you chose to go that way. I chose to believe in God, or no god, and you say, "No sorry I can't accept that, there must be God, because I believe it, I like it." - or "it is my tradition" - and so on. If we once recognise the division, the agreement, the disagreement, reward and punishment and so on, then we can begin to look actually at ourselves, because ourselves is the world. Right? What we are, the world is. If we are violent, suspicious, ungenerous, the world is like that. This is obvious, isn't it? Because we have made this society, this monstrous, ugly, immoral world in which we live, with all the gods, you know, all that business. It has become a great circus, painful circus, or pleasurable circus. So to see exactly what we are without any distortion. What are we? Psychologically, not biologically. Biologically it has been put together through millenia upon millenia. Psychologically from the beginning of man there is violence, hate, jealousy, aggression, trying to become always something more, more, more, and much more than what we are. Is it that one is merely listening to the description? Or see the fact,

not the idea of the fact? You understand? There is a difference between fact and the idea of the fact. That is, we have an idea, seeing something and we make out of that an idea, and then pursue the idea. I shouldn't be like this but I must be like that. That is an idea. First I see what I am, not what I should be - right? Then I see exactly what I am. That is a fact. Fact does not need an idea, a concept, an ideology. It is so. I am angry. That is a fact. But if I say "I must not be angry" then it becomes an idea. Are we together in this?

So what is it that you are making out of this? Is it that you are concluding a set of idea? Or seeing the fact as it is? - that we are jealous, aggressive, lonely, fear and all the rest of it? The whole psyche, the persona, the ego, is all that - right? Are you suspicious of this? That is, all this is the past, the memories that we have collected - right? I have been afraid, I know what is fear, and the moment that feeling arises I say, "that is fear". That very saying that it is fear is an idea, not a fact. I don't know if you are following all this? Sir, the word tree is not the actual tree - right? Right? The name K is not the actual K. The word is not the thing - right? So when you observe your brain is caught in a whole network of words, words, words - right? Can you look at yourself without the word? Oh, come on Sirs, play the game with me, will you? The ball is in your court. That is, can we look at your wife, at your husband, at your children, or your girl friend, or whatever it is, without the word? Without the image? That word, that image, is the division. Right? Can you look at the speaker without the word? - the word being all the remembrances about the speaker, the reputation, what you have read or not read, and so on, just to

observe. Which means one must grasp, understand how the brain operates - right? Your own brain, not the brain of philosophers, or the spiritual writers, or the priests or somebody or other. Just to observe yourself without the word. Then we can look at certain facts, why human beings get hurt - right? That is very important to find out.

From childhood we are hurt - do and don't do - right? There is always the pressure, always the sense of being rewarded and punished - right? You say something to me which I don't - which I get angry about and that hurts me - right? So have we realized a very simple fact that from childhood we are hurt, and for the rest of our life we carry that hurt. Afraid of being hurt further, or attempting that one must not be hurt, which is another form of resistance - right? So are we aware of these hurts and therefore create a barrier round ourselves, the barrier of fear - right? Can we go into this question, fear? Shall we? Not for my pleasure, for you I am talking about. Can we go into it very, very deeply and see why human beings, which is all of us, why human beings have put up with fear for thousands of years - right? We see the consequences of fear. Fear of not being rewarded, fear of not being - a failure, fear of your own feeling that you must come to a certain point and not being able to, your weakness - right? And all this breeds certain forms of fear. Are you interested in going into this problem? It means going into it completely to the very end. Not just saying, "Sorry that is too difficult". Nothing is too difficult if you want to do it. The word difficult prevents you from further action. But if you can put away that word difficult then we can go into this very, very complex problem, not only verbally, which is

fairly - we can explain all the causation, all the effects and the effects becoming the cause and so on. It is a chain.

First why do we put up with it? If you have a car which goes wrong you go to the nearest garage, if you can, and then the machinery is put right and you go on. Is it that we have not - that there is no one we can go to and he will help us to have no fear - you understand the question? Do we want help from somebody to be free of fear? Right? Psychologists, psychotherapists, psychiatrists, or the priest, confession, or the guru who says, "Surrender everything to me, including your money, then you will be perfectly all right." We do this. You may laugh, you may be amused, but we are doing this all the time inwardly.

So, do we want help? Prayer, prayer is a form of help, asking to be free from fear is a form of help. The speaker telling you how to be free of fear is a form of help. But he is not going to tell you how. Because we are walking together, we are giving energy to discover for yourself the causation of fear. If you see something very clearly then you don't have to decide, or chose, or ask for help, you act - right? Do we see clearly the whole structure, the inward nature of fear? Or you have been afraid and the memory of that comes back and says that is fear - you understand what I am saying?

So let's go into this carefully. Not the speaker is going into it and then you agree or disagree, but you yourself are taking the journey with the speaker, not verbally or intellectually, or verbally, but delving, probing, investigating - right? We are finding out - we want to go, no, we want to delve as you dig in the garden, or to find water, you dig deep, you don't stand outside on the earth and

say, "I must have water." You dig, or go to a river. So first of all, let's be very clear: do you want help in order to be free of fear? If you want help then you are establishing an authority - right? You are responsible then for establishing an authority, a leader, a priest - right? So one must ask oneself before we go into this question of fear, whether you want help? Of course you go to a doctor, if you can't do certain things for yourself, if you have pain, or a headache, or some kind of disease, you naturally go to a doctor. There he knows much more the organic nature of your organ so he tells you what to do. We are not talking about that kind of help. We are talking about whether you need help, somebody to instruct you, to lead you, and to say, "Do this, do that, day after day and you will be free of fear." That means we want someone to help us - right? The speaker is not helping you. That is one thing certain. Because you have dozens of helpers, from the great religious leaders - God forbid! - and to the lowest, you know the poor psychologist round the corner. So let us be very clear between ourselves that the speaker doesn't want to help you in any way psychologically - right? Would you kindly accept that? Honestly accept it? Don't say yes, it is very difficult. In all your life you have sought help in various directions, some say "Yes, I don't want help." It requires not only perception, seeing what the demand for help has done to humanity. You ask help only when you are confused, when you don't know what to do, when you are uncertain - right? But when you see things clearly, see, observe, perceive, not only externally, but inwardly much more, when you see things very, very clearly you don't want any help, there it is. And from that action. Right? Are we together in this? Let's again repeat, if you don't mind. The

speaker is not telling you how. Never ask that question how. Then there is somebody always giving you a rope. The speaker is not helping you in any way. But together we are walking along the same road, perhaps not at the same speed. But set the speed of your own and we will walk together. Clear? We are in accord?

If you are not clear about demanding help you will have to go somewhere else. Probably you will. Or turn to a book, or turn to somebody, not towards the speaker. Sorry to depress you. Or to say sorry I won't stretch out my hand, that is not it. [Tape turns over]. If you are walking together we are holding hands together. There is no stretching your hand and seeking help - right?

Are we working together? Or am I working and getting hot about it?

What is the cause of fear? Go slowly please. Cause. If you can discover the cause then you can do something about it, you can change the cause - right? If a doctor tells me, tells the speaker he has got cancer - which he hasn't - suppose he tells me I have got cancer, he says, "I can remove it easily and you will be all right." I go to him. He has to remove it. The cause comes to an end. So the [noise of train] - so the cause can always be changed, rooted out - clear? If you have got a headache you can find the cause of it, if you are eating wrongly, or you smoking too much, or drinking too much and all the rest of it, either you stop it, your drinking, smoking and all the rest, or you take a pill to stop it. The pill becomes then the effect which stops for the moment the causation - right? So cause and effect can always be changed, immediately, or you take time over it. If you take time over it then during that interval all other factors enter into it. So you never change the

effect, continue with the cause - clear? Are we together in this? So what is the cause of fear? Why haven't we gone into it? Why do we tolerate it, knowing the effect of fear, the consequences of fear? If we are not at all afraid psychologically, no fear at all, you would have no gods, you would have no symbols to worship, no personalities to adore - right? Then you are psychologically extraordinarily free - right? And also fear makes one shrink, nervous, apprehensive, wanting to escape from it and therefore the escape becomes more important than the fear. Are you following? So we are going to go over together to find out what is the cause of fear. The cause, the root of it. And if we discover it for ourselves then it is over. If you see the causation, or many causes, then that very perception ends the cause - right? Are you listening to me, to the speaker, to explain the causation? Or you have never even asked such a question? I have borne fear, my father, my grandfather, the whole race in which I am born, the whole community, the whole structure of gods, rituals, is based on fear and the desire to achieve some extraordinary states. Right?

So let us go into this. We are not talking about, together [noise of train] - we are not talking about various forms of fear, fear of darkness, fear of one's husband, wife, fear of society, fear of dying, fear of - you know, we are not talking of the various forms of fear. It is like a tree that has got many, many branches, many flowers, many fruits, the flowers become the fruit, but we are talking about the very root of that tree - right? The root of it. Not your particular form of fear. You can trace your particular form to the root of it. So we are asking: are we concerned with our fears, or with the whole fear? Right? With the whole tree, not just one branch of it. Because

unless you take - you understand how the tree lives, the water it requires, the depth of the soil and so on, merely trimming the branches won't do anything - right? So we must go to the very root of fear.

So what is the root of fear? Don't wait for me. I am not your leader. I am not your helper. I am not your guru - thank God! We are together, as two brothers, and I mean it, the speaker means it. It is not just words. As two good friends who have known each other from the beginning of time, walking along the same path, at the same speed, looking at everything that is around you and in you. So together we will go into it. Please, together. Otherwise it becomes just words, at the end of the talk you will say, "Really what am I to do with my fear?"

Fear is very complex. It is a tremendous reaction. If you are aware of it, it is a shock, not only biologically, organically, but also a shock to the brain. The brain has a capacity, as one discovers, not from what the others say, it has capacity to remain in spite of a shock, healthy. Certain - I don't know all about it - but the very shock invites its own protection. Right? You go into it for yourself, you will see. So fear is a shock. Momentarily, or it continues in different forms, different expressions, different ways. So we are going to the very, very, very root of it. To understand the very root of it, we must understand time - right? Time as yesterday, time as today, time as tomorrow. I remember something I have done, of which I am shy, or nervous, or apprehensive, or fearful, I remember all that and it continues to the future. Right? I have been angry, jealous, envious - that is the past. I am still envious, slightly modified, but I am fairly generous about things but envy goes on.

Right? This whole process is time, isn't it - right? You understand? Say yes, for God's sake! No, don't say yes! You understand? That is, what do we consider time?

Let's begin again. What do you consider is time? By the clock, sunrise, sunset, the evening star, the new moon with the full moon comes a fortnight later. What is time to you? Time to learn a skill? Time to learn a language? Time to write a letter? Time to go to your house from here? All that is time as distance. Right? I have to go from here to there. That is a distance covered by time. Right? Right? So time also is inward, psychological. I am this, I must become that. Becoming that is called evolution. Evolution means from the seed to the tree. And also I am ignorant but I will learn. I don't know but I will know. Give me time to be free of violence - right? You are following all this? Give me time. Give me a few days, or a month, or a year, I will be free of it. So we live by time. Not only going to the office every day from nine to five, God forbid, but also time to become something. Look, you understand all this? Right? Time, the movement of time. I have been afraid of you and I remember that fear and that fear is still there, and I will be afraid of you tomorrow. I hope not, but if I don't do something very drastic about it I will be afraid of you tomorrow. So we live by time - right? Be clear on this. Please let's be clear on this. We live by time. Which is, I am living, I will die. I will postpone death as far away as possible but I am living, I am going to do everything to avoid that. Though that is inevitable - right? So we psychologically as well as biologically, we live by time.

Is time a factor of fear? Please enquire. Time, that is, I have told a lie, I don't want you to know, but you are very smart. You look at

me and say, "Yes, you have told a lie", "No, no, I have not" - I protect myself instantly, because I am afraid of your finding out that I am a liar. Or partly liar. So I am afraid - right? For something I have done, which I don't like you to know, and I am afraid of that. Which is what? Thought, isn't it - right? I have done something which I remember, and that remembrance says be careful, don't let him discover that you told a lie because you have got a good reputation as an honest man and protect yourself - right? So thinking and time are together. There is no division between thought, thinking and time. Are we clear on this matter? Please be clear on this matter, otherwise you will get rather confused later. The causation of fear is time/thought, the root of it - right?

Audience: I am not quite clear.

K: Wait Sir. You can ask questions when there is the question and answer meeting. I believe some time next week.

So are we clear on this thing that time, that is, the past, with all the things that one has done, and that thought whether pleasant or unpleasant, specially if it is unpleasant, I want to protect it, or change it, or impossible to change therefore I say, "By Jove, I am frightened of it." Right? Which is thinking about it. So time and thought are the root of fear. This is an obvious fact. A very simple verbal fact. But to go behind the word and see the truth of this time/thought, then you will inevitably ask: how is thought to stop? Right? It is a natural question, no? If thought creates fear, which is so obvious, then how am I to stop thinking? You understand my question? Right? Tell me how am I to stop thinking? Because I see the cause is thought, because I remember what I did, I am frightened of it, I don't want you to find out, so it is thinking -

right? Then I ask you, "Please help me to stop my thinking." I would be an ass to ask such a question but I am asking it. How am I to stop thinking? Is that possible? Go on Sir, investigate, don't let me go on. Thinking. Because we live by thinking. Everything we do is through thought. To write a letter, to learn a language, to go to your office, to do all the business, the whole process of thinking. We went into that carefully the other day. We won't waste time in going into the cause, the beginning of thinking, how it comes, experience, knowledge, which is always limited, memory and then thought. I am just briefly repeating this.

So is it possible to stop thinking? Is it possible not to chatter all day long? Giving the brain a rest, though it has its own rhythm, the blood going up to it, its own activity. Its own, not the activity imposed by thought - you understand? [Noise of train.] - There seems to be a lot of trains today. May I point out, may the speaker point out, that is a wrong question. Who is it that stops thinking? You understand my question? It is still thought, isn't it? When I say, "If I could only stop thinking then I would have no fear", the very statement that "I wish I could stop it", who is that that wishes to stop thought? It is still thought isn't it because it wants something else? Right?

So, what will you do? You understand my question? Any movement of thought to be other than what it is, is still thinking - right? I am greedy, but I must not be greedy, it is still thinking. Thinking has put together all the paraphernalia, all that business that goes on in churches and all that is put together by thought. Like this marquee or tent is put together carefully by thought. So thought is the very root of our existence, apparently. So we are

asking a very serious question, seeing what thought has done, invented the most extraordinary things, computer, the warships, the missiles, the atom bomb, the surgery, medicine, if you like medicine, and also the things it has made man do, go to the moon and so on. Thought is the very root of fear. Right? Do we see that? Not how to end thought. Do we see actually thinking is the root of fear, which is time? Seeing, not the words, "I am seeing", but actually see. When you have pain, severe pain, the pain is not different from you, you act instantly - right? So do you see as clearly as you see the clock, the speaker and your friend sitting beside you, see that thought is the causation of fear? Don't, please don't ask: "How am I to see?" The moment you ask how, someone is willing to help you, then you become their slave. But if you [noise of train] - but if you yourself see thought/time are really the root of fear, take time, take deliberation. It doesn't need decision, just the seeing. A scorpion is poisonous, a snake is poisonous, the very perception of it you act.

So one asks why don't we see? Why don't we see one of the causes of war is nationalities - right? One of the causes. Why don't we see that one may be called a Muslim, and you may be called a Christian, why do we fight over names, over propaganda? Right? Do we see it, or just memorize or think about it? You understand Sirs that you are - your consciousness is the rest of mankind. Mankind, like you and others, mankind goes through every form of difficulty, pain, travail, anxiety, loneliness, depression, sorrow, pleasure, every human being goes through this. Not only the Swiss, not only the you, but every human being, all over the world, whether they be Russian, American, and all the rest of it. So our

consciousness, our being, is the entire humanity. Do you understand? This is so. How unwilling we are to accept such a simple fact. Because we are so accustomed to individuality. I, me, first. So if you see that, if you see that your consciousness is shared by all other human beings living in this marvellous earth then your whole way of living changes. But we don't see that. You need argument, you need lots of persuasion, pressure, propaganda, which are all so terribly useless because it is you that you have to see this thing for yourself.

So can we, each of us, who are the rest of mankind, who are mankind, look at a very simple fact. Observe, see that the causation of fear is thought/time? Then the very perception is action. And from that you don't rely on anybody. The guru is like you - you understand? The leader may put on different robes and put on all the jewels and all that, strip him of all that and he is just like you and me. But he has achieved greater power and we also want greater power, money, position, status. So could we look at all this, see it very clearly, and then that very perception ends all this rubbish. Then you are a free person.

May we stop? And may we get up? For the speaker to get up you have to get up.

SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1985

You heard all the announcements. May I also announce that I am going to talk? And also that you are going to share in the talk. It is not a solo, but together, and the speaker means together, not that he is leading you or helping you or trying to persuade you, but rather together, and that word is important, together we take a very, very long journey. It is rather a difficult path - rather, I won't use that word, that is a dangerous word - a sentier, lane, a way that will be rather complex because we are going to talk about self interest, austerity, conduct and if it is possible in our daily life to end all sorrow. This is a very important question: why humanity after so many thousands and thousands of years has never been free from sorrow, not only each one's sorrow, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness involved in that sorrow but also the sorrow of mankind. We are going to talk about that. And also, if we have time, we are going to talk about pleasure, and also death.

It is such a lovely morning, beautiful, clear blue sky, the quiet hills and the deep shadows, and the running waters, the meadow, the grove and the green grass. We ought also - we should talk over together what is beauty on such a lovely morning? Could we talk about what is beauty? Because that is a very important question. Not the beauty of nature or the extraordinary vitality, dynamic energy of a tiger. You have only seen tigers in a zoo but the poor things are kept there for your amusement. If you go to some parts of the world where the speaker has done, he was close to a wild tiger, as close as two feet away. Don't get excited!

And we should also go into this question because without

beauty and love there is no truth. And we ought to examine very closely the word beauty. What is beauty? You are asking that question and so is the speaker asking that question. So we are both together looking, not only at the word, the implications of that word, and the immensity, the incalculable depth of beauty. Should we talk about it? We can talk about it, but the talk, the words, the explanations and the descriptions are not beauty. The word beauty is not beauty. It is something totally different. So one must be, if one may point it out, one must be very alert to words. Because our brain works, is active in a movement of words. Words convey what one feels, what one thinks, and accepts the explanations, descriptions because our whole brain structure, most of it, is verbal. So one must go into it very, very carefully not only with regard to beauty but also with regard to austerity, with regard to self interest. We are going to go into all these questions this morning, if we will.

So we are asking ourselves: what is beauty? Is the beauty in a person, in a face? Is beauty in the museums, paintings, classical paintings, modern paintings? Is beauty in all the music - Beethoven, Mozart, Bach and all the rest of them? Is beauty in a poem? In literature? Dancing? And all the noise that is going on in the world called music? Is all that beauty? Or is beauty something entirely different? Right? We are going into it together. Please don't be, if one may respectfully point out, don't accept the words, merely be satisfied with the description and explanations, not agreeing and disagreeing, all that business, let's put out all that, if we can, from our brain and look at it very carefully, stay with it, penetrate into the word.

Because as we said without that quality of beauty, which is sensitivity, which implies not only the beauty of nature - the deserts, the forests, the rivers and the vast mountains with their immense dignity, majesty, but also the feeling, not the romantic imaginations and sentimental states - those are merely sensations. Is beauty, then we are asking, a sensation? Because we live by sensations. Sexual sensation, with which goes pleasure, and also the pain that is involved in the feeling that it is not being fulfilled, and so on. If we could this morning put out all those words from our brain and look at, go into this enormous question, very complicated, subtle, what is the nature of beauty? We are not writing a poem.

When you look at those mountains, those immense rocks jetting into the sky, if you look at it quietly you feel the immensity of it, the enormous majesty of it. And for the moment, for the second, that tremendous dignity of it, the solidity of it, puts away all your thoughts, your problems, for a second - right? And you say, "How marvellous that is". So what has taken place there? The majesty of those mountains for a second, the very immensity of the sky and the blue and the snow clad mountains, drives away all your problems. It makes you totally forget yourself for a second. You are enthralled by it, you are struck by it. Like a child, who has been naughty all day long, or naughty for a while, which he has a right to be, and you give him a complicated toy. And he is absorbed by the toy until he breaks it up. And the toy has absorbed him. You understand? The toy has taken him over and he is quiet, he is enjoying - right? He has forgotten all his family, mother, you know, "Do this, don't do that", and the toy becomes the most

exciting thing for him. You understand? The mountain, the river, the meadows and the groves absorb you, you forget yourself - right? So is that beauty? You understand my question? To be absorbed by the mountain, by the river, or the green fields, that means you are like a child being absorbed by something else - right? And for the moment you are quiet, being absorbed, taken over, surrendering yourself to something. Is that beauty? Being taken over? You understand? Surrendering yourself to something great? And that thing forcing you for a second to forget yourself. So then you depend. Depend as the child does on a toy, or depend on a cinema, television, and for the moment you have identified yourself with the actor, or the actress. Surely all that is a form of being taken away from yourself - right? Would you consider that state, being taken over, surrendering, being absorbed, that quiet second, is that beauty? When you go to a church, or a temple, or a mosque, there the chanting, the rituals, the intonation of the voice, everything is so organized, so carefully put together to create a certain sensation, which you call worship, which you call a sense of religiosity. Is that beauty? Or beauty is something entirely different. You understand? Are we understanding this question together?

Is there beauty where there is self conscious endeavour? Or there is beauty only when the self is not? When the me, the observer, is not? So is it possible without being absorbed, taken over, surrendering, to be in that state, without the self, without the ego, the me always thinking about itself? You understand my question? Is that possible at all living in this modern world with all its specializations, with its vulgarity, its immense noise that is

going on - not the noise of running waters, of the song of a bird. But is it possible to live in this world without the self, the me, the ego, the persona, the assertion of the individual? In that state when there is really freedom from all this, only then there is beauty. You may say, "Well, that is too difficult, that is not possible. I prefer looking at a painting, or being in a lovely spot where there is a great sense of silence and quietude." And is it possible to have no self interest at all? Right? We are going to go into that.

Is it possible to live in this world without self interest? What does self interest mean? What are the implications of that word? How far can we be without self interest and live here, in the bustle, the noise, the vulgarity, the competition, the personal ambitions and so on and so on? We are going together to find out - right?

Self interest, you know what that word means so I don't have to explain it. Self interest hides in many ways, hides under every stone and every act. Hides in prayer, in worship, in having a good profession, in having great knowledge, in having a special reputation, like the speaker. When there is a guru who says, "I know all about it. I will tell you all about it" - is there not also self interest there? One may be an expert, a specialist, skilful and there is this seed of self interest. It has been with us for a million years. Our brain is conditioned to self interest. And if one is aware of that, which means just to be aware of it, not to say, "I am not self interested, it is wrong, it is right - how can one live without self interest?" You know all the arguments and pros and cons. Just to be aware how far one can go, how far one can investigate into oneself and find out for ourselves, for each one of us, how far in action, daily activity, how far in our behaviour, how deeply can

one live without a sense of self interest?

So if we will we will examine all that. Because - not because, sorry. Self interest divides, self interest is the greatest corruption - sorry! The word corruption means to break things apart - rompere, to break. And where there is self interest there is fragmentation - your interest as opposed to my interest, my desire opposed to your desire, my urgency to climb the ladder of success opposed to yours. So where there is self interest, just observe it, you can't do anything about it - you understand? Just to observe, to stay with it and see what is taking place. If you have ever dismantled a car, as the speaker has done, and the car ran afterwards, if you ever have dismantled a car then you know all the parts, you know how it works and you learn all about it, not merely get in the car and drive off. I am talking of the 1925 cars, at that period they were very simple, very direct, very honest, strong, beautiful cars. And when you know something mechanically, then you can feel at ease. You can know how fast to go, how slow, etc. etc. So if one knows, understands, is aware of our own self interest then you begin to learn about it - right? You don't say, "I must be against it", or for it, "How can I live? Who are you to tell me myself?" etc, etc. When you begin to be aware choicelessly, not say, "Well this is my self interest, this is my...", but to be aware choicelessly of your self interest, to stay with it, to study it, to learn about it, to observe all the intricacies of it, then you can find out - one can find out for oneself where it is necessary, where it is completely not necessary - right? It is necessary to live daily - right? To have food, clothes and shelter and all the physical things. But psychologically, inwardly, is it necessary - is there a necessity to have any kind of self

interest? You understand my question? That is, to investigate relationship - right? You understand? Because in our relationship with each other there is mutual self interest. You satisfy me and I satisfy you. You use me and I use you. I sell you, you sell me down the river! - right? You understand all this? We - in our relationship, is there self interest? This is important to understand because - sorry I don't use that word, it is silly.

To find out if there is self interest in our relationship. Where there is self interest there must be fragmentation, breaking up - right? I am different from you - self interest. What is relationship? Relationship to the earth, to all the beauty of the world, to nature and to other human beings and to one's wife, husband, girl, boy and so on, what is that bondage, what is that thing that we say, "Yes, I am related"? You understand my question? Please investigate this thing together. Don't please rely on the description that the speaker is indulging in. Let's look at it closely.

What is relationship? And when there is no relationship we feel so lonely, depressed, anxious, you know the whole series of movements hidden in the structure of self interest. What is relationship? When you say, 'My wife', 'My husband', what do you mean by that? When you are related to God, if there is God, what does it mean? So that word is very important to understand. I am related to my wife, to my children, to my family. Let's begin there. That is the core of all society, family. In the Asiatic world family means a great deal, to them it is tremendously important, a family. The son, the nephew, the grandmother, grandfather - you understand? It is the centre on which all society is based. So when one says, 'My wife', my girl, my friend, what does that mean? Most

of you probably are married, or a girl friend, or a boy friend - right? What does it mean to be related? What are you related to? When you follow a guru and say, "I am following him", what are you following? You understand? Let's move away for a second from the wife and husband and we will come back to it a little later. You might rather not like to investigate that question, husband and wife, girl and boy, but we can approach it more quietly. When you follow somebody, guru, a prophet, when you follow the speaker, or some other person, politician, and so on what is it you are following, what is it that you are surrendering, giving up? You understand? Is it the image that you have created about the speaker? Or the guru? Or the image that you have in your brain that it is the right thing to do and therefore I will follow it - you understand? Is it the image, the picture, the symbol, that you have built and that - you are following that, not the person? You understand? Not what he is saying? The speaker has been talking for the last seventy years - right? I am sorry for him! And he has established a certain... unfortunately, some reputation, and the books and all that business, so you have created naturally an image, a reputation and you are following that. Not what the teaching says. The teaching says, "Don't follow anybody." But you have the image built, and you are following that which you desire, which satisfies you, which is of tremendous self interest - right?

Now let's come back to the wife and husband and all the rest of it. When you say, 'My wife', what do you mean by that word, what is the content of that word, what is behind the word - you understand? Look at it. Is it all the memories, the sensations, pleasure, pain, anxiety, jealousy, all that is embodied in the wife -

right? Or in the husband. The husband is ambitious, wants to achieve a better position, more money, and the wife not only remains at home but she has her own ambitions, her own desires. So there they are. They may get into bed together, but the two are separate all the time - right? Let's be simple with these facts and honest. And so there is always conflict. One may not be aware of it and say, "Oh, no, we have no conflict between us", but scrape that a little bit with a heavy shovel, or with a scalpel and you will find there the root of all this is self interest - right? And the self interest may be in the professionals. Of course there is - doctors, scientists, the philosophers, the priests, the whole thing is - you understand? Which is sensation, desire, fulfilment - right? We are not exaggerating we are simply stating 'what is', not trying to cover it up, not trying to get beyond it or anything, there it is. That is the seed in which we are born, and that seed goes on flowering, growing until we die. Or there is a control of all that. You understand? Controlling the self interest. That very control is another form of self interest. Bien? How cleverly self interest operates. And also it hides behind austerity.

So we have to examine that word, what do we mean by austerity? Right conduct - right? What is austerity? Because the whole world, specially the religious world, has used that word, have laid down certain laws about austerity, specially for the monks and various monasteries of the West, and also as there are no monasteries in India and Asia, except in certain Buddhists and so on, in India they are single. You understand? There are no organized monasteries, fortunately. So what do we mean by that word austere? With which goes great dignity - you understand?

What do we mean by that word austere? We looked up in the dictionary what that word means. May I explain what the dictionary - which is the common usage of a language. It says it comes from Greek, to have a dry mouth. Which means dry, harsh, not just the mouth, harsh. Is that austere? That is, to deny oneself the luxury of a hot bath, you say, "No, I'll have a cold", or to have few clothes, or a particular form of robe, taking a vow to be a celibate, to be poor - you understand? To control oneself tremendously, all one's desires, you know, all the rest of it. Is that austerity? Or austerity is something entirely different? One has those who have fasted, who have sat up straight endlessly, controlling themselves, having a few clothes. Surely all that is not austerity. It is all outward show. Right?

So is there an austerity that is not a sensation? You understand? That is not contrived at, that is not cajoled, that is not saying, "I will be austere in order to..." Is there an austerity that is not visible at all to another? You are understanding all this? Is there an austerity that is - an austerity that has no discipline. The word discipline means to learn [tape turns over] The sense of a wholeness inwardly in which there is no craving, there is no breaking, there is no fragmentation. And with that austerity goes dignity, quietness.

One has to also, if we have time we must, we have to understand the nature of desire. That may be the root of the whole structure of self interest. Desire. Right? Are we together in this? Desire is a great sensation - right? Desire is the senses coming into activity. As we said earlier, sensation is of great importance to us. Sensation of sex, sensation of new experience, sensation of

meeting somebody who is well known. I must tell you this lovely story. A friend of ours met the queen of England, shook hands with her and on with all that kind of stuff. After it was all over a person came up to her and said, "May I shake hands with you because you have shaken hands with the queen?"! [Noise of train] It is always we live by sensation, sensation is tremendously important to us. Sensation of being secure - please watch it - sensation of having fulfilled, sensation of great pleasure, gratification and so on. What relationship has sensation to desire? You understand? Is desire something separate from sensation? Go into this please. It is important to understand this thing. I am not explaining it. We are together looking at it. What is the relationship of desire to sensation? When does sensation become desire? Or are they inseparable? You follow? Or do they always go together? Right? Are you working as hard as the speaker is working? Or are you just saying, "Yes, go on with it."? Or you have heard this before and say, "Oh God, he has gone back to that again"?

You know the more you understand the activity of thought, the more you get at really the depth, the root of thought, then you begin to understand so many things. Then you see the whole phenomenon of the world, nature, the truth of nature, and then you ask what is truth. I won't go into all that for the moment.

So we live, our life is based on sensation and desire. And we are asking: what is the actual relationship between the two? When does sensation become desire? Right? You are following this? At what second does desire become dominant? I see a beautiful camera, with all the latest improvements. All that you have to do is to lift the camera and look at it, it is already taken. There is sensation of

observation - right? The seeing the beautiful camera, beautifully made, very complex and it has great value, as a pleasure of possession, pleasure of taking photos, and all the rest of it. So there is sensation, seeing that camera there. Then what is that sensation to do with desire? You understand? When does that desire begin to flower into action, and say, "I must have it"? You understand? Right Sirs? Have you observed the movement of sensation, whether it is sexual, whether it is climbing the hills, and the valleys, overlooking all the world from a great height, or when you see a lovely garden, see the beautiful garden and you have a little lawn around your place. And you see this take place and then what takes place that turns the sensation into desire? You are following all this? Please don't go to sleep. It is too lovely a morning. If you stay with this question: what is the relationship of sensation to desire, stay with it, not try and find an answer. But look at it, observe it, see the implications of it. That is to stay with it. Then you will discover that sensation, which is natural and so on, that sensation is transformed into desire when thought creates the image out of that sensation. You understand? Yes? That is, I have a sensation, there is a sensation of seeing that camera, very expensive, beautiful and so on. There is sensation. Then thought comes along and says I wish I had that camera. You holding it, you taking the pictures and so on. Then thought creates the image out of that sensation - right? At that moment desire is born. I don't know, is it clear? Right Sir? Look at it yourself, go into it. You don't need any book, any philosopher, anybody, just to look at it. To look at it patiently, tentatively, go slowly, then you come upon it very quickly. That is when sensation becomes, or sensation is a

slave to thought and thought, with its image creates something - you understand? At that moment desire is born. Right? And we live by desire: I must have this. I don't want it. I must become... you follow? This whole movement of desire.

Now what relationship has desire to self interest? We are pursuing the same thread. Or as long as there is desire, which is creating the image out of sensation by thought, as long as there is that desire there must be self interest. Right? Whether I want to reach heaven, or become a bank manager, or rich person, it is the same. Whether you want to achieve heaven [noise of train] - whether one wants to achieve heaven or become a rich man, they are exactly the same. Right? If one desires to be a saint, a noble, and all that business, and the other fellow says, "I have a great skill," it is exactly the same thing - right? One is called religious, the other is called worldly. How the words cripple us - right? You don't look at this.

So we must come to the question - it is now half past eleven - we must come to the question: what is sorrow? Is it sorrow exists as long as there is self interest? Please go into it. If you understand all this you don't have to read a single book. If you really live with this thing the gates of heaven are open - not heaven, you understand, that is just a form of speech. So I am asking a very serious question which has haunted man from the beginning of his existence, a million years or more. What is sorrow, the tears, the laughter, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the despair? And can it ever end? Or man is doomed for ever to live with sorrow? Go on Sirs. Everyone on the earth, everyone, whether they are highly placed or nobody at all, everyone goes through this turmoil of

sorrow, the shock of it, the pain of it, the uncertainty of it, the utter loneliness of it. And the sorrow of a poor man who doesn't know how to read or write, when you look at him, when you talk with him, he is like you, he has his own sorrow, and you have your own sorrow. You understand all this? So the sorrow of millions and millions of people who have been slaughtered by the powerful, by the bigoted, tortured by churches, the infidel and the believer - you understand all this? Religions, specially Christianity, have murdered more people than anybody else - sorry! Great wars, hundred years war, thirty years war, of the religious people, church. All this, there is sorrow in the world - right? Sorrow of the man who has nothing, except one meal a day and sleeping on the pavement. You don't know anything about all that. So there is sorrow. What does that word mean? Is it a mere remembrance of something that you have lost and therefore you feel sorrowful - you understand? You had a brother, son or wife, dead, and you have the picture, the photo of it on the piano, mantelpiece, or next to your bed. The remembrance of that incident, the memories of all those days and that - those memories are suddenly cut off - right? - is that sorrow? Is sorrow engendered, cultivated by memory? You understand my question? Do you understand our questions to each other? Does memory of the things remembered, and when that is cut by death, by accident, old age, or whatever it is, you understand, when the memory is not, actually not, but the memory continues, is that sorrow? Is sorrow related to memory? Come on Sirs.

I had a son, or a brother, or an aunt. I like - I will use the word like for the moment. I call that like love. I liked those people very

much. I lived with them. I have chatted with them. We played together. All that memory is stored. And my son, my brother, my mother, or somebody, dies, is taken away, gone for ever. And I feel a shock, shed tears, and I feel terribly lonely. And I run off to church, temple, pick up a book, do this or that, to escape. Or say, "Well I will pray and I'll get over it. Jesus will save me." You know all that business. Sorry, I am not belittling the word. Or use the other word - Buddha, or Krishna - you follow? It is the same. It is the same thing with a different name. Or the same symbol, the same content of the symbol - symbols vary but it is the same content.

So is it - is sorrow merely the ending of certain memories, actually, though I have memories but the actuality that created those - that brought together those memories have ended, therefore I feel I am lost. I have lost my son. Is that sorrow? Or, we are not being harsh, just examining it, self pity? Concerned more with my own memories, pain, anxiety, than the ending of somebody - you understand? Is that - is sorrow self interest? Please go into it all. And I cultivate that memory. I am loyal to my son. I am loyal to my former wife, though I marry a new wife, I am very loyal to my..., which is the remembrance of those things that have happened in the past. Is that sorrow? Or there is the sorrow of failure, success, you know the whole momentum of self interest identifying itself with that word and shedding tears. And these tears have been shed by man and woman for a million years - right? And we are still crying. The war in Lebanon, in Afghanistan, the brutality of all that. And the Afghanistans and the Lebanese are crying, shot to pieces because of an idea that we must dominate,

we must be different. Right? The idea. Thought is destroying each other. And think of all the people who have cried before you.

So is there an end to sorrow? The word sorrow also implies passion. There is - as long as there is self interest identifying itself with those memories which have gone, which are still there but the actuality is gone, that self interest is part and parcel - is the movement of sorrow - right? Can all that end? Where there is sorrow there cannot be love. So what is love? You understand? Can we go on tomorrow, not tomorrow, sorry, Sunday? Or shall we go on with it now? You know we have entered into very, very serious subjects, all this. It is not just something you play with for a Sunday or Wednesday morning. It is something deeply serious all this. It is not galloping down the road. It is walking in the pathway slowly, watching things, you know watching, watching, watching, staying with things that disturb you, staying with things that please you, staying with things that are abstract, all the imaginations, all the things that the brain has put together, including God. It is the activity of thought. God didn't create us. We created God in our image, which is - I won't go into this, it is so clear and simple.

So to talk about love, which also implies death. Love, death and creation. You understand? You can spend an hour on this because it is very, very serious. We are asking: what is creation? Not invention. Please differentiate between creation, invention, new set of ideas - you understand? That is, new set of ideas. And those new set of ideas are inventions, technologically, psychologically, scientifically and so on. We are not talking about ideas. We are talking about very serious things, that is love, death and creation. This cannot be answered in five minutes. Forgive me. We will deal

with it tomorrow, next Sunday. Not that I am inviting you. We will go into this. And also what is religion, what is meditation, if there is something that is beyond all words, and measure and thought. You understand? Not put together by thought. Something that is inexpressible, infinite, timeless. We will go into all that. But you cannot - one cannot come to it - or for it to exist if there is fear, lack of relations, right relations, you follow? Without all that in your brain, free from all that you cannot understand the other. Right? Now may we stop?

SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST JULY 1985

This will be the last talk at Saanen. We will continue at Brockwood, in England.

May we continue what we were talking about last time that we met here? We were saying among other things that this is not a lecture; a lecture is meant to inform, to instruct on a particular subject. This is not a lecture, nor is it an entertainment. Entertainment means amusing yourself, or going to a cinema, or going to a ritual in a church, or in a temple, or a mosque. This is not an entertainment. Nor is it a mere matter of intellectual, theoretical, psychological - what word shall we use? - psychological pursuit. Philosophical pursuit rather. Philosophy means love of truth, not talking about what has already been talked about. And we are not discussing, or concerned with what others have said. We are together, you and the speaker, as two human beings, you, not this large audience but you as a person, and the speaker are having a conversation together, about their life, about their problems, about all the travail of life. Their confusion, their fears, their aspirations, their desires to achieve success, either in the business world or in the so-called religious world, or in the spiritual world, that is success to reach Nirvana, Heaven, or Enlightenment is the same as success in the business world. I hope we understand each other. It is not much difference. A man who is successful in life, making pots of money, then grows, expands, changes and continues in the line of success. There is not much difference between that person or the so-called - the man who is seeking truth, achieving something of a success in that direction.

Both are seeking success. One you call worldly, the other you call non-worldly, spiritual, religious. We are not dealing with either of those two. We are concerned you, as a human being, single, or double, and the speaker are having a conversation together. He means together, you sitting there and unfortunately the speaker sitting up here. So it is between you and the speaker.

You and the speaker have been talking about relationship, between man and woman, boy and girl and so on. We have been also talking about fear, whether it is at all possible ever in life, living in the modern world, to be utterly free psychologically of all fear. We went into that very, very carefully. And also we talked about time, time by which we live, the cycle of time, which is [noise of train] - the cycle of time which is the past being processed in the present and continues in the future. The past being our whole background, racial, communal, religious, experiences, memories, all this is the background of all of us, whether we are born in the distant East or in Europe, or in America. That civilization, that culture is the background of all of us. That background goes through changes, it is processed in the present and continues to the future. Human beings, you and another, are caught in this cycle. That has been going on for millions and millions of years. So the past going through the present, modifying itself, is the future. And that has been our evolution. Though we biologically have changed from a million years ago until now, but psychologically, inwardly, subjectively we are more or less what we were a million years ago - barbarous, cruel, violent, competitive, self-centred, egocentric. That is a fact. So the future is the present. Right? Is this clear to you and to the speaker? The

future. That is the past modifying itself which becomes the future, that future is now, unless there is a fundamental, psychological change. Are we together? And that is what we are concerned about. Whether it is possible for human beings, you and another, to bring about psychological mutation, psychological total revolution in oneself, knowing if we are hurt now, wounded psychologically, as most people are, modifying itself in the present but goes on in the future. So the future hurt is now. Is that clear? Nous sommes d'accord?

So is it possible for human beings, for you, to completely bring about a mutation? That mutation changes the brain cells themselves. That is, if one has been going North all one's life, some person comes along and says, "Going North has no importance at all, no value, there is nothing there. Go East, or West, or South." And because you listen, because you are concerned, because you are deliberate, you go East, that very moment when you turn and go East there is a mutation in the brain cells altogether because going North has become the pattern, the mode, and when you go East you break the pattern - right? It is as simple as that. But that requires not only listening, not merely to words, not merely with the hearing of the ear, but also listening without any interpretation, without any comparison, listening directly, then that very listening breaks down that conditioning. Not bring up all your traditions, your background, your interpretation, none of that, but like when a child listens to a good story, he puts all his naughtiness aside and listens.

And also we talked about seeing. Seeing very, very clearly what is, what is happening in the present world, wars in Afghanistan, the

most appalling things are going on there. In Lebanon, in South America, the Far East. Man from a million years or two millions ago killed with a club, then he invented an arrow. He thought that would stop all wars. Now you can vapourize millions and millions of people with one bomb. We have progressed tremendously outwardly, technologically. The computer is going to take over probably all our thinking. It will do better, far better than we can in a second. And I do not know if you have gone into this question. But you should. What is going to happen to the human brain when the computer can do almost anything that you can do, except of course sex, it can't look at the stars and say, "What a marvellous evening it is". It cannot possibly appreciate what beauty is. So what is going to happen to the human brain? Will it wither when the laser computer can take all that over from you? It will save a lot of labour. So either we turn to entertainment, the tremendous weight of the entertaining industry, sport. Or another form of it: go to a church, temple, mosque to be entertained, sensation. Or turn in a totally different direction. Because psychologically, inwardly, you can go limitlessly. The brain has an extraordinary capacity, each one's brain. Look what technology has done. But psychologically, subjectively, we remain what we are, year after year, century after century: conflict, struggle, pain, anxiety and all the rest of it. That's what we talked about over the last four talks, three talks - wasn't it three talks?

Audience: Four talks.

Krishnamurti: Right, thank you.

And we also talked about thought. What is the nature of thinking, what is thinking. We went into that very carefully. All

thought is memory, based on knowledge, knowledge is always limited, whether now or in the past or in the future. Knowledge is always perpetually, eternally limited because it is based on experience, without experience, which is always limited, so knowledge is limited, memory, thought. That is the process of our thinking. And thought has invented all the rituals in all the religious places. It has invented gods through our fear, and so on. We talked about that at considerable length and in detail.

This morning we ought to talk over together, you and the speaker together, not the whole audience. There is no whole audience, there is only you and the speaker. We ought to talk over together, you and the speaker, about love, death, what is religion, what is meditation, is there anything beyond all the human endeavour, or is man the only measure? Is there something beyond all structure of thought, is there something that is timeless? This is what we have to be concerned with, you and the speaker this morning. All right?

We live by sensation. We talked about that. We want - our whole structure is based on sensation - sexual, imaginative, romantic, fanciful and so on. And also, as we said, self interest is the greatest corruption. And is sensation, that is the stimulation of the senses, is that love? We are investigating this thing, you and the speaker together. We are taking a very long journey. It is a long lane, you and the speaker are walking together. Not that he is ahead and you follow but together, step in step. Perhaps holding hands together, friendly, not dominating either each other, trying to impress each other. So we are, you and the speaker, are walking quietly, exploring, investigating, watching, listening, observing.

So we are asking each other: what is love? That word has been spoilt, spat upon, degraded. So we must be very alert to the abuse of that word. So what is love? Is it mere sensation? I love you and I depend on you, you depend on me. Perhaps I sell you and you sell me. I use you, you use me. If I, if the speaker says "I love you" because you are there, and you feed my vanity because you are a very large audience and I feel happy, pleased, gratified. So is gratification, fulfilment, attachment, is that love? Is love put together by thought? So you and the speaker are investigating together, so don't go to sleep this nice lovely morning.

So is love sensation? Is love gratification? Is love fulfilment? Dependence? And is love desire? Please don't - investigate it together, don't please agree or disagree. We went into that thing - we always approach anything by either we agree or disagree. If we could put aside altogether from our vocabulary, from our brain, saying "I agree" and "I don't agree". "My opinion is this and your opinion is that". Judgements. If we could put aside all that and just face facts as they are, not only in the world, but also in ourselves. Things as they are. That demands great honesty, the urgency of honesty. Can we do that this morning and face things as they are, not imagine romantically, or sentimentally, or it is our tradition, putting aside all that? Then we can begin to question, enquire into what is love.

We said, is it sensation? Desire? As we said previously in these talks, we went into the question very deeply into the whole structure of desire. We haven't time to go into that all over again. To make it very brief, desire is the result of sensation, and that sensation, thought gives a shape, an image - you understand? That

is, sensation, then thought gives an image to that sensation, and at that second when thought moulds the sensation, at that second desire is born. We have gone into that. So we are asking: is love desire? Is love thought? Please go into it. It is your life we are concerned, each one of us, our lives, our daily lives, not some spiritual life, not some - following some guru with his inanities, putting on special robes and all the rest of it, whether it is the robes of Middle Ages, that is in the churches, or the robes of recent gurus. It is very important, this question. Is love merely the structure of thought? In our relationship with each other, man, woman, boy and girl and so on, apart from sexual sensations, when one says to another, "I love you", is it dependence? One is fulfilling himself, or herself in another and therefore in that relationship thought comes in, and then the thought creates the image, and that image we call love. Or call that image love. So we are asking: is love - it is unfortunate to use that word - is love put together by thought? Is love antagonism? Can there be love when there is ambition? When we are competing with each other? Is their love when there is self interest? Please don't merely listen to the speaker. Listen to yourself. Listen, find out for yourself. When you discover through what actually is you can go very far. But if you merely depend on another, his words, his books, his reputation, that is meaningless. Throw all that away and one has to look at oneself. One has to have passion. Passion can exist only, as we said the other day, when suffering ends. Passion without fanaticism, which then becomes terrorism. All the fanatical movements in the world have got tremendous passion. Fanaticism breeds passion. That passion is not the passion which comes into being when there

is the ending of sorrow. We went into that.

So we are asking: is love all this? Jealousy, which is in hate, anger, desire, pleasure and so on, is it all love? Dare we face all this? Are you, and the speaker, honest enough to discover for ourselves the perfume of that word?

And from that we ought to consider what place has death in our life? Death, talking about it, is not morbid. It is part of our life. It may be from childhood until we actually die, there is always this dreadful fear of dying. Aren't you afraid of death? We have put it as far away as possible. So let us enquire together what is that extraordinary thing that we call death. It must be extraordinary. So without any kind of romantic, comforting, believing in reincarnation, life after death, which is an excellent idea, marvellously comforting. The origin of it probably began with the very, very ancient Hindus. And the Greeks - the Egyptians talked about it, then Pythagoras the Greek talked about it. If there is a continuity of each one of us, that is, live now, the same thing will be a better opportunity next life, if one believes in that sincerely, deeply, as millions do, then what you do now matters. Right? What you are now. What your conduct, what your daily life is. Because if there is a continuity then next life of course you will have a better castle, better refrigerator, better cars, better wife, or husband. Those who ardently believe in it, they don't behave properly, they are not concerned about the future any more than you or another.

So could we also put that comforting idea aside? Not that one Christian world believes that you go straight up to Heaven you are so..., or down below! I would - the speaker would like to tell you a joke about it but he won't! [Laughter] It is really quite a funny joke,

but it would take too long, our time is limited.

So what is death? What is living? What is living? Daily life. And what is death? If we don't understand our daily living, what relationship has death to that? You understand? So first we must enquire what is living. What do we mean by living? What do we mean by good life? Is good life having a lot of money, cars, changes of wives, or girls, or going from one guru to another, and caught up in his concentration camp? [Laughter] Please don't laugh, this is actually what is going on. Is good life enjoyment, tremendous pleasure, excitement, a series of sensations, going to the office from morning until night for sixty years? For God's sake, face all this. Working, working, and then dying. This is what we call living. [Child cries] I am sorry you and I can't compete. [Laughter] Sorry! Is this what we call living? - constant conflict, constant problems one after the other? [Noise of train] This life to which we cling, of which we know, we have acquired tremendous information, knowledge, about practically everything, and that knowledge we cling to. But those memories which we have, we are deeply attached. All this is called living - sorrow, pain, anxiety, uncertainty, and endless sorrow and conflict. And death comes through accident, old age, senility. That is a good word. What is senility? Why do you attribute it to old age? Why do you say, "Oh, he is a senile old man"? I may be. Are you senile? Senility is forgetfulness, repeating, going back to the old memories, half alive - right? And so on. [Tape turns over] That is generally called senile. I am asking you - I have asked this question, the speaker has asked this question very often of himself - so we are both in the same camp. Is senility an old age problem? Or senility begins when

you are repeating, repeating, repeating. You follow? When you are traditional, go on, go to the churches, temples, mosques, repeat, repeat, repeat. Kneel and the other fellow touches his forehead to the ground, and the Hindus prostrate [noise of train]. So senility can be at any age - right? So ask yourself that question.

So death can happen through old age, through an accident, through terrible pain, disease. And when it comes there is an end to all your continuity - right? To all your memories, to all your attachments, to your bank account, to your fame. You may be the central figure of entertainment, that too comes to an end.

So we ought to consider what is continuity - you understand? And what is ending? May we go into that? What is it that continues? That is, a series of movements which becomes a continuity. And what is it, the meaning of that word ending? You understand? Something that ends. Why are we so frightened of ending something? Whether it be tradition, a habit, a memory, an experience? Can all that end? Not calculated ending, an ending which is not effort, determination? I end something to achieve something else. Death, you can't argue with death - right? There is a marvellous story of ancient India. It is too long again. [Laughter] It is really a marvellous story. I don't know if we have time because we have to talk about religion, meditation, if there is something beyond all this human endeavour. All right, I will repeat that story very, very briefly.

A Brahmana boy - a Brahmana, you understand, a Brahmin of ancient India, he has collected a lot of things, cows and all the rest of it. And he decides to give them away, one by one. And his son comes to him and says, "Why are you giving away all this?" He

explains it why when you collect a lot of things you must give them away, begin again. You understand the meaning of it, the significance? You collect and then give away everything that you have collected. I am not asking you to do this. So the boy keeps on asking that question. And the father gets angry with him and says "I will send you to death if you ask me any more questions." And the boy says, "Why are you sending me to death?" So as the Brahmana when he speaks says something he must stick to it, so he sends the boy to death. And the boy arrives at the house of death after talking to all the teachers, philosophers, gurus and all the rest of it, he arrives at the house of death. I am making it very, very brief. And there he waits for three days. Follow the significance of all this, the subtlety of all this. He waits there for three days. And death comes along and apologizes for keeping him waiting because after all he is a Brahmin. He apologizes and says, "I will give you anything you want, riches, women, cows, property, anything you want." And the boy says, "But you will be at the end of it. You will always be at the end of everything." And death then talks about various things which the boy can't understand - right? It is really a marvellous story.

So let's come back to realities. Probably you like a lot of stories to be told. I have got quantities, I am not going to.

So, what is death? Is time involved in it? Time. Is time death? I am asking you, please consider it. Time, not only by the watch, by the sunset and sunrise, but also psychologically, inwardly. As long as there is the self interest of time - right? You are following this? As long as there is the self interest, which is the wheel of time, then there must be death. So is time related to death? Oh, come on Sirs.

If there is no time, is there death? Are we together? Please this requires - this is real meditation, not all the phoney stuff. Time, psychological time, not the time of the big clock, or the clock, the watch on your wrist. [Noise of train] For us time is very important. Time to succeed, time to grow in that success, and bring about a change in that success. Time means continuity. I have been, I am, I will be. There is this constant continuity in us, which is time.

Right? If there is no tomorrow - may I enter into all this? This is a dangerous subject. Please pay your attention if you are interested in it, otherwise yawn, and rest and ease. If there is no tomorrow, would you be afraid of death? If death is now, instant, there is no fear is there? There is no time. You are capturing what I am saying? So is time - is death - as long as thought functions in the field of time - right? - which we are doing all day long - then there is inevitably the ending of saying it might end, therefore I am afraid. So time may be the enemy of death. Or the time is death.

That means, if the speaker is attached to his audience, attached to this, because out of that attachment he derives a great deal of excitement, sensation, importance, self interest, envious of a person who has a larger audience - right? If the speaker is attached, whether to an audience, to a book, to an experience, to a type, to a fame, then he is frightened of death. Attachment means time. I wonder if you understand all this? Attachment means time. So can I, can I, you, be completely free of attachment, which is time - right? I am attached to you. I depend on you. I cry for you. And you do exactly the same to me. We are attached to each other. And death comes and ends that. So can I end that attachment now? Not wait for death, but be free of that attachment completely? Yes Sir.

Face that fact.

So living is dying and therefore living is death. Together. You understand what I am saying? Oh come on Sirs. That is why one has to lay the foundation of understanding oneself not according to philosophers, psychiatrists and so on. To understand oneself, not through books, but to see, watch one's behaviour, one's conduct, the way - the habit, the accumulation that we have collected through millenia upon millenia, know all that inside you. The racial, communal, traditional, personal. And the knowledge, the awareness of that is not of time, it can be instant. And the mirror in which you see this is the relationship between you and another, between you and your wife, to see in that relationship all the past, the present habits, future, everything is there. To know how to look, how to observe, how to hear every word, every movement of thought. That requires great attention, watchfulness.

So death is not in the future. Death is now when there is no time. When there is no me becoming something, when there is no self interest, egotistic activity, which is all the process of time.

So living and dying are together always. And you don't know the beauty of it. There is great energy in it. We live by energy. You take sufficient food, and right diet and so on, and it gives a certain quality of energy. That energy is distorted when you smoke, drink and all the rest of it. The brain has extraordinary energy. And that extraordinary energy is required to find out for oneself, not be directed by another, to discover, or for that thing to happen.

So we are going to enquire into that. That is, what is religion? Please understand, we have talked about fear, we talked about psychological wounds, not to carry for the rest of one's life. We

talked and have gone into it together, what is relationship, the significance of relationship. Nothing can exist on earth without relationship, and that relationship is destroyed when each one of us pursues his own ambition, his own greed, his own fulfilment, and so on. We talked about fear. We went into it together, into the question of thought, time, sorrow and the ending of sorrow. And we have talked this morning also about death. Now we are capable, alive to find out what is religion. Because we have got the energy. You understand? Because we have put all that human conflict, self interest aside. If you have done it, which then gives you immense passion and energy, incalculable energy. And what is religion?

Is religion all the things that thought has put together? The rituals, the robes, the gurus, the perpetual repetition, prayers and the whole thing, is that religion? Or is it a big business concern? There is a temple in South India that makes a million dollars every third day. You understand what I am saying? Every third day that temple gathers one million dollars, every third day. And that is called religion. They spend the money, oh, in different ways. And Christianity, look what it has done, tremendous riches. The Vatican, the churches all over the world. Go down the Fifth Avenue of New York, there they are, rich as pomp. Is that religion? Going every Sunday morning to some - to hear some preacher and repeat the ritual, is that religion? Or religion has nothing whatever to do with all that business? Because it can only ask this question when it is free from all that, not caught in the entanglement, in the performance, in the power, position, hierarchy of all that. Then only you can ask the question: what is religion? Is God created by thought, by fear? Or is man the image of God? Or God is the image

of man? Right? If one can put all that aside to find out that which is not put together by thought, by sensation, by repetition, by rituals, all that is not religion - at least for the speaker. That is all - it has nothing whatever to do with that which is sacred.

So what is then - how - no - what is truth? Is there such a thing as truth? Is there such a thing, an absolute, irrevocable truth, not dependent on time, environment, tradition, knowledge, what the Buddha said, or what somebody said? The word is not the truth. The symbol is not the truth. The person is not the truth. Therefore there is no personal worship. K is not important at all. So we are seeking what is truth. If there is any. And if there is something that is beyond time. The ending of all time. And they have said that meditation is necessary to come upon this. Right? To have a quiet mind. We are going to go into that. If you will allow me. We have got a very short time. Sorry. By the clock.

What is meditation? The word means ponder over, according to the dictionary. To think over. And also it has a different meaning, which is to measure, both in Sanskrit and in Latin and so on, meditate means not only to ponder, to think but also to be able to measure - right? Which means comparison, of course. There is no measurement without comparison. So can the brain be free of measurement? Not the measurement by the rule, by the yard stick, kilometres, miles, but the brain be free of all measurement, the becoming, not becoming, comparing, not comparing. You understand? Can the brain be free of this system of measurement? I need to measure to get a suit made. I need measurement to go from here to another place, distance is measurement, time is measurement. Oh come on. You understand? So can the brain - not

the mind, we will go into quickly what the mind and the brain are - can the brain be free of measurement? That is comparison. No comparison whatsoever. This is real meditation. So that the brain is totally free. Is that possible, living in the modern world, making money, breeding children, sex, all the noise, the vulgarity, the circus that is going on in the name of religion. Can one be free of all that? Not in order to get something. You understand? To be free.

So meditation is not conscious meditation, you understand this? It cannot be conscious meditation, following a system, a guru, collective meditation, group meditation, single meditation, according to Zen, Buddhist, Hindu, you know, it can't be a system because then you practise, practise, practise, and your brain gets more and more dull, more and more mechanical. So is there a meditation which has no direction, which is not conscious, deliberate? Find out.

That requires great energy, attention, passion. Not lust, that is just... Then that very passion, energy, the intensity of it is silence. Not contrived silence. It is the immense silence in which time, space is not. Then there is that which is unnameable, which is holy, eternal.

May we get up?

1ST PUBLIC TALK MADRAS 28TH DECEMBER 1985

I would like to know why you are all here. I really mean it. With what intention, with what purpose, with what kind of imaginary or superstitious concepts that one has? And perhaps, if I may be so bold as to suggest it, you might have come with those ideas, with those formulas. And I am afraid you will be disappointed because - I hope you can hear, all right? I hope you all can hear - one has talked all over the world for a long time, seventy years, that's a long time, and one has naturally built up all kinds of fanciful, superstitious imaginary reputations, and those reputations, those images that one has created are really meaningless because what we are talking about is totally different from a lecture. A lecture is meant to inform, to instruct, to guide and so on. This is not a lecture. Please we must be very clear on that point. This is not a lecture. There is no intention on the part of the speaker to guide you, to help you - forgive me if I use that word - or to inform you about something you would like to be talked about, theoretical, superstitious, imaginary, a fixation, as it were. But we are going to deliberate together. That word has a very deep meaning, deliberate, which means weigh together, take counsel together, nourish each other, not physically, I hope, but psychologically, intellectually and penetrate as deeply as possible into one's own consciousness, into its own function, its own way of thinking, living. This is not a theoretical meeting, talking about various things that should be, or that has not been, but together, you and the speaker are taking counsel together, weighing things together. Please, this is not just a

lot of words. The speaker really means what he says, whether you like it or not. He says we are going to take counsel together, weigh things together, not I weigh and then tell you about it, but rather that together you and the speaker take counsel together, weigh together. This is not propaganda because we are together investigating, asking, questioning, doubting.

The idea and the fact are two different things. The fact is one thing. The microphone is not an idea, it is a fact. So the fact is what we are going to discuss, not the idea of the fact. I hope all this is clear. All right? Sir, should I keep quiet as you are keeping quiet? This is a serious meeting, not just an exchange of words.

Something wrong sir? So from the very beginning we must be very clear that this is not a lecture, we are not talking about theories, what has happened to human beings through the long two and a half million years of evolution, but what we are, what we have become, and what is our future - not of mankind, what is the future of all of us? Right? Let's be clear on that point. We are going to deliberate, that is take counsel together. Taking counsel together we nourish each other, both intellectually, non-verbally and psychologically. It is not something intellectual. It is not romantic, not superstitious, imaginary and so on. So we are together, you can't just sit there and say, yes, yes, or no, no. You are partaking, you are sharing, you are weighing, taking counsel together. Right? Is that understood between us?

And we are not doing any kind of propaganda, or inviting you to join a particular sect. And here I must add I am not your guru, you are not my followers. We are not setting up a new cult, a new society, a new ashram, a new kind of concentration camp. If this is

very clear between us, that you and the speaker together are going to take part in all the talks - if there are future talks, that depends on the physical condition of the body.

So we have existed on this earth, according to the scientists and archaeologists and so on, for over two million years, and here we are. What are we? Right? You ask yourself. I am not suggesting what you are. We are opening up the deep cave, the deep underlying causes, the reality that lies behind the cause. So we are going to go into that during the talks. I don't know how many there will be, but I can't assure you. They will tell you whether there will be talk tomorrow, or not. Or there will only be a talk, that is today, and Wednesday a Question and Answer meeting, and next Saturday the last meeting.

So together we are going to look at this world, that is ourselves. Right? Are you willing? Or are you frightened, hiding behind all kinds of absurd theories, all the psychological innuendos, all the thing man has put together as they call it religion, the existing society, that is the degeneration that is gradually going on: pollution in all the cities, despoiling the air, and also corruption. This is what we are caught in. So what has gone wrong with us? Or is this a natural course? You understand my question? Do you really want to listen to all this rubbish? You must read about all this in newspapers, if they are honest, magazines, and of course all the gurus in the world have destroyed that thing which they want.

So let us begin, but please bear in mind this is not a lecture. You haven't come to listen to me. You have come to listen to yourself, however complicated that self is, however superficial, however deep. We are going to go into all that. Perhaps not in one talk, but

we will see at the end of the talk whether the speaker survives. That's what is behind it: asking you to sit quietly for two or three minutes after the speaker has gone, and the speaker will find out if he can continue tomorrow, or will he collapse at the end of it? It's up to you, because otherwise you, as a listener, may say, yes, yes, it sounds very good, or not at all good. It is not logical, or illogical and so on. Right?

What are we, as human beings, who have lived on this earth for such a long period of time, why are we as we are? You have understood my question? Right? Have you understood my question? Yes, sir?

Q: No.

K: What?

Q: He says he hasn't understood.

K: It is very simple. I am using ordinary English, not professional English. I will say it once more: we are sharing all this together. You are not merely listening to the speaker, we are taking counsel together, we are deliberating. That word is really a very good word, to deliberate, it means take counsel together, weigh things together, not your prejudice, not your opinions, not your conclusions, but the whole process of thinking, what it has made man into and so on. Right? If you don't understand it, I'm sorry I am not going back to it. We are talking ordinary English.

So what has happened to us, to each one of us? That is, we have lived on this earth as human beings for a very, very long time, which is called evolution. And during that evolution of experience, knowledge, thinking, all the things that man has put together, including his superstitions, his gods, his various empires, and when

you come down to the actual fact, what has happened to each one of us? Don't you want to know? Or are we frightened to know? Which is it? Gosh, what's the matter? Not a response.

Q: We want to enquire.

K: I don't understand what you are talking about. And you are the rest of the world; what you suffer, what you go through, the daily boredom, the pettiness of one's life: the struggle, the pain, the anxiety, the sorrow, the negligence, the carelessness, indifference. And this is shared by all humanity. Right? Everybody goes through this, your guru - if you have one, I hope you haven't got any - your guru, if he is at all awake, if he is at all sane and rational, he goes through all this. The kings and the ministers go through all this: pain, anxiety, uncertainty, sorrow, death, hoping for something in the future. This is what all human beings, wherever you go, however civilized one is, or not, every human being goes through this. Right? Are you doubting that fact? Do you doubt that, that every human being throughout the world goes through all this? And this makes up our consciousness. Right? Are we understanding each other? Are we working together? Are we investigating together? Or am I guiding you, helping you? I am not. Please be assured of one fact: I don't want to help you, I am not your guide or your helper. Then you will ask, why am I sitting here. You are sitting here probably out of curiosity, out of what you have heard, or read a few lines in a book, or you have been told, go and listen to the chap, you will find out. So please be clear, the speaker is not guiding you, is not helping you. He won't help you. Because you have been helped, all through the ages you have been helped: saviours, gurus, mahatmas, you know the whole list

of them, they are all too willing to help you, with their ashrams, with their Foundations, including this! And you have been helped. If you have any trouble you trot off to a guru, or to a temple asking for help, which is called prayer. And you have been helped, you have been guided, politically, religiously, psychiatrically, and at the end of it all you are what you are.

So the speaker says - please take this seriously - he is not guiding you, he is not helping you. On the contrary, together we are walking the same path, together we are sharing, nourishing. I am using the word 'nourishing' both intellectually, psychologically, we can't feed each other, there are too many people.

So bearing that in mind all the time, that you and the speaker together are looking at this whole problem, not just my sorrow, or your sorrow, your anxiety, uncertainty. It is shared by every human being on earth. And your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind. Right? You may not agree, but investigate, even intellectually, logically, not emotionally then you are lost. Logically, sanely, looking at it, not with prejudice, opinions, but look at it: you suffer and so does the man in Russia. You are uncertain, so is the man in China. Right? So your consciousness is shared by all humanity, so you are humanity. Right? You are humanity, not Mr Smith, Mr Rao, or something like that. If that is shown to you, not accepted but shown logically, investigating together, sharing together, then what shall we do? Do you understand my question? Seeing all this, how humanity has been divided into nations, into sects, into religions - my guru is better than your guru - and so on. This division, this separation exists all over the world. That's one of the major causes of war, nationalities.

Right? But you will go on with your nationalism, with your Hinduism, with your tradition in spite of what the speaker is saying. Right? Right, sir? You all agree, I am glad, but we will carry on as before. Right? You are a rummy crowd!

When one actually realizes this fact, that you the entire humanity, not physically, but psychologically, then you invariably must ask the question, what am I to do. Right? Don't wait for me to tell you. We are sharing together. We are taking counsel together. This is not a lecture. I must repeat this because you are used to lectures, somebody pouring forth for your information. So what shall we do, if we see the rational, sane fact, that we are the entire humanity? Of course, you won't see this because to you it is very important to have individuality: I am separate from you. Of course you are separate from me physically, you are a woman, I am a man, or I am taller, you are shorter and all the rest of it. Apart from biological division, consciousness, our consciousness which is the I with all its memories, experiences, with its longing and all the rest of it, that consciousness is shared by every human being. Right? You won't agree to all this. It doesn't matter, I'll go on; if you'd like listen, do, but it doesn't matter if you listen or don't listen. Like the birds, they go on singing, like a storm full of wind, rain and thunder and great beauty of light.

So if one actually, not theoretically or intellectually, realizes, that is, to realize something, like a cobra is poisonous, a rattle snake is poisonous, so don't go near it. It is not mere conclusion, it is your death if you go near it. So physically we are conditioned to a snake. So you are conditioned, shaped, moulded in the idea that you are separate human beings. You have a separate soul, the

Christian idea and if you realize that you are humanity, not whether you question it, you are. If you look at it carefully, go into it deliberately, not avoid it, you will see you suffer, the other man suffers, he quarrels with his wife, and children and all the rest of that daily life. So what shall one do? Right? What will you do? What's your action? Not conclusion. You understand, sir? Because a conclusion is not a fact. You may derive from a fact a conclusion, but the conclusion is not the fact.

I am in the midst of a sea of people who don't seem to react to all this. Your whole religions are based on individuality, all your prayers, your worship. It doesn't matter, I'll go on.

So what shall one do? What am I to do, living in this society, the society that is so corrupt, what shall I do? Whatever I do, will it affect the society? You understand? Will it affect my neighbour, will it affect the man, not in the moon, but the man in Russia? So I have to ask, who created this society? Right? Are you at all thinking together, or not? Oh my god, what am I to do if you don't react, if you don't smell something? So we are asking, who created this society which is so immoral, so corrupt, all over the world, which is destroying man, which is degenerating, which is polluting the whole world, what shall I do, or not do, to affect this society? Do you understand my question? So I ask myself, am I different from the society? Right? Who created this society which we live in? Right? Are you asking that question yourself, or are you just listening to me? Are you asking that question? What's your answer, if you are really using your brain, not just nodding your head? What's your answer? Not some gods.

Q: Something...

K: I am talking for a while, if you don't mind, a little later. You don't mind? When there is a question and answer meeting, if there is one, you can put all kinds of questions to me. So who created this society? My father, your father, my grandmother and your grandmother. Right? They all helped to build up this corrupt society in which we live. So we are the creators of this society, the builders of this society, through our ambition, our fears, the desire for security in my relationship, in my job, power, position. Right? We all want that. Am I saying the truth, or something imaginary? So we are the builders of this society. Society is not different from me, from us, because we are ambitious, we are greedy, we are frightened, we want position, power, privileges. Right? We want all this, and god too, occasionally. So god is our creation too. You may not agree, don't agree, let's investigate it, share it. The western world is captured by that particular religion, and they are making havoc out of it. Sorry, I mustn't say that. God and money go together. The least trouble you have, you want somebody to help you, emotionally, or sexually, or psychologically. There are all those temples, mosques and churches and a convenient priest there. I am not being cynical, I am just showing you the facts.

So what shall I do, knowing that I am the rest of humanity, not Mr K? You understand my question? What am I, as a human being, who is the rest of mankind, I don't ask whither mankind, where mankind is going because I am mankind. I wonder if you see the importance of this. I wonder if you see the depth of this, the beauty of it, the immensity of it, the responsibility. I am afraid you don't. Because if you really saw, felt utterly responsible for your brother, utterly responsible for your neighbour, not that you won't interfere

with him or hit him on the head, or tell him what to do, you are the neighbour, you are your brother's keeper. I don't know if you see all this.

Then what shall I do? I am not asking your help, I am not asking through prayers for that almighty to guide me - if there is an almighty. I am asking this question, putting this question to myself, as you must, and I hope you do. What shall I do, knowing that I am the rest of mankind? I am mankind. I may be a woman, or a man, short, tall, brown, or whatever colour, colour is not important, what is important is, is what is inside the skull.

So what shall I do? Whatever I do, will it affect the society, which is me. You understand? Society is me. I have separated myself from society, but the fact is society has been put together by man. And man in his desire to have security, permanent security, through property, through convictions, through formulas and so on and so on, he has done everything. Right? He has built churches, he has built mosques, he has built temples, not only in this country, but they are taking them to America unfortunately.

So what shall I do? I am not separate from society, I am not separate from the rest of humanity, so whatever I do has immense meaning and responsibility. Right? Immense. So what is my responsibility? Right? What's your answer? Don't sit there and look at me. My first response to that is, what do we mean by action? Right? I want to do something, not only as a human being, I want to affect society, I want to change society, I want to stop this degeneration that is going on. You know what is going on in the world. I won't go into all that. So what action shall I take?

So before we put that question, or in putting that question, I

must enquire what is action. You tell me, what is action? To act. To act according to a formula is no action at all because you repeat, and that repetition is part of our security. And that repetition gives us a certain sense of well being, we are stable, we are firm. So is action based on certain memories, certain knowledge, certain past experiences and so on? What is action? What is it to act? Not, I will act, or I have acted, to act now. You understand my question? No? You are all very well educated, aren't you, BAs, MAs, engineers, PhDs and MAD and so on. You are all well educated, and probably you have never put this question to yourself: what shall I do, realizing I am the entire humanity, and the responsibility of it, the greatness of it? So we are asking, what is action? To act, not in the future, that is not action, not, I have acted, which is the past. So what is action which has no past or the future? Go into it, this is a tremendously important question. If you base your action on the past it is no action, it is a repetition, modified, a little changed but it is still repetition. Right? God, Where are you educated!

So is there an action, please I am asking this question most seriously, is there an action which is not dependent on the past or conforming to a future pattern? You understand? Or - this is a little more difficult - or there is no action at all. We will have to go into it much more slowly. Do you want to listen to all this blah? Or do you want to sit still and meditate? I don't know what you call meditation. That is one of those words that is bandied about all over the place. You go to a little village in California and they talk about meditation. I say, what do you mean by that word? They don't know but they are going to meditate. I won't go into that now.

So action which is not dependent on time. You understand this? No, careful, sir, don't agree with what is being said for heaven's sake. Is there an action without the motive, self-interest, without gaining reward? You understand my question? All this implies time. Right? I will be rewarded for my good work, I will be rewarded if I pray for a refrigerator - why not, that is as good as god, more real than god, more actual than god. So is there an action - this requires your using your brain, not your emotions - which is not based on self-interest, a conclusion towards which you are working? So you have to investigate what is time. You understand? Because we function in time. Am I boring you? Would you kindly tell me if I am boring you.

Q: No, sir.

K: I know, I know. The invariable answer. But am I actually boring you? So you have to look into the nature of time. Right? What is time? Not according to sunrise, sunset, that has its own pattern, a new moon in the tender sky, and the full moon, which I saw the other day rising out of the sea. It was a marvellous sight. Sunrise and the evening star, all that is part of time. And there is time also if you have a small child, a baby to grow up into a man, it requires a lot of time, twenty years, thirty years, ninety years. And that also means time. We live with time; you have to get up in the morning at a certain time, cook and all the rest of it. So we live, function, act within the limits of time. To us time is extraordinarily important. There was a meeting here at five thirty, and you have to make all kinds of arrangements to get here at five thirty. So did the speaker. So we live in time, not the time of the scientists, which is too complicated - I won't go into that. We live by time but also

there is physical time and there is psychological time. Right? That is, I am, I will be. I am jealous, uncertain, ambitious, wanting to fulfil, climb the ladder and all the rest of it; to climb the ladder you need time, step by step to get to the top. Right? So there is psychological time and physical time. Is this clear? Don't agree, please. You are not agreeing with me, this is a fact. You are not used to this kind of thinking, that is your trouble. You don't want to share anything with anybody.

So are we bound to time? You understand? I am greedy, but give me a little time, I will be non-greedy; give me a little time to be non-violent. Right? So we use time as a means of reward and punishment. Right? Do you read newspapers? They inform you about everything that is happening according to their editor, and you absorb all that is being said in the newspaper. But here you are not absorbing, you are actually thinking. And if you don't want to think you can go home, much better. But if you want to think, find out, you have not only to use your brain, which is extraordinarily active, if you want money you work like hell to get it. If you want a position, power, good lord, look at them all working their hands off. And if you want to find out if there is an action which is timeless - you understand my question - which is not based on time as past, present and the future. So what is time, apart from physical time? Time includes the past. Right? All the knowledge which the scientists have acquired, step by step, experience by experience, trying without failing, adding more and more and more to what already they know. Right? Do you understand something of what I am saying? Good!

So time is the past, time is the present, time is the future. This is

the cycle in which we are caught. I remember my experience, what a lovely time I had, that's memory. Then that day which was so horrible, I remember that. So my brain is full of memories of the past, the present and the future. So the future is what I am now. Right? Right, sirs? Don't agree, sir, please for god's sake don't agree. If you don't see it doesn't matter, but since you have taken all the trouble to come here it's a waste of money and your energy if you don't listen, if you don't capture the real inward story of all this, you are wasting your time, your energy, your money. So time is the past, the present and the future. The scientists would say something else, I have discussed this matter with them, they want all kinds of complicated manoeuvres to bring about their own conclusions.

Now the past is time - all the memories, all the knowledge, all the experience, all the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, the despair, uncertainty, all that is the past. And that is acting in the present. Right? Modified, changed slightly, but all the past is acting now. What you thought ten years ago, slightly modified, it is still going on. You believe in god, so that belief gives you a certain security, and tomorrow you will still believe in god whether it is illusory or fanciful or nonsensical. So the past modifying itself in the present becomes the future. Right, clear? Very simple. So the future is now. No? Because what you are, you will be tomorrow unless you radically bring about a mutation. You understand what I am saying? You are all asleep. Would you like to go to bed? Probably you have never thought about all this, you have never gone into it, you have never taken the trouble to investigate, you have never given time, a little time during the day to say, my god, what is all

this about, what is all this living, what is the meaning of this nonsensical way of living. So if you could give ten minutes now, giving your attention, giving your heart to find out, not mere intellectual, verbal action but give your whole being, your heart to find out, you will find out very quickly for yourself. Then no god, no priest, no country, no power, position and all that, they disappear completely, they are meaningless.

So the future is now. You understand? Because I am this now: I am greedy, envious, I have several enemies - not I, suppose I have - enemies, it is my country, it is my god, my guru is better than your guru, and all the rest of that nonsense. So if you can put all that aside - opinions, judgements, evaluations and face the fact that you are after two million years what you are now: frightened, lonely, depressed, anxious, uncertain, that's what you are now, today. Tomorrow you will be exactly the same, slightly modified, but you will be exactly the same. So the future is now. I don't know if you see this.

So the question then arises: what is change? Do you understand? If I am greedy now, or angry, I have been envious, jealous, I have got a great many hurts, if there is no radical mutation now I will be exactly the same tomorrow. It is logical, sane, therefore I ask myself, what is change? You understand? Is there such a thing as change? You understand all this, at least some of you? We use the word 'transform', which means change forms: I am this but I am going to change into that, which is still the same pattern. Right?

What does the word 'love' mean to you? Have you ever asked that question? Love of god, love of pictures, love of literature, I

love my wife, which may be rather doubtful. I love literature and so on. What does that word mean to each one of us? Would you like to wait to answer, take time? Or shall I proceed with it? You understand? Would you like to answer that question, what is love, or would you want me, the speaker, to go into it. It's much easier for the speaker to go into it! It is an important question, very, what is love? How will you find out? How will you find out for yourself the truth of the matter, not all the romantic values, you know all that stuff, I don't have to. So what is it that is love, which is not emotion, which is not sexual response, which is not an imaginative - you know, all that stuff? So what is love to you?

Q: Silence.

K: Silence. Is that love? Silence. When you hit your wife, or push her, or do something to her, are you silent? Anything goes in this country. Right? All the saints, all the gurus, all the latest miracle workers, and all that, you absorb everything. Right? Somebody writes a book, and you say, yes, I agree with that. Somebody comes along and contradicts that and you say, yes. And you have banished from this country Buddha. Or you say, yes, he is one of us. So your brain is capable of absorbing rubbish, agreeing with something that appears to be true. Don't you do all this, actually, if you face the fact? Don't you? Your brain is capable of absorbing anything that goes in the name of religion: pure rubbish; and something most extraordinarily true. And this melange, this mix up, that's your life. Right?

I have to stop. So what is love? I have to stop now. We will have to go into this either Wednesday, or tomorrow, or next Saturday. Right? Is that all right? You don't mind?

Q: Tomorrow.

K: You'd love that? Don't be funny, sir. Why do you want it tomorrow? It is convenient for you, is it?

Q: Tomorrow is Sunday.

K: Tomorrow is Sunday, is that right? And so it is convenient for you. Suppose it is not convenient for me? You are not serious. Anything goes. So sirs, we had better stop and Mr Narayan will announce whether I talk tomorrow or Wednesday. Is that all right sirs?

Q: Yes.

K: Goodbye sirs.

MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST JANUARY 1986

On a week-day to see so many people seems rather absurd, doesn't it? I hope - one hopes that you will all take the trouble to listen to each other.

Last time that we met here, it was on Saturday, we talked about what is love. You may remember it, if you were here. And we are going to enquire together, I mean together, into this whole problem, which is very, very complex. And so, if you don't mind, you have to think, not just agree, not say, 'Yes, it is all right', and then go your own way. So we are going to enquire together into this problem of what is love. Together, not that the speaker is the only talker but together we are going to examine. This is not a lecture, not to instruct, or guide, or help. That would be too stupid because we have had all that kind of help for generations upon generations and we are what we are now. We must start with what we are now, not what we have been in the past, or what we shall be in the future. What we shall be in the future is what you are now. Right? What we are now, our greed, our envy, our jealousy, our great superstitions, our desire to worship somebody, to say 'You are a holy man' and all that tommy rot. So this is not a lecture, not an entertainment, not something you just accept, or deny, but we are talking over like two friends, if you like two enemies across the border. But we are talking together. So you have to exercise your brain, drive it, force it, think it out.

So we are going to go into these questions: what is love? And to enquire very deeply, profoundly into it, we must also enquire first:

what is energy? Energy. Every gesture you make is based on energy. While you are listening to the speaker you are exercising your energy. To come here from a long distance, from Benares, or still further up, you have to use a great deal of energy. Right? To build a house, to plant a tree, to make a gesture, to talk. From childhood, from the baby, the first cry of a baby is based on energy, supplied for the moment by the mother and so on. I won't go into all that.

So we must enquire what is energy? Are you all right, can one go on? I can go on, the speaker can go on indefinitely because he has been at it for sixty years, or seventy years, putting the same thing in different words. So if you will kindly, seriously listen because hearing is a great art, perhaps one of the greatest arts, to listen to what the other person has to say, not to interrupt, not to say, 'Yes, I agree with you and let's talk about something else'. We have to enquire first if you can listen at all. This is not a lecture, or an instruction, and all that stuff, we are together examining, questioning, doubting, never, never accepting what the speaker says, never. Right? Don't say, 'Yes we agree' but then go on accepting. He has no authority. So we will start.

What is energy? This has been one of the questions of the scientists. And they say energy is matter. Right? But previous to that: what is energy? You understand? It may be matter. It may be every kind of thing. But what is energy? Primordial energy? Who brought this energy about? Are you understanding what I am talking about? I am not sure. Because this has been a very, very serious question. So we are together taking a long journey into this; together, you and I walking by the same stream. You are not just

following the speaker, you are not just saying, 'Yes, that sounds very good, so does the Upanishads, and the Gita and all that bilge that has been said, so we understand'. It isn't a bit like that. First of all one has to have great doubt. Right? Great scepticism. Right sirs? No, don't agree please, don't agree. You don't doubt anything, you accept everything. So doubt, scepticism of your own experience, of your own thoughts, of your own conclusions, doubt it, question it, not accepting a thing from any book, including my own. I am just a passer-by, he is not important.

And we are going to enquire together, it is very important please, together. You know what that means? Co-operating together to build something, to enquire into something, to see what is clear, what is doubtful, what is not clear. You are doing it. And the speaker has done this but you have to do this. So we are together, walking up a very long stream, you can make that stream a very, very, very strong current that will wipe you away, throw you on to the banks, or you can deal with it. So it requires your energy. Right? It requires your energy.

So we are asking: what is energy? (Sound of crows) That crow calling is part of energy. Right? The trees, the birds, the stars, the moon, the rising of the sun, and setting of the sun, it is all energy. Right? Probably you doubt it but it doesn't matter. And whatever you speak requires energy, the first cry of the baby out of the womb, that cry is part of that energy. Right? To play a violin, to speak, to marry, sex, everything on earth requires energy. Right? So we're enquiring together what is this energy, what is the origin, what is the source, how has it begun, who created this energy? Please, carefully, don't say, 'God' and that will be that. I don't

accept god. The speaker has no gods - is that all right? You accept that? You will accept anything, so it doesn't matter, I will go on.

Please don't allow yourselves to accept what the speaker is saying at any moment - in his books, in his talks, in his videos, and all that business. So what is this energy? We cannot possibly exist without this energy. There is no existence on earth without this energy: the trees, tremendous energy to pull up water right to the top, tons of it. That is tremendous energy. To build an aeroplane, hundreds of people are responsible for it. To go to the moon and so on. So whatever we do, or don't do, is energy. Right? The dancer, the violinist, the painter, the house-mother, the army general, everything requires energy. Right? That is a fact whether you accept it or not, it doesn't matter. And we are enquiring: what is that energy? The origin of it, not just energy, or accept what the scientists say, which is, energy is matter and so on. I won't go into all that because the speaker has talked to many of them about this matter. And the religious people say 'God' and that ends it. Or some guru says... and that also ends it. They don't enquire, they don't doubt, they don't question, they don't have scepticism. Right?

So here we are saying, if you can, abandon all that; what the ancient people have said, abandon all that and leave it at the roadside and we will take a journey together. If you can't put all that aside, or leave it on the roadside, you can't follow the speaker, you can't understand the speaker. Right? Don't bother to understand him, it doesn't matter. But unfortunately you hear a lot of words and you say, 'Yes, that sounds reasonable' and so on and so on. We are not dealing with words. Words are not the mountain. The word mountain is not the mountain. The word K is not K. You

understand all this? So your name is not you. To recognize that your name is not you. I think this is important to understand. The word is not the actual. Right? Is that clear? The word is not the tree. The word tree is not that. Right? So we have to be very careful now, not to be entangled with words. I wonder if you follow all this. Right? I can go on. My friend has given me a signal, my old friend.

And we are going into something that requires all your energy, all your brain, which is matter, which is the accumulated experience of a million years. And all that evolution means energy. Right? So I am saying - I am asking myself, you are asking for yourself, so I begin to ask myself, is there energy that is not contained, or stimulated, or held within the field of knowledge? You understand my question? Within the field of knowledge. That is, within the field of thought. Please don't agree with it. You agree with everything that is said.

So I ask myself: is there an energy which is not put together, stimulated, arranged by thought? You understand? Thought gives a you great deal of energy, to go to the office every morning at 9.0 o'clock, or 8.30, thought gives you that energy. Right? I must earn more money, I have a better house. Right? Thought, thinking, gives you the energy. I believe it took two or three hundred people, or three thousand people, to build a rocket that went to the moon. Right? So all that requires energy. To shake hands with you, to say, 'How are you?', to recognize old friends sitting across there. I am glad they have found a place, we can see each other. So I ask myself, I know thought, thinking, thinking about the past, thinking about the future, planning for the present, that gives a tremendous

energy. Right? Right sirs? Thinking I must build a house, so I go to the office, I agree with him, and so on and so on. And you require a great deal of energy to be educated. Right? From ignorance, as they call it, I am not saying it is ignorance - from not knowing mathematics you gradually learn, and energy, to college, university and then you become some kind of something or other. And you have a job, to that every day of your life you go. Or you retire at an early age and die. So thought, please understand this, it is very important if you will, thought creates this energy, to build an aeroplane, think of what has gone into that. Hundreds of people have worked at it, step by step, by step, constructed it, and they have produced 747s, or whatever it is, it is a most marvellous machine that can never go wrong, or man can make it go wrong. And so on and so on. So thought is an extraordinary instrument of creating energy. Right? May I go on? Right?

If one doesn't see that as an actual fact then you are off the mark. Right? If you don't see it as an actual fact that thought creates tremendous energy; you want to become a rich man and you work like blazes to get to be a rich man. Right? You want to do some kind of crazy propaganda and you work very hard, you join groups, sects, gurus and all the rest of that business. So thought is an extraordinary instrument of engendering thought. Right? Thought engendering energy. Right? Don't agree.

So then we have to enquire into the very, very, very nature of thought. Right? Not say all the excuses. (Don't bother about this. I fell yesterday and I hurt myself, that is all, that is over. You can give your attention to something else.) So thought, which has planned this society, which has divided the world into Asia and

Europe, the communist, the socialist, the capitalist, and the democratic republican, all that is created by thought. It is simple. The army, the navy, the airforce, to kill, not only for transportation but also to kill. This is so obvious, isn't it? So thought is very important in our life because without thought we can't do anything. Right? For you to come here from a distance required planning, adjusting, taking a train, aeroplane, taking a bus, etc., etc., all that is part of your thinking. Right? So what is thinking? You work it out, don't listen to me. What is thinking? You can't live without a certain kind of thinking. Right? Planning, going back to your house, going back to do your work and so on, get married, sex and everything is contained in the process of thought. So what is thinking? The speaker has talked about it a lot, so don't go back to his books. Don't say, 'Yes, I have heard that before'. But here you forget all the books, all the things you have read because we must approach this each time anew. So thinking is based on knowledge. Right? If you had no knowledge, how to come here, or take a bus or this or that, you wouldn't be here. So knowledge, memory, thought. Right? Agree? And we have accumulated tremendous knowledge, how to sell each other, how to exploit each other, how to build bridges, how to create gods and temples, we have done all that. The various ashrams, you know all that business, concentration camps of a certain kind. So thought has done all this: created the army, the navy, the aeroplanes. Thought has also, through knowledge, temples and all that business. So without experience there is no knowledge. Right? Be logical sirs. Logic is necessary up to a certain point. But if you start without logic, clarity then you become superstitious, imaginative, coming to

conclusions, building temples and all that kind of nonsense.

So without experience there is no knowledge. The scientists are adding everyday something new. Please follow this carefully, if you don't mind. Experience is limited. Right? Because we are adding more and more to it, through knowledge. Experience, knowledge stored in the brain as memory and then that is the beginning of thought. Right? Am I right? Or are you right? What do you say? God, don't you feel anything? So experience is always limited. Right? Because you are adding more and more and more everyday in the scientific world, in your own life you can learn something more. So experience is limited, therefore knowledge is limited, memory is limited and therefore thought is limited. Right? Am I sane or insane? And we live by thought. So we never recognize, though thought can imagine the most extraordinary heaven and hell, the Olympic gods of the Greeks, the Egyptian gods - do you know anything about all that? No, it doesn't matter.

So your thought is always limited and your gods whom thought has created will always be limited. Right? I know you don't like this but I am going ahead. So your gods, your thinking, however wide it may be, however narrow it may be, all this is limited. And from this limitation we try to find the energy. You understand what I am saying? We try to find the origin, the beginning of creation.

So thought has created fear. Right? No? Hasn't it? Aren't you frightened of what may happen two years later - no? Aren't you frightened of losing a job, of not passing exams, of not climbing the ladder - you know what I mean by climbing the ladder? Getting more and more and more successful. And you are frightened of not being able to fulfil. You are frightened of not being able to stand

alone, being strong for yourself. You always depend on somebody. All that breeds tremendous fear. Right? Won't you wink at me! So it is one of our daily facts that we are frightened people. Right? Would you agree to that very simple fact that we are frightened people? And fear arises when we want security. Right? You just listen. All right, I will go on. Don't bother. I will go on.

Fear destroys love. You cannot have love - love cannot exist where fear is. Fear is a tremendous energy. And love has no relationship with fear. They are totally divorced. Right? So what is the origin of fear? Right? All this is to understand, to be alive to the nature of love. If you don't understand all this then go and carry on whatever you are doing. Be happy with it, enjoy yourself, making money, positions and all that. But if you want to go into this very carefully you have not only to examine what is thinking, and the machines, the computers are doing that marvellously - you don't know anything about it. I talked to some of the professors in England just before I came to India, before the speaker came to India. There are computers that can think backwards and forwards. You understand what that means? They can think what? One has to get up at six therefore one has to plan to get up at six. Right? And after six what it has to do. And I believe that is called - I have forgotten, it will come back. So the machines, please understand this for god's sake, the machines, which is the computer - you know that joke? One is praying for god, and there is a computer next door, and the computer says, 'Whom are you praying to? God is here.' No sir, you don't know how serious it is. So - architecture, that's the word. I only learnt this recently and it may be wrong, it may be right, a computer can think what has happened and plan

what will happen for the future. Which the brain is doing. You understand? You plan to come here, you spend so much money, so much time and then go back, go forward. So the computers can think forwards and backwards, which is call architecture - they may have changed the name by now. I am going to ask one of the specialist here.

So thinking has created fear. Right? Thinking about the future, thinking about the past and not being able to adjust quickly to the environment and so on and so on. So thought and time. Right? No, you don't understand. I will go on. Thought of tomorrow, what might happen, my wife might leave me, or might die. I am a lonely man, then what am I to do? I have several children so I had better marry - remarry someone or other because at least they can look after my children. And so on. That is thinking of the future, based upon the past, right, and so thinking and time are involved in this. Right? Thinking about the future, future being the day after tomorrow, or tomorrow, and thinking about that causes fear. Right? So time, thought, are the factors of fear. And we have examined thought, we have examined time. Time is the past, the present and the future, the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, planting a seed and it becoming a huge tree. That is time. And also we have got inward time, I am this but I will become a rich millionaire. I am greedy but give me time, I won't be, next life perhaps. And so on and so on. So time and thought are the central factors of fear.

I am looking for a clock.

Audience: Ten past six.

K: Thank you. So I have talked for a hour and a quarter.

Audience: Forty minutes.

K: Is that all, too bad! So, let me finish this. Allow me another twenty minutes, if you don't mind. Do you mind? I won't keep you very long. It won't make any difference if you listen to me or not. You will carry on in exactly the same way as you have been living. You won't change, you won't do a thing because you are caught in a rut, in a groove, in a pattern. And you will go on and death is there. Right?

So we are enquiring into something which you may not understand but it doesn't matter. Time, thought are our principle factors of life. And both time inwardly, I am this but I will be that, or I have been, I shall be, I am, I shall be, all that involves time. And time is thought. They are not two separate things. They are both movements. Then what place has death? You understand sirs? What place in my life has death, suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, all those terrible things I have gone through? That is enough.

Sir, I had better take your watch, whoever will give it to me. I might lose it, or you might lose it.

You understand sirs. Please understand this very carefully. Time, thought are central factors of life. And we are saying thought and time are the factors of fear. That is a fact whether you like it or not. So what has suffering to do with time? You are following all this? What has suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair and all the travail that man goes through, is that all our life? You understand what I am asking you? We are journeying together. You are not just sitting there and listening to a nonsensical speaker. I am asking you. This is your life, right sirs, facts, not imagination. You are born, educated and you fit into BAs, MAs, and all the rest

of it, PhDs, in order to get a job, or you become a great Prime Minister, or minister, for god's sake, you understand? This is your life. This is your consciousness, your consciousness is composed of your fears, of your knowledge, of your time, you know consciousness. Your knowledge, everything is in your consciousness. And in that consciousness, of which you are, that consciousness you have always thought is yours, mine. My consciousness. You understand my question?

Don't cross your legs, just sit comfortably as you were. Don't suddenly change.

Your consciousness, if you examine it very carefully, not examine it through judgements, evaluations, what you know, but if you examine it very carefully, your consciousness is made up of its content. Right? Do you understand what I am saying? What you think, your tradition, your education, how many fears, whether you want to exchange your wife for a new wife, or whether you go to a certain temple, all that, loneliness, fear, is what you are. You may think you are divine inside but still you are thinking. When you say, 'Yes, there is god in me', it is still the product of thought. So your consciousness, which is what you are, not physically, but psychologically, inwardly which is your consciousness, is the consciousness of mankind.

This we carefully went into. Don't accept anything he says. Every human being on this earth goes through sorrow, pain, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, quarrels, coaxing, wanting this, not wanting. All that is what you are. If you imagine that you are a god incarnate, that is part of thought. Right? Thought, as we pointed out, is limited. So your consciousness, what you are, is the rest of

mankind. Every man goes through this. Or every woman. Every human being goes through this. Right? Every human being: your neighbour, your father, your grandfather, and the past generations all over the world. So you are not individuals. This is a blow. Don't accept it. Examine it, don't say 'It is rot', or 'It is not a fact because the Gita says something', or the Upanishads say something, or the Bible says something - it is a fact that you, your suffering, your pain, your anxiety, your loneliness, your knowledge, is common - I won't use common - is shared by every human being. Right? So you are not a separate soul, a separate atman. I know you don't like this because you were brought up to swallow anything that goes along.

So there must be freedom from fear, from hurts, from every kind of thing human beings have put together. There must be freedom, you understand, not just words. 'India must be free from the rest of the world'. That is just nonsense. Nobody can live by themselves, they need a friend, they need somebody to help them.

So, we are trying to find out, enquire, into what is love. Right? We are saying, as long as there is fear of any kind, biologically, fear of attachment, fear of loss, fear of any kind, the other cannot exist. If there is any kind of attachment the other cannot exist - the other being love. So we are going to enquire, if time allows. Then seeing all this, from the beginning, from the baby to the grown man, seeing what the world is, and enquiring into what is death, why are we all so frightened of death? You understand? You know what it means to die? Haven't you seen dozens of people killed, or hurt, haven't you? No? Are you strange people, or what? Belong to a different planet? We have seen death. We have never enquired

very deeply into what is death? It is a very important question, as what is life. You understand? We said life is all this rot. We have said life is knowledge, learning, you know, all that stuff, going to the office regularly every day at 9.0 o'clock, or 10.0 o'clock, quarrelling, battling, wanting this and not wanting, you follow? We know what living is. Right? A series of actions produce a series of reactions and sorrow, pain, that is our life. Then if that is living, which it is, don't say, 'Yes, living is something extraordinary' - this is living, quarrelling, divorcing, fighting. But we have never enquired seriously into what is death. You understand what I am talking about? We know what is living, if you are honest, and you can imagine anything you like but this is living. You can imagine heaven is there and god sort of looking after you, every prayer is answered and all that rot. At least for me, for the speaker. But we have never seriously enquired into what is dying. All right sir?

What is dying? It must be an extraordinary thing to die. No? Extraordinary thing. Everything has been taken away from you: your attachments, your money, your wife, your children, your country, your superstitions, your gurus, your gods, everything is gone. Right? You may wish to take it to the other world but you can't take your money, your bank account. Right? - your attachments, your gurus, your temples. You can invent temples up there, not after you are dead but while living you can invent all the gods on earth. But when death comes it says, 'Look, you cannot take anything with you, all your attachments, all your affections, all your hurts, all the things that you have gathered in life, you can't carry, there is no space for that'. Right? So death says, 'Be totally detached'. Right? That is what happens when death comes. You

have no person to lean on, nothing. Right? Have you understood this? You can believe what you will, be reincarnated next life, that is a very comforting idea, but it may not be a fact, it may be your imagination, your longing, your 'I can't leave my wife', I have left so much for my son but I will meet him next life so I'll tell him off and so on.

So we are trying to find out what it means to die, while living, not committing suicide, I am not talking about that kind of nonsense. I want to find out what it means to die. Not jump in the river, I don't mean that, or go off to the Himalayas and die there. But I want to find out for myself what it means to die. Which means can I be totally free from everything that man has created, including myself? You know there is an Italian joke, sorry to repeat it: the whole world will die, perhaps including me! So I want to find out the actual fact when death says, enough. Right? Do you want to find out? No. Do you really want to find out?

What does it mean to die? Give up everything. Right? Not sacrifice, death, sensation, don't use those silly words. It cuts you off with a very, very, very sharp razor from your attachments, from your gods, from your superstitions, from your desire for comfort next life and so on and so on. So I am going to find out what death is because it is as important as living. So how can I find out, actually, not theoretically, make evaluations about it and form societies, and you know, all that circus? But I actually want to find out, as you want to find out, I am speaking for you, so don't go to sleep. So what does it mean to die? One is very healthy, the body is functioning, there is no disease, like K - at ninety one, he has no disease, no pain etc., because I have seen experts, doctors. So what

does it mean to die? Put that question to yourself, don't listen to me. While you are young, or when you are very old, this question is always there. Right? It is always asking, demanding what it means to die. Are you interested in this? Are you? Oh no, don't shake your heads. You know what it means? To be totally free, to be totally unattached to everything that man has put together, or what you have put together, totally free. No attachments, no gods, no future, no past. You don't know what it all means either. You don't see the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the extraordinary strength of it. So while living to be dying. You understand what that means? While you are living, every moment you are dying. So throughout life you are not attached to a thing, your wife, your father, your mother, your grandmother, your country, nothing - because that is what death means. Right? You may wish for another life. That is all too easy, too simple, too idiotic.

So living is dying. You understand? Living means every day you are abandoning everything that you are attached to. What you worship, what you think, what you don't think, your gods, your country, nothing. Can you do this? Can you do this? A very simple fact but it has got tremendous implications. So that each day is a new day. You understand? Each day you are dying and incarnating. Oh, you don't understand. There is tremendous vitality, energy there. You understand? Because there is nothing you are afraid of. There is nothing that can hurt, being hurt, it doesn't exist. Thought is limited, therefore it has no importance; it has importance because I have to get up and go in five minutes, but time, thought, fear, attachment, and all the things that man has put together has to be totally abandoned. That's what it means to die. God may be

waiting to save you in heaven - it all sounds so ridiculous. So can you do it? Will you try it? Will you experiment with it? Not for just a day; every day. No, sir, you can't do it. Your brains are not trained for this. Your brains have been conditioned so heavily, by your education, by your tradition, by your books, by your professors, all the rest of it. This requires to find out what is love; love and death go together. Because death says be free, non-attached, nothing you can carry with you. And love says - there is no word for it. So love can exist only when there is freedom, not from your wife, for a new girl, or a new husband, but the feeling, the enormous strength, the vitality, the energy of complete freedom.

Next time we meet we will talk about religion and meditation. I hope that is all right. I am sorry there are only three talks but the speaker cannot carry on. You understand? He is ninety one and that is good enough.

MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 4TH JANUARY 1986

You don't mind if we start five minutes early? I suppose we must talk.

Will you kindly participate in what he's talking about? Will you? Follow if you wish what he is talking about. Not only follow, but, together, share, I mean participate in it, not just think about it or casually pay attention to it, but rather together go into what the speaker is going to talk about presently.

One or two things must be made very clear. This is not a personality cult. The speaker has an abomination of all that - to worship somebody - because everything he is saying is contradictory if you personally worship an individual, or make something, him, into a god, into a... all the nonsense that goes on in the world. What is important is to listen to what he has to say, share it, not only listen, but actually participate in what he's saying. You may agree, or disagree, which you are perfectly right to do, but since you are here and since the speaker is here, we are talking over together. We have talked about - I've forgotten - we talked about life, the very complexity of life, the beginning of life. We are going together. What is life, what is the origin of all this, the earth, the marvellous earth, the lovely evening and the early morning sun, the rivers, the valleys, the mountains and the glory of the land which is being disseminated, spoiled?

So, what is the origin of all this? If you say 'god', then it's finished; then you can trot along quite happily because you've solved the problem. But if you begin to question, doubt, as one

should, all gods, all gurus - I don't belong to that tribe - if you begin to question all that man has put together through a long evolution of two million years from the beginning of the Sumerians, and so on, the Hebrews, ancient Egyptians, down the corridors of history, they've always asked this question: what is the beginning; what is the origin; how has all this come about? I hope you're asking this question. Don't just listen to me, to the speaker with wide eyes, or with narrow eyes, whatever eyes you have, but share it, tear it to pieces, don't, please accept anything he says. He's not your guru, thank god; he is not your leader. He is not your helper. Right? So, that is the platform, that is the beginning of this talk.

This is a very serious talk we will go into, and unless your brain is active, not just sit there and gaze, is actually active, I'm afraid, one is afraid that you won't be able to follow. That would be useless, for the speaker, if you sit there and listen to a lot of words; but if we could together take a long journey, a very long journey, not in terms of time, not in terms of belief or conclusions or theories, but as we have examined very carefully the way of our lives, fear, uncertainty, insecurity and all the inventions that man has made including the extraordinary computers and so on, if you take a long journey into this, where are we at the end of two million years? Where are we going. Not some theory, not what some wretched book says, however holy it is. Where are we all going? And where have we begun? They're both related to each other: where we are going, where we began. The beginning may be the ending. Do you understand? I don't know if you understand what I'm talking about. Don't agree. Find out. There may be no

beginning and no ending and we're going to investigate into that together. Is that all right? Do you approve of all that? It doesn't matter if you approve or not, I will go on.

From the beginning of time, man has always sought, thought in terms of religion, right? The ancient Egyptians had their Isis, Osiris and all the gods and the ancient Hebrews, and so on right down to the present day. What is religion? You understand my question? What is religion? Why are we so inclined, or not, say I don't believe in anything, but man has always sought something more than this world. They've worshipped the stars, the suns, the moons and their own creations; it has been a tremendous endeavour, effort, energy, spent on ancient temples, mosques and the churches of course. They have spent tremendous energy on this. Some of them most extraordinarily beautiful, others are hideous - around the corner you can find them. And we're asking: what is the spirit of man that sought something beyond the work, the present day agony, the travail, the work, going to the factory, to the office and climbing the ladder of success, making money, trying to impress people, trying to command, right from top to bottom? Right? Right? Are you agreeing to this? It is a fact whether you agree or not. You're all seeking power in some form; wanting to be at the centre of things - in Delhi, or here, or in other places. You all want to be there.

But, we're asking: what is religion; what is it that made man spend enormous treasures, or give treasures to a temple and so on; what made him do all this? Are we talking together? Yes? Yes? Somebody tell me a little bit. What made him do all this? What was the energy that was given to all this? Was it fear? Was it a

seeking a reward from heaven, or hell, whatever you like to call it? Seeking a reward? Was that the origin? Because man as you, you want a reward, you want something in exchange. You pray three times or five times a day and you hope in return some entity will give you something, from a refrigerator to a car to a better wife, or better husband, or wait for grace, something that you can hope, cling to. Right? This has been the history of all religions, right, organized, you know the temple near here call Tirupati. I'm sure you go there, but it doesn't matter, they make, I believe, a million dollars every third day. Right? Right? No? So, god and money are always together. That's how the Catholic Church was built, tremendous treasures there, extraordinary valuable jewels and all that. So, you too have it here, your various temples and all the puja and worship and all that triviality; all that is really nonsense.

So, we are trying to find out, enquire very, very deeply what is religion, not obviously all this moneymaking stuff. Right? Do you go along with what I'm saying, even for an hour? But afterwards you can go back to your temples, to your prayers, to your - what's it called in Sanskrit, I've forgotten for a moment - it doesn't matter. So, we are asking what is that which is nameless, which is the supreme intelligence, which has no relationship with all our prayers, with all our temples, mosques, churches; of course that's all man-made. Right? Right? All the gods, all the temples, mosques and so on, even that, all that is man-made. No? We have built the churches (not you, you're all in the offices or somewhere else) but the builders of the ancient monuments, ancient temples, all that, all the rituals, all the strange dresses they put on, medieval dresses, to impress the people. But if you brush all that aside, any intelligent

man must, brush all that aside, the prayers, the worship, the puja, giving garlands to some idol, right, and the priest muttering some Sanskrit words, probably which he doesn't himself understand, and probably it's his tradition and thereby he earns a lot of money, and so on. If you can put all that aside, not become cynical, not become merely sceptical, but a really enquiring brain, right, enquiring brain. Have you got such a brain? Enquiring brain, a brain that's active, a brain that enquires into everything, not only outside which the scientists are doing in their way, the world, the outside world, but have you got a brain that is enquiring into its own thoughts, into its own consciousness, into its own pains, sufferings, all the rest of it. Have we got such a brain?

Here, we must separate the brain from the mind. You don't mind? The brain is the centre of all our nerves, all our knowledge, all our theories, opinions, prejudices, college, universities, all that knowledge is gathered in the skull. Right? It is there, all the thoughts, all the fears, and so on. Is the brain different from the mind? Don't look at me, I'm asking you a question. If you seriously pay attention to what the speaker asked, is there a difference between the brain, your brain, that is inside the skull and all the knowledge you have gathered, not only you, but your forefathers and so on, for two million years? It's all encased in there. So, that brain will always be limited. Right? Don't agree, sir, this is much too serious. And is the mind different from this, from my consciousness, from my daily activities, from my fears, anxieties, uncertainties, sorrow, pain and all the theories which man has gathered about everything - it is there. Right? And the mind has no relationship with the brain, but it can communicate to the brain, but

the brain cannot communicate with it? Am I making something clear to you? Do you understand my question? Don't agree, please, that's the last thing to do, agree with me. The speaker is saying the brain is the keeper of all our consciousness, of our thoughts, of our fears, and so on, and on, and on. All the gods, all the theories about gods and all the unbelievers, it's all there. Nobody can dispute that unless you're a little bit odd. You know the word 'odd'? It's all there, but this brain which is conditioned by knowledge, by experience, by tradition, and so on, it cannot have any communication with that mind which is totally outside the activity of the brain. I don't know if you will accept this; don't bother, just think about it, look at it. But that mind can communicate with the brain, but the brain cannot communicate with that because the brain can imagine infinitely, the brain can imagine the nameless; brain can do anything. You understand? And that's too immense because it doesn't belong to you; it's not your mind, your etc., etc.

So, we are going to investigate - together, please bear in mind always together - not only the nature of religion, but also enquire into the computer. You know what the computer is? Don't you? Yes. It's a machine. It can programme itself. It can bring about its own computer. The father computer has its own son computer who is better than the father. You understand all this? You don't have to accept this. It's public, it's not something secret, so watch it carefully. That computer can do almost anything that man can do. It can invent all your gods, all your theories, your rituals, even better at it than you will ever be. So, the computer is coming up in the world, not only in the factories, but also it's going to make your brains something different. Which is - you've heard of genetic

engineering - oh god, don't you hear all these things? They're trying to, whether you like it or not, to change your whole behaviour. That is genetic engineering. They are trying to change your way of thinking. You understand what I'm saying?

Oh, don't stare at me, sir. Will you go and sit somewhere else? Will you? Will you go and sit somewhere else? Because you are staring at me all the time. Sit there, sir, would you?

Q: It's only my eyes.

K: I know, I know. That's good enough. Would you sit there, sir? Good. Thank you.

So, genetic engineering and the computer, when the two meet together - they're going to presently, in a couple of years - what are you? You understand what I'm asking, sir? What are you; as a human being what are you? Your brains are going to be altered. Your way of behaviour is going to be changed. Right? They may altogether remove fear, remove sorrow, remove all your gods. They're going to, sir, don't fool yourself. Because it all ends up either in war or in death. Right? So, this is what is happening in the world actually. Genetic engineering on the one side and computer on the other and when they meet, as they're inevitably going to meet, what are you as a human being? Actually, your brain now is a machine. You are born in India and say: 'I'm an Indian'. You are encased in that. Or you're born in Russia, back again. And so on. You are a machine. Please don't be insulted. I'm not insulting you. You are a machine who repeats, repeats, or says it different - you know a machine, like a computer. Right? Don't imagine there is something divine in you - that would be lovely - something holy that is everlasting. The computer will say that to you too.

So, what is becoming of a human being? What's becoming of you? And we have also to enquire - this is a very serious subject, don't agree or disagree, just listen, you can't, probably you can't take part in it - what is creation? You understand my question? You understand my question at least - creation. Not the creation of a baby, that's very simple, or the creation of a new something or other. Invention is totally different from creation. Invention is based on knowledge. Right? I can improve, the engineers can improve the jet; the improvement is based on knowledge and the invention is also based on knowledge. So we must separate invention from creation. Will you? No, no, sir, don't agree. This requires your total energy, your capacity to penetrate, not just say: yes, yes. The difference between creation and invention, you understand the difference? Invention is essentially based on knowledge. Right? I improve the clock; I have a new gadget, because the old gadgets I have used, I have found something new and I invent something else. So all invention is based on knowledge, right, on experience. Inventions are inevitably limited because they're based on knowledge. Oh, for god's sake, somebody wake up. So, knowledge being ever limited, inventions must always be limited. In the future they may have no jets, but something else and that will go from Delhi to Los Angeles in two hours, that's an invention based on previous knowledge which has been improved step by step by step, but that's not creation. Right? I get rather fed up looking at those faces which say nothing.

So what is creation? So what is life? You understand? Life in the tree, life in the little grass, life in the scientist, life, not what they invent, what they do, but the beginning of life. I don't know if

you understand, life, the thing that lives. You may kill it but it's still there in the other.

So, we're asking, don't agree or disagree, don't nod your head, but see we are enquiring into what is the origin of life. C'est d'accord? Vous etes comme moi? I'm sorry. So, we are going to enquire into the absolute - something that's really marvellous. Not a reward. You can't take it home and say: I'll use it.

What is meditation to you? Would you kindly tell me. What is meditation? You meditate, some of you, don't you? No? Oh, god. Some of you do, don't you? What is meditation? The word, it's common language in the dictionary, means: to ponder over, to think over and, to concentrate, to learn to concentrate on something, not let your brain wander all over the place. Right? Right? Is that what you call meditation? Be simple, sir, be honest. That is what? Giving every day a certain period and you go to a room quietly, sit down for ten minutes, quarter of an hour, meditate. Right? Right? Do you agree with that, sir? No? Then what is meditation to you? Concentration? Thinking about something very noble? You can't answer all these questions.

So, we are going to first enquire what is meditation. Any conscious effort to meditate is part of your discipline of the office, because you say: if I meditate, I'll have a quiet mind, or I'll enter into another state. And so on and so on. The word 'meditation' means to measure, which means to compare. Oh, lord. So, your meditation becomes mechanical, right, because you are exercising energy to concentrate on a picture, an image, or an idea and that concentration divides. Right? You understand what I mean? Concentration is always divisive. No? I want to concentrate on

that, but thought wanders off. Then I say I mustn't wander off, come back. You repeat that all day long, or half an hour. And then you come off it and say well I've meditated. And this meditation is advocated by all the gurus, by all the - you know, lay disciples, and so on, and so on; and the Christian idea is: I believe in god and I'm sacrificing myself to god. You understand what I'm saying? And, therefore, I pray to save me, save my soul, save my etc., etc. Is all this meditation? Tell me, I know nothing about meditation, at least not this kind. Will you tell me? Is this meditation? Tell me, sir, don't be frightened, I'm not your guru, or your boss, or your - Tell me if this is meditation. It's like an achievement. Right? If I meditate for half an hour, by Jove I feel better. Or is there a totally different kind of meditation? Right, sir? Totally different?

I'm asking you, but since you won't answer I must answer. In the word 'meditation' which is measurement, as I said, which is comparison of achievement, that's not meditation. I say don't accept anything that the speaker says, at any price. The speaker says that is not meditation at all. That's merely a process of achievement. Right? You have been one day not able to concentrate; you take a month and say: yes, I've got it. That's like a clerk becoming a manager. Right? So is there a different kind of meditation which is not effort, which is not measurement, which is not routine - please pay attention to what I am saying - which is not mechanical? Is there a meditation in which there is no sense of comparison, or there is no reward and punishment? You understand what I am saying? So, is there any meditation which is not based on thought which is measurement, time, and all that? You understand my question? How can one explain a meditation

that has no measurement, that has no achievement, that doesn't say: I'll be that; I am this, but I'll become that? That being god or super-angel.

So, that requires, if I may point out, not for you to accept or deny, just pointing out, is there a meditation which has nothing to do with will, with an energy that says: I must meditate - which has nothing to do with effort at all? The speaker says there is. You don't have to accept it. He may be nuts. He may be talking nonsense, but he sees logically that the ordinary meditation is self-hypnosis, deceiving oneself and when you stop deceiving, stop all that mechanical process, is there a different kind of meditation. And unfortunately, the speaker says: yes. That is not for you to say: yes, I agree, I'll meditate. You can't get at it through effort, through giving all your energy to something. You can't, there is no - you understand? It is something that has to be absolutely silent. Don't achieve silence now. Don't sit in meditation. Please don't do it, sir. You can't do it. First of all, begin very humbly, very very humbly and, therefore, very gently and, therefore, no pushing, driving, saying: I must do this. It requires a tremendous sense of not only aloneness, but a sense of - I mustn't describe it. I mustn't describe it because then you'll go off on descriptions. If I describe it, the description is not the real. Right? The description of the moon, or of the Himalayas, painted, description is not the Himalayas. Right? So, we'll stop describing. It's for you to play with it, or not play with it, going your own way and your own peculiar achievements through meditation and so on, and so on, reward and all the rest of it. So, a meditation which is absolutely no effort, no achievement, no thinking; then the brain is quiet. You understand? Not made

quiet by will, by intention, by conclusion and all that nonsense; it is quiet. And being quiet, it has infinite space. Are you waiting for me to explore? And you swallow what I explore. God, what kind of people are you?

So, is your brain ever quiet? I'm asking you. Is your brain, thinking, fearing, your office work, your thinking of your family, what they will do, your sons and your daughters, thinking, which is time and thought, is your brain ever quiet? Would you kindly tell me?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What, sir? Don't be nervous. Say what you want to say and if you can't say it forget it. Is your brain ever quiet. Not made quiet by drugs and by all kinds of things, whisky and various forms of drugging yourself. You drug yourself when you believe. You drug yourself and say: yes, this is perfectly right; the Buddha has said that, therefore it must be right. You're drugging yourself all the time, therefore you have no energy of that kind that demands into the penetration of something immense.

So, we're going back now to find out what is creation. You understand? What is creation? Because it has nothing to do with invention. That's gone. So what is creation, the origin, the beginning? What is life? Tell me, sirs, what you think of it. What is life? Not going to the office and all the rest of it, sex and children, or no children but sex and so on and so on. What is life? What gives life to that blade of grass in the cement? You understand? What is life in us? Not all the things we go through, power, position, prestige, fame, or no fame, but shame. So, that's not life, that's part of our mishandling of life. But, what is life? You

understand my question? You understand, sir?

Why are you listening to me? What makes you, if you are listening at all, listen to the man? What is the motive behind your listening? What do you want? What's your desire? Behind the desire there is a motive. So what is desire? First, carefully let's quickly examine it. Desire is part of sensation, isn't it? I see this beautiful clock or ugly clock; it's a sensation. The seeing brings about a sensation. Oh, this is normal, sir. From that sensation, thought comes and makes an image of it. That is, I see this clock, rather nice, I would like to have it. The sensation of seeing, then thought coming and making an image of that sensation; at that moment, desire is born. It's very simple. Right? So, is there a brain, your brain, which is not muddled up, muddled by environment, by tradition, by society and all the rest of it?

So, what is the origin of life? Are you waiting for me to answer it? You are waiting for the speaker to answer that question? Are you? Would you kindly tell me yes or no. I'll wait. If you tell me, then I'll go on. This is much too serious a subject for you to play with, because we are trying to enter, enquire into something that has no name, no end. I can kill that bird; there is another bird. I can't kill all birds; there are too many of them in the world. So, we are enquiring into what makes a bird, what is creation behind all this? Right? Are you waiting for me to describe it, go into it? Yes, sir? You want me to go into it? Why?

Q: To understand.

K: What do you understand?

Q: What is creation?

K: Why do you ask that? Because I asked? You see again,

you're - sorry, sir. No description fits, can ever describe the origin. The origin is nameless; the origin is absolutely quiet; it's not whirring about making a noise. Creation is something that is most holy; that's the most sacred thing in life and, if you have made a mess of your life, change it. Change it today, not tomorrow. If you are uncertain, find out why and be certain. If your thinking is not straight, think straight, logically. Unless all that is prepared, all that is settled, you can't enter into this world, into the world of creation. It ends.

This is the last talk. Do you want to sit together quietly for a while? All right sirs, sit quietly for a while.

May we get up now? Slowly, slowly, sir.

BROCKWOOD PARK DISCUSSION WITH M WILKENS AND D BOHM 12TH FEBRUARY 1982

K: One of our problems this morning is the difficulty of thinking together, not about something but the capacity to think together. I wonder what prevents people doing that. Is it their opinions, is it their conclusions, their concepts, their ideals, their tremendous deep rooted prejudices?

B: I feel it is because people stick to this thing, that they have an opinion which they are identified with, they don't know it but they are sticking to it.

K: Is that what prevents people from thinking together, co-operating together?

B: Well that is clearly a major factor, you can see it politically, let's say east and west.

K: Oh, politically, of course.

B: Well if we wanted to have peace we would have the two sides ready to discuss without fixed opinions.

K: Of course, of course. But that's impossible with the politicians.

W: Well no, I don't agree it is impossible.

K: I mean at present, as it is.

W: Yes, but I mean, as you say, there is nothing like this which is impossible.

K: No, nothing is impossible but if they want to do it they can do it.

W: Yes, and I think if we want them to do it, we can make them do it.

K: Yes, that's right. If we ordinary citizens want them to do it, they will do it. Now how will you help the ordinary citizens to want this?

W: Well I think they have to overcome their sense of helplessness. And I think ultimately also that they need to recognize their own responsibility, it isn't just the politicians who are being awkward, they are being awkward too.

K: It comes back to being responsible in everything you do, each person. And they don't feel that way, they don't feel responsible. They turn to the leaders, the political leaders, religious leaders, or some kind of leader and they depend on them.

W: And they blame them.

K: Blame them. Exactly! So the thing is so topsy turvy, the whole thing is.

B: Well it seems to me that we can't begin that way either because it is no use blaming people for what they are. But people are unwilling...

K: Therefore one has to begin with oneself.

B: But is it possible that some people could begin anyway, regardless of what the others are doing?

K: Leave the others.

B: Well we can't affect the others at the moment but you have once suggested that later if some people could do it then eventually others would come in.

K: Yes, quite.

B: So it doesn't mean we are neglecting the others but...

K: ...we keep the door open.

B: Yes, it is not the right order to begin with the others.

K: No. I agree. One has to begin with oneself.

B: Or with whoever.

W: But if you say we are ourselves our relationships, that what I am is my relation with other people, and therefore one must look at, observe these relationships, in that sense one is beginning with others. One is beginning...

K: ...with the others and with oneself, constant interrelationship.

W: When you said that there were these blocks and that people couldn't...

K: ...jump...

W: ...between one person and the other, this isn't always the case. Is it not relevant that sometimes between two people who have a close relationship and a loving relationship, there is a great deal of being on the same wave length, and immediately a kind of empathic relationship that one mind is not really separate from the other mind. But is this not possibly relevant to this whole thing of the changing of one's own, the transformation of one's own mind, that it is through this process of interaction.

K: Interaction, quite. Sir, would it be sufficient if half a dozen of us really understood this business? Could we affect the world? I think we could. Hitler affected the world.

B: Hitler was only one, of course. He did it mostly by himself.

K: Of course. The crazy man, he infected the whole world.

B: Well there was a programme recently on the BBC about Thomas Paine, and it showed that he actually had a significant affect on the whole world. He had a tremendous energy and passion. It was very clear in that programme that he affected the whole of history.

K: Yes, sir. Then that raises the question: why is it that we are not passionate? Why is it that we are all so luke warm? I think we are lustful for power, for this, or for that, but we seem to have lost, or never had this passion for doing the correct thing, doing the good thing.

B: I was only going to say that I think part of the reason for this lack of passion is just the failure to comprehend this point: you see many people might feel that it is very important to do something but they say society is so big...

K: So big that you are smothered.

B: Overwhelmed. So the question, there is lack of clarity on this point, that what can we actually do, to make it clear that it is really possible to do something.

K: Yes, sir, absolutely. I feel it is really possible.

B: It has to be so clear that one does not waiver when there is trouble, when it becomes difficult.

W: I think that the society conditions us so that we do feel helpless. That is part of the difficulty.

K: But why are we concerned about society? Why should it smother us, why should it curtail, or destroy our passion? And what is passion? How does one have that - not how, not a method, but when does it take place? That's better. When is passion let loose?

W: Well we know when it is not let loose, and that is when all these native forces stop it. And I suppose the basic thing is that if the individuals in society are being dominated by their own self images then they want to perpetuate the state of affairs where this appears to be so. And so they will exert a conditioning influence

through society to keep us all in this state of helplessness and delusion.

K: Does passion for responsibility, say for example, if you have tremendous passion, does it come with the end of sorrow? Is it related to suffering, passion? Is the word passion etymologically connected with suffering?

W: Well that is just a question, in one sense, of scholarship, which I am not up on, but you mean it more deeply presumably.

K: Of course. You see I have just come from India, there were about seven thousand people in Bombay, a whole cross section of society - the very rich, the middle class and some very poor. I talked to them in English, of course, and you see they really don't understand this extraordinary complexity of life, they just want solutions to problems, personal problems, economic problems, spiritual problems, they want solutions. And seeking solutions doesn't solve the problems.

B: No. But I think that is just the point, people first of all generally don't understand that, that solutions are irrelevant, and that helps to dissipate their energy obviously.

K: So the approach to the problem is important, and the approach is not the resolution of the problem but how you look at the problem. Is the problem different from you? Rather, you are the problem, the problem isn't out there.

B: But to communicate that is difficult because you see a person who is unemployed feels his problem is out there, if he only had a job he would be all right. Now you were saying something much deeper: in what sense do we say the problem is you? Suppose somebody starts out, you want to talk with somebody and he is

unemployed.

K: Yes, sir, I was listening the other day to the unemployed, they were being interviewed - they were bitter, angry, furious, for three years they haven't been employed, and they were furious about the leaders, conservative leaders, labour leaders and so on. They are not concerned about anything except employment, getting money, food, shelter, that's all they are concerned about. I think the vast world is concerned about that and nothing else.

B: Now, suppose you want to talk to this man, how would you make him concerned with something more?

K: "No," he says, "bread first, for god's sake bread first. Keep all your spiritual stuff for later when you have given me bread." I have talked to a lot of people in India and other places, it is the same problem, sir, whether bread comes first or the other thing comes first. If it is the bread then there is no solution, and we are caught in that, all of them are caught in that, the bread first. And the other is, if you can have it you are lucky. But as the vast majority of people are concerned with immediacy, how are you going to shown them anything? You can't. Therefore is it only reserved for the well-to-do who have leisure, who have certain opportunities to be alone, to look at themselves, talk about it? That seems so terribly unfair. But that is a fact. So will the leisure class, or people who have leisure, will they understand their relationship? Or they use that leisure to amuse themselves, to entertain themselves?

B: Well, it makes no difference.

K: It makes no difference, that's what I am saying. I think leisure is a marvellous thing. I think you learn infinitely more when

you have leisure.

B: Perhaps, coming back to this question of salary, you see, people who are suffering they are unemployed, they are ill, badly governed and so on, now you have said that passion is connected with sorrow, so that might be an approach.

K: But you see, will even the leisurely people, even the fairly well educated people, who are really facing the problems of life, and the problems of the world, will they have leisure enough to give their time, their energy, to say, look, let us understand the relationship of each other and go into it all. It seems so extraordinarily difficult for most people.

B: Well, yes I understand that. That's why we are saying if some people could start this might affect the others. There are people who have leisure and who are interested, but I think they do not quite see the real possibility of this. There are people who might be ready to do this but they don't see that anything is possible.

K: Yes, sir, I know.

B: Now if they could see that something is actually possible, more of them might come in.

K: So how do you help - say, for instance, help me to see that there is a possibility, there is a door open for me to escape from all this horror - not escape, sorry - to understand this whole business, how will you help me? By talking to me, by pointing out all the miseries, all the confusion, by analyzing, by seeking a cause? We have done all that.

B: That's not enough. Now we were saying that people with great energy, like Hitler, or Thomas Paine, or various other people, have had their effect on history, some good, some bad. And the

question is, is it possible that a group of us to...

K: Possible to?

B: For a group of us.

K: Oh yes, oh rather, of course, that is the only way.

B: Which will actually penetrate all this...

K: ...mess! Of course it is possible. That's what we are trying to do. In Brockwood, or any of the other places, is to gather a whole group of people who think alike - not alike, who think, who have a good understanding of relationship and go into all that. But it seems so incredibly long.

Sir, would you say, to go into another subject, would you say we are the masters of time? That we make our own time? Apart from the physical time, the inward time, the inward hope, the inward getting better, the inward idea of becoming something, all that involves time. If we could shorten the time, that is, I am violent, and I think I can get over that violence given time. And so I invent time. Whereas actually if I have no time 'what is' becomes extraordinarily important and it can be changed. But if you allow me time I am lost. I do not know if I am conveying anything.

W: Well is the following relevant here that if you take someone who has lived their whole life and not been able to in anyway develop much, and they have a few days to live, and while they are dying they suddenly - well I mean I have seen an old man recently who was dying and for the first time in his life he seemed to have a role, he was dying, and no one could take this away from him. Well now, some people would say this is very sad, but it's only for a day or two, but surely the length of time doesn't matter at all.

K: No.

W: Is this partly the kind of thing that you mean that we are always measuring things, and saying, this is important because this is bigger than that in time, but really it is the quality.

K: Can the mind stop measuring? Which means I am the past, the present and the future. I am that. And my time is tomorrow - I hope I will be happy tomorrow. So I am inventing my own time. So I am the master of my time. And if I understood this really deeply, then I would deal with 'what is' and finish with it immediately. I don't know if I am conveying something.

W: Yes, you mean you would be aware of 'what is' instead of being dominated by the thoughts about what was, or what might be in the future. So you would...

K: I would give all my energy to that.

W: To 'what is'. Yes. But then do you mean that the sorrow is a question of memory and of the past?

K: Yes, that's right.

W: And so that these memories from the past are preventing you from experiencing directly 'what is'.

K: Yes. And also if I recognize that I am the past, the present, and the future, I am all that, and whatever happens I have to deal with what is happening immediately, not postpone it, not find any excuse and all the rest of it.

And also we were talking about, at Ojai, with Dr Bohm, has man, human beings, taken a wrong turn?

W: He has always been on a wrong turn!

K: And therefore there is no way out? That is hopeless, to think in those terms is impossible.

B: Well it is the same as we were saying this morning about

knowledge. That is, knowledge is time.

K: Knowledge is time.

B: Because it's the past coming to the present making the future. It is the same, to be without time and knowledge, to end the activity of knowledge. Knowledge is not merely abstract knowledge, but it is very active, because it makes time.

K: Thought is time. Can thought come to a stop? Because thought has created all this mess, thought has invented wars, the whole thing is invented by thought.

B: Of course thought has invented all sorts of good things too.

K: Oh, of course. That goes without saying.

B: We want to say that thought comes to an end, which doesn't mean that the useful features of thought will stop.

K: No, no thought has its place.

B: But thought dominating comes to an end.

K: No, I mean thought as time coming to an end.

B: What kind of thought is left without time?

K: Emptiness.

B: Well is that thought as well?

K: No.

B: But I meant, suppose you have to think to do something.

K: There you have to think.

B: But does time come in when you have to think?

K: Yes, of course. I have a job as a surgeon, or whatever it is, and I have to think. That is necessary and right to think there. But I am questioning this whole issue of thought dominating my life.

B: Yes. Thought about oneself.

K: Thought about oneself, thought about the future, thought

about the past, thought about my family - thinking, thinking, thinking. Thought is limited, my actions are limited, and therefore more catastrophe, more misery. So I am asking myself whether thought can come to an end psychologically, inwardly, but outwardly I need to have thought? So we can put that aside. So can thought come to an end altogether? Thought is knowledge, thought is time, thought is limited, divisive, and thought has created wars, and the churches, and the things inside the churches, and temples and all the rest of it. One sees thought is very, very limited, destructive.

B: That kind of thought.

K: We have said that. So can thought come to an end inwardly? That means can the content of consciousness, which is the result of thought, can the contents be wiped out? That is fear, anxiety, agony, all the beliefs, all that is my consciousness. And that is time. And so I am asking can time, thought, come to an end? But thought as knowledge in occupation, in professions, in skill, is necessary. We don't have to go back to that, repeat over and over again.

W: But could I transpose this question you are raising to the matter of a relationship, to two people? Then does it go like this: that if thought comes to an end there is some kind of direct apprehension between the people, but the thought has come to an end in the sense that it is not dominated by thoughts of what these people did before, or what they might do in the future, but a direct apprehension of 'what is' at that instance?

K: Now sir, just a minute. My mind - one's mind, I won't say my mind - one's mind is chattering, talking endlessly, reading,

tremendously active all the time about the trivial things and the great things. I am asking as thought has its place why should I be thinking about anything. You understand my question? Why should I be thinking about my future, about my past, or about myself, why? Why this accumulation of psychological knowledge? That is really my question. Physical knowledge, knowledge to act skilfully in any field, there it is necessary. But is knowledge necessary inwardly?

W: Well it does seem to me that thought is part of a creative relationship, but it is only a component in the whole thing.

K: Yes, but is thought love?

W: No it isn't.

K: Therefore?

W: But I do wonder a little bit whether thought doesn't come into love somewhat? I mean it is bound to to some extent.

K: No. I wonder if love is thought.

W: No, certainly not.

K: Therefore is it possible to love another without thought? To love somebody means no thought. And it brings about a totally different relationship, a different action.

W: Yes, well I think there can be a great deal of thought in a loving relationship, but the thought is not the primary...

K: No, when there is love thought can be used, but not the other way round.

W: Not the other way round, yes. The one has a primacy over the other. Whereas the trouble, the basic trouble is that it tends to be the other way round, we are like computers which are being run by our programmes. I think what I was trying to do for a minute

was that if you say that we are our relationships, I was trying to transpose what you were saying about can thought come to an end, to the relationship and think what kind of relationship is there without thought. I think that was what I was trying to get clearer.

K: Just see what takes place without thought. I have a relationship with my brother or my wife, and that relationship is not based on thought but basically, deeply on love. And in that love, in that feeling, that strange feeling, why should I think at all? Love is comprehensive. And when thought comes into it it is divisive, it destroys the quality, the beauty of it.

W: But is love comprehensive, is it not all pervasive rather than comprehensive because surely love can't express itself adequately without thought.

K: Comprehensive in the sense whole. I mean love is not the opposite of hate.

W: No.

K: So in itself it has no feeling of duality.

W: I suppose love is much more a quality of the relationship, and a quality of being which pervades.

K: Yes. When thought comes into it then I remember all the things she did, or I did, the troubles, the anxieties, all those creep in. That's one of our great difficulties, we really haven't understood or felt this love which is not possessiveness, attachment, jealousy, hatred and all that.

W: Isn't love sort of largely awareness of the unity?

K: Would you say love has no awareness, it is love. It isn't that love is aware that we are all one. It's like a perfume, it is a perfume, you can't dissect the perfume, or analyse the perfume, it is

marvellous perfume. The moment you analyse it you dissipate it.

W: Yes, but I think - all right, if you say it is a perfume then it is somewhat like a quality, but then quality is associated with this sense of unity, is it not, that this is one kind of aspect.

K: But you are giving it a meaning.

W: I am talking around it! I am not trying to pin it down. But I mean, can there be love without any awareness of this unity?

K: It is much more than that.

W: All right, it is more than that. But can it exist unless that sense of unity is there?

K: Just a minute. I am a Catholic, and I love, I have compassion. Can there be compassion, love, when there is this deep rooted belief, idea, prejudice? Love must exist with freedom - not the freedom to do what I like, that is nonsense. Freedom of choice and all that has no value where we are talking about, but there must be total freedom to love.

W: Yes, well I mean, what I was going to say was, which you might say is nonsense, the Catholic might have quite a lot of love but it has limits to it in certain situations.

K: Of course. Yes, of course.

W: But it is like your point, can you have an egg which is partly bad!

K: Yes.

W: But this sense of unity is part of the whole business, is it not?

K: If we have love there is unity.

W: Yes, all right. Inevitably. That would satisfy me. I agree with you that having a sense of unity won't turn love on.

K: You see all religions and the people who are religiously minded have always turned love and devotion to a particular object, or a particular idea, a symbol. It isn't love without any hindrance to it. That's the point sir. Can love exist when there is the self? Of course not.

W: But if you say the self is a fixed image, then love can't exist with any fixed image, with anything fixed because it has no limits.

K: That's right, sir.

W: But it seems to me that in the relationship by the dialogue and a movement between two minds with no sense of limit...

K: Ah!

W: ...and necessarily outside time, because time would be putting a limit, then something new can come up.

K: But can two minds ever meet? It is like two parallel railway lines, they never meet. Is our relationship with each other as a human being, wife and husband and so on, is it always parallel, each pursuing his own line, and never actually meeting in the sense of real love for another - love even without object?

W: Yes, well in practice of course there always is some degree of preparation because...

K: Yes, that's all I am saying.

W: I mean if the relationship can be on a different level then there are no longer lines separated in space.

K: Of course. But to come to that level seems almost impossible. I am attached to my wife. I tell her, I love her. And she is attached to me. And is that love? I possess her, she possesses me, or she likes being possessed and so on, and all the complications of relationship. And I say to her, or she says to me, "I love you". And

that seems to satisfy us. And I question whether it is love at all.

W: Well it makes people feel more comfortable for a time.

K: And is comfort love?

W: I mean it is limited and when one partner dies the other is miserable.

K: The loneliness, the tears, the suffering. We really should discuss this thing. I used to know a man to whom money was god. And he had plenty of money. And when he was dying he wanted to look at all the things he possessed. And the possessions were him. He was dying to the possessions outwardly, but the outward possessions were himself. I don't know if I am... And he was frightened not of this state of coming to an end but losing that. I don't know if I am conveying it. Losing that, not losing himself and finding something new. Death - well we mustn't begin with that, death is far. Do we go into it?

W: Well could I just ask you a question about death? What about a man who is dying and wants to see all the people he has known, all his friends before he dies, is that an attachment to these relationships?

K: Yes, that is attachment. He is going to die and death is rather lonely, it is a most exclusive club, exclusive action. And in that state I want to meet all - my wife, children, grandchildren, because I know I am going to lose them all and I am going to die, end. It's a terrifying thing. The other day I saw a man who was dying. And, sir, I have never seen such fear in my life, actually absolutely fearful of anything, of ending. And I said - I knew him - so I said, what are you frightened of? He said, "I am frightened of separation from my family, from the money I have had, from the things I have

done. And this," he said, "is my family, I love them. And I scared stiff of losing them."

W: But I suppose the man might want to see all his friends and his family to say...

K: ...Goodbye, old boy. That's a different matter. We will meet on the other side!

W: Possibly.

K: I knew a man, sir, it is very interesting, he told his family, next year, in January, I am going to die on such and such a date. And on that date he invited all his friends and his family, he said, "I am dying today", and made the Will. "Please leave me". They all trooped out of the room, and he died!

W: Yes, well if the relationships with all these other people were him and he was going to die, he would just like to see them the last time, and now it is finished - 'I am finished, I die'. That was not an attachment.

K: No. Of course not. And the consequence of attachment is painful, anxious, there is a certain sense of agony, of losing.

W: Constant insecurity.

K: Insecurity.

W: Fear.

K: All the rest follows. And that I call love. I love my wife. And I know deeply inside all the travail of this attachment, but I can't let go.

W: But you still feel distressed that your wife would be sad when you died.

K: Oh, yes, that is part of game, part of the whole business. And she soon gets over it and marries somebody else, and carries on the

game.

W: Yes, one would hope so. But one could be worried and afraid of other people's sorrow.

K: Yes sir. Yes sir.

W: Presumably the acceptance of one's own death would reduce their sorrow.

K: No. Is sorrow attached to fear? I am afraid of death, I am afraid of ending my career, all the things I have accumulated both physically and inwardly, all that comes to an end. And fear then invents reincarnation and all the business. So can I really be free from the fear of death? Which means can I live with death? Don't misunderstand that. I am not committing suicide, live with it, thrilled with the ending of things - the ending of my attachment. Would my wife tolerate it if I said, "I have ended my attachment to you"?! There would be agony. So I am questioning this whole content of consciousness put there by thought, and thought predominates our lives, and I say to myself, hasn't thought its place, and only its place and nowhere else. Why should I have thought in my relationship with my friend, or with my wife, or some girl, why should I have thought about it? When somebody says, "I am thinking of you", it sounds so silly.

W: Well one often does need to think of other people for practical reasons, of course.

K: That's a different matter. But I am saying, where love is why should thought exist? Thought in relationship is destructive. It is attachment, it is possession, it is clinging to each other for comfort, for safety, for security, and all that is not love.

W: No. But as you said love can make use of thought, and there

is what you call a thoughtfulness in relationship.

K: That's a different matter, yes, yes.

W: So that thought...

K: Look: I am attached to you, I am attached to my wife, or my husband, or whatever it is, or to a piece of furniture. I love my wife in that attachment, and the consequences of that are incalculably harmful. And can I love my wife without attachment? Marvellous it is, to love somebody wanting nothing from you.

W: That's a great freedom.

K: Yes, sir, so love is freedom.

W: But what you appear to be saying is, that if there is love between husband and wife then if one dies you seem to be implying the other would not have sorrow. I think maybe that's right.

K: I think so. That's right, sir.

W: You would transcend sorrow.

K: Sorrow is thought. Sorrow is an emotion, sorrow is a shock, sorrow is a sense of loss, the feeling of losing somebody and suddenly finding yourself utterly desolated and lonely.

W: Yes. You mean a state of loneliness is contrary to nature, so to speak.

K: So if I could understand the nature of ending, ending something all the time - ending my ambition, ending my whatever it is, to end sorrow, to end fear, to end the complexity of desire. And to end it, which is death.

W: Yes, but I think the Christians used to talk about it being necessary to die everyday.

K: That's right.

W: The same idea.

K: Necessary to die everyday to everything that psychologically you have gathered.

W: And everyone agrees that death is freedom.

K: That is real freedom.

W: There is no difficulty in appreciating that. You mean you want to transpose that ultimate freedom into all one's life.

K: Yes, sir. Otherwise we are slaves. Slaves to choice, slaves to everything.

W: Not masters of time but slaves of time.

K: Slaves of time, yes.

LONDON 2ND PUBLIC TALK 6TH JUNE 1982

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We went into at some length the question of fear, whether it is possible at all to be totally and completely free of fear. We pointed out the nature and the structure of fear, the contributory causes of fear.

And we said that fear cannot be suppressed or transmuted, or escape from it. It is to be observed, and to discern that the observer is the observed, the observer is not separate from fear. The observer, who is the past, with all the accumulated knowledge, he separates himself, and thereby either suppresses fear, escapes from it, or tries to transcend it, go beyond it. All that implies conflict.

And as we human beings have lived in conflict for thousands of years, we should consider together whether it is possible entirely to eliminate fear, conflict. And that is possible only when the observer realizes he is not separate from that which he is observing, psychologically. Then that division between the observer and the observed disappears entirely. This is not just an idea, a cunning activity of thought. Observation has nothing to do with thought. To observe the whole movement of fear, the complexity of it, not come to it with any kind of motive or try to go beyond it, but just to observe it.

And it's very important, it seems, that one has to learn, if we can use that word, and learning is not a matter of time, here - to observe without the accumulated remembrances of the past. That requires a great deal of awareness, to be aware of the whole contributory causes of fear, and the consequences of fear. And observe it as it grows, as it moves.

And when there is no conflict, which can only take place when the observer realizes that which he is observing is himself, that the observer is the observed, then all energy which we have been dissipating in conflict, in trying to surmount it, go beyond it, suppress it, totally disappears. Therefore when there is the observer, which is the observed, then there is the energy which is not dissipated, which then dissolves entirely fear. This is what we were talking about yesterday.

One listens to a lot of these ideas and draws a conclusion, an abstraction of what one has heard, and that abstraction becomes a principle, an ideal, a thing to be achieved. Whereas if one listens without the abstraction taking place, just listens to the whole psychological movement of fear, not make an idea of it, but actually observe it, as one observes a marvellous mountain, you can't do anything about it, it is there. Similarly to observe this whole nature of fear. And in that observation there is no dissipation of energy. And hence the totality of that energy wipes away fear, entirely. Either we hear all this, make an abstraction, as an idea, and pursue the idea. Or without abstraction observe one's own fear, because most of us have all kinds of fears. We may have no fear at the moment, sitting here in a rather hot hall, but there is this fear, hidden or obvious. And where there is fear there is all kinds of neurotic activity. Is one aware of the whole root of fear, the conscious as well as the hidden fears deeply in the recesses of one's own psyche?

Or we just listen to these words totally unrelated to actual fear that one has. Or you listen very carefully, discover whether it is for oneself false or true. And that very denial of the false in which a

great deal of energy is wasted, then that accumulated energy, dissipates fear.

We said too, yesterday, that we'd talk about pleasure - pleasure in various forms, pleasure of possessions, pleasure in becoming something, pleasure in all the sensory responses. But to understand the nature of pleasure one must go into the nature and understand what is love. Because when one loves, if that is possible at all, pleasure has quite a different meaning. It may not be necessary at all. So we ought to, together, as we said yesterday in our conversation with each other, go into this very complex problem of what is love.

And please, this is not a sermon. We have spoilt that word, we use it in so many ways - love of climbing a mountain, sexual love, love of achievement, love of power, position, status, love of something that gives you personal enjoyment and so on. What is the difference between the thought that has created the pleasure of love and love itself? What is the nature of love, which is not desire, which we talked about briefly yesterday, and love which is not pleasure, love which is not recollection of past incidents?

So one asks, is love desire? Is love pleasure, which is the remembrance of some happy events, sensory or psychological happenings? Is the remembrance of past events, the pleasure that one derives from those events, and the cultivation of desire, is - (short gap in tape) How is one going to find out, because it seems to us, in our conversation together, without this quality, what one calls love, and the perfume of it, the reality of it, not the verbal description of it, the actuality of that state of mind, one has to really understand deeply that desire, pleasure, and remembrance

has no place at all where love is concerned. Is that at all possible?

In enquiring together into this matter one must go also into the question that the brain records every incident. It's a recording machine, like a computer, so it is mechanical. And being mechanical, it is constantly repetitive. And our conditioning is to repeat a pleasure, either it be sexual or other forms of pleasure. Can the brain register what is absolutely necessary and not register any form of psychological events? Please, this is a very serious question, because all our conditioning, the content of our consciousness, is the mechanical process of the brain which records.

And so one's life becomes mechanical. In that mechanical field, one may invent, but it's still born out of knowledge, and knowledge is incomplete, always, about anything.

So thought is born of knowledge. And so thought is always incomplete. Knowledge always lives within the shadow of ignorance. So we're always functioning within the field of knowledge, which is our conditioning. Please, if I may point out, and one hesitates to point out, please don't just listen to all this as words, as ideas, but enquire with the speaker into the nature of one's repetitive mechanical mind, neither accepting nor denying it, but closely, attentively observing it, observing your own quality of mind, of brain, how terribly conditioned it is, like the British and the French and so on. And also conditioned by the religious concepts, conditioned by the climate and so on, by tradition. And when one is enquiring into a very deep subject like love, it behoves us not to come to it with our conditioning. So can we bring order in the confused, messy consciousness? Can there be order in this

disorder of our whole way of life, our society, our culture, the language which we use, our reactions, so contradictory, and observe our consciousness with its content? Because when one observes it, there is such deep contradiction in it, wanting peace, to live a happy life, creative life, and yet doing everything opposite to that. So our consciousness is in perpetual conflict, and rather messy.

And is it possible to bring about order, because order is supreme virtue. Order is totally unrelated with disorder. Having a disordered brain, consciousness, seeking order from that disorder, is still disorder. Right, are we meeting each other - I hope. If I am confused, disorderly, messy, and I try to find order out of this confusion, that order is still disorder. Order exists only when there is total ending of disorder. That is, disorder expresses itself in conflict, in contradiction, saying one thing and doing another, thinking one thing and acting totally differently. We're such, if one may use without creating irritation, we are so, such hypocrites. And out of this disorder, we try to find order.

So can disorder end, because when there is an ending to total disorder, there is supreme order. So one has to enquire into what is disorder, how it arises. I hope you're all interested in all this. Since you're here, probably you are slightly interested in all this, not too deeply, probably it's such a lovely morning you'd like to go out and play golf. But since you are here, sitting in a hot place, uncomfortable and so on, please do consider seriously all that the speaker is saying - don't brush it off. Because the world is in complete disorder, the world is in a state of insanity, talking about peace and killing each other, talking about peace and selling

armaments. All that's going on, which we talked about briefly yesterday. It's a very serious matter, not an entertainment, our minds are used to entertainments. So please give your serious attention to all this, if you will.

What is disorder? Because where there is disorder, there can be no love, where there is fear there is no love, where there is mere search for continuity of pleasure, love cannot possibly exist. So one has to enquire, if you are at all serious and very, very honest, what is the nature of disorder, why we live in such disorder.

Is not disorder a contradiction? Is not disorder, which expresses itself in conflict, psychologically, inwardly, or outwardly, is not disorder the pursuit of an ideal? When one is confronted with the actual, is there not disorder when the future is more enticing than the present, and so on? So disorder essentially is a contradiction. That is, as we went into it yesterday, human beings are violent - that's a fact, that's a reality. At the least possible challenge or hurt or considered honour, we are ready to kill another. We've had two terrible wars and we are still pursuing wars and we are still talking about peace - it's a contradiction, utter dishonesty. And where there is conflict in relationship with each other, man, woman, with neighbour or neighbour who is thousands of miles away, where there is conflict in our relationship, there must be disorder.

To perceive that instantly, not rationalize it, discuss it, be clever about it, but to see the truth of it, immediately, that there is only the fact which is, we are violent, and not try to become non-violent. While you are trying to become non-violent, you're being violent, whereas, if we face the fact that we are violent, inherited through various centuries and inherited from the animal and so on. You

know, to see the false, see our illusions, and move away from the false, then that which is, is truth. But we have so many illusions, and these are the contributory factors of our disorder. To be aware of this whole movement of disorder, not to say, I must dissolve them, or in order to have order, but to observe it very closely, with all your energy, then that state of disorder in oneself disappears entirely. That is to put one's house in order. There is order then, and there is no contradiction. You mean what you say, exactly. There's no double talk. That means one has to be a light to oneself, not follow anybody; in the realm of the spirit, there is no authority, no intermediary between you and that reality, the truth.

But we have allowed ourselves to have intermediaries, leaders and so on. So if we understand this nature of disorder, then out of that comes, naturally, easily and sweetly, order, which is the highest form of virtue, in our action, in our thinking and so on.

And as we said, where there is disorder in ourselves and contradiction, love is not possible. I may tell my wife, if I have a wife or a girlfriend, I love you. But that's just a pleasurable expression. But love demands a great deal of enquiry. One cannot love another if you belong to any kind of group, nationality, religious adherents. There must be freedom, totally, to love. The very word 'freedom' is the expression of love, the word itself means 'love', freedom.

And without love there is no compassion - social service, doing good, being kind, tender, generous, has nothing to do with compassion, that's only part of sympathy, natural expression and so on. But compassion demands a great deal of intelligence. The intelligence of thought, which is cleverness, is not intelligence.

That supreme intelligence exists only where there is compassion, love and order.

Then we can go to the next subject: there can be no love if there is jealousy, hatred, no sense of antagonism. How can you kill another, if you really love, whether for your country, for your interest, for god or whatever it is, how can you kill another if you love. Please, this is all very serious - do consider all this, because we are living in a world which is terribly dangerous, which has become dangerous, totally insecure, and without this quality of intelligence, born of compassion and love, you cannot bring about a totally different social order.

We also should talk over whether sorrow can end, and what is the relationship between love and sorrow. Can there be love where there is suffering, both inwardly and outwardly? So we ought to talk over together whether it is possible to end suffering, this terrible burden that man has carried for millenia upon millenia. There is not only personal suffering, but the suffering of the world. Those who have been brought up without any clothes, food, or one meal a day, living in degradation, poverty, and these terrible wars. How many people have shed tears, and apparently we don't seem to learn from all this, we are still carrying on, like primitive people, barbarians killing each other. So we ought to consider what is the relationship between love and sorrow. If one loses one's brother, wife and children, if one is attached, and is attachment love? Where there is attachment there must be suffering. Attachment breeds fear, anxiety, pain, grief, sense of utter loss. And that breeds sorrow. Is it possible to love another without any kind of attachment.

And if we do not go into this matter deeply, for ourselves, talking about love has very little meaning. Perhaps some of you have heard the speaker for the last 60 years or more and we are still caught in the old tradition and the old habits of attachment and attempting to become detached, trying to struggle to be detached. Detachment leads to cynicism, cruelty; whereas if one understands the nature of attachment, and goes into it deeply and sees the consequences, then seeing that which is false, then the false drops away. One hasn't time to go more into this, because there is something more to talk over together, if you're not too tired.

We ought to talk over together a very complex problem, of what is death. Why human beings throughout the world, of whatever colour, whatever nationality, whatever race, whatever religion, are so scared of death, so frightened of it. Or you treat life as a jolly good experience, and you die and you say, I had a jolly good life. But those who are really quite serious in their intent to find out the whole meaning of death, must enquire, not only into the fear, which we went into, but also what is death - the ending. What is ending? Why is one frightened so much if things end? I will lose my brother, he's dead, he's dying. And I'm attached to him, I like him, companionship and all the rest of it, or my wife or my sister or my girlfriend. And I'm afraid of losing, afraid of being utterly lonely, facing old age without any companionship. Or being young, the same pattern is repeated, if one thinks, looks at it at all.

So what is death, what is the meaning of death, which means, the ending, the ending of everything - ending of your possessions, ending of all your remembrances, ending all your attachments, ending of all the pleasurable or unhappy habits. So we ought to

enquire, not into what is death, but rather into what is the ending of the known. Because our minds, a brain, has always functioned within the known. And when it is challenged, which is the ending of the known, which is death, it is scared, it is frightened, it shrivels up.

So is it possible to end it while living - not commit suicide, I'm not talking about that - the ending. Say, for example, the ending of attachment, attachment to one's work, to one's name, to one's family, to one's ideas and beliefs and doctrines, the ending of one's god, if one has god. The total denial, which is, the essence of death, all the known. That is death, the ending of the known is death. So can we live with death all the time. I wonder if you understand what I'm talking about.

I'm living, plenty of vitality, energy, drive, clear, but I'm attached to something, I'm attached to my reputation, sitting here and talking to them. I'm attached to that - if I am, I'm not, but suppose I am. To end that attachment for addressing large audiences right over the world, to completely, totally, without any effort, to end that sense of dependence, because that is death.

So while living, to live with this constant ending of accumulation, constant ending of every record. That requires a great deal of attention, awareness, energy. When once you perceive that, then it becomes like a river full of water that is flowing.

Also, we should discuss, talk over together, if you're not too tired, the question of religion, meditation, and if there is anything sacred. The speaker puts meditation and religion at the end of the talk, because if you talk about religion and meditation and so on at the beginning, a mind that is confused, disorderly cannot possibly

meditate - it has no meaning, it may practice all kinds of silly theories. Please don't be offended by what the speaker is saying

So we should consider what is a religious mind. Religions throughout the world have played an extraordinary part in one's life, seriously or superficially. It has become an entertainment. All the words and the symbols and the processions and the things that go on in the name of religion, are put together by thought. And thought, as we talked about the other day, yesterday and previously, is not sacred at all, it is merely a material process, born of knowledge, memory, stored in the brain.

So first to find out what is truly a religious mind, one must be free of all religious dogma, whether the Hindu, Buddhist, Christian or whatever it is, Muslim, Islamic world, entirely, totally completely free of all that. Because that's part of our conditioning. We have been programmed for two thousand years, as Christians, three to five thousand years as Hindus, Buddhists and so on. Because to find out for oneself what is a religious mind, there must be complete freedom from all orthodoxy, tradition, and all the amusements in the name of religion that goes on.

Because in those ideas, in those conceptions, the symbols, saviours, we have found security for a complex, miserable, confusing life. That's our safety escape from this. But when we have put order in our lives here now, then there is no fear, and the mind that is absolutely without a shadow of fear, psychologically, has that quality of a religious mind.

And beliefs, whether Christian belief or Buddhist, or Hindu or the belief of the Muslim - why should we have beliefs at all? Belief in God - God is the invention of thought, because god is the

ultimate security. And in the name of god we have done terrible things, burnt people, tortured people.

So one has to be free entirely of all belief and faith and dogma. Why is it that when we will talk about religious matters we are so gullible, we don't exercise, apparently, our reason, sanity, common sense. We accept everything. And scepticism and doubt is denied in the Christian world; in the Hindu and the Buddhist organization of religion, there is, doubt is encouraged, doubt is a part of virtue.

So the mind can only understand that which is religion in the sense, to find out or to come upon that which is sacred - if there is something sacred. Because technological culture cannot possibly bring about a totally global culture, religion; and that's impossible, global interrelationship of humanity, which is the only goal of all politics. And to come upon this, if there is anything sacred, which thought has not invented, meditation is necessary.

India, unfortunately, has brought this word into this western world recently. The Christian world had its own contemplative order, contemplative state of mind. The gurus and others have brought this idea of meditation. And these people have invented or brought their old tradition from Tibet, from Zen, Japan, from Burma, from India - the mischief began in India, first. That meditation means you must practise something, practise a method, practise to be silent, practise to be aware, practise the moment which is the present and so on - practise.

When you are practising something you're being repetitive, if you're playing the piano and you're practising, you may be practising the wrong note. But here you think it's necessary to practise, day after day, take a vow, being a monk, you know, the

whole business, there is no time to go into that. So we practise. The more you practise the more your brain will become dull, obviously, whether you're practising various systems of meditation, which means, your brain is becoming more and more mechanical, it's never free. And to find out or to come upon that which is nameless, timeless, sacred, there must be complete freedom, not brought about by desire, by thought, but by ending that which is not free, like attachment, like pursuit of pleasure, the self-fulfilment, self-centred activity and so on. This demands a great deal of enquiry, great deal of energy, perception, not only knowing oneself, knowing oneself not through any form of analysis, but knowing oneself through observation of one's reactions in our relationship with each other. Those reactions are really what we are. And when it reveals what we are, that revelation becomes knowledge to us, and so we accumulate more and more knowledge of ourselves. And that knowledge becomes a hindrance to freedom. Please, I haven't time to go into this, just see the truth of it quickly.

So one asks, is there a stop to thought and time? Because if there is time, that is if there is thought, the perpetual occupation, as most of us are perpetually occupied, thinking about various things, chattering, the mind is never, the brain is never quiet, but always groping, searching, remembering, hoping. Such a mind, obviously, is never quiet.

But to perceive that it is not quiet, without any direction, say it must be quiet, to perceive it, to observe it's not quiet, then it becomes extraordinarily quiet, without any compulsion, without any practice, which means one requires great sensitivity, attention, awareness. Only in that absolute silence of the mind, a silence

which is not cultivated by thought, it isn't a silence between two noises, or between two thoughts, this silence is not that. Silence demand total freedom from all self-centred activity and pursuit of pleasure and fear and so on. Only in that silence completely can there be that which is nameless.

NEW YORK UNITED NATIONS TALK TO AN INVITED AUDIENCE 11TH APRIL 1985

I am supposed to talk on World Peace beyond the 40th anniversary of the United Nations.

Mankind, man, has lived on this earth over fifty thousand years, and perhaps much longer, or for less duration. During all this long evolution man has not found peace on earth - 'pacem in terris' has been preached long before Christianity, by the ancient Hindus and the Buddhists. And during all this time man has lived in conflict, not only conflict with his neighbour but with people of his own community, with his own society, with his own family, he has fought, struggled against man for the last five thousand years, and perhaps more. Historically there have been wars practically every year. And we are still at war. I believe there are forty wars going on at the present time. And the religious hierarchy, not only the Catholics but the other groups have talked about 'pacem in terris', peace on earth, goodwill among men. It has never come about - to have peace on earth. And they have talked about peace when you die and go to heaven and you have peace there.

One wonders, if one is at all serious, why man kills another human being - in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of some ideology, or for his country - whatever that may mean - or for the king and the queen, and all the rest of that business. Probably we all know this: that man has never lived on this earth, which is being slowly destroyed, and why man cannot live at peace with another human being. Why there are separate nations, which is after all a glorified tribalism. And religions,

whether it be Christianity, Hinduism, or Buddhism, they are also at war with each other. Nations are at war, groups are at war, ideologies, whether it is the Russian, or the American, or any other category of ideologies, they are all at war with each other, conflict. And after living on this earth for so many centuries, why is it man cannot live peacefully on this marvellous earth? This question has been asked over and over again. An organization like this has been formed round that. What is the future of this particular organization? After the 40th year what lies beyond?

Time is a strange factor in life. Time is very important for all of us. And the future is, what is present. The future is now, because the present, which is also the past, modifying itself now, becomes the future. This has been the cycle of time, the path of time. And now, not beyond 40 years of this organization, but now, at the present time if there is no radical change, fundamental mutation, the future is, what is now. And that has been historically proved, and we can prove it in our daily lives.

So the question really is: whether human beings, you and us, sitting on the platform - I am sorry to be sitting up here - are human beings? And as long as we with each other, or with man and woman, are in perpetual conflict there will be no peace on this earth. One may talk about it endlessly. The Roman Catholic hierarchy talks about 'pacem in terris', and they have been also responsible for appalling wars in the past. A hundred years of war, torture, all kinds of horrible things they have done to man. These are all facts, actualities, not the speaker's wish. And religions, including Islam, Hindus, Buddhists, and so on, they have had their own kind of war. And the future beyond the 40th anniversary is

what is going on now.

One wonders if one realizes that. The present is not only the past, but also contains the future; the past modifying itself constantly through the present and projecting the future. If we don't stop quarrels, struggles, antagonism, hate, now it will be like that tomorrow. And you can stretch out that tomorrow for a thousand years, it will be still tomorrow.

So it behoves us to ask ourselves whether we, as human beings, single or a community, or in a family, whether we can live peacefully with each other? Organizations have not solved this problem. You can reorganize but war still goes on. So organizations, whether it is world organization or a particular kind of organization to bring about peace, such organizations will never succeed because human beings individually, collectively, nationally, are in conflict. Strong nations, like America or Russia, are at war with each other - economically, ideologically, and actually - not bloodshed yet. So peace cannot possibly exist on this earth if there are nationalities, which, as we said, is glorified tribalism. Nationalities give certain security, man needs security and he invests in nationalism, or in a particular ideology or belief. Beliefs, ideologies and so on, have separated man. And organizations cannot possibly bring about peace between man and man because he believes in something, he believes in certain ideologies, he believes in god and others don't.

I wonder if one has ever considered, religions based on a book - like the Koran or the Bible - become very bigoted, narrow and fundamentalist. And religions like the Hindu and the Buddhist, they have many, many books, all considered sacred, real, straight

from god's mouth! They are not so bigoted, they are tolerant, they absorb. So there is this conflict going on: those who rely, put their faith in books, and those who do not put their faith in any book. So conflict between the book and those who accept multiple books. I wonder if one is aware of all this.

And we are asking deeply, if you are serious at all, whether you and I, and those of us who are involved in organizations, can live at peace with each other? Peace requires a great deal of intelligence, not just demonstrations against a particular form of war, against a nuclear or atom bomb and so on. Those are the products of minds, brains that are entrenched in nationalism, in some particular form of belief, ideology, so they are supplying armaments - the powerful ones, whether it be Russia, America, or England or France - armaments to the rest of the world, and they also talk about peace, supplying at the same time armaments.

It is a vast cynical world and cynicism can never tolerate affection, care, love. I think we have lost that quality - quality of compassion. Not analyse what is compassion - it can be analysed very easily. You cannot analyse love, love is not within the limits of the brain, because the brain is the instrument of sensation, it is the centre of all reaction and action, and we try to find peace, love, within this limited area. Which means, thought is not love because thought is based on experience, which is limited, and on knowledge, which is always limited, whether now or in the future. So knowledge is always limited. And having knowledge, which is contained in the brain as memory, from that memory springs thought. This can be observed very simply and easily if one examines oneself, if one looks at one's own activity of thought,

experience, knowledge. You don't have to read any book, or become a specialist to understand your own way of thinking, living.

So thought is always limited, whether it is now or in the future. And we try to solve all our problems, both technological, religious, and personal, through the activity of thought. Surely thought is not love, love is not sensation or pleasure, it is not the result of desire? It is something entirely different. To come upon that love, which is compassion, which has its own intelligence, one has to understand oneself, what we are - not through analysts, but understanding our own sorrows, our own pleasures, our own beliefs.

You know wherever you go, all over the world, mankind, human beings, suffer, for various reasons, it might be petty or some very, very deep incident which has caused pain, sorrow. And every human being on this earth goes through that on a minor scale or a tremendous incident, as death. And sorrow is shared by all mankind, it is not your sorrow or mine, it is mankind's sorrow, mankind's anxiety, pain, loneliness, despair, aggressiveness. So you, and we, are the rest of humanity, we are not separate human beings psychologically. You may be a woman, or a man, you may be tall, dark, short and so on, but inwardly, psychologically, which is far more important, we are the rest of mankind. You are the rest of mankind, and so if you kill another, if you are in conflict with another, you are destroying yourself. You can observe this very, very carefully if you look at yourself without any distortion.

So there can only be peace when mankind, when you and I, have no conflict in ourselves. And you might say, "If one achieves, or comes to an end of all conflict within oneself, how will it affect

the rest of mankind?" This is a very, very old question. This has been put thousands of years before Christ, if he ever existed. And we have to ask whether in ourselves sorrow, pain and anxiety, and all that, can ever end? If one applies, looks, observes, with great attention, as you look with considerable attention when you are combing your hair, or shaving, with that quality of attention, heightened, you can observe yourself - all the nuances, subtleties. And the mirror is your relationship between human beings, in that mirror you can see yourself exactly as you are. But most of us are frightened to see what we are, and so we gradually develop resistance, guilt, and all the rest of that business. So we never ask for total freedom - not to do what you like, but to be free from choice. Where there are multiple choices there are multiple confusions.

So can we live on this earth, 'pacem in terris', with great understanding of mankind, which is to understand yourself so profoundly, not according to some psychologist, analyst. They too have to be analysed. So we can, without turning to the professionals, as simple laymen we can observe our own idiosyncracies, tendencies. Our brain - the speaker is not a specialist about brain matter - our brain has been conditioned to war, to hate, to conflict. It is conditioned through this long period of evolution, whether that brain with its cells, which contain all the memories, whether that brain can free itself from its own conditioning. You know it is very simple to answer such a question. If you have been going north all the days of your life, as humanity has been going in a particular direction, which is conflict, and somebody comes along and says, "That leads nowhere". He is

serious, and perhaps you are serious. Then he says, "Go south, go east, any other direction but that". And when you actually move away from that direction there is a mutation in the very brain cells themselves because you have broken the pattern. And that pattern must be broken now, not forty or a hundred years later.

And can human beings have the vitality, the energy, to transform themselves to civilized human beings, not killing each other?

Chairman: May we ask questions?

K: Yes, sir, ask any questions. Delighted!

Chairman: We have time for some questions and Mr Krishnamurti has kindly agreed to answer any questions you may ask. When you ask a question please raise your hand so that the sound will be connected. Thank you.

QUESTION: I am asking a question with regard to wanting a spiritual expression that I feel linked up with. Am I being heard? I don't think so. I feel there is a disconnecting sense that is being communicated to me. I would look forward to a spiritual connection to myself and fellow people in this group that would be an elevating sense. That is what I would look forward to experiencing at this lecture, a more uplifting spiritual sense of oneness, rather than an intellectual expression.

K: First of all, I don't understand the word 'spiritual'. Is it emotional, romantic, ideological, or something vague in the air; or facing actuality, what is going on now, both in ourselves and in the world? Because you are the world, you are not separate from the world. We have created this society, and we are that society. And whatever experiences one has, so-called religious and spiritual, one

must doubt those very experiences, one must question, be sceptical. I wonder if you realize that the word 'scepticism', questioning, enquiring, is not advocated in the Christian world. Whereas in Buddhism, and Hinduism, that is one of the essential things, you must question everything, until you discover or come upon that truth, which is not yours, or any others, it is truth.

And this enquiry is not intellectual. Intellect is only a part of the whole human structure. One must look at the world and oneself as an holistic being. And truth is not something to be experienced. If one may point out, who is the experiencer apart from experience? Is not the experiencer part of the experience? Otherwise he wouldn't know what experience he has had. So the experiencer is the experience; the thinker is the thought; the observer, in its psychological sense, is the observed. There is no difference. And where there is difference, separation, there comes conflict. With the end of conflict there is freedom, and only then truth can come into being. All this is not intellectual, for god's sake. This is something that one lives, and finds out.

QUESTION: You laid a great deal of stress on enquiry and scepticism. I wonder if you could tell me if faith plays a role in that too?

K: What is faith? What do you put your faith in? One has faith in some experience, one has faith in some belief, or in a symbol, and so on. Why does one have faith? Is it out of fear, out of uncertainty, out of a sense of insecurity? When you have faith, for instance as a Hindu in some symbol, and you hold on to that faith, or to that symbol, then you are at war with the rest of the world. But to enquire gently, hesitantly, questioning, asking yourself, then

out of that comes clarity. And there must be clarity to understand that which is eternal.

QUESTION: At the end you said that we need to break the pattern of conflict between man. My question to you is, do you see that as something of an evolutionary process that inevitably will happen? Or do you see it as something that we all have to work very hard to achieve? And there is an expression that goes something like this: in times of darkness the eye begins to see. And why I am throwing this at you because in a sense it is either going to happen, or it is not going to happen, but how do you see it happening?

K: I don't quite understand your question, sir.

Q: All right. You talk about breaking the pattern, man has a pattern, the brain has a pattern, and that pattern has to be broken in order for there to be peace in the world.

K: Of course.

Q: Now do you see the breaking of that pattern being an active movement, or a natural progression in the evolution of man?

K: Sir, have we evolved at all?

Q: I think we are continuously evolving.

K: So you accept evolution - psychological evolution, we are not talking about biological or technical evolution - psychological evolution. After a million years, of fifty thousand years, have we changed deeply? Aren't we very primitive, barbarous? So I am asking if you will consider whether there is psychological evolution at all? I question it. Personally, to the speaker, there is no psychological evolution: there is only the ending of sorrow, of pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair and all that. Man has lived with it

for a million years. And if we rely on time, which is thought - time and thought go together - if we rely on evolution then another thousand years or more, and we will still be barbarous.

Q: My question is: what would have to happen for there to begin to be psychological evolution as the speaker understands it?

K: What about psychological evolution? I don't quite understand the question.

Q: You have said that you do not think there has been psychological evolution. My question is: what can happen so that there will be, so that there can be, psychological evolution.

K: Madam, I am afraid we haven't understood each other. We have lived on this earth from the historical, as well as ancient enquiry, on this earth for fifty thousand years or more or less. And during that long period of evolution psychologically, inwardly, subjectively, we have remained more or less barbarous - hating each other, killing each other. And time is not going to solve that problem, which is evolution. And is it possible, we are asking, for each human being, who is the rest of the world, whether that psychological movement can stop and see something afresh?

Q: I wanted to ask you the same question phrased in a different way: what should we do in order to effect this resistance towards evolution. I just want to say one more thing. There was a Dr Bohm last month, he said the same thing you are saying in a different way, he is a scientist, he was explaining the same problem. I wonder what do you think we could we do right now in order to effect this?

K: I have got it. What could you do right now? Right? Change completely! - both psychologically and outwardly. First the

psychological revolution, not evolution, but revolution, change completely. That is the real action of humankind, not trying to fiddle around on the periphery.

QUESTION: You stated that an important condition for understanding humankind is beginning to understand ourselves clearly. Do you see that within these rooms within the next forty years, at the United Nations, that this understanding of humankind through understanding ourselves will become a part of global decision making?

K: I couldn't answer that question because I don't belong to the organization. Ask the bosses!

Q: I would like to add another note, perhaps a note of greater encouragement in my question. You indicated that organizations may not provide the answer, and you also indicated that the history of humanity would incline you to pessimism about the future or salvation. I think it depends upon the nature of the organizations and whether these are serving the interests of humanity and prepared to evolve, as the UN and many other groups evolve, and as humans evolve, provided we do not kill ourselves off and provided we can connect ourselves by the affection and respect for which our genes are also coded. There is no end to what we might do on or off this planet. And the implication there, which I share, is that we have evolved because we have the capacity for love and cooperation, and that we are not doomed because we manifest hate and fear and greed, and have succumbed in the past to iniquities like that. But by the very existence of the United Nations we have an illustration of man's capacity for growth and shared goals. I think that the present does contain the future and we by acting

energetically in the present can affect our future and our survival. Therefore I ask, what is the answer to the question you raised about when one achieves peace within oneself, how will it affect the rest of humanity, given the time limits?

K: What is the question, sir?

Q: The question was: when one achieves peace within oneself how will it affect the rest of humanity without organizational structures?

K: I explained that, forgive me, sir, I explained it. To say, if I change how will it affect mankind, the rest of the world? That is the question, isn't it, sir? Wait a minute, sir.

Q: That is the question.

K: I think if I may most respectfully point out, that is a wrong question. Change and you will see what happens. This is really a very important thing. We have to put aside all the side issues. Please do realize something tremendous: that you are the rest of mankind psychologically. You are mankind, whether you live in India, Russia, China or in America, or Europe, you are the rest of mankind, because you suffer, and everyone on this earth suffers in his own way. We share that suffering, it is not my suffering. So when you ask a question: what difference will it make if I or you change, if I may most humbly point out, it is a wrong question. You are avoiding the central issue. And we never seem to face the central issue, the central challenge that demands that we live totally differently, not as Americans, Russians, Indians, or Buddhists or Christians.

I wonder if you have realized Christians have been responsible for killing humans far more than any other religious group. Don't

get angry please! Then Islam, the Muslim world, then the Hindus and the Buddhists come much later. So if the so-called Christians, the Catholics included, about eight hundred million people, if they said, "No more wars", you will have peace on this earth. But they won't say that. It is only Buddhism, Hinduism, said, "Don't kill. If you kill" - they believe in reincarnation - you will pay next life. Therefore don't kill, don't kill the least little thing, except what you have to eat, vegetables and so on. But don't kill.' We as Brahmins weren't brought up that way, not to kill a fly, not to kill animals for your food. But all that is gone. So please we are suggesting that the central issue to stop wars is, you must stop your own antagonisms, your own conflicts, your own misery and suffering.

Why do we choose, apart from physical things - two good materials, clothes, between cars? You choose there because of their function and mileage and so on. But psychologically why do you choose at all? Why is there this choice? There is choice, you can move from one town to another, from one job to another - not in Russia, not in the tyrannical world, in the totalitarian world you are stuck in your place, you are not allowed to move - unless the bosses agree. And in this country, in a so-called democratic societies, you have a choice to do what you like. And you call that freedom - to fulfil yourself, to become a great success. You have there tremendous choice. Now we are talking about choice in the psychological field. If you see things very clearly there is no choice. It is unfortunate that we don't see things clearly. We don't see clearly that nationalism is one of the causes of war. We don't clearly see that ideologies breed wars, whether it is the Marxist ideologies, or Lenin, or our own particular form of ideologies. So

we choose from one ideology to another, one religion to another, one group to another, and we think we are free. On the contrary, it shows confusion. And when we are confused we act in confusion, therefore multiply confusion, as the politicians are doing - forgive me.

Q: We have a written question here for Mr Krishnamurti. Do you believe in the so-called realized soul?

K: Do you believe in so-called realized souls? I don't know what it means. Just a minute, sir.

QUESTION: I'm sorry right now you are talking from a public forum and once this lecture is over probably you will return to a privacy that probably you cherish greatly. So there is for most human beings in this world a division between public life and private life. Could you comment on this division? Do you feel it leads to conflict, is it necessary?

K: Between public life and private life? Is that the question? Why do you separate this? Why do we separate public life as though something outside, and private life? If one lived correctly, precisely, not intellectually, but holistically, then there is no outward life and private life. Holistically, that is to live as a whole human being, not as a sectarian, not as an individual, not as a petty little mind, brain active in our self interest. Sorry if I am emphatic. Is that finished, sir?

Chairman: There are two more questions.

QUESTION: If you are living peacefully and the tyrant attacks, do you not defend?

K: What will you do then? If you live peacefully and a tyrant or a robber attacks you, what will you do? That is the question. Do

you live peacefully for a day or two? Or you live peacefully all your life? If you have lived peacefully for many years then you will do the right thing when you are attacked.

Sirs, the speaker has been at this talking for the last sixty years, and more - all over the world except behind the Iron Curtain, before the war he was all over Europe - and these questions have been put to the speaker for sixty years. The same pattern is being repeated by the young generation, by a civilization that is recent like America, the same questions, with the same intention, to trap the speaker, or to really understand the speaker, or to understand themselves. And if you have the misfortune or the fortune to have talked for sixty years you will know all the answers and all the questions. There is no difference between question and answer. If you understand the question really deeply the answer is in the question.

Chairman: Mr Robert Miller would like to ask a question.

QUESTION: Well it is not to ask a question, it is to congratulate you for your statement. And to confirm that having lived in this organization for almost forty years and having lived more than sixty years, I have come to the same conclusion as you. We are all being programmed, we are being programmed into a nation, into an ideology, into a religion. And all these are fragmented human beings. It took me forty years to be in this house to be de-programmed from the two or three nationalities imposed on me, each time I got also a gun to shoot at the other direction. And it is here that after having seen the world in its totality and humanity in its totality that I have come to the conclusion that it is more important to be a human being than to be

a Jew, or a Catholic or a Frenchman, or a Russian, or a white, or a black.

K: Quite right.

Q: And in my book I will not kill under any reason, or for any nation, or for any religion, or for any ideology. This is the conclusion which is also yours.

K: Is it a conclusion, sir? Or an actuality?

Q: That is my actuality.

K: That's right. Not a conclusion.

Q: I am not arguing about religions but will remind that, 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' is not exactly a Christian precept. On the contrary, Christ thought the peaceful way was to care for your fellow human beings, have compassion and love for one another. But I would like to know how to break this pattern of confrontation among human beings. I am not talking about States because States are formed by human beings and governments too, they are human beings that rule the countries. How can we break this pattern? How is it that mankind has not been able to practise such glowing thoughts as those that Christ wrote to us and were written also by all religions? I would like very much to see if we could find a formula, a solution to break that terrible pattern of confrontation, and hate even between families, as Krishnamurti has pointed out because it is not just war among nations, there is always a confrontation, even among children you see one is with Mama and the other one wants to be there. That pattern, how could we break it?

K: May I answer your question? We are programmed, like computers - we are Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists and so on. As

Mr (?) pointed out, we are conditioned. Do we realize, or see actually, actually, not theoretically, or ideologically, but actually see that we are programmed? Or is it just a casual statement? If you are actually programmed do you realize the consequences of being programmed? One of the consequences has been hatred, or war, or separating yourself from others. If one realizes that you are being programmed, pressurized, preached at, and if one really sees that, you abandon it, you don't want a formula for it. The moment you have a formula then you are caught in it. Then you become programmed again because you have your programme and the other fellow gives you another programme. So what is important is to realize the actuality of being programmed, not intellectually, with all your blood, energy.

Chairman: Because of the time element we will not be able to entertain any more questions. On behalf of the Pacem in Terris Society and the Movement for a Better World, we would like to thank our honoured guest speaker and Brother Fellow and Ambassador Barry who are the Honorary Presidents of the Society, and all of you who came to attend the lecture today.

I have a very simple ceremony before you leave. Mr Krishnamurti was here last year on the 17th April, just about the time we had the Pacem in Terris day. And this year we were very fortunate to have on the twenty second anniversary of the Pacem in Terris , and you have already heard about it. On behalf of the Pacem in Terris Society at the United Nations, we have the honour of presenting you, Mr Krishnamurti, the World Teacher, with the United Nations 1984 Peace medal.